

Appendix C1
Meeting Notes

SOCORRO-SIERRA

REGIONAL WATER PLANNING

August 19, 2003 Meeting Summary

The final steering committee meeting for the Socorro-Sierra Regional Water Plan took place on August 19, 2003, from 2 to 4:30 p.m. in the Socorro City Hall. Fourteen people attended.

Approval Process

Project Manager Joanne Hilton, of Daniel B. Stephens and Associates, first outlined the process for completing the final report. A draft report will be produced by the end of September and the executive summary distributed to Steering Committee members and elected officials; the complete plan will be placed in several locations available to the public in each county. Comments will be due by the end of October. Mary Helen Follingstad of the Interstate Stream Commission (ISC) noted that it was important for the ISC to know which local governments supported the regional water plan and advised that they approve a resolution of support. Such local support aids in obtaining project funds from the State Water Trust Board. Regions do not have to resolve every issue but can state individual conflicts in the “acceptance criteria.” The endorsed plan would be submitted to the ISC in December for its final approval.

Public Welfare Issues

The first question to surface from the attendees dealt with the issue of people selling their water rights yet continuing to irrigate. John Carangelo, co-chair of the steering committee from Socorro County, answered that such residents are either 1) selling their water rights and leasing them back, 2) selling their rights and leasing water from the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD) water bank, or 3) stealing water. He advocated a policy be placed in the regional plan stating that those who retain their old water rights would have the first right to irrigation water.

Ms. Hilton then brought up the issue of public welfare. State water law allows the sale or transfer of a water right unless it is contrary to “public welfare” or conservation or causes impairment of senior water rights. She asked whether the group wanted to include a statement addressing public welfare in the regional water plan.

Some attendees advocated including a public welfare statement that would protect the region from water transfers out of the basin. If selling water rights would harm the culture or economy of a region, it shouldn't be allowed. Others disagreed, saying that a water right is private property. Mary Helen Follingstad mentioned a court case in the Chama Valley that halted transfer of water rights from an acequia due to the public welfare. After further debate, the consensus was to have a simple public welfare statement in the plan.

Ms. Hilton said she would work on the language and email it to attendees for their comments.

The meeting then moved to consider comments on specific alternatives, actions recommended to carry them out, and the parties designated to implement them. Comments were recorded by Barbara Herrington of Sites Southwest and are detailed in the keyword database, which is attached. Below are summaries:

1d) Storing Elephant Butte water at higher elevations: Participants felt they were being overridden by larger players in the state, such as the ISC, and would like more input into decisions.

2a) Adopt local water conservation plans: Participants feel they can't dictate conservation policy to municipalities and that each system must develop their own plan. Nevertheless, they agreed they could provide their conservation plan to local governments as a model.

3h) Promote use of low-water-use crops: Participants were dubious about this, given recent attempts to grow onions and lettuce in the region. They did, however, support the identification of commercially feasible low-water-use crops that could be sold for as much money as alfalfa, the crop commonly grown in the area.

3I) Improve on-farm irrigation efficiency: People support this, but don't have the funds to implement.

4d) Remove exotic vegetation and 5a) Identify, protect and monitor areas vulnerable to contamination: One participant questioned whether spraying salt cedar to eradicate it was safe for humans. He noted that they were warned not to spray when minnows were passing by. It was noted that certain herbicides can be used near water. Nevertheless, the group added requirements for monitoring the effects on public health as actions to carry out both alternatives.

6e) Ensure public involvement by...disseminating information: The group discussed hiring a public involvement coordinator to disseminate information on water planning, given that John Carangelo has been doing much of the work as a volunteer for the past few years. Grants are available for such coordination. The action was revised to say "assign" a coordinator rather than "hire."

7b) Encourage retention of water within the planning region: Most participants supported this. One possibility would include selling water rights to the county for later development.

7c) Develop a water banking system...: Most participants felt a regional water bank should be investigated. Programs and funding to research the ways and means are available.

