

Supporting Document K-3

Preferred Scenario Development

**Mid Region Council of Governments
and
Middle Rio Grande Water Assembly**

**Retreat
June 21, 2003, Intel**

Facilitators: Lilly Irvin-Vitela and Lucy Moore

Resource person: Howard Passell

Participants:

Bob Prendergast	Phil Pohl
Lee Brown	Lora Lucero
Susan Kelly	Dan McKay
Andy Smith	David Stoliker
Danny Hernandez	Elaine Hebard
Terese Ulivarri	Kevin Bean
John Brown	Lynn Montgomery
Lisa Robert	Robert Cordova
Mike Trujillo	Ginger Eldridge
Don Lopez	Richard Barrish
Mary Murnane	Reid Bandeen
Bob Wesseley	Leslie Kryder
Elizabeth Chesnut	Henry Pacelli

PURPOSE: To discuss difficult issues and identify points of agreement and disagreement in order to build a scenario which has the maximum support possible among Water Assembly and MRCOG membership.

DECISION MAKING AND GROUND RULES: The group agreed to use a limited amount of time to discuss an issue and try to reach consensus. Consensus would be defined as everyone being able to live with the proposal. Participants will take the consensus points back to their constituencies or boards for final approval. Failing consensus, the summary of the retreat would explain the points raised for the further edification of the authors of the draft plan.

The group agreed to listen to each other carefully and with respect, to look for areas of common ground, to share the time so all have a chance to speak, and to maintain a sense of humor, if possible. They also agreed to permit caucuses by anyone who needed to call one, and that all cell phones should be turned off.

retreats.doc

PRIORITIZING ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION: Participants ranked the 22 issues listed on the agenda, plus two additional issues, Water Quality # 23, and Watershed Management # 24.

Results of the ranking are listed below:

- Land use and water planning connections (10 votes)
- Growth management (10)
- Rio Grande Compact requirements (10)
- Domestic well control and metering (8)
- Number of acres in agricultural production – now and future (5)
- Importation of water rights to the region (5)
- Watershed management (5)
- Water banking (4)
- Future rainfall – based on 1990's? 1950's? 1600's? (4)
- San Juan/Chama numbers? – less than 75,844? (4)
- Ag use of water for ranching/livestock in region (4)
- Minimum volume to be stored at Elephant Butte – 400,000 af? (4)
- Instream flow rights (3)
- Authorization for additional storage at Abiquiu, impacts of upstream storage (2)
- Current projection for population growth – a given? (2)
- Desalination (2)
- How does ownership of water rights figure into planning process? (1)
- How can/should water consumption be reduced on farms? (1)
- How can/should water consumption be reduced in conveyance systems (1)
- Conservation and yard size (1)
- Water quality (1)

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES:

Land Use and Water Planning: The question before the group was: Should land use policy be made on the basis of water availability? Although there may be a natural link and a necessary connection between land use and water planning, some questioned whether or not the link would produce a quantifiable water savings. The benefits might include: an economic vitality, preserving a sense of community, and a sense of living within our means.

State subdivision laws require that in rural communities developers have water rights in hand in order to receive a permit. Some questioned whether or not those requirements were enforced adequately, and what the impact on wet water supplies would be. Many subdivisions were grandfathered under the law, and others some say were “rubber stamped.”

The group discussed timing issues. Should water use decisions be made simultaneously with land use decisions? Should water be a veto in land use decisions? Many felt that land use connections should be made early in the water planning process, and that comprehensive planning at the local level should address water.

retreats.doc

Land use planning should include attention to design, so that building in a flood plain, for instance, is prohibited.

The group also acknowledged that much development occurs on agricultural land, and that the loss of that land can impact water resources, particularly the shallow aquifers.

There was concern that municipalities would not be able to afford to comply with mandates requiring connections between land use and water availability. Some also wondered about unintended consequences of such policies.

The group reached consensus on the following statement:

Land use plans created within the region need to consider the availability of renewable water supplies.

