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CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I call this August 22nd, 2012, meeting of Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority to order. Let the record reflect that all members are present, with the exception right now of Mr. Rael.

Let's go ahead and begin with a silent invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, which will be led by Councillor Garduno.

(Whereupon, there was a moment of silence.)

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councillor Garduno.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you Councillor Garduno.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. I make a motion to prove the June 20th, 2012, minutes.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a second. Any questions?

Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no.

That carries unanimously.

(6-0 vote. Agenda Item 3 approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next we have proclamations...
and awards, the quarterly employee awards. The first recipient will be Margie Ulibarri.

You want to come up?

Margie is the top customer care representative for the customer service division for the third and fourth quarters of FY 2012. Margie answered a total of 6,756 inbound calls, with less than 3 percent abandon rate. She has assisted 747 customers in this last month.

Congratulations, and you will be receiving a check for $250. Thank you.

The next recipient is Leon Torres. He will be receiving a check for $500. Is Leon here. It states here Leon started off in customer service and transferred to operations. Leon attained his Water Level I within one year of being hired. Leon has caught on very quickly to our advanced treatment process and he volunteers to come in on his days off and work late. He has recently stepped up to work in the control room to cover vacancies.

Congratulations, Leon Torres.

The next recipient is Jeremy Saenz, who is here. Congratulations. He will be also receiving a $500 taxable check. Jeremy is the Utility Technician II, working the groundwater plant division. Jeremy
took on the challenge or starting a facility roof inspection and repair program. This project is currently still being worked on. Jeremy has made repairs to 25 facilities throughout the water utility authority. Repairs range from simple leakage repairs to applying roof singles, paper and tarring the roof, adding roof fence, gutters and roof jacks. Having the ability to do in-house is a huge advantage to the water utility authority.

Thank you very much for all your service. Please come on up.

The next item on the agenda is public comment. Ms. Jenkins, how many individuals do we have signed up to speak?

MS. JENKINS: We have 12.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have 12 individuals. You will have two minutes to speak, with a warning bell at one and a half minutes. Would your please go ahead and proceed.

MS. JENKINS: Colonel Jeff Lanning, followed by Joe Wechsler.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: And those individuals that are here, we apologize for the construction work that is being conducted here. But I think there's still some seating here in the front, so once your name has
been called, if you can please come to the front.

Welcome, sir.

COLONEL LANNING: Thank you, chairman Sanchez, Councillors and Commissioners. I thought it was important for me to come down here today. You've all met Colonel Don Conley. His time at Kirtland Air Force Base has come to an end and he's moved on to his next assignment in the Air Force, I'm the mission support group commander that's following in his footsteps. And I thought it was important, since the Air Force members change out from time to time that it's important for you to see the new face of the mission support group and for me to come down here and introduce myself.

So Colonel Jeff Lanning. I'm coming here from the Pentagon. I've been stationed in Albuquerque before and so it's nice to be back in the southwest and away from the Pentagon.

I also thought it was important for me to let you know my personal commitment to working on the bulk fuel facility, the fuel spill that we have, and working on the remediation of that fuel flume. It's a personal responsibility that I have and a commitment that I have to do that during my time here at Kirtland Air Force Base.
More importantly is to reaffirm the Air Force's commitment and to declare to you all here once again that the Air Force takes ownership of this fuel plume and that we are committed to the remediation of that fuel plume and to working together with the City of Albuquerque and the County of Bernalillo and water utility authority to ensure safe drinking water for the City of Albuquerque.

So we are committed to doing that. I look forward personally to working with you and for the Air Force base and we work with you to develop contingency plans in the unlikely event that we actually get any of the constituents that show up in the drinking water.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And, Colonel Lanning, thank you for coming down here today. It means a lot to us for you to reach out to us in your new assignment so we don't have to come hunt you down or get to know you in some other less favorable venue. And so it means a lot to me, and I think I speak for the board. Thank you for being here this evening.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.
COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Colonel Lanning, thank you for taking over what is, I'm sure, a really tough situation. It's tough because it's so unknowable. And one of the things that we've been wanting to get, of course, is to a point where all of us, the community, the Air Force and everyone feels comfortable enough to say that we are well on our way to remediating what has happened.

We're not there, but, again, thank you, as commissioners have said, for being forthright and for taking it on. We plan to work with you, but on the other hand, we also hope to make sure that any agreements that we have are agreements that are beneficial to the constituents that we serve. But thank you again for being here.

COLONEL LANNING: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Colonel. Appreciate your time and coming down.

Next.

MS. JENKINS: Joseph Wechsler, followed by Janet Greenwald.

MR. WECHSLER: Good evening. My name is Joe Wechsler. I'm a registered engineer here in New Mexico. You've seen me before. I can't pull a Danny
Kaye stunt. Remember Danny Kaye? He could tell you the history of Europe in two minutes. I can't do that.

But I got some big news for you. I did some studies on the water injection. Started out as a cost analysis of water injection that's being proposed by the water authority. Well, I came up with some big news, that the present situation at Abiquiu Reservoir is costing the water authority -- it did, in 19 -- in 2011, it cost 13,200 acre feet lost to evaporation. In 2010 it 14,400 acre feet lost to evaporation.

That's too much to stay in the San Juan Chama system.

In addition, cost -- quick -- not so quick cost analysis. One of the big things I turned up is repurifying the water that you're pulling up from down below. At 5,000 acre feet a year, the cost is quite high. Purification, if my numbers -- it's quite -- I might have made a mistake, but I come close to $30 million to purify ten -- 5,000 acre feet of water. That can be -- that overshadows your pumping costs, it overshadows every last aspect of that project. And in addition to the loss of evaporation of 13,000 acre feet a year on present average comes to close to $38 million a year.

This has got to be done in detail by your
people before anything can be done in this area. And I definitely would like to see the results of their calculations.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Janet Greenwald, followed by Floy Barrett.

MS. GREENWALD: Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I'm Janet Greenwald. I'm co-coordinator of Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive dumping and a member of Aqua Es Vida Action Team and on the aquifer working group.

I haven't prepared anything to say, I was in another meeting all day, but I'm just speaking from my heart here. I feel that in a certain way that you, this board, are like the knights of the roundtable when it comes to protecting our water. And it seems that our aquifer is under assault in a number of different ways.

We all know about the Kirtland aviation fuel spill. And we are learning about the spill from Sandia National Labs at the site of the Tijeras Arroyo which now is just a quarter mile from the Eubank well field.

So tonight I know that both of those issues
are on your agenda, and I just wanted to let you know
that we're counting on you to protect our water,
especially for the very vulnerable people among us,
the fetus and the young child. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Ms. Greenwald.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Floy Barrett, followed by Judy Cowell.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: She still hasn't arrived. We haven't seen Floy yet; she's coming.

Judy Cowell followed by Carol Benson.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Welcome.

MS. COWELL: Thank you. I'm Judy Cowell. It's nice to see the handicap accessibility plan in action here.

I just would like to say a few words, don't need the whole two minutes. One, I sure hope that Kirtland Air Force Base and the military facility that is using -- takes orders, that the order is given and that really gets into motion at a very much faster rate, because it has been a problem now for almost 14 years and a lot has been said and work needs to be done.

On Sandia National Labs, there are a lot of brilliant people working at Sandia National Labs. And
I know one of the problems that they've stated about cleaning up the mixed-waste landfill and the other radioactive chemicals that have been dumped on the land up there is that it's too toxic for people to go in there and deal with it. But they apparently helped with the development of robots to go to Mars, and I am suggesting that they develop robots to clean up the mess here.

And then finally, I just want to say, I've learned this word, trichloroethylene, it's one of the many contaminants that we're dealing with it, and it's associated Parkinson's disease and other organ -- very serious illnesses. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Carol Benson, followed by Michael Jenson.

MS. BENSON: I'm afraid I also didn't have time to prepare anything, but I just want to thank you so much for giving us a chance to be here and tell you what we are about.

I'm a member of AVAT and we're so very concerned about the many threats to our water that have come to light. We hope that now those of you who have some power will be able to secure the kind of
funds that are going to be needed for this project with the mixed-waste landfill, particularly. And we hope that you'll raise an alarm now and get the remediation started. Because it seems to us that it's kind of like the Congress putting everything off to another committee to study things; that no remediation is getting started soon enough. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

MS. JENKINS: Michael Jenson, followed by Bob Alley.