7e) Identify, quantify and adjudicate all water rights...Ms. Follingstad noted that this not not being supported by residents in northern New Mexico. They instead support legislative efforts to determine water rights allocations.

7f) Make water rights non-condemnable: The group added an action to support legislative efforts to make this law.

7h) Preserve deep well water for drinking only: The Bosque del Apache uses well water in dry periods. Santa Fe limits domestic wells where there is city utility service. Others said people should be able to water their gardens with well water. Consensus was to change the alternative to “Preserve and protect deep well water.”

REGIONAL WATER PLANNING

April 17 and 22, 2003 Meeting Summaries

The final round of public meetings for the Socorro-Sierra Regional Water Planning process got underway at 6 p.m. in the evening on April 17, 2003, in Truth or Consequences and April 22, 2003, in Socorro. Once again the first part of the evenings consisted of a “Dutch treat” dinner at K-Bob’s Restaurant starting at 5 p.m.

At both these meetings, Joanne Hilton, project manager from Daniel B. Stephens and Associates, presented a slide show that reviewed the alternative selection and evaluation process. She also described which alternatives would receive a full evaluation, based on a public ranking process, and which would receive a limited evaluation or be addressed elsewhere in the plan, and she presented preliminary results of feasibility analyses for the priority alternatives. Barbara Herrington from Sites Southwest recorded comments as participants were asked about and discussed the social or public welfare implications of each alternative, the political feasibility, the potential environmental impacts, and implementation issues. Participants then had the opportunity to discuss and remove from mention in the plan any alternatives that received lower scores.

Truth or Consequences Meeting

Only two persons attended this meeting; both were county planning commissioners and one owned a business in T or C. The low attendance was likely due to a conflict with a hastily called meeting on Governor Richardson’s proposal to deliver more water to Texas, providing that New Mexico could store more water at higher elevations. They carefully reviewed and commented on the proposed alternatives, however.

Generally they favored controlling non-residential surface water evaporation, getting rid of salt cedar, and encouraging all orchards to install drip irrigation. They advised that the plan promote voluntary as opposed to mandatory actions, such as requiring increased building densities and infill development. They generally supported disincentives to both export water from or import water to the region, but did not want to restrict an individual’s ability to control his or her own water rights. A water bank might be acceptable if it operated only within the region. Similarly, conservation methods would be acceptable if the conserver would have the ability to sell or lease the water conserved. (Ms. Hilton pointed out that conservation alone would also have benefits in times when farmers did not receive their full water allotments.)

Other ideas discussed included: 1) it doesn’t make sense to increase the water supply requirements for new subdivisions beyond the current 40-year supply, and 1) they opposed a sliding scale water rate that would force businesses to pay more than their share for water. A fixed rate that was high enough to encourage economic development but discourage over-use would be preferable. They favored using potable water for domestic consumption and graywater for the landscape.

Socorro Meeting

The Socorro meeting focused primarily on discussion of the top-scoring alternatives, which had been analyzed by consultants.

1d. Store Elephant Butte Reservoir water at existing higher-elevation/latitude reservoirs

The more than thirteen participants at the Socorro meeting discussed this issue at length. Benefits they saw included saving more acre-feet (as less is lost to evaporation), creating a constant water level (beneficial to fish spawning), and potentially stretching the irrigation season. Obstacles mentioned included the scarcity of available holding places upstream, the need for a continuous release or smaller storage places between El Vado and Socorro to avoid “dead spots,” the economic effects on Elephant Butte and Socorro, and the legal requirement of “use it or lose it” regarding water rights. Two participants called for an analysis of the impact on fishing, a several million dollar a year operation. The consensus was that more information was needed, but that the alternative was worth exploring further.

1e. Control non-reservoir surface water evaporation by reducing surface water areas in engineered and natural locations.