Growth Management: Much of this discussion focused on whether or not water availability should be a constraint on growth, and if it is, how that constraint can be implemented. There was also concern that growth is a population issue, and that without addressing population, growth management is meaningless. Mandating who lives where, however, can be controversial or even illegal. Another question asked whether the goal was to have a single regional growth management plan to be considered by each local government, or whether to recommend that each local government develop its own growth management plan. Without a regional approach, some feared that one local government would shove development to the least restrictive jurisdiction. A coordinated regional approach can be undermined without local buy-in, said one. Another anticipated that each jurisdiction within the region would receive a certain budgeted amount of water. A participant pointed out that if the region does not manage its own growth, “someone else will.”

There was discussion about the extent of water savings from various kinds of growth management. Infill, for instance, reduces water consumption. A participant suggested that the plan should be more selective about kinds of development, and limit industrial projects.

Participants warned against gentrification, and development constraints that make affordable housing unaffordable and destroy communities.

Local economies are currently dependent on a growth model, and they will need help learning about and shifting to alternative models of economic development.

The group worked on the language in the “Summary of the Feasibility of the Candidate Alternative Actions,” and came close to a consensus on the following. The dissenting voice preferred “water plan” to “growth management plan.”

Develop a sustainable and coordinated regional growth management plan which local governments in the middle Rio Grande region should adopt and implement in order to:
1) reduce water consumption;

retreats.doc

- 2) *minimize impact on water resources;*
- 3) *encourage conservation -oriented economic development;*
- 4) *ensure adequate water supplies for any proposed development, and*
- 5) *consider the carrying capacity and location of development.*

Meeting the Rio Grande Compact Requirements: This discussion included a principle for consideration by the planners: that any shortfalls be shared equitably among water users. Neither urban nor rural should take a disproportionate share of the hit. Again, the inclusion of urban irrigation within the MRGCD is an issue. Participants wanted also to insure that meeting the compact would not mean extreme measures like lining the Rio Grande.

The group agreed by consensus that:

The region must meet the requirements of the Rio Grande Compact in accordance with the missions, goals and objectives of the plan.

There was much discussion about how to meet those requirements, and Howard Passell demonstrated various scenarios on the model.

Domestic Well Control and Metering: The group exchanged pros and cons of domestic well controls and metering. The argument against controls and metering include the opinion that the concept is politically unpopular, the number of wells and the amount pumped is not significant, the amount of water saved questionable, and the cost of metering and enforcement may be prohibitive. Besides, the State Engineer by law cannot deny a domestic well permit., and restrictions may constitute a taking of private property. It was suggested that sampling in order to learn more about the impacts of wells made more sense than across the board metering.

Proponents of metering and controls feel strongly that the number of wells in the region is well over 100,000, permitted and unpermitted, and that with the potential for each well to pump 3 af a year the impact on the water resources could be disastrous. They argue that it is important to have as much data as possible about *all* uses, including wells and their impact on groundwater supplies. The Institute for Public Law survey showed general support (6 on a scale from 1 to 7) for metering wells, which is an indication that there is public, if not political, support for metering. Many wells, they suggested, are being used for irrigating. Some feared a priority call on the river (like Pecos) without this kind of information and controls, and suggested that the cost of metering could be prepared for. Because it is a difficult sell, a regional level policy might be more successful than a local one. The mechanism of declaring Critical Management Areas may be another vehicle for the State Engineer to use in controlling domestic wells.

Some suggested metering all new wells, and grandfathering existing wells, or focusing on the problem areas where groundwater supplies are endangered.

The group discussed the following language:

- All future wells should be metered. SE should investigate and determine the number of domestic wells in the region.
- All uses of water in the MRG should be measured, and new uses should not impair existing water rights and permits.
- The SE should be allowed to place conditions upon domestic well permits

The group agreed by consensus on the following statement:

All uses of water in the MRG should be measured, and new uses should not impair existing water users.

Number of Acres in Agricultural Production, now and in the future: Participants began by pointing to definition problems. Calculations on agricultural land in production are skewed because of the number of MRGCD acres which are actually outdoor urban areas, or yards, not acres under commercial cultivation. The kind of information needed is usually gained through the State Engineer's hydrographic survey process, but there have been no resources for that effort to date. The group agreed to leave the amount of current acreage question to the Analysis Team, and to focus on the anticipated percentage change in that number in the future.

