

Appendix B
Public Involvement

Appendix B1

**Example Meeting Notices and
Press Releases**

NE NM REGIONAL WATER PLAN			
County	City	Type	Name
Union	Clayton	Paper	Union County Leader
Union	Clayton	Radio	KLMX
Quay	Tucumcari	Email	Tucumcari Chamber of Commerce
Quay	Tucumcari	Radio	KQAY / KTNM
Quay	Tucumcari	Newspaper	Quay County Sun
Harding	Roy	Bulletin Board	Village of Roy
Harding	Mosquero	Village Hall	Village of Mosquero
Curry	Clovis	CofC Media Distrib	Clovis/Curry Co Chamber of Comm
Curry	Clovis	Email Dist List	City of Clovis
Curry	Clovis	Radio/TV	KAMR, KENW, KFDA,
Curry	ABQ	TV	KOBR is local TV for KOBchannel4
Curry	Clovis	Radio/TV	KTQM, KVII, Rooney&Moon
Curry	Clovis & ?	Other Media	Chase Gentry, Jeff Lynn
Curry	Clovis	Paper	Clovis News Journal
Curry	Clovis	Radio	KICA/KKYC
Curry	Clovis	Radio	KWKA/KTYM
Curry	Clovis	Paper	Amarillo Globe News
Curry	Texico	Paper	Stateline Tribune
Roosevelt	Portales	CofC	Portales/Roosevelt Co Chamber of C.
Roosevelt	Portales	Paper	Portales News Tribune
Roosevelt	Portales	Paper	The Chase (ENMU)

Regional Water Planning

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
April 18, 2005

Contacts:
Joanne Hilton, (505) 822-9400
John Burkstaller, (505) 822-9400
Richard Primose (505) 461-3451

Northeast NM Region Explores Alternatives to Current Water Use and Supplies

Water planning representatives from Northeast New Mexico will begin brainstorming alternatives to how water is now used and supplied in the region at the May 2, 2005 meeting of the Steering Committee for the Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan.

The public is invited to attend the meeting as representatives from Curry, Harding, Quay, Roosevelt, and Union counties also explore preliminary information on water system surveys and discuss how population and economic projections will be updated by consultants. The meeting will be held from 1 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. in the Territorial Room of the Tucumcari Convention Center, 1500 West Route 66.

This is the fourth meeting of the public planning process to develop a Regional Water Plan for the five-county area. Development of the regional plan is being guided by a Steering Committee composed of representatives from the five counties and various cities and soil and water conservation districts encompassed by those counties.

At the organization meeting in September 2004, Steering Committee members elected Richard Primrose, City Manager of Tucumcari, as chair and Joe Culbertson, Harding County, as vice-chair. Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, a hydrology firm in Albuquerque, was contracted to develop the regional water plan.

The regional water plans are funded by grants from the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission that are approved by the NM State Legislature. They serve as guidance for interstate water management decisions.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
August 16, 2005

Contacts:
Joanne Hilton, (505) 822-9400
Richard Primose (505) 461-3451

Northeast NM Region Starts Setting Priorities for Water Supply and Use

Water planning representatives from Curry, Harding, Quay, Roosevelt, and Union counties will meet Monday, August 29 to start choosing their preferred alternatives to how water is currently used and supplied in the region. Their choices, after subsequent public input, will form the framework of the new 40-year Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan. The public is invited to attend the meeting to be held from 1:00 p.m. to 4 p.m. in the Liberty Room of the Tucumcari Convention Center, 1500 West Route 66.

During the meeting, project consultants from Daniel B. Stephens & Associates and Sites Southwest will also present an update on projected population, economic development and water demands in the region.

This is the fifth meeting of the public planning process to develop a Regional Water Plan for the five-county area. Development of the regional plan is being guided by a Steering Committee composed of representatives from the five counties and various cities and soil and water conservation districts encompassed by those counties.

At the organization meeting in September 2004, Steering Committee members elected Richard Primrose, City Manager of Tucumcari, as chair and Joe Culbertson, Harding County, as vice-chair. Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, a hydrology firm in Albuquerque, was contracted to develop the regional water plan.

The regional water plans are funded by grants from the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission that are approved by the NM State Legislature. They serve as guidance for interstate water management decisions.