MR. JENSON: My name is Michael Jenson. There are a number of things I want to comment on on the agenda today. You've got a really full one. Item C-12-18 customer advisory committee. There are three people up for reappointment. One of them didn't attend a single meeting last year. The other two didn't attend at least half of the meetings. You can say that about almost all of the members of the customer advisory committee.

There are statutory requirements that require people to attend or be replaced, so I fail to see why somebody who didn't go to a single meeting is actually up for reappointment. And I think that needs to be addressed if we're going to have a really functioning and valuable customer advisory committee.
I urge you to support the water protection advisory board's request to you to ask the New Mexico congressional delegation to support increased funding for Sandia's environmental management and cleanup.

I read the customer opinion survey results and three things jumped out at me. Customers want a sustainable supply, infrastructure replacement and repair, better water quality going into the river, more enforcement and a number of other things, but they seem resistant to paying for it. So you all have your work cut out for you to educate them on the connection between things they want and how we get there. I don't envy you.

There's going to be a report on drought and water use and you'll see that Bernalillo County continues to be in a severe drought. The seasonal drought outlook is for persistent and intensifying drought in the county and most of the state. And water production, congratulations to Katherine, is slightly down but essentially lie flat over the last three years. So, I mean, that's a good thing, but if we're going to get to things like the sustainable water supply when it appears that the water utility authority has already reached the limits of the river -- the conservancy district just dinged you all for
pumping -- I mean, for diverting water that didn't exist in the river. That's also something that needs to be dealt with. And if you need clarification on anything, I can answer questions.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Mr. Jenson. I think that Councillor Garduno has a question.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Chair, thank you.

Mr. Jenson, are you saying that some of the members of the board or --

MR. JENSON: Of the customer advisory committee.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And the meetings, were there meetings held?

MR. JENSON: No, they did not -- well, first of all, there were only seven meetings out of a possible 12 I think in the past year. And I'm not sure, I need to go back and look, but one or two of those might not have even actually met due to the lack of a quorum, even though they were scheduled.

But this one individual in particular didn't attend a single meeting. And there are statutory requirements for attending meetings. I know that back in 2009, Gabe Nimms, who was on the CAC at the time as a public interest advocate, you know, asked to be taken off the CAC because he couldn't come to the meetings. So there is some precedent for people
actually taking responsibility for, you know, what
they're supposed to be doing.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: So your concern is that
we're not --

MR. JENSON: Well, why is somebody being
reappointed who didn't go to a single meeting? I
mean, can't you find somebody else to take that
person's place and maybe urge the other CAC members to
like step up their game a little bit.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno, we can
discuss that further. That agenda item will be coming
up this evening.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Yeah, I think we are going
to. Thank you.

MR. JENSON: Might I just add one thing? There
are members of the public who've attended more
meetings than the CAC representatives.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you. Appreciate it.

MS. JENKINS: Bob Alley, followed by Elaine
Hebbard.

MR. ALLEY: Thank you for the opportunity to
speak. I don't know how many people are aware, but in
1957 there was a hydrogen bomb dropped about three
miles south of the international airport that created
an explosion. There was no nuclear pit in the bomb,
but it threw plutonium out for a radius of one to two miles, and that's the same place that the new housing subdivision is going down there. They're going to make that area into a park so that the children are playing with the plutonium.

And I think when it comes to all the issues that are going on at Sandia and Kirtland, you have the mixed-waste landfill, which is full all kinds of radioactive that hazardous materials that's never been cleaned up, you have a nuclear reactor that's not properly protected, the question to you is: Do you stand with the people of Albuquerque or do you stand with the military industrial complex?

Over 50 percent of this country's budget goes to the military industrial complex, so I would suggest that you hold out and hold their feet to the fire and you get everything to clean this up.

You know, people aren't going to be able to sell their houses there with this carcinogenic fuel spill underneath their property. It's not going to happen. And what happens when it gets to the city wells and we run out of water?

We have a major problem gentlemen. Do you stand with the military industrial complex or do you stand with the people? We will know what you do.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Mr. Alley.

MS. JENKINS: Elaine Hebbard, followed by Dave McCoy.

MS. HEBBARD: Hello. My name is Elaine Hebbard. Clearly there are a lot of issues that are in front of you, so in my two minutes I'm going to limit it to the CAC appointments, the customer advisory committee. Resolution R-206-27 created the CAC and it says that they may be removed for any of the following reasons:

- The member has an absent for more than two meetings unless -- consecutive meetings, unless the absence is excused by the chair; or the member has been absent, whether accused or not, for more than 50 percent of the meetings during any of the consecutive four-month period.

I suggest that actually if that were strictly applied, most, if not all, of the members of the CAC would have to be removed. That's not exactly what I'm here to do, to ask for today. My question is, as Mr. Jenson is, though, why should people who have failed to come to earlier meetings consistently be reappointed?

Furthermore, this board is in need of good advice, not just from staff but from the various
members throughout the community, from a broad-based set of people. So when a meeting is not held in the last 13 months -- there could have been 13 meetings, there were seven. One of them at least did not have a quorum. The other one may have not been called because of lack of a quorum. But this board needs those kinds of advice on water -- well, water quality is handled through the water protection advisory board, which has a separate agenda of making ability.

So there's so many reasons that I think the board needs to ask that the CAC -- or legislation be renewed. So I would suggest that rather than reappointing the folks tonight, who's -- actually their terms ended last April, form a subcommittee, look at the CAC legislation, maybe make some suggestions, such as looking at the Denver model, come back in a month with those suggestions in the terms of a recommendation or a resolution and hold a meeting for public input. Thank you very much. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Next speaker. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Chair, I just --

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I know that we're going to
discuss this when it comes us, but it concerns me that I heard you and I think Mr. Jenson say that the public -- folks from the public attend more often than board members.

MS. HEBBARD: That's the truth, yes.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: We'll discuss more later.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Councillor Garduno. Thank you.

MS. JENKINS: Dave McCoy, followed by Paul Robinson.

MR. MCCOY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members. My name is Dave McCoy, Citizen Action. It's good to see the water utility moving forward with some ideas for remediation funding and that sort of thing.

I've been reviewing reports from the fourth quarter submitted by Shaw, and specifically Appendix F. It's very disappointing to see that's happening with the sampling, you know, samples that were supposed to be put on ice, immediately shipped overnight. Five days before they arrive at the laboratory, oftentimes two to three weeks before they're looked at, analyzed. These are volatile organic compounds. Those are supposed to be looked at immediately according to EPA protocol. They're not
being followed. Kevlar bags with fixed air samples, they're only supposed to be good for 48 hours, they're arriving, being looked at -- in fact, not being looked at because they say that they can't be examined after 48 hours. Samples that arrive with the seals broken, samples arriving in a cooler that is not between 0 and 6 degrees centigrade, very disappointing.

The only way the public knows or the people on this board whether or not -- what the status is is by monitoring. If you don't know -- if you don't have good sampling, you don't have good monitoring and you don't know what's happening, and it does a lot to public anxiety about this spill when you don't even have monitoring wells out by the municipal wells. So I hope that the upcoming resolutions in combination will address that.

The other concern very briefly is it's --

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Mr. McCoy, your time is up. Thank you.

MR. MCCOY: Okay. Any questions?

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. McCoy, I know that you're concerned about the way it's progressing, but is there something that's being done now that you
I think will be a better system, something that's being proposed, the bio mass -- and I don't know --

MR. MCCOY: Remediation?

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Right. Is that something that you're concerned about?

MR. MCCOY: Well, I haven't seen any data to justify the statements that are being made about bioremediation. And I haven't seen much in the way of soil vapor extraction. And now that the bulk of the LNAPL liquid jet fuel is trapped beneath the water table, as has been reported since the third quarter, soil evaporation is not going to work in its present formulation for that. And this aquifer is in deep trouble.

And Shaw and the Air Force need -- and New Mexico Environment Department, for that matter, need to stop touting this soil vapor evaporation as the end-all solution. It is not going to happen that way, not the way it's set up and not with the problem of the LNAPL being trapped beneath the water table.

There needs to be some real scientific expertise brought from a national level to look at this situation. Perhaps the EPA Kerr Laboratory and some of its experts. This should be a boots-on-the-ground defense of our aquifer, and it's
not happening. If you look at the type of treatment that was done at other Air Force facilities around the country, it's been unsuccessful.