A permanently lower level of the pool at Elephant Butte reservoir will result in an enlarged delta area with increased evapotranspiration loss (although less than the loss from the surface water). The meeting consensus seemed to be that the low-flow conveyance had to be improved and the evapotranspiration reduced in order to deliver sufficient water to Texas.

3e. Improve efficiency of surface water irrigation conveyance systems

Regarding improvement of water irrigation conveyance systems, most seemed in favor provided there was money available to line ditches with concrete and it wouldn't alter water rights in future years. In general, the acequias prefer more efficient conveyance over reduced diversions. While reduced diversions could help endangered species, it might be less efficient if the diversion didn't have enough “head.” La Joya already has off-farm metering and others will have in a few years. Tax credits would offer more incentive for this.

4b. Control brush and weeds along water distribution systems and drains

The meeting consensus was to continue controlling the canal-side brush and weeds even though it did not produce huge water savings.

3i. Improve on-farm irrigation efficiency

To improve on-farm efficiency, participants agreed that drip irrigation would be economically feasible for groundwater if the OSE would approve low-volume wells, but not for river diversions due to the expense of pumps and filters. Orchards are prime candidates for drip irrigation. Agricultural land needs to be flood-irrigated periodically to flush out the salts. Farmers also need to be able to sell or lease water saved through

conservation. Regarding laser leveling, participants agreed this is a well-known state-of-the-art practice that is already occurring.

4d. Remove exotic vegetation (ie, salt cedar, Russian olive) on a wide scale

Removing exotic vegetation, particularly salt cedar, garnered a lot of support from meeting attendees. Socorro is already treating 5,000 acres in September through aerial spraying. There are Federal matching funds available for re-vegetation, and participants questioned when more state funds would be made available for this.

4g. Delay start-up of irrigation season

This alternative received mixed reviews. One participant said it could be done depending on the crop; alfalfa, for example, requires water three weeks later. Another participant asked it be removed as an option.

7b. Encourage retention of water within the planning region

Participants seemed divided over the issue of retaining water rights in the region. While they saw the economic value in keeping water in the region, many were hesitant to restrict an individual's control of his own water rights. A new state statute that goes into effect in March 2004 allows acequias to adopt provisions, if they choose, that would require acequia approval of transfers into or out of an acequia or community ditch. Participants seemed open to exploring the option of a water bank to help manage this issue.

6f. Require proof of sustainable water supply for approval of new development.

Socorro County currently relies on the Office of the State Engineer to evaluate whether a proposed subdivision can furnish the required 40-year supply of water. While meeting participants had a distaste for regulations in general, several felt better rules were needed to protect people who purchased homes as well as to prevent later repercussions to the County.

7j. Restrict installation of new domestic wells

The remaining alternative that generated a lot of debate was that calling for restrictions of new domestic wells. Participants opposed the fact that landowners can sell water rights to a parcel of property, then still subdivide it and use 3 ac/ft a year for each dwelling unit as a domestic well. They said domestic wells can impair senior water rights because they don't require a water right. Municipalities can require developers to deed their water rights in exchange for municipal water service. The consensus seemed to be that the report needed to address this inequity; some thought domestic wells should be restricted only where they infringed on farmers and ranchers.

Meeting attendees agreed that the remainder of the alternatives should be included in the report as well. General comments included a recommendation that the report not emphasize alternatives over which the region has little control. Another opinion was that

too many entities now have control over water and that after the regional plans are completed, the state has to consolidate all these interests into a coherent plan.

REGIONAL WATER PLANNING

October 24, 2002 Meeting Summary

The third Steering Committee meeting for Year 2 of the Socorro-Sierra Regional Water Plan got underway at 6:15 p.m. after dinner at K-Bob's Restaurant in Socorro. More than 20 persons from both counties participated in ranking more than 40 alternatives to how water is currently used in the region according to a decision matrix. The matrix was designed to score the alternatives numerically. The alternatives with the top scores would then be compared with those that scored the highest during multi-voting (by dots) at the previous meeting.