There was a discussion of the value and nature of agricultural land. A participant pointed out that the definition should include grazing, since in some parts of the region agricultural land is used for livestock. Another noted that once agricultural land is lost, it cannot be regained. Preserving land in agriculture is insurance for the future, a buffer for unpredictable times ahead. Irrigated land provides economic benefit to small communities, food for surrounding areas, wildlife habitat, recharge for the aquifer, benefits to the air shed and view shed, preservation of cultural and historic values, and "room to breathe."

Some felt that the number of acres under cultivation would remain constant, and that without Pueblo figures and projections it was difficult to be accurate. As the bosque is restored some land may return to cultivation. Others felt that a decrease in agricultural land was inevitable, based on current development rates and patterns. Land should not be considered "out of production" just because it is fallow as a result of crop rotation.

Again, there was concern about unforeseen consequences of policies on constituents in the region. The group also discussed the impact of the marketplace on the use of water. Some saw farmers as vulnerable to market pressures; others saw the price of water as a useful mechanism. And again, there was the question of whether or not water is really gained for the system if land goes from irrigation to development.

The group agreed on the concept that "double dipping" should be prohibited, but found it difficult to define the concept in a way that permitted natural vegetation to flourish, or remaining water rights to be used. The intention was to insure that the equivalent amount of wet water would follow the water rights that were sold off a piece of land, and that the owner would not

retreats.doc

continue to use that amount of water on the “source site” that had been sold or leased for use on another site.

The group discussed the following proposed language:

- Strengthen and enforce the rules that currently exist in the MRGCD.
- Do not permit transfer from SW to GW.
- Ensure that the source sites of transfers truly stop consuming water.
- Stop gross examples of double dipping.
- Promote water banking with competent protections for third parties. (can be considered under A-67)
- Identify recharge areas in ag lands and establish protective policies for those areas. (can be considered under A-30)
- Develop protective mechanisms for ag properties based on productive capabilities.
- Develop methods to relieve market pressure on agriculture to sell water rights.
- Develop fiscal incentives that can relieve market pressure on agriculture to sell water rights to another consumptive use.

The group agreed by consensus on the following statements:

Principle: Values of agricultural land include health of ecosystem; recharge, future potential in terms of compact deliveries, food security and economics; airshed and viewshed, wildlife, and cultural/historical values.

We anticipate that with no policy changes there is likely to be a 25-30% reduction in irrigated acreage by 2050.

Permit emergency leasing to meet Compact obligations and environmental needs.

Develop protective mechanisms for ag properties to support the principles named above.

NEXT STEPS:

retreats.doc

- The Analysis Team will reconcile conflicting numbers, including number of agricultural acreage, and others, **by the end of July.**
- The Public Welfare group will meet during June and July to further the development of the public welfare statement for the draft plan. Next meeting is at Lora Lucero's house, **Wednesday, June 25, 5:30 - 7:30.** Call for directions:
- Water Resources Board meeting to consider scenario, **July 9**
- Joint Meeting,* WRB and WA to continue today's work, **July 15, 4:00 - 8:00 pm** – location to be announced
- Retreat, WRB and WA to continue today's work and consider goals, objectives, and public welfare statement, **Saturday, August 2, 9:00 am - 4:00 pm.**

* The group agreed it may be necessary to appoint a smaller group to work on issues if progress is not adequate at these joint meetings.

Summary prepared by Lucy Moore. Please contact her with comments or corrections: 505-820-2166, or email: lucymoore@nets.com

**Middle Rio Grande Water Assembly and Water resources Board
Joint Meeting July 15, 2003**

Facilitators: Ric Richardson and Lilly Irvin-Vitela

Participants: Bill Sapien, Don Lopez, Terese Ulivarri, Mike Trujillo, Dave Hill, Lee Brown, Bob Grant, Robert Cordova, Martin Zehr, Ted Asbury, Betty Behrend, Tom Menicued, Mike McCan, David Stoliker, Susan Kelly, John Stomp, Bob Prendergast.