Just recently in New York, you know, they signed off with a no further action for an air force base there. Then they recently rediscovered that the community's water is being contaminated. So there's a very poor success rate. And you've got the biggest spill in the nation, so it's going to require the largest response in the nation, and that's not happening here. You've got only four soil vapor evaporation wells operating, if you want to look at that.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I'm going to ask you to hold your comments. We've given you some additional time. We really appreciate your time.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Paul Robinson, followed by Susan Rodriguez.

MR. MCCOY: I'm going to have to go across the street. There's a trial going on there and I'm involved in that. I'm sorry I have to leave.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: No problem thank you.

MR. ROBINSON: Good evening. My name is Paul Robinson, I'm research director at Southwest Research
and Information Center. I want to address the Items R-12-13 and R-12-14, as well as the other business, water protection advisory board presentation.

These are the items that address Kirtland and Sandia, and I encourage you to take as strong an action as you can related to establishing a goal of accelerating an investigation of cleanup at Kirtland, which I hope is the goal of the two Kirtland resolutions, 13 and 14.

But I also want to address the Sandia presentation from the board. The board is recommending that the authority write Sandia to encourage them to invest heavier in environmental remediation in order to also accelerate that investigation and remediation of sites that are affected by Sandia sources.

These are both very important actions and these are among the first actions that elected officials in Albuquerque and Bernalillo County will be taking in terms engaging these agencies on the shared resource that needs to be protected and is suffering at these various sites.

A number of the commissioners have requested that the aquifer be returned to its original condition, which is a much higher standard than the
environmental department generally seeks to obtain because it's standard based. Trying to accelerate the remediation investigation beyond what the environment department thinks is reasonable, there's also a way to find out more, spend money in a way that hopefully will reduce the long term cost, because both of these sites are going to have decades of remediation left.

 Again, thank you very much for your time.

 CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you for coming down, Mr. Robinson.

 Next speakers.

 MS. JENKINS: Susan Rodriguez, followed by Floy Barrett.

 MS. RODRIGUEZ: Good evening. I am Susan Rodriguez, and I've been a 24-year resident and I've raised a child here. My husband is retired from the state engineer's office. And I'm a very concerned citizen.

 I am active on AVAT, Aqua es Vida Action Team and Citizens Action. Now, I don't know how much you know or you care to know or even want to believe, but this isn't a matter or their facts and our facts. You really have to pay attention to this because this is -- we trust you, we have to trust you. You're on the board, you have a job to do, and you have to get
this beginning to start to get them the clean up at least -- and I just found out there's a nuclear reactor over there at Sandia, so I have a problem with that.

But right now, it's a mixed-waste dump where Mesa del Sol and the -- I understood that the Realtors were aware of it but now it's been quite, so they are really -- it's just dishonest not to tell the people what's going on unless you guys don't believe it or don't want to, but if I knew that was going on there and I was buying a house there, I would stop it right away. It's absolutely outrageous that we would be building homes there and not telling people what's going on within, what, three miles, ten miles.

Sandia has been dumping very dangerous water, water that's contaminated, for the many years they've been there. Then we have the Kirtland spill, which is another, I mean, outrageous situation. You know, just one thing on top of another. I teach my child when you have a problem, deal with it now, because soon there's going to be another one.

And we're all adults here and this is what's going on. It's one problem after another, and this is our aquifer, this is our drinking water, this is the town we love, and I really hope that you would --
don't care what your politics are. You know it's --
this shouldn't be a matter of politics. It's a matter
of human safety and the future of our city. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Ms. Rodriguez.

Next speakers.

MS. JENKINS: Floy Barrett.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Floy Barrett.

Okay. That concludes the public hearing.

Next we will move on to announcements and
communications. Item A is the next scheduled meeting.
It's September 19th of 2012 at 5:00 p.m. in the
Vincent E. Griego Chambers.

And Item B is -- Item 10A has been deferred
until the September meeting.

There are no introductions tonight. The
next item on the agenda is the approval of the consent
agenda. Board members, you may request that any of
these consent agenda items be removed from the consent
agenda.

I move approval of the consent agenda.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a
second. Any questions?

Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by
saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DE LA CRUZ: Opposed, no?

That carries unanimously.

(7-0 vote. Agenda Item 8 approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next item is Item 9, the approvals, that's Item A, WUA Floor Substitute R-12-13.

Commissioner De La Cruz.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would move adoption. First that the original item be replaced with this one. And if it's so accepted, that it be deferred for 60 days.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. You have a motion and a second.

Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My confusion arises from the fact that this is a floor substitute for R-12-13 and at the very last sentence, it eludes to the fact -- and I've had a conversation about this, but it eludes to the fact that Commissioner De La Cruz and Councillor Garduno have worked together on this resolution. And that's just not true.

I have had no part in this. It is not a
floor substitute that I would support. So I'm not sure why this has been proffered or even moved forward. In fact, the important part of it is already not true.

I'd like to have an explanation as to why this happened and why this is being moved forward as if it were a done deal.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Again, Councillor Garduno, this is a bill of Commissioner De La Cruz's, but I think he's requesting a deferral.

Also, do you want to explain your position.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: I think staff did that inadvertently, so I'll Mr. Sanchez talk about that.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to Councillor Garduno. I think it was a poor choice of words. If you recall at the last meeting, Commissioner De La Cruz and Councillor Garduno each presented separate resolutions, and during that discussion collectively decided or agreed upon merging those two efforts. It was simply a staff effort at merging those two, and in the staff report, it made mention of working together when it should have reflected had agreed to substitute the resolutions with one. So I apologize to Councillor Garduno.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.
COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Not notwithstanding that, and I accept the apology, I know that things happen sometimes when you're trying to do good work and things get mixed up, however, this is the floor substitute to R-12-13.

What I remember and I think we have a copy of the minutes, what I remember was a discussion that there would be an attempt or some kind of meeting of the mind on the part of both the commissioner and councillor to see if either or both of the R-12-13 and R-12-14 could be assuaged so that they would be one or at least come together with the many citations that would satisfy both attempts to get at what we were trying to accomplish. That never happened.

So this has nothing to do with R-12-14 and I guess everything to do with R-12-13. And if the commissioner is willing to move that forward, that's his prerogative, but it's not a floor substitute for R-12-14.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: And also, Commissioner De La Cruz, on this, do you want to just defer R-12-13 without the floor substitute and because we haven't voted on the bill with the floor sub yet.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Well I don't want to confuse the notion that this would be a replacement
for at least my original resolution, but the deferral
is not so much for the item itself as the enactment of
it officially. So I'm open and flexible.

Executive Director, if I might ask, can we,
by the rules, adopt the item and at the same time no
enact? I want to make sure that we're clear about
that.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner De La
Cruz, if your question is can you approve a floor
substitute and defer it without approving it entirely,
the answer is yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, might I point
out that a simple amendment even to this floor subject
dictating the enactment, because I think the major
meat of this is enabling Mr. Sanchez to negotiate with
Kirtland Air Force Base regarding this issue, if we
just put an enactment time in, say, Section 6 or date
at the end as an amendment, that would solve all of
the problems and be very clear without a deferral.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: What I'd like to do,
Commissioner De La Cruz, is first make a motion to
adopt R-12-13, and then we'll go ahead and have a
second motion for the floor substitute.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. So moved.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a second.

And now do you want to move the floor sub?

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a second to adopt Floor Substitute WUA -- Floor Substitute R-12-13.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Maybe staff could make clear what it is this floor substitute that is not in Councillor Garduno's proposal. That would be helpful in making this decision whether we are to do the substitute or not.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hart Stebbins, I'm going to have Rick Shean discuss that since he drafted this document.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Go ahead and proceed.