Project manager and hydrologist Joanne Hilton, of Daniel B. Stephens and Associates, presented a short summary of the regional water planning project. She explained that the focus of the project was to find alternative ways to use existing or new supplies of water in the region so that they would meet the demand projected for 2040. At previous meetings, attendees had brainstormed a list of alternatives, clarified and refined them, and decided upon nine criteria by which to evaluate them. Those ranked highest by the group will be researched in depth by the project team.

Since the last meeting, the technical project team and S.S. Papadopoulos and Assoc. had scored the alternatives according to how well they met 7 of the 9 criteria based on a scale of 1 to 5 that was designed to move those with the highest scores to the top of the priority list. For example, the fairly costly alternative of "Reclamation, treatment and use of saline water" scored 1 on *local capital costs*, 2 on *local operating and maintenance costs*, 2 on *feasibility of state funding*, 3 on *feasibility of federal funding*, 5 on *physically possible*, 3 on *legal impediments*, and 4 on *saves or produces more water* (broken into three scores: during *diversion*, during *consumption*, *timing* or how soon the effects would be felt).

On October 24, participants first decided on the weights to give each criterion based on a scale of 1 to 5. The criteria scores would later be multiplied by each weight to arrive at a final score for each alternative. After determining weights, the participants moved on to score each alternative on the remaining two criteria: *impairment/public welfare* and *support by political leaders*. Due to time constraints, the group agreed not to score to postpone evaluation of eight alternatives that involved water conservation as Jim McCord, hydrologist and team member, is preparing a separate report on this. Also, two alternatives addressed elsewhere in the plan were also not scored.

Following that, Ms. Hilton totaled the scores on her laptop spreadsheet and Barbara Herrington, meeting facilitator, recorded the alternatives with scores of 160 or more on flip charts for the audience to view and compare with the top-ranked alternatives chosen by dot voting at the last meeting, which were posted on the wall on printed sheets. Participants then had a chance to add other alternatives from the remaining list or delete those they did not wish to pursue. Both lists are attached. These alternatives will be researched in more depth and results presented to the Steering Committee and public at the next meeting. The meeting adjourned approximately 9:15 p.m.

REGIONAL WATER PLANNING

June 20, 2002 Meeting Summary

The second Steering Committee meeting for Year 2 of the Socorro-Sierra Regional Water Plan got underway after a “dutch treat” dinner at K-Bob’s in Truth or Consequences. More than 15 persons from both regions joined in several exercises designed to begin clarifying and prioritizing water use alternatives that will be included in the final plan.

Project consultants Joanne Hilton, project manager, of Daniel B. Stephens and Associates; Jim McCord, a hydrologist with Hydrosphere, and Barbara Herrington, a planner and meeting facilitator with Sites Southwest, reviewed the percentage of current water use in the region by user and reported on progress made between the first and second steering committee meetings.

During that interim, the Alternatives Subcommittee of the Steering Committee—Rob Bowman, Jane Farmer, and Peggy Johnson—had clarified and reorganized the alternatives suggested at the previous meeting into seven categories (see attached list) and deleted a few that were “unrealistic,” such as repealing NAFTA. They also added a number of potential alternatives derived from other regions that were proposed by John Carangelo, co-chair of the Steering Committee. In addition, Joanne Hilton had discussed with S.S. Papadopoulos and Assoc. (SSPA) which alternatives could be analyzed by a water budget model they developed under a contract with the state and the U.S. Army Core of Engineers. A second list of these was constructed. The SSPA group has proposed to perform a quick analysis of all these alternatives to estimate the amount of water each might save or produce and to spend more time on the top choices.

Both sets of alternatives were listed on wall posters and in handouts. The meeting first broke into several groups of from four to five persons to review the list, seek clarifications and make any additions. They then reported results to the entire group and corrections and additions were made to the wall posters.