Purpose: To continue discussing unresolved issues and identify points of agreement and disagreement in order to build a scenario which has the maximum support possible among the Water Assembly and Water Resource Board membership.

Decision-making and Ground Rules: The group agreed use a limited amount of time to discuss each of the issues and try to draft a consensus statement about each. The ground rules for the discussion that the group had defined at the retreat in June 21, 2003, included listening and speaking respectfully and carefully; building on common ground; sharing the amount of time dedicated to discussing each issue; using the available time as effectively as possible; maintaining a sense of humor; and caucusing when necessary. Participants agreed to take the consensus agreements back to their constituencies for final approval. If agreement on an issue is not possible, the meeting summary will serve to clarify the debate about the issues for those who are drafting the plan.

Issues for Discussion:

1. Importation of water rights to the region.
2. Watershed Management
3. Water Banking
4. Future rainfall projections
5. San Juan Chama numbers
6. Ag use of water for ranching and livestock in the region
7. Store minimum volume at Elephant Butte- 400,000 af?
8. In stream Flow
9. Authorization for additional storage at Abiquiu, impacts of upstream storage
10. Current projection for population growth- a given?
11. Desalination
12. How does ownership of water rights figure into the planning process?
13. How can/should diversions be reduced in conveyance systems?
14. How can/should water consumption be reduced in conveyance systems?
15. Conservation and yard size
16. Water Quality

Discussion of Issues:

1. *Importation of Water Rights to the Region:* The question before the group was: Should the plan support importing water from Socorro/Sierra or any other regions, especially if there are water savings in these regions from restoration of the Bosque?

The group discussed the advantages and consequences of importing water, especially in light of the overall goal of the plan to balance water use with renewable supply. However, the group concluded that the Middle Rio Grande region should maintain the option of pursuing available water with the consent of the exporting region. During the discussion, several of the members of the group raised questions about who would make and oversee such decisions and how would the imported water be made paid for?

The group reached consensus on the following statement:

The Region should seek to import and used any water that is available including water made available through desalination where feasible.

2. *Watershed Management:* The question raised for the group's consideration was: To what degree should watershed management be pursued as a regulatory and conservation tool within the region? The group discussed the purpose of managing water on a watershed basis and agreed that it is a sound concept and used the language from the alternative on watershed management as the basis for their consensus statement.

The group reached consensus on the following statement:

Implement local and regional watershed management plans through all land and water agencies in the area to increase water yield and prevent erosion.

3. *Water Banking:* The question before the group was: In what way can or should water banking be used in order to protect water rights and insure beneficial use?

The group defined water banking as a mechanism to temporarily lease water rights to maximize use without the permanent transfer of rights from one owner to another. During the discussion the group identified three primary objections to water banking. The objections include: 1.) By facilitating its commodification, water may be moved out of agriculture use more quickly. 2.) There is no institutional clarity about the regulation and oversight of water banking: Would the regulation be based on a state or regional agency? 3.) To the extent that water is treated as a commodity within the, there is a precedent for treating water as a commodity between states.

The group also discussed the implications of water banking on agricultural practices. Recent legislation has recognized that acequia associations have the right to approve or disapprove the sale of water rights.

The group reached consensus on the following statement:

Water banking should be implemented within the region in order to maximize beneficial use and to permit the water right to stay with the owner while the water is leased for a period of time.

4. Future rainfall projections: The question for the group to consider was framed as: What historical data should be used to make projections about future rainfall and the consequent intensity of drought? How do different data sets frame the conditions that we need to consider when problem-solving?

The group discussed the validity of the major data sets that are used for historic rainfall and to project future trends. On the one hand the tree ring data from El Malpais may not be reflective of the hydrological conditions in the Middle Rio Grande region. On the other hand data from the 1950's forward may be based in one of the wettest periods in the history of the region. The group agreed that other data sets are incomplete.

The plan should use a range of numbers from the data available and a series of hydrological conditions to get the best approach. The plan would include a drought management plan, as required, to recommend what to do if there is not enough water to meet the compact.