MR. SHEEN: Good evening. Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Stebbins, sort of the missing elements, one, the floor substitute for 12 was trying to also -- for 12-13 was pulling the seriousness and the tone I
1 think from both resolutions.
2 Some of the elements in dealing with soil
3 vapor extraction, items that the water utility
4 authority is not directly involved with, although
5 only, you know, we're obviously monitoring what's
6 being proposed for cleanup and the progress of it, it
7 was taking, you know, the concept of noting that there
8 was a threat to the production wells, that there was a
9 need to coordinate with Kirtland Air Force Base on the
10 implementation planning and the actual implementation
11 of the contingency plan, and finding a source for the
12 funding for this. And it was the intent of this -- of
13 the resolution to revise an MOA that we have an
14 existing -- that they already reimburse us for cost of
15 monthly compliance sampling, you know, at ten of our
16 wells, the Burton and the Ridgecrest wells.
17
18 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you, Rick.
19 So this floor substitute authorizes the executive
20 director to enter into an agreement with the Air
21 Force. And is there a time frame set on that, or that
22 is just at the convenience of the two parties?
23
24 MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
25 Stebbins, I think that's one of the reasons to defer
26 this. My hope is that within 60 days we can go to the
27 Air Force and hammer out some agreement that we could
bring back to the board to attach to this or some
resolution. So I think this is of such importance
that you should not just delegate it to me. You
should be aware of what it contains and adopt it as
part of a resolution. So that would be my
expectation.

And I've talked to Colonel Kubinick and he
thinks 60, 90 days might be realistic.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you. Because
I just have a question about Section 4, which
authorizes you to enter into an agreement but it does
not specify that that agreement has to come back to us
for approval. Is that something that we need to
either amend this to accomplish, or is that I don't
see anything that directs you to bring it back to us.

MR. SANCHEZ: That's up to the board. You have
my word that I would not enter into an agreement
without your approval.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Great.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno and then
Commissioner De La Cruz.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I guess to further explain my position,
this is a floor substitute for R-12-13, has nothing to
do with R-12-14. Notwithstanding the attempt to
incorporate some of the verbiage and some of the
sentiment that is in R-12-14, there is quite a bit
that has been missed.

I'd be glad to read the numerous items that
were if not deleted, certainly not enjoined in the 13
floor substitute.

There is nothing in the floor substitute
that talks about the extraction technology that could
be researched and brought forward. There's nothing in
Floor Substitute 13 that talks about the poor
understanding of the size and depth and rate of
expansion of the LNAPL. There's nothing that
references that there should be an approved
containment plan. There's no remediation plan or
ongoing effort to remove to the liquid portion of the
jet fuel, the LNAPL. There's nothing and no mention
about the full size of the dissolved EDB contaminant
to the plume, and no monitoring wells close to the
city wells.

There's also no mention of water utility
authority being the authority that the Air Force
should be working with because they are the
governmental entity that has the most jurisdiction
over water. Then in the section for -- the resolve
section, Floor Substitute 13 speaks in no way to the protection of health, public health, or the environment of the city. It says nothing about the water utility authority acting immediately to enter into negotiations with the Air Force. It talks about a memorandum of understanding that is extant, that's going on right now, so it doesn't change anything there. So there's nothing to do and his has nothing to do with negotiations entering into emergency measures if something were to happen at any one of the wells that the city or the water authority has control over.

It mentions nothing about Albuquerque's drinking water resource and the protection thereof. There's nothing in there about groundwater monitoring as close as possible to the Ridgecrest municipal wells. There's nothing, again, as I said, about the technologies installation of water treatment facilities for the wells, including financial assurance. It talks about paying for the tests but nothing about wellhead costs that could be, you know, not only extra, it would be astronomical.

It talks not at all an about the expansion or the further movement of the LNAPL, which we don't know the size of right now and it's trapped under
groundwater because of the recent rains. And the plan
to implement aviation technologies is not addressed at
all in Floor Substitute R-12-13.

So I reject that R-12-14 has been in any way
incorporated with R -- or Floor Substitute R-12-13.

In fact, if anything, much has been excluded.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Commissioner De La Cruz and
then CAO, Mr. Perry.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

This document and the resolution is not
intended to be a technical paper on this matter. It
is a resolution. It isn't an ordinance. It isn't law
and typically would not have a level of detail, but it
strives to embody the spirit of the intent and to give
some direction at the same time to staff.

What the resolution would also intend to do
is to have staff move forward in creating an agreement
rather than a memorandum of understanding, which I
think is a lessor activity. And so I hope,

Councillors and Commissioners, that you agree with the
spirit of the intent and allow at the same time for
staff to work with the Air Force so that we can move
forward with getting this job done.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Mr. Perry.

MR. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with Commissioner De La Cruz's assessment of the proposed legislation, R-12-13. I see it and always have seen it as his attempt to have the water utility authority engage in a cooperative agreement, a beginning point, basically.

And that begs the question about what can be in the MOU at this particular time, or, I guess perennially, what comes first, the chicken or the egg. And I think that the legislation is good to the extent that it empowers Mr. Sanchez to begin working with Kirtland Air Force Base towards addressing some of the more specifics of these problems.

But month after month of these board hearings for the last six months, I've heard, and I'm certainly sure that most of the folks that we've talked to have thought that the assessment of the extent of the problem is still uncertain, and certainly the remediation of the problem remains uncertain as to the best approach.

We've heard from technical experts. I thought that Kirtland Air Force Base and state environmental health department did and excellent presentation a couple meetings ago and that
presentation points out some of the mischaracterization of Councillor Garduno when he says that the water utility authority has the most jurisdiction. Clearly, when it was laid out in the presentation, the water utility authority does not have the most jurisdiction. They may have the most interest as it relate to the protection of the city, the county, the region's water, but they certainly don't have the most regulatory interest.

That is a very complicated issue. It was put forth in that presentation in fairly succinct and understandable terms for a layperson, but we get into great legal complexity with all of that.

And, then, secondly, as it relates to, you know, how to proceed from here, I support the legislation and would think the best approach from my perspective would be to defer it, to allow Mr. Sanchez to come and proposal at least a draft agreement so that we'd have the opportunity to look at the draft agreement in context of what the legislation proposes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: It just seems right, since I was referenced in the last speech, that I would
respond. And I think that when it comes to the chicken and the egg, this egg is hard boiled at this point. I don't think we're going to get any life out of that.

But let me tell you that if we don't have some kind of agreement at this point -- and I disagree that the water authority has no jurisdiction over water, that's why it's called the water authority. Its job is to make sure that all water is safe to drink and certainly not a detriment to the health of its residents nor the environment. It's pretty clear to me.

Now, as far as what would be good to have in there, I just delineated a number of things that I would like to see in there. And it is up to the board to accept whatever it is they want. I will not -- neither defer nor pull R-12-14 if in fact Floor Substitute 12-13 is pushed forward with no change whatsoever. So I leave it up to the board.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. Let's go ahead and proceed. We have a motion and a second for WUA Floor Substitute R-12-13. All those in favor, signify by saying yes.

SIX MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no.
COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: No.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: That carries on a 6-to-1 vote.

(6-1 vote. Floor substitute approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Did you want to defer that, Commissioner De La Cruz?

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Mr. Chairman, I think I have already made that motion.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: It will now be a separate motion.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: So moved.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: We have a motion and a second to defer WUA Floor Substitute R-12-13. All those in favor, signify by saying yes.

SIX MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: No.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: That carries on a 6-to-1 vote.

And do you have a time frame, Commissioner De La Cruz?

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes. I would propose a 60-day deferment.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I said no.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. That's fine.
(6-1 vote. Agenda Item 9A deferred.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. Let's go ahead and proceed to the next item, that's Item B, WUA R-12-14, protecting the Albuquerque water.

Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As I've stated, I think that this agreement or this direction to staff to seek an agreement with Kirtland Air Force Base to make sure that a lot of these items are protected and a lot of these things get done is in order. I put it in front of you, I read them already. I'd be glad to read them again, but if people have had an opportunity to read them through, then I would just ask that it be -- or I so move and ask for your support.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno, I would like to see a deferral on this to see if we can incorporate -- and I thought the staff was going to do that, because we had made the recommendation, that the two bills be looked at.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: That was my understanding also.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Right, and that did not happen. But I believe that some of your recommendations could also be incorporated into the
1 floor substitute as amended when that comes back to
2 the council. So I'd like to move a 60-day deferral on
3 WUA R-12-14.

4 COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: With the caveat that both
5 of these resolutions be looked at an incorporated in a
6 way that is fair.

7 CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I think that's fair and I
8 think that's equitable.

9 COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Okay. I defer --
10 CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Do we have a second on that

11 motion?

12 COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a
14 second. Any questions?

15 Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by
16 saying yes.

17 ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Opposed, no.

19 That carries unanimously.

20 (7-0 vote. Agenda Item 9B deferred.)