The group then had a chance to indicate their top choices for each list. Individuals first ranked the alternatives to be analyzed by SSPA. They each received three green dots to place on the alternatives they favored the most and two red dots to place on alternatives they did not want to explore further. The top three choices, with six votes apiece, were (3e) Improve the efficiency of surface water conveyance systems to agricultural land; (4d) Remove exotic vegetation (i.e. salt cedar, Russian olive) on a wide-scale; and 7c) Develop a viable water banking system to facilitate the transfer of water within the planning region. The group consensus was to remove (1g) Dredging and deepening of Elephant Butte Reservoir.

To set initial priorities from the full alternatives list for Daniel B. Stephens and Associates to analyze, participants were given eight green dots and three red dots. The top nine are underscored on the attached list. Following this exercise, participants selected a preliminary list of criteria from lists used by the Colfax and Middle Rio Grande Regional Water Planning groups to be used to evaluate the Socorro-Sierra alternatives. The next Steering Committee meeting will be scheduled for fall.

Questions and Comments Received During the Public Meeting for
The Socorro/Sierra Regional Water Plan
Sarracino Middle School
March 3, 2001
2:00 PM

DBSA:

Is there a state framework water plan? No.
If the residents adopt this plan, does it supercede the state plan? No, it becomes part of the state plan.

Goals:

What do you do in this plan when you discover there is not enough water?
This issue is address in the alternatives section, which has not been done yet.
Occasionally, there are wet years. The plan is nice, but...
Not enough water for population growth.
Rivers are over-appropriated-more water rights than water.
Mining from aquifers.
Important to have a plan that states we do not have enough water today. We do not want Albuquerque and Las Cruces to take water from Socorro and Sierra.
Moratorium-stop development.
If all regions say they need water, how do you make a state plan? The state will then come into play and make policies. Las Cruces cannot plan for water in Socorro or Sierra. Inter-regional planning. Alternatives.
Is there a plan to treat water that is unusable (San Augustin Plains)? Find water quantity, quality, and then claim water.
Lots of salty water east of the Rio Grande.

Groundwater:

1200' depth is saline.
Need a more in depth study-quality and development
Is water on Federal land available for use? Apply to state engineer for water right then it could be leased or contracted.
Could the water plan make a claim to the San Augustin Plains through the County Commission? Can make a plan for future use, under alternatives. Address needs of farmers/agricultural use/population centers.
Who makes decision that 'entity' made claim? Contracts JPA's.
Is the water on Federal land a change in point of diversion? Dealt with by State Engineer.
After the state plan is done, can the Federal government supercede this? Policy on this is coming out of litigation over silvery minnow. The Endangered Species Act trumps state law. Litigation-Feds need to pay a fair market value for the water. Domenici is backing state law-work ESA through state law.
NEPA/EIS for any major federal action.

EIS required for Bureau of Reclamation. Judge reprimanded EIS back to US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Is there any way citizens can make statements to court? Contact MRGCD, City of Socorro. Sign and affidavit-could become part of record.

Erroneous premise-beginning with this on silvery minnow issue. Answered by Court.

Surface water point of diversion-ask State Engineer not to change points of diversion. Advertise the change in point in diversion and then citizens can protest that change.

Depletion of compact delivery.

Water demand:

Salt cedar has greatly increased since 1975, is there a significant riparian increase?

Projected industrial demand. Younger people leaving. If industry was in our area, people would stay. Leave this open as a possibility

The amount of water moved out of the Socorro area will be looked at in next year's scope.

Will regions have any power or authority?

Estimated that 90% of salt cedar is on private land. Provide an incentive for removal of this.

Save Our Bosque Task Force, BLM office, First Tuesday of each month, 9:30 am.

ESA-willow flycatcher

Need defensible regional water plan.

Work with economic development entities.