The group made the following consensus recommendations:

The water plan baseline hydrological data will be defined by the Analysis Team and approved by the Action Committee and the Water Resources Board.

5. San Juan Chama numbers: The question before the group was: How much water is available from the San Juan Chama project?

The discussion centered on how much water will actually be available from San Juan Chama (75,000 AF vs. 60,000 AF). If there is a drought there may be less water and the Bureau of Reclamation may decrease the yield allocated to the Middle Rio Grande Region. It may be more realistic to reduce the amount expected. Members of the group agreed that it is politically infeasible to propose using less water than has been allocated and contracted.

The group also agreed that drought conditions, the Endangered Species Act, and other legal issues should be addressed as they arise, but using any number less than what the amount for which there are legal contracts leaves the region vulnerable to others wanting to utilize the water that the region has not planned for and used.

The group reached consensus on the following statement:

The San Juan Chama water allotment that will be used in the projected scenario is the amount currently contracted to users within the Middle Rio Grande.

6. Agricultural use of water for ranching and livestock in the region: The question before the group was: In what way will the draft plan include ranching/livestock issues in the agricultural alternatives to address water conserving agricultural practices within the sub region?

The group reached consensus on the following statement:

This issue will be taken off the table because it is already being addressed in the sub region's plan.

7. Store minimum volume at Elephant Butte- 400,000 AF? The question that this alternative raised was: Does it make sense to store the minimum amount of water (as little as possible) at Elephant Butte because of high rate of evaporation at Elephant Butte and the consequent water loss? The discussion focused on the fact that storing water upstream in other reservoirs at higher elevations or in the aquifer does not result in the evaporation losses as storing water at Elephant Butte; therefore there would be significant water savings.

The group agreed that it made sense to store as little as 400,000 AF in Elephant Butte so long as Interstate Compact requirements to deliver water to Texas were met and there was not undue environmental impacts of storing water in upstream reservoirs. (See the discussion below under Authorization for additional storage at Abiquiu. Same rationale informed decision-making)

The group reached consensus on the following statement:

Water may be stored at Elephant Butte in any amount so long as New Mexico Maintains compact requirements.

8. In stream flow: The question that was raised for the group by this alternative was: Does endorsing in stream flow as a beneficial use in the plan contribute to creating a water right for the river?

The debate centered on whether this alternative is an environmental priority or would be contrary to the current policies of the State Engineer. Further some members of the group asserted that putting this alternative in the plan would indicate that the region supports the Federal Government in making decisions about water rights for the State. With current court decisions, Federal considerations about the Silvery Minnow and the Endangered Species Act may result in creating an in stream flow requirement.

Other members of the group asserted that the State of New Mexico and State Engineer Office should be responsible to determine Instream flow and beneficial use. The group also raised concerns about competing interests between the environmental needs and interests and agricultural need for Rio Grande water.

There was no consensus on this issue.

9. Authorization for additional storage at Abiquiu reservoir, and the impacts of upstream storage: The question before the group was: Should the plan include a assumption that the region requesting that additional storage (up to 400,000 AF) be authorized at Abiquiu Reservoir when it comes up for federal reauthorization? The

current scenario recommends agreeing to the existing amount of storage in Abiquiu that has been authorized. Authorization of additional storage has raised questions about the environmental, social and economic impacts of this action. Requesting additional storage would require renegotiation of the compact to permit storing more water upstream.

The key questions covered in the discussion include: 1) What are the impacts of storing more water at Abiquiu on the Wild and Scenic river designation in the stretch of the river above the Reservoir? 2) What are the potential impacts on the ability to store water at Abiquiu to institute flood control measures? 3) Is the potential for saving water by storing water upstream rather than at Elephant Butte through the reduction in losses from evaporation significant enough to justify this action?