21 CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next item it Item C, WUA
22 C-12-17, approving write-off of uncollectible accounts
23 receivables, Second Chance, LLC.

24 Mr. Allred, welcome.

25 MR. ALLRED: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board,
we're requesting a write-off of accounts receivable balance of $54,900 for a lease, outstanding lease payment to Second Chance. When they kind of went out of business, that receivable was left on the books. This receivable is a little different than most of our receivable. One, for the size of it, but primarily because we don't have the ability to put a lien on this business or this property, unlike our other receivables. So we do a very good job collecting our outstanding accounts receivable balances but duty to nature of determination of second balances. But due to the nature of the termination of Second Chance and the size of the balance, we're requesting to write that balance off our books.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: So does this mean that Second Chance gets a third chance or last chance?

I'd like to move approval -- yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sir, can you please explain how it is that the water utility comes to be a co-owner or a partial owner of this facility? Because I understand it's the old west side jail; is that correct?

MR. ALLRED: Commissioner Hart Stebbins and
Mr. Chair, when we first entered into this, the building that Second Chance moved into was owned by the City of Albuquerque. They actually had a lease for the building. The property the building sits on is the property of the water authority, and we lease the property space to Second Chance to provide the services they were providing in that facility.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Council President Jones.

COUNCILLOR JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Did the lease agreement not in fact have any kind of a personal guarantee or any means of collecting this?

MR. ALLRED: Councillor Jones and Mr. Chairman, no, it did not.

MS. POWELL: We wouldn't do that again, would we?

MR. ALLRED: We will not.

COMMISSIONER JONES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Mr. Perry.

MR. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, that last question from Councillor Hart Stebbins, I didn't fully understand. How was it that the water utility authority came into position of
a piece of real property that the jail sits on when it
split away from city, and I'm just curious, if you
know.

MR. ALLRED: Mr. Perry and Mr. Chairman, the
property resides by our soils amendment facility, so
at the time when they built the facility there, it was
property at the time owned by the City of Albuquerque,
which was purchased by the water utility at this point
in time and became an asset of the water utility.

MR. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you. I'd like to move
approved of WUA C-12-17.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a
second. Any questions?

Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by
saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no.

That carries unanimously.

(7-0 vote. Agenda Item 9C approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next item is Item D, WUA
C-12-18, the appointment to the customer advisory.

Mr. Roth.
MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, this appointment is to fill a vacancy in the resource economics area that has traditionally been filled by UNM economics professors.

The nomination for consideration today is David Brookshire. He's a distinguished professor and director or the science impact laboratory for policy and economics within the UNM Department of Economics. He specializes in environment resource economics. His attached biography shows his involvement in several water resource research projects, and he specializes in public policy issues in the natural resource, environmental and natural hazards area. And staff represents his appointment.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Are there any questions?

Seeing none, I move confirmation.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a second. Any questions?

Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no.

That carries unanimously.

(7-0 vote. Agenda Item 9D approved.)
CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next item is Item E, WUA C-12-19, reappointment to the consumer advisory committee. Mr. Roth.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board, three of the current committee members have completed their first term and they are eligible to be reappointed for a second two-year term.

The three members are Lola Bird, who represents the landscape architecture category, Fred Arfman, who represents the water system engineering category, and John Shomaker, who represents the water resource planning category.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Commissioner De La Cruz.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Mr. Roth, is this the individual or individuals that have been missing all of the meetings?

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chair, Commissioner De La Cruz, Fred Arfman has a 69 percent attendance rating, John Shomaker has a 63 percent attendance rating, and Lola Bird has a 50 percent attendance rating.

Ms. Bird has some medical issues. Before she had to take her leave, she actually had a 75 percent attendance rating. Even during her medical leave, she did attend a couple meetings. So she does meet the requirements of the resolution.
CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Commissioner Hart Stebbins.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a list of meetings since August of 2011 which shows some very different results from what you just stated in terms of attendance. What time period are you looking at?

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hart Stebbins, for 2000 -- or since her appointment up until she had to take her medical leave, from June 2010 through May 2011, she had a 75 percent attendance rating. If you look at 2011, she attended four of the eight meetings, 50 percent attendance rating.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you. And Ms. Bird is not really the one that I'm interested in because I understand she's had some health issues.

But, you know, I'm looking at Mr. Arfman, for example, two meetings attended since August 11th. Who's the third one? Shomaker, right, he's the other one we're looking at? Again, a 50 percent attendance since August, and that does not include some meetings that were canceled.

I guess my question is, has anyone talked to these individuals and asked whether they're interested...
in continuing to serve on this board given their attendance record?

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hart Stebbins, when I realized that their terms had expired and they're eligible for reappointment, I contacted them and asked them if they were interested in serving for another two terms, and they had were both -- all were very enthusiastic about continuing to participate on the customer advisory committee.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Do you think it's necessary that maybe we revise this ordinance so that we are able to appointment alternates or something or some other measure that might allow us to have a better attendance at these meetings? I mean, we have done that on our -- the Bernalillo County Commission had to do that for our ethics board because we were having trouble getting a quorum.

And, again, it looks like several of the last -- several of the meetings over the last year have been canceled. Six meetings canceled. Do you know whether that was canceled because of a scheduling conflict, a lack of a quorum? Do you know?

MR. ROTH: Commissioner Hart Stebbins, many times we don't have a meeting because there's no agenda items, there's no topics to discuss.
Specifically during the summer months, when this board doesn't meet. Usually the first couple months, there's topics that are standard, such as the budget items and review of the conservation's goals. So the first four meetings are very standard and usually they're always able -- we usually do have meetings for the winter and the spring. It's the summer months that sometimes we don't have agenda items.

I don't remember what -- I think it was the April meeting of this year where we actually didn't have a quorum. And to my knowledge, it's the only time in the last two years where we didn't have a quorum for a meeting.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: All right. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Sanchez, if you have something.

MR. SANCHEZ: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest we do two things. One is perhaps draft a letter for your signature to each member stressing the importance of attendance and the importance of the function they perform on your behalf. And, two, follow up on Commissioner Hart Stebbins recommendation
that perhaps we look at a mechanism for an alternate from these individuals or the board, depending on attendance, as long as they meet the intended category and have the qualifications for that.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you. That sounds like a good recommendation. My concern is that I think we're talking about numbers that are really boggling. Of 12 possible meetings, only seven were called. And of seven called, some folks only attended -- and I think it was said 50 percent, 62 percent and 69 percent, which really drops it down to three, four and five of the seven, which is only -- not 63 percent of 69 percent, but more in the order of 42 percent and 48 percent and 52 percent.

So, you know, remember when they say about figures -- anyway, you know what I'm talking about. That is concerning to me, that we only -- they only meet seven times out of 12, and of those seven times, people are missing three, four and in some cases, five meetings. That's tantamount to commissioners not attending -- wouldn't it be nice if we didn't have to. But -- and I take it to heart what Commissioner Stebbins is saying, that a lot of times, you know, like Ms. Bird has fallen into a situation where I'm
sure she -- it's hard for her to attend, but we should
have a mechanism where she doesn't get penalized if
that's the reason she's not attending. But if other
folks don't have as compelling a reason, then we
should have some other mechanism that either helps the
customer advisory board -- because remember, this is
what this is. This is representing the customer, and
if we don't have the customer represented in any way,
then we're not getting real in-depth information for
some of the decisions we could or may make in the
future. So with that, I would entertain not only what
Commissioner Stebbins has said, but shored up by what
Executive Director Sanchez has said. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Any other questions?
I move confirmation of the reappointments to
the customer committee.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion, and a
second by Council President Jones.

Any other questions?

Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by
saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed?

That carries unanimously -- okay. Carries
on a 6-to-1 vote.

(6-1 vote. Agenda Item 9E approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Our next item is Item F, WUA C-12-20, the agreement with Bernalillo County for a pilot loan program to connect residents to available water services. Commissioner Wayne Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

This program came out of our attempts to provide water to the Carnuel area. And most of you are familiar with the issue of poor quality drinking water. And one of the things we've found from residents there is that our PIPE program, which is a grant-based program, wouldn't necessarily help all of those residents because it doesn't apply to folks who have renters and it doesn't apply to the folks whose income may be above what is required for the PIPE program but still don't have the money to pay for their side of the installation. This isn't about the UEC, which is already financed by the water authority.

