

**Handwritten Public Comments from the January 2004 Community
Conversations**

The first set of comments is from the Community Conversations held January 27, 28, and 29, 2004.

Public Comment

January 27, 2004

I use less than 7 gallons of water for ALL uses inside my home—including washing my clothes by hand and flushing the stool. We all choose daily everytime we turn on faucets—spoiled rotten stupidity OR wise, fair sustainability. The least sane choice is to make sure that we use NO more water than is being replenished in the aquifer. Far more sane and responsible would be to consume much less water than is being replenished in order to gradually return the aquifer level to what it was centuries ago, before the European invasion.

Honest personal testimonies inspire others to change their ways. Honest personal testimonies from local people about exactly HOW they now greatly save water in their homes. I urge you all to contact newspapers and radio and TV stations. Urge them to carry brief testimonies (at least one every week) from a broad diversity of people—women, men, young, middle age and older, well-known and NOT well know from all ethnic groups, from many occupations, from every part of the city.

I LIVE IN Albuquerque

Don Schrader 1810 Silver SE, Apart. B. 87106

Public Comment

January 27, 2004

conservation [sic] practices (at the household and industry levels) along with public education are important to establishing sustainable use of water

quality of water is just as important as the quantity of water—in response to pavement as a more efficient means of recharging the aquifer—now does this affect water quality? Are we sending more pollutants into the aquifer?

How does the plan address the low-income community—ex) are there programs that make conservation activities accessible to this community?

I agree with the gentleman that stated that we should manage our water at the watershed level--.

I LIVE IN

Public Comment

January 28, 2004

My comments are with regards to farm irrigation.

1. Water is being waster when farm land is not laser leveled. I've seen fields where water has to rise 6"+ in one area to get 1" of water in another.
2. Some people are watering weeds instead of crops. (I'm paying for it so I'll waster it)!
3. Scedueling [sic] of water needs to be be fixed. I have scheduled [sic] water with the ditch rider only to see that two or three people above me have lowered there [sic] checks after I've watered one acre. After the ditch rider take care of the water thieves, I have to water that same acre again, in order to water the rest of the land.
4. People are watering roads (Sleep on the job)

I LIVE IN Belen, Valencia Co.

Albert Chavez

864-6314

Public Comment

January 28, 2004

1. What happens to animal and plant habitat when you asphalt and concret [sic] all that is green and good
2. The water contamination problem in the city is caused by a city that allows intense development in areas where it wasn't allowed.
3. Till Mimi Stewart and Bill Richards that when we bought our property, we bought the water.

I LIVE IN Bernalillo

Public Comment

January 28, 2004

1. Aquifer recharge MUST be recognize [??] from irrigate
2. Metering and charging for water is not acceptable ESPECIALY when develop[ers] have their infic slnuctih [??] paid for by tax payer
A developer should buy my meter.
3. We live in a desert—Get OVER IT—Development must be slowed to preserve what we have.
4. Change name of H2O plan to HOW TO SCREW the farm and support the big contributor to politicians campaigns.

I LIVE IN Bernalillo

Public Comment

January 28, 2004

1. We need HONEST political leadership who knows NEW development is NOT planning for the future.
2. If you measure my H2O use, I will use it all every year!
3. The river itself is a living entity and it should be kept wet—including in Los Luna[s].
4. This is not the fault of the silvery minnow—it is over use by a large city that lies, cheats, and steals.

I LIVE IN Bernalillo

Public Comment

January 28, 2004

R1-2 yes

R1-3 yes

R1-5 yes

R1-8 superimportant

R2-4 yes

R2-9 Alb. Tried part of this in 1970's and much was ignored

R2-11 possible good idea

P48 4 items superimportant yet you seem to have caved in

R4-1 most of this done years ago

R4-3 not practicle—give real world example

R6-2 not practicle expensive and don't work like that

R7-1 good

R8-1 at what cost in \$ and is non renewable. Using our grandkids legacy.