The group discussed that it is not clear that storing additional water at Abiquiu would affect the area of the River designated as Wild and Scenic. Many members of the group also asserted that there are Federal regulations about affecting rivers designated as Wild and Scenic, and the plan would be subject to those restrictions. Further, flood control guidelines regulate the maximum amount of water that may be stored at Abiquiu. Other members of the group pointed out that storing water at a higher elevation in New Mexico would result in significant water savings because there would be less evaporation at Elephant Butte.

The group reached consensus on the following statement (in contrast to the present assumption in the draft converged scenario):

As a plan, the Region should seek to store as much water upstream as possible to the extent that it may be approved by regulatory authorities. This would require Congressional authorization.

10. Current projection for population growth – is it a given?: The question that this alternative raised was: Are the about the population projections from Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER) the best to use in the plan? The issue was raised because BBER did not project to 2050 (only to 2020), and analysts other than BBER had projected population for the time period from 2020 to 2050.

Members of the group pointed out that the data from BBER was the best information available, and that the Water Action Committee had revised the population projections in the plan after a presentation from Deli Alcantara, the State Demographer from BBER. A recommendation was made to consult with Deli Alcantara to see if she has projected the population to 2050.

The group reached consensus on the following statement:

The water plan will be based on BBER population projections.

11. Desalination: The question that was before the group from this alternative was: Why does the scenario only look to Tularosa as a potential source to import desalinated water?

The group discussed that while it is important to look at all sources of water in addition to desalinated water from Tularosa, importing desalinated water from the Estancia basin may prove difficult given the position about not exporting water from that region. There are also concerns about contaminating the existing water supply in the

desalination process. This concern has also been raised in regard to tapping and desalinating Albuquerque's deeper, but brackish aquifer. The reason why importing a modest amount of Tularosa's desalinated water was that because the hydrological data suggests that the aquifer could be mined with limited risk to fresh water. However, the group also recognized that costs for the technology to desalinate the water and constructing a pipeline to transport the water might prove to make the alternative prohibitively expensive.

The group reached consensus on the following statement, recommending a similar approach to this issue as "Importation of Water to the Region:"

The Region should seek any water that is available including desalination where feasible.

12. How does ownership of water rights figure into the planning process? The question before the group was raised because of the high regard and public interest in protecting individual water rights, and that the plan does not address the issue of ownership of water rights.

The group discussed that the plan does not address water rights specifically because past attempts at dealing with water rights in the context of planning has derailed the planning process. Member of the group from the water assembly pointed out that while the ownership of water is crucial, water rights are looked at as a separate and important issue. Further, many water rights are in dispute and many of the basins have not yet been adjudicated. This leaves several unknowns that a plan cannot meaningfully address at this time. However, the group pointed out that it is recognized that implementation of the plan will necessarily involved issues about the adjudication of water rights. The water assembly has carefully crafted a statement to the effect that their intent is NOT to affect water rights.

The following language was agreed to by consensus:

The ownership of water rights is an issue properly dealt with at the State level and not within a regional water plan. However, the Region endorses the early adjudication of water rights in the Middle Rio Grande region.

13. How can/should water consumption be reduced on farms?

This discussion was similar in focus and content to the discussion about reducing diversions and conserving water in conveyance systems. (See the following discussion, number 14.)

The group reached consensus on the following language:

Promote on-farm water conservation

14. How can should water consumption be reduced in conveyance systems?: In addition to this specific question, this alternative raised the following questions for the

group: What is the basis for the assumption that water is “consumed” in conveyance systems? Which ditches should be lined and which ditches should not be lined?

There was discussion that most water from conveyance systems is not really consumed or lost. Rather, the water seeps back into the shallow aquifer, and the seepage is beneficial as it helps to recharge the aquifer in many places and replenishes local wells. Further, unlined ditches also help to maintain riparian health. Although lining ditches makes them easier to clean there are cultural implications of ditch cleaning that should be respected.

The group agreed that there are some conveyance systems that are more appropriate than others to line. Increasing irrigation efficiency makes sense. There are other ways such as a well-implemented and monitored ditch rotation system that would do more to improve efficiency.

The group reached consensus on the following language:

Change the question to- How can/should diversions be reduced in conveyance systems? The focus should be on high volume conveyance systems that don't reach the river or recharge the aquifer.