So what we did is we looked at a way maybe to find a stopgap, to fill that gap between the PIPE program for those folks who may not have the money in their home or may not be able to apply for a loan to pick up the other 3500 or so dollars in this program.
The county is putting up seed money of $150,000 to start a pilot program and this will be a countywide program, but the water utility authority will be handling, in essence, the servicing of the loan and for which we will provide the water -- or the water authority will take a half a percentage point of the interest as an administrative, and hopefully this will become a self-sustaining fund and hopefully it will be very successful. It's the right approach for those folks, in my opinion.

We have with us today Dan McGregor and Adrienne Candelaria in the back if you have any questions regarding the program. The county will administer the construction phase and the loan program, and the water utility authority will be, again, servicing the loans through the water bill.

I'm excited about this program and I think it's going to help a lot of folks. And we've received a lot of accolades, even from Washington, D.C. in our efforts to this extent. So with that, I would move approval.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion, and a second by Commissioner De La Cruz. Any questions?

Councillor Garduno.
COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I just have a couple of very quick questions. I think it's a great idea, because it was one of the concerns that I know you, Commissioner Johnson, had about making this a successful endeavor after the work that, you know, had been put into it.

The $150,000, you're saying that it would be kind of a revolving loan, or how is that going to work? I tried to read through here and I didn't understand it.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, Councillor Garduno, the idea is the $150,000 would be really seed money for this. We would charge somewhere around -- and I'll let either Dan or Adrienne come down and correct me if I'm wrong. Would be 7 percent, I believe, interest rate on this money, so we would be being paid back. And I think the time frame is ten years. But any of those specific details, I'm sure they'll be happy to answer for you, Councillor.

In the long run, it may be that $150,000 is inadequate to the fund, because we really haven't gotten a real good feel for how popular the program will be. It's an option for folks who may not be able to find money anywhere else.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I think it's a great idea,
and I don't if you wanted to flesh that out a little more.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Yeah, go ahead and state your name for the record, please.

MS. CANDELARIA: Good evening. Adrienne Candelaria with the Bernalillo County Purchasing Department.

Chairman and Councillor Garduno, to answer your question about this concept of revolving, as the water authority bills the customer, part of that payment will be specifically for this loan. The principle will go back to the county and back to this account to be loaned out again to another customer.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And I think that's what will make it sustainable, again, like you say, if all 150,000 goes out and people default, and maybe not. But I think it's a great, great endeavor. And thank you, Ms. Candelaria.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Commissioner De La Cruz.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Before we take the vote, I just want to commend Commissioner Johnson for taking the lead on this. I want to commend county staff and city staff as well. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I would also like to applaud the County Commission for your efforts.

We have a motion and a second to adopt WUA C-12-20. All those in favor, signify by saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no.

That carries unanimously.

(7-0 vote. Agenda Item 9F approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We are now under other business. Item A has been deferred. Item B is the 2012 customer opinion survey presentation. Frank Roth and he will be introducing Brian Sanderoff.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chair, Members of the Board, every two years the water authority conducts a customer opinion survey to obtain input on the customers on the utility's programs and services. This will be the fourth survey conducted, with the first one being completed in 2006.

As with the first survey, the utility contract with Research & Polling to carry out the survey. With us tonight is Brian Sanderoff, president of Research & Polling. He's going to be providing a summary overview of the results.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Go ahead and proceed, Mr. Sanderoff. Welcome.
MR. SANDEROFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. Brian Sanderoff, the head of Research & Polling. I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you tonight. We have a Power Point presentation.

As Frank said, we recently conducted a customer satisfaction survey. We also measured perceived importance of various services that you provide. We surveyed 500 of your residential customers at random as well as 100 of your commercial customers. This work was fielded in May and June and it has a margin of error of about plus or minus 4 percent among the residential sample.

And so getting right to the results and hitting the high points, just I know there are a lot of the numbers on this page so let's just go through one of them real fast. Basically, on this particular page, we're looking at overall satisfaction with services. There were 11 attributes that were tested on three of the next set of slides.

This is the first slide. It ranks the attributes in terms of percentage satisfied from top to bottom, so as we go through these attributes, you can see the ones that fared best. And you can also see the results from 2012 as well as from the two
prior studies. The bottom line on this slide is that when it comes to satisfaction levels of your residential customers and your business customers, on the issue of reliability and availability of water to your home or business, your customers are very satisfied, specifically 86 percent. To the categories are you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, we find that 98 percent of your customers were very or somewhat satisfied with the reliability and availability of the water supply. It was the same for the commercial customers. We are looking at residential here.

Also on reliability, another strong point for your operation is the reliable drainage of wastewater from the home to the sewer line. So reliability is what you score best on. It's not unusual for a utility to do that, electric, gas, whatever. What people expect most from a utility company, whether it be gas, water or electric, is reliability. People who don't have it complain, but people who do appreciate it.

Next came quality of drinking water. Notice that the top two issues on reliability really fared in the 90s when you add up the very and the somewhat satisfieds. When it comes to quality drinking water,
also strong, 48 percent very satisfied, 31 percent somewhat satisfied, which adds up to 79 percent. However, it's worth noting that 18 percent of your residential customers are dissatisfied with the quality of the water. And this number hasn't changed much in the last number of years, but we do have this group. I think in future years we ought to ask at that point, "Well, why do you feel this way?" The only insights we have is a question later when we ask people who use bottled water, filtered water, "Well, why do you use it?" and taste was a big thing, besides convenience, perceptions on impurities and some contamination. But quality drinking water, good score, 79 percent to 18 percent, but work to be done in this area for sure.

Other attributes that we see on this page dealing with education and water conservation programs, those fared well. We don't have to dwell on them.

Continuing on on the next slide, going down the line on ranking by satisfaction level, effectiveness of controlling odors, good scores. Only 9 percent dissatisfied if you add up the somewhat and the very. Effectiveness in repairing leaks and response time, good scores, 11 percent dissatisfied.
So when it comes to operational issues, reliability, strong scores.

Condition of sewer lines throughout the city. We're seeing dissatisfaction levels rise here. 16 percent of the residential customers were dissatisfied with the condition of the sewer lines throughout the city.

If we go to the next slide, we ask the same question on condition of the waterlines throughout the city. And notice that when you add up the very dissatisfied, 9 percent, and the somewhat dissatisfied, 17 percent. We're up to now 26 percent of residential customers expressing some dissatisfaction with the condition of the waterlines throughout the city. 56 percent, however, are satisfied, but there has been a drop in satisfaction levels from the last study.

When it comes to effectiveness to respond to overflows or backups, very few were dissatisfied. 40 percent just did not know because they didn't have an experience with it. Same thing for ease of navigating the information on your website, only 2 percent are dissatisfied. Those who have used it are pleased.

On the next slide, here we asked, "Have you
contacted the water authority for any issues or concerns?" And so on the first column you see, "Yes, I've contact them." So "Problems or questions with your water or sewer bill," 17 percent of your customer have actually contacted the authority with questions or issues on it.

Well, "How satisfied were you with the outcome?" And notice that if you add up the very and the somewhat satisfied and the very and somewhat dissatisfied, 56 percent were satisfied and 40 percent were dissatisfied. Now, a person calls up, they have a problem or question with their water bill, they may not get a resolution. Whether that failure to receive resolution is the fault of the water authority or just not being able to satisfy the customer, that could be debated. This might be a fascinating issue also to dig deeper on. But the point to you is, about 40 percent are not satisfied with the complaint that they're filing.

When it comes to water, sewage service interruption or mainline break, 9 percent have contacted you, perhaps witnessed a line break, and to that group, 50 percent were satisfied with the response and 46 percent dissatisfied, like a one-to-one ratio. So there's work to be done here.
Digging a little deeper, looking at response times, looking at training issues with customer service representatives, I think all that's order. Questions about meter reading, 8 percent have called with questions on the water meters. 42 percent were satisfied with the outcome and 56 percent dissatisfied. There were not problems with advice on water conservation or a new connection service. So that's a page that needs some reflection on.

We asked about how do you communicate with the water authority among those who have. Spoke to employees on the telephone is still the primary means. Spoke to and employee in person, 14 percent. Used the website, used voice mail and e-mail, also came up in small numbers, but they add up over time. So the phone is still it, but there has been quite a bit of in-person contact.

