From Michael Black

Interesting. Another confidential Confidentiality Agreement with the Dept Interior.

We need to enquire into the legal sufficiency of Confidentiality Agreements. I never heard of this ever occurring prior to the Agreement on the ALP.

Now it appears they are Standard Operating Proceedure.

> From: Steve Cone <scone@infoway.lib.nm.us>
> Date: Tue, 13 Apr 2004 07:03:34 -0600
> To: alp@macinstruct.com, ohanna Polsenberg <Johanna.Polsenberg@mail.house.gov>
> Cc: barryh@daily-times.com, jwhipple@ose.state.nm.us, jims@daily-times.com,
> Bob Johnson <NMFOG@aol.com>, Rob Genualdi <rgenualdi@sjcounty.net>
>
> >> 'if they didn't sign we couldn't discuss it with them because that's
> >> the agreement we had with the federal government,' [Dunlap]
> >> It would be interesting to see a copy of this "agreement". How was it
> >> formulated and who authorized it?
> >>
> >> 'bring in people who had made valid comments on the settlement so we
> >> could discuss with them where we're going and what we're trying to do
> >> to answer those valid complaints.' [Dunlap]
> >> Who is making these judgments on what comments are "valid", and how are
> >> these judgments being made? Many who submitted what they thought to be
> >> valid comments were not invited to this meeting. The State of New
> >> Mexico has delivered sets of these comments to libraries here in San
> >> Juan County, but "valid comments/complaints" have not as yet been
> >> distinguished from the invalid.
> >>
> >> according to the confidentiality statement signed by those who
> >> attended the invitation-only meeting.
> >> Who drafted this confidentiality agreement and on what authority?
> >>
> >> Open Meeting Violations Denied -- Talks Discussed Water Settlement
> >> Posted by Steve Cone on 6:06 AM April 13, 2004
> >>
> >> Dunlap said the federal government wanted the discussions kept
> >> confidential. No one was forced to sign the confidentiality statement,
> >> but were told the 'if they didn't sign we couldn't discuss it with them
> >> because that's the agreement we had with the federal government,' he
> >> said. Dunlap said the idea behind the meeting was to 'bring in people
> >> who had made valid comments on the settlement so we could discuss with
> >> them where we're going and what we're trying to do to answer those
> >> valid complaints.' Since the draft of the settlement is being
> >> discussed, 'it wouldn't be fair to the Navajo tribe or anyone else' to
> >> make public what's in it now, Dunlap said . . . . .
> >> Read More or Comment at . . .
> >>
> >> http://www.alpcentral.com/article.php?article_id=449
> >> -------------------------
> >> To post your own message to the list or respond to this message, please e-mail
> . . .
> alp@macinstruct.com
> ................................
> Breaking news and views at -- A-LP Central
> ................................
> http://www.alpcentral.com
> ................................
> . . . in defense of the Animas & LaPlata rivers -- don't buy the lie
> ................................
> To unsubscribe from this mailing list, please send an e-mail message to . . .
> ................................
> scone@infoway.lib.nm.us
> ................................
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