- 1. Respect the recharge areas for local wells and places where the conveyance replenishes the shallow aquifer.*
- 2. Respect cultural values.*
- 3. Consider the environmental impact on the riparian system.*

15. Conservation and yard size: The question before the group was what is the relationship between yard size and water conservation? The group discussed the value of reducing irrigated areas in a yard as well as in parks and golf courses. The group agreed to reframe the issue as “Landscaping Conservation” and to break the issue in to two parts, one having to do with reducing the amount of turf lawns in residential areas, and the other addressing irrigated golf courses, parks and public green spaces.

The group reached consensus on the following statements:

15A. Reduce the amount of turf and non-xeric landscape areas by regulation on a regional basis through local ordinances.

15B. Reduce the amount of irrigated golf course acreage proportionate to population and maintain green spaces in parks while encouraging conservation practices and xeric landscaping.

16. Water Quality: The question that this alternative raised was: How should water quality issues be addressed in the plan?

The group discussed that the I.S.C. maintains that the regional water plan must include “specific and practical means for addressing water quality management.” Members of the Water Assembly pointed out water quality is one of the expressed in the goals of the plan, and the group agreed that a water quality analysis should be an important component of the plan and should be done on the converged scenario. Water quality should not be viewed as a separate issue or alternative in the plan. The group also

observed that water quality issues should be addressed in a way that does not affect water quantity.

The following statement was reached by consensus:

The issue should be deleted- Water quality is not an alternative but must be a basic ingredient of the Regional Water Plan as referenced in the Mission, Goals and Objectives and as required by law.

WA/WRB JOINT SCENARIO WORKSHOP
July 15, 2003

Results

1 - Importation of water **rights** to the region.

The Region should seek any water that is available including desalination where feasible.

2 - Watershed management

Implement local and regional watershed management plans through all land and water agencies in the area to increase water yield and prevent erosion.

3 - Water banking

Water banking should be implemented within the Region in order to maximize beneficial use and to permit the water right to stay with the owner while the water is leased for a period of time.

4 - Future rainfall – based - on 1990's?1950's? 1600's?

The water plan baseline hydrologic data will be defined by the Analysis Team and approved by the Action Committee and the Water Resources Board.

5 - San Juan/Chama numbers? – less than 75,844?

The San Juan Chama water allotment that will be used in the projected scenario is the amount currently contracted to users within the Middle Rio Grande.

6 - Ag use of water for ranching/livestock in region

Deleted – Already in subregions plan

7 – Store minimum volume at Elephant Butte – 400,000 af?

Maintain compact requirements

8 - Instream flow rights

Consider in-stream flow to preserve riparian health and quality of life. (No consensus)

9 - Authorization for additional storage at Abiquiu, impacts of upstream storage

As a plan the Region should seek to store as much water upstream as possible to the extent that it may be approved by regulatory authorities. This would require Congressional authorization.

10 - Current projection for population growth – a given?

The water plan will be based on BBER population projections.

11 – Desalination

See “Importation of Water to the Region”.

12 - How does ownership of water rights figure into planning process?

The ownership of water rights is an issue properly dealt with at the State level and not within a regional water plan. However, the Region endorses the early adjudication of water rights in the Middle Rio Grande Region

13 - How can/should water consumption be reduced on farms?

Promote on-farm water conservation.

14 - How can/should [diversions](#) be reduced in conveyance systems?

Focus on high volume conveyance systems that don't reach the river or recharge the aquifer.

1. *Respecting recharge areas for local wells*
2. *Respecting the cultural values*
3. *Consider the environmental impact on riparian health*

15 - ~~Conservation and yard-size~~ Landscaping Conservation

15A Reduce amount of turf and non-xeric landscape areas by regulation on a regional basis through local ordinances.

15A Reduce the amount of irrigated golf course acreage proportionate to population and maintain green spaces in parks while encouraging conservation practices and xeric landscaping.

16 - Water quality

Deleted – Water quality is not an alternative but must be a basic ingredient of the Regional Water Plan as referenced in the Misson, Goals and Objectives and as required by law.