Overall rating of customer service representatives, these are among those who have had contact. Well, 56 percent rate their content as excellent or good. And 16 percent rate it poorly if you combine those last two, the bars on poor and very poor. So, you know, again, people who call up have a problem, and sometimes you're able to revolve it and sometimes you can't. What I've learned over the years
is if someone calls with a problem and you resolve it,
you become more satisfied customers than those who
have never had a problem in the first place. So I
like to look at people who call with problem as an
incredible opportunity to make them even more
satisfied than regular passive customers. So work to
be done on this area. I look at it as an opportunity.

Next slide tracks overall customer service
reps over time. So if you look at the excellent
column, you see the bar to the left, that 19 percent
is this cycle. It was 30 percent the prior study and
25 percent the one before that. So excellence and
goods have gone down a bit. Fairs and poors have gone
up a bit when it comes to customer service
representative overall satisfaction.

More specifically, is a courtesy, no.
81 percent who have contacted the CSRs are satisfied
either very or somewhat with the courtesy of them.
Knowledge and ability to answer the questions, okay,
66 percent satisfied and 25 percent dissatisfied if
you add up the somewhats and the verys. So, again,
training perhaps an issue. Length of wait, 13 percent
are complaining about the length of time to speak to a
customer service rep. That's not a bad number. You
should see it with some companies. Sometimes you're
on the phone with credit card companies for a half hour. I've seen numbers as high as 50 percent dissatisfied there, but that's always something that can be improved.

Overall satisfaction with billing, it's fine, whether it be understanding the bill or the bill payment options or the bill statement accuracy. Notice that if you add up the very and the somewhat satisfied, they're all in the 80s. So billing service issues, everything looks great. This.

Is was an interesting question to look at over time. We asked your customers about awareness, where's that water come from anyway that comes into your tap. You know, where's the Albuquerque water supply come from. And look back in 2008, 26 percent were saying, well, both from the surface water and the aquifer. The big increase in awareness happened between '08 and 2010. And you were working a lot on awareness level campaigns at that tie informing the customers the shift toward more surface water usage. But from 2010 to 2012, awareness that it comes from both sources hasn't changed, it's plateaued. Aquifer only went from 50 percent in 2008 down to 29 percent and it's plateaued. So we're moving in the right direction, but we still have to perhaps reinstitute a
campaign now that it's been going for a while to remind people of the multiple sources of water that we use in the city and the county.

In the past, do you basically utilize bottled water or filtered tap water for your drinking or cooking, 51 percent are saying most of the time. Now, in 2006 that 51 percent was 37 percent. So we're seeing an increase in utilization of bottled water and filtered for cooking and drinking at home. 20 percent some of the time, so only 29 percent of customer are not using it at all.

Well, why are you using bottled water or filtered water, taste, 46 percent; convenience, we all know not to leave the house in the house in the morning -- you open up the refrigerator, you pull out that bottled water, you take it in the car. Convenience is a big factor for using bottled water, but taste was the biggest.

Perceptions of impurities in the city/county water, chemicals, contamination, lack of confidence, those issues were coming up as well. Taste was the biggest one, and convenience, but we're seeing some other concerns, perceptions that are out there on this topic.

We measured lots of attributes as they
1 relate to the importance of water conservation and
electrical issues. On a 5 point scale, with 5
being very important and 1 being not important at all,
how important are these things. Here you're looking
just at the 5's and the 4's, the very important and
the somewhat important, and then the total importance
is that third column. So what was Number 1? This
was 13 items we tested over the next two slides.

     Number 1, providing a long term water supply
for future generations, 90 percent are saying that's
very important for your you to do. The next two deal
with treated water, which was interesting. The
reusing of treated water, wastewater, to irrigate
public spaces and the quality of treated water being
returned back into the river. So those were seen as
really important items as it relates to water
environmental issues. Investing in the repair and
replacement of old water sewer lines, 86 percent
important. Enforcing the current laws on wastewater,
those things scored highest.

     Now, on the next page, we continue on with
this important issues, these issues asking people how
important they are. And, really, all of the 11 items
that we tested that you're working on, to one extent
or another, scored important, except for the bottom
one, and the bottom one, 36 percent rated important, providing more bill payment options. Now, that doesn't mean if you don't come up with some great new option, you shouldn't do it, but it just means that these other issues are more important to folks.

We asked people to agree or disagree with these statements on that same scale. "Do you follow the water by numbers program when setting irrigation?"

Well, 62 percent are saying I strongly agree with that, that I do follow them.

Do you agree or disagree your house would conserve more water if they had an easier way to monitor their use, 75 percent are agreeing with that, very or somewhat. So a lot of the programs you're doing or considering are validated as being important by your customer.

The next one is good one, though. Agree, disagree. Water and sewer services are a good value for the amount of money I pay, 43 percent strongly agree, 41 percent, somewhat. So that adds up to 84 percent think the water cost is a good value. Water value is good for what they pay. On the commercial customers, the business people, that was 90 percent. So that was encouraging.

By the way, on most of the issues, the
results between the business customers and the residential customers were quite similar.

But the cost of water is an important factor for me when deciding how much water to use, so is water priced high enough that people think about how much they use. 75 percent are saying yes, the price does some into play. But later you'll find out people don't want you to raise the water rates just for the sake of conservation. They didn't like that idea.

There should be financial strong penalties for people who use too much water, 71 percent agree.

The next page got into some of those rate issues, whether to agree or disagree. Because water is a scarce resource, rates should be designed to reflect the value of the water. Okay, 67 percent agree, but 29 percent disagree and so on. If you look at the one second from the bottom, water rates two should be increase to cover the true cost to treat water delivery to our homes, 53 percent agree and 43 percent disagree. And then water rates should be increase to encourage water conservation, 61 percent disagreed. So as we heard one of the speakers earlier, people are very, very committed to water conservation, they think it's important, they think it's important for the future of Albuquerque, they
1 just don't want rates to be set based on it.

2 Readership levels of bill inserts that you
3 receive with your water bill, 38 percent are saying
4 they read those inserts most of the time, and
5 40 percent are saying they read them some of the time.
6 So 78 Persian. Readership of your annual water
7 report, 70 percent are saying they read it most of the
8 time or some of time. There's always a fudge factor
9 in there, but believe me, we do some readership
10 studies where we do get a ton of people who say they
11 just don't look at it at all. But there's probably a
12 little inflation in there.

13 Okay. We asked a few questions on Kirtland
14 as well. The first question that we asked was to ask
15 people to self-report their level of knowledge of the
16 Kirtland Air Force Base fuel spill. And what we found
17 was that 27 percent of your customers reported that
18 they feel they're very knowledgeable on the topic, 35
19 percent, somewhat knowledgeable, 36 percent, not
20 knowledgeable. We can call it 38 with the don't
21 knows.

22 So my reaction to this is there's --
23 knowledge could be higher. Some people are paying
24 attention. In fact, 62 percent are saying they're
25 very or somewhat knowledgeable, but this is an area
where we could have seen higher very knowledgeable that we didn't. In looking at the demographics, it was interesting that people in the mid heights and men, for some reason, were more likely to say they were very knowledgeable about the issue than other demographic groups. So more work to be done on getting the word out, so we have 38 percent that are just not up on the issue.

Among those who are aware of it, we asked how important this issue is to them for Kirtland Air Force Base to clean up the fuel and the groundwater. And what we found was 64 percent said it's very important, 33 percent said somewhat important. So 97 percent of your customers are saying very or somewhat important for the base to clean up the fuel and the groundwater.

All demographic groups felt similarly on this. It's not as if there was big variations by region. It seemed to be in the minds of the customers, a citywide, a countywide thing, not just a particular regional thing.

And then the final question was overall satisfaction with the Air Force Base's effectiveness in addressing the fuel contamination. Here, and this was only asked among those who were aware of the
issue. 11 percent vary satisfied. 33 percent somewhat satisfied. 23 percent somewhat dissatisfied 14 percent, don't know. Excuse me for not moving this along.

So if you add up the very and somewhat satisfied, we find that 44 percent of your customers are satisfied and 42 percent are dissatisfied. That one-to-one ratio is not all that good. You know, you'd expect to find a higher ratio of satisfaction to dissatisfaction.

So really to summarize the survey, we find that reliability is your strong point as it relates to customer satisfaction when it comes to the available of water, the production of that to the home, when it comes to reliable drainage from the home and the business to the sewer line, that's your strength.

