

John Whipple

From: skimbler
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2004 9:24 AM
To: scone; alp; Johanna.Polsenberg
Cc: barryh; John Whipple; jims; NMFOG; rgenualdi
Subject: Re: [A-LP Central] Albuquerque Journal --Associated Press

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 Procedure.

> 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>
> Subject: [A-LP Central] Albuquerque Journal --Associated Press

>> '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](mailto:scone@infoway.lib.nm.us)  
>  
> -----

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---