SOCORRO-SIERRA REGIONAL WATER PLAN SEPTEMBER 11, 2000 MEETING SUMMARY

I. Population Estimates and Projections:

Barbara Herrington, planner with Sites Southwest in Albuquerque, presented a preliminary report on the assumptions, estimates and projections of populations in Socorro and Sierra Counties from 1990 to 2040. Preliminary data from the cohort-component computer model yielded 2040 population projections of 17,147 for Sierra County and 30,481 for Socorro County. These figures are higher than the BBER projections but lower than those in the 1994 update prepared by Gregg White. She also distributed a package of tables and explained how the firm was trying to verify or cast doubt on the 1990 Census counts for population and housing.

Richard Ramsey questioned the exclusion of the Elephant Butte zip code on the population map. John Carrangelo suggested contacting the Department or Chamber of Commerce for economic projections. Jim Shaffner agreed to try to get school enrollment data from the Belen School District.

II. Historical and Current Water Use

Jim McCord, a hydrologist from Hydrosphere, solicited comments on his draft report of Historical and Current Water Use. He noted that they still have not received a response to the survey from the T or C water system. Al promised to help. He also pointed out that water categories have changed over the years, complicating comparisons of the amount of use in each category. Following is a summary of comments:

- The Steering Committee wishes to use “consumptive use” rather than “depletion” to indicate water that is used and not returned to the river. Depletion from the committee’s point of view is only from an aquifer. “Diversion” means the total amount of water diverted. State these definitions in the report.
- Jim noted that they obtained the numbers for self-supplied domestic use by subtracting the population served by the various water utilities from the 1990 Census. The problem in Sierra County is that the water utility population is larger than the Census population. This may be because seasonal winter visitors would be counted in the water utility populations but not in the Census.
- Livestock may be undercounted. Department of Agriculture reports do not include horses and pigs. The assessor charges a tax for livestock, so they often are unreported. Figures obtained from local agricultural agencies, however, were thought to be fairly accurate.
- What daily per capita use should the plan use for projections? Use is approximately 60 gallons per capita per day for both the rural areas and Socorro City. Use in other cities ranges from 152 in Texas to 290 for Las Vegas. Are Socorro and Sierra counties selling themselves short? Brian Wilson from the SEO suggests using 100 gallons per capita per day. Some reasons may be that water from the Mutual Domestic Water Associations is restricted to domestic use (inside the house plus 2 dogs, 1 cow, 1 horse) but the rest and landscaping are to be supplied from individual wells. Larger cities have parks, golf courses, and hotels, which increase the per capita water use rate. Should different numbers be used for the county and city?
- Albuquerque is also counting evaporation of water from Elephant Butte.

III. Water Rights Law

Dominique Carton, an attorney with Daniel B. Stephens and Assoc. in Albuquerque, reviewed water rights law in New Mexico. Some issues that arose during the discussion included:

- The La Jolla Acequia Association may have to go to court at some point to fight a charge that it abandoned certain water rights after its ditch washed out.
- Mutual Domestic Water Associations need to make sure that potential sellers have valid water rights before they purchase them.
- Pre-basin wells are a category of water rights that needs to be quantified.
- Adjudicating a basin is a \$10 million process for the state (Mary Helen).

Socorro/Sierra Regional Water Planning Steering Committee
103 Neel Ave., Socorro, NM 87801 (505) 835-1710 ext. 5
2101 S. Broadway, T or C, NM 87901 (505) 894-2232

February 2, 2000
6:00 PM

Present: See attached list.