Water quality is also strong, but we have to think about these 18 percent who are concerned about it whether it be because perception is on taste or perception is on impurities or contamination.

Conditions of the water and sewer lines are beginning to have increased dissatisfaction levels. Obviously you have infrastructure issues. Some of that received some media attention, but some people have, you know, witnessed concerns in this area.
When it comes to customers service issues, I think there's, you know, examination worth doing there of the training of the CSRs and trying to improve the resolution rate of customers who call in.

And when it comes to Kirtland Air Force Base, we're seeing that not as many people are paying attention to the issue as they should, but among those who are paying attention, there's a very mixed bag of whether they feel the base has been effective in remedying this issue.

I stand for any questions if there are any.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Sanderoff. A lot of numbers to try and crunch through, but one of the things you said that caught my attention was that -- or one of the graphs was condition of waterlines. How would the customers know the condition of waterlines. What did they base it on, the fact that there were breaks in their front yard or...

MR. SANDEROFF: Mr. Chair, Councillor Garduno, that's good question. I mean, these are all perception questions, you know. I would say that it's based on their personal observations, and it's also based on what they hear from their friends and
neighbors, it’s based on the media. If we remember, we had that one very visible water break that the water was spewing out, and it was on the news all the time, and going into a school. I mean that could have affected the percentages by a few points. So I think it’s a combinations of all those things.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Right. And I agree that I think there are issues and we’ve talked about it. A lot of the infrastructure, certainly in the district that I represent, you know, they need to be replaced and they’re going to happen all the time. I just don’t know what can be done to ameliorate that, you know, feeling of, oh, my gosh when is it going to break in front of my house, I guess.

MR. SANDEROFF: Right. I think that if a lot of investment was made in infrastructure and word got out, that would increase confidence levels of the general public.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I think so, too.

Mr. Chair, if I may continue for just --

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Go ahead and proceed.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Sanderoff, you mentioned that those who contacted the water authority and had a resolution, obviously, homely, in the positive were move satisfied with other issues having
to do with the water authority. And that leads me to think somehow we need to communicate with our customers more often. I mean, that's the first thing that came to my head. What do we do? I mean, not only just the inserts, but do we get out there and tell folks, you know, this water is not only precious, but it's something you rely on and we're very interested in making sure that it's protected.

I don't know what the verbiage would be or the narrative, but it certainly is something I think we ought to you think about to get out there. And that's unfortunately one of the areas that I dabble in, and somethings successfully and sometimes not.

MR. SANDEROFF: Mr. Chair, Councillor Garduno, I would agree with that. It's a combination of things. Again, if a person calls with a complaint and you turn it around and exceed their expectations, you've got a fan.

If you tout the achievement that you have accomplished, if people recognize the moneys that are being spent are being spent well and you show them those achievements, I think it's a combination of all those things.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I just lost one of them.

One more thing, I think, and that is, now,
the study was mostly -- 500 residents and most --

MR. SANDEROFF: 100 customers.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: 100 customers?

MR. SANDEROFF: Business customers. I'm sorry.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Business customers. But then when it came to the fuel spill, it was 300 or so, the number of contacts?

MR. SANDEROFF: No.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: That's what it has here.

MR. SANDEROFF: Well, and recall what I said. We surveyed 500 residential customers, and so the 500 were asked the question on awareness of the fuel spill. But then on the next question, it was only among those aware.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: So you parsed out the aware folks?

MR. SANDEROFF: Right, because there's no sense to ask perceived effectiveness of how the base is doing among people who never heard of the issue.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Right, right.

MR. SANDEROFF: So the cell size goes down, and you'll see in these statements, you'll see it will say among those aware of the fuel spill. That's why the cell size drops.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I'm seeing that right now.
So I guess the next question would be, and you said it but I think I missed it, where was the preponderance of folks that were asked -- or that were aware and than were asked, do you know? I think you said mid heights.

MR. SANDEROFF: The mid heights area, Mr. Chair, Councillor Garduno, was more likely to be dissatisfied with the effectiveness, and all groups thought it was equally important to deal with and the mid heights was also more likely to be very knowledgeable.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I have one quick question, Mr. Sanderoff, regarding the overall water quality, that percentage came fairly high. Yet when it came to the question regarding bottled water, there was still 40 percent of those users that were using bottled water, and you said it was for convenience, but that number seems awfully high especially if the water quality numbers were also high. That number I thought would be much smaller.

MR. SANDEROFF: Yes, it's true that most people compliment the water quality, but most people are using bottled and filtered water. It's become a habit for many people. The convenience side of the bottled water probably is not speaking to the poor quality,
perceived poor quality of the water itself. So you have to back out the convenience component.

But if people put a built-in filter now into their sink and they use that for cooking, that would fall into this category. I have -- I'm perfectly satisfied with the water I receive, but I still have a Brita filter that I use out of habit. And so I think that there are a lot of people who fall into that group.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: So you're part of that 40 percent then, right?

MR. SANDEROFF: I am.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. Any other questions for Mr. Sanderoff?

Thank you for your presentation.

MR. SANDEROFF: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Last item on the agenda is Item C, water conservation and drought status update.

Ms. Yuhas.

MS. YUHAS: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We saved the best for last because we know you're going to be brief.

MS. YUHAS: You know, I know that that's what you like about my presentations.
So I have some good news and some bad news. We're going to hit the bad news first. Up until about last week, predictions were that the drought was going to be easing, we were going to be getting more rain. That kind of changed last week. What you see on this side is the drought monitor from the National Association Atmospheric Administration. And what we're seeing with this is that we're still in severe drought. Even though we've been getting rain, it hasn't really made up for the deficit.

In the next slide is the prediction of rainfall in the next month. Up until last week, New Mexico looked as green as Arizona. Now you see that they're not so sure it's going to be increased rainfall in area in the next month.

This slide is for the next three months. And, again, this was -- you know, we looked like Arizona. We were green, they were thinking we were going to get a lot of rain this fall. Now it's not so sure.

And what this slide shows you is based on those, we're going to see persistence of the drought in New Mexico rather than an easing of the drought, and that's too bad.

But some good news, you have seen this chart
before, and I'll just quickly orient you. All of the
different lines are different models of predictions of
ocean temperatures in the equatorial Pacific. When
we're up at the top of this chart, we're happy because
we're moving into warmer ocean temperatures and El
Nino conditions that generally bring us more rain.
Bottom is bad; that's La Nina, colder ocean
temperatures and less rain.

So what we're seeing is predictions for this
fall, winter and early spring of 2013 that are saying
El Nino conditions should develop, things should be
getting better. Maybe not in the next three months,
but maybe and winter will be normal for us.

And a little bit more good news is that even
though we're having a severe drought, our customers
are doing a great job. When I looked at our water
usage numbers on Monday and I have to say this because
it's such a good number, but we were 800 million
gallons than we at this same time last year.

You know, we've met our water conservation
goal of 150 gallons per person per day last year, so
we're heading into the end of the year with a very
positive outlook for what our customers are doing.
They're really doing a great job through this drought.

And last, very quickly I'd like to let you
know that we started our educational field trips for
fourth graders down to the river at the Rio Grande
Nature Center. Starting this Monday, we're going to
be having them every Monday from 9:30 to 1:30. The
kids are having a great time. They're getting dressed
up in historical costumes, learning about the history
of water usage in our region, along with careers in,
water all of the things that we need to do to
conserve, they're writing songs, they're having a
great time, they're going on a hike.

So if you'd like to come and see that, we
would love to have you there, introduce you to the
kids, show you off, all of those things. And that's
it.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Are there any questions of
Ms. Yuhas.

Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Just a compliment. Thank
you very much for the work you do, but also the way
you do it. It's just a pleasure to see someone who,
although in, you know, presenting sometimes not great
information because we are in a drought situation, I
think you have a way of saying it that leads us all to
know that we're trying really hard and certainly you
are. So thank you for that.
The other thing I was going to say was, can we leave that plastic in the back there, because when you see a picture, it looks like a mountain. I don't see it now, but when you see folks that are at the podium, it looks like a mountain.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: With the exception of the tape.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: People fall into the mountain, a snowcapped mountain. Let's hope that's true.

MS. YUHAS: That would be nice.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Ms. Yuhas. Thank you, Councillor Garduno.

If there's no further business before this water authority, this meeting is adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned.)
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