R8-2 cost? Not practicle in most cases

We don't have to grow. We need better jobs for our existing populations. Growth just increases what problems we have. Let's improve what we have.

I LIVE IN Valencia

Public Comment

January 29, 2004

In face of what is almost a 25% deficit in the annual water spending the solution should be an across the board reduction of water use by all users. The 2000-2050 plan needs to have some teeth in it to enforce this level of conservation – 25%. This should be possible in every sector of water use—every sector is responsible for wasting water whether its farming, industrial, or household users. The seeming present free-for-all development and water “spending,” or use has a price that every user is responsible for.

1. Water needs to be priced at its social cost which will result in reduction of use, and well users should be required to have meters and pay some fee to fund the appropriate state agency that would enforce water conservation. Urban water system users should have part of their water bill payment used similarly.
2. R-1 1 thru 9 should be required not just voluntary.

I LIVE IN Corrales Bill Emmington

Public Comment

January 29, 2004

Concerns: Domestic well policy – substantial controversy will occur with reduction or restriction of well use due to impairment of aquifers [sic] unless impairment is fairly quantified—who determines quantification reasonably and fairly—taken to the extreme the argument for impairment could completely stop community growth.

Water transfer process—Transfers of water rights must be open to all “stakeholders” – who determines who are legitimately affected stakeholders? This is a vague definition and can be unreasonably used to stop an transfer whether legitimate or not. Require better definitions.

Growth Management. This needs to be better defined and reasonable so that local jurisdictional control is not unfairly taken away by combined land use and water use authority.

Public Welfare. This is a very difficult definition for a fair and balanced view. This should not be allowed to become a general “catch all” to argue against any water use or transfer request.

I LIVE IN

Public Comment

January 29, 2004

1. Clear Rio Grande Channel—will help save on evaporation—less surface area etc.
2. Monatar [sic] kinds of trees and shrubs that are along RGW way and penalize the owners of the land—rather than tax the H₂O.

Good job on this project—Keep up the good work. Thanks for your efforts.

I LIVE IN Corrales

Public Comment

January 29, 2004

1. If state water plan is done, how is our region's plan going to be acknowledged?
2. Michael Cadigan will tell you it is a developer's constitutional!? right to develop [sic] – what constitution. What do we say to him? He tells his constituents this!
3. Mayor Chavez has told me that Albuquerque is not in the plan. Like he is going to ignore it or is exempt!

I LIVE IN Taylor Ranch

Public Comment

Section 5.8.1

Change “Elephant Butte” Reservoir to “El Vado” reservoir.

Comment from Subhas Shah of MRGCD

Comments on the following pages are noted as Water Assembly comments:

Public Comment

The water being discussed at public meeting is not public water it has owners and 70% is owned by farmers. Important concept.

Public Comment

Enjoyed the meeting—great info and well expressed.

I see two meteorites heading straight for collision. If we have “to move” on this water plan and we also have “to educate” people on the need and use of agriculture – I don’t see how we can “move” and not even have started a way for the “education” of people. Before we can all accept any plan, we have to be completely informed. When and how do we plan to begin the education of water use from the very necessary agriculture prescriptive?

Education of convenience stores fast-food, etc. MUST include not washing off your parking lots! Brooms, please (just a big pet peeve of mine!)

Thanks—

Barbara Van Buskirk

I LIVE IN Valencia

Public Comment

1. You have to change the New Mexican lifestyle and change our needs to lower water use.
2. Why are we taking water out of the Rio Grand bed by Alameda to water the Baloon [sic] Park golf course and other golf courses in the Heights. It seems this goes against all our efforts to conserve water. We need to prioritize our water use.
3. Restrictions have to be mandatory with warnings and fines in place. I read an article that water use increased when they used voluntary restrictions. If you use water rate increases, have it over a certain amount. So the more you use the higher rate you pay. So in that way the essential water use rates would still be low. Allow so much per person. Commercial use would be calculated different.
4. There is essential Agricultural use and non-essential – don't group it all in one.

I LIVE Bernalillo County