- I. Introductions-Jim McCord, Hydrosphere; Joanne Hilton-DBSA; Barbara Herrington and Phyllis Taylor-Sites SW introduced themselves to the Steering Committee.
- II. Project Background and Year 1 tasks-Joanne Hilton gave a summary of the water planning to date and also summarized their tasks for this year. Attached is the Critical Path chart listing the deliverables that they will be completing this year. Water planning began in 1987 in the State of NM to protect the water resources by answering the following questions: how much water is available, how much water is needed, and what alternatives can be implemented to meet the needs. There are sixteen planning regions within the State of NM. These plans will be placed with in the statewide plan. This has originated from litigation with Texas. NM must show its need for more water, not just say it needs the water. The original plan was completed in 1994. The ISC released its template for regional water planning in late 1994. This region received another grant to revise the 1994 plan to concur with this template. The remainder of work to be done with this plan, based on future funding from the ISC, includes: water budget tool for alternatives analysis, water conservation plan, drought vulnerability assessment and contingency plan, and water quality assessment. There is a bill before the legislature for another \$1,000,000 to continue water planning. Jim McCord recommended talking with Ben Altimirano, Joe Fidel, Max Coll, and Lucky Varela-members of the Senate and House Finance committees about the importance of regional water planning and the need for the \$1,000,000. Attached is a fact sheet about regional water planning that you can use when talking to people about the importance of this that Jim McCord and John Carangelo handed out at the meeting.
- III. Public Involvement Plan-see attachment-Phyllis Taylor facilitated this discussion. Some items suggested are: Enchantment newspaper (newspaper that goes out once per month to COOP subscribers), Voter registration list, District Newsletters, Socorro Electric Coop Channel 86, Utility bills, FSA newsletter, newspaper articles. It was decided that legal notices were not needed. One copy of mailings could be distributed to each big stakeholder instead of numerous copies. Attached is a Mailing list and a Contact list-add anyone to these that you can think of and return to Nyleen or Merry Jo. Nyleen and Merry Jo will be the collection points of information. They will get these to Phyllis, Barbara, Joanne, and Jim as needed. There is a copy of

the ongoing public involvement plan in the Socorro and Sierra SWCD offices. These are notebooks that we will be adding information to as the plan progresses. Anyone may come to the office and review it. It will contain the minutes, press releases, newspaper articles, technical reports, etc.

Nyleen and Merry Jo then discussed signing the Steering Committee up as NRCS Earth Team Volunteers. The Steering Committee volunteers their time to serve the community. The Socorro and Sierra NRCS field offices need to sign up these volunteers as part of their program. This will look good for the NRCS offices and it will also keep track of in-kind service provided by the Steering Committee that can be reported in our water plan to the ISC.

Attached is the sign up form and a time keeping sheet (make copies of this or come by the office and we can give you more). If you have not signed up, please do so and return the form to Nyleen or Merry Jo. Thanks.

- IV. Goals and Objectives-Phyllis facilitated this discussion and Barbara recorded the comments on the goals and objectives. Attached is sheet listing the goals and objectives from the 1994 water plan. These were discussed. Attached is list of everyone's comments. Please review and comment on the goals and objectives. If you have any suggestions, please get these to Nyleen or Merry Jo. Phyllis and Barbara will be preparing a list of the goals and objectives with some language options. This will go out to the Steering Committee for review.

- V. Adjourn.

SOCORRO-SIERRA REGIONAL WATER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING FEB. 2, 2000

NOTES ON PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN (Consensus is in bold)

4a ii Mailing List

- ◆ Voter registration? (too many)
- ◆ Utility bills (Socorro water and gas)
- ◆ Channel 86
- ◆ Enchantment –published by the electric coop
- ◆ S&W newsletters, FSA monthly
- ◆ **Limited Mailing list**
- ◆ Legal ads? Probably not necessary

4b Public Comment

- ◆ Report on progress in ads

4d Documents

- ◆ 100 copies prior—RCND
- ◆ Steering Committee has final update (98)
- ◆ Soil and Water can copy drafts
--Need 2 originals, clipped not bound

4d Interim report to Steering Committee

- ◆ Soil and Water to copy
- ◆ NRCS Earth team volunteers, can count as in-kind service on contract

Water Plan

- ◆ At Soil and Water monthly meetings will be a conference call between Steering committee and S&WCD