Northeast New Mexico
Regional Water Planning

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
November 3, 2005

Contacts:

Joanne Hilton (505) 822-9400
Richard Primrose (505) 461-3451
Barbara S. Herrington (505) 822-8200

**Northeast NM to Choose Water Alternatives to
Explore in Regional Water Plan**

Sites Southwest, LLC

121 Tijeras NE, Suite 3100

Albuquerque, NM 87102

phone: 505-822-8200

fax: 505-822-8282

email: mail@sites-sw.com

web: www.sites-sw.com

What alternatives to the way water is supplied and used in Northeast New Mexico should be explored in depth by consultants developing a long-range water plan for the region? The Steering Committee guiding the Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan will make these decisions at its next meeting Monday, November 7, 2005, in Tucumcari.

The public is invited to the afternoon meeting, which will take place from 1 to 4 p.m. at the Tucumcari Convention Center. The list of water alternatives was proposed by Steering Committee members and participants who attended one of the four public meetings held in the region from October 19 through 21. They include such proposals as the Ute Pipeline project, agriculture and municipal conservation, watershed management, infrastructure upgrades, well head protection plans, and water rights protection.

At the meeting, representatives from Curry, Harding, Quay, Roosevelt, and Union counties and consultants from Daniel B. Stephens & Associates will prioritize the list of alternatives and report on the status of the Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Planning process. Participants will be able to ask questions and voice opinions.

Development of the regional water plan for the northeast plains area is being guided by a Steering Committee composed of representatives from the five counties, and various municipalities and soil and water conservation districts encompassed by those counties. The regional water plans are funded by grants from the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission that are approved by the NM State Legislature. They serve as guidance for interstate water management decisions.

At the organization meeting in September 2004, Steering Committee members elected Richard Primrose, City Manager of Tucumcari, as chair and Joe Culbertson, Harding County, as vice-chair. Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, a hydrology firm in Albuquerque, was contracted to develop the regional water plan. Sites Southwest, a planning and landscape architecture firm in Albuquerque, is helping facilitate and publicize the meetings.

Appendix B2
Meeting Notes

MEETING SUMMARY

Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Planning Kick-off Steering Committee Meeting September 7, 2004, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Agenda

Introductions

Project Overview (slide show) and Team

Steering Committee Logistics (location, timing, advertising)

Identify Regional Water Planning Issues (facilitated nominal group exercise)

Planning for Upcoming Issues Workshop

Materials

Agenda

Handout of slide show

Questionnaire for small group discussions

Summary

Following introductions, John Burkstaller, PE and Joanne Hilton, hydrologist, from Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc. presented an overview of the project. Their slide show summarized the scope of work in Phase I and Phase II and explained how the water supply and demand would be assessed, how the legal issues would be analyzed, and how alternatives would be identified and evaluated.

Barbara Herrington, planner with Sites Southwest, then facilitated a discussion about the location and advertising of future steering committee and public meetings. After a short break, the steering committee members split into four groups of three to four people to discuss five questions posed to them by the team. After half an hour, the entire group reconvened to report the results of their discussion, question by question, to the facilitator, who recorded their answers on a flip chart. (Questions and answers are attached).

Before adjourning, the group discussed the time, place and purpose of the Issues Workshop called for in the request for proposals for the project. They also elected officers.

Decisions

- The Steering Committee elected by acclamation Richard Primrose, City Manager of Tucumcari and the project fiscal officer, as chair.
- Joe Culbertson was elected vice-chair of the Steering Committee.
- It was agreed that Steering Committee meetings should be open to the public and publicized as such. Committee members gave the facilitators names of newspapers and radio stations and other potential outlets for publicity.

- The group discussed the merits of voting on issues that could not be resolved by consensus and how votes would be cast. Should each representative—potentially one from each of the 34 municipalities and each Soil and Water Conservation District— have a vote? Consultants will draft a process, which will be discussed at the next meeting.
- Steering Committee meetings should be held in a central location, i.e. Tucumcari, but public meetings should be rotated around the region.
- The Issues Workshop will be held Monday, November 15, from 10:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Tucumcari.

Attendees

Steve Bechtel, Union County
 Milz Bickley, Roosevelt County
 Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
 Mike Delano, Ute Creek Soil and Water Conservation District/NRCS
 Sherrita Fluhman, Ute Creek Soil and Water Conservation District
 Pete Hulden, Curry County
 Carrie Lindsey, Southwest Quay Soil and Water Conservation District
 Sherman Mach, Village of House
 Kendyl Monroe, Union County
 Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
 Seth Richards, Town of Clayton
 Joe Thomas, City of Clovis
 Terry Turner, Quay County
 Larry Wallin, Village of Logan
 Gary Watkins, City of Portales

Project Team

John Burkstaller, PE, Project Manager, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
 Joanne Hilton, Hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
 Barbara Herrington, AICP, Planner and Facilitator, Sites Southwest, LLC
 Mike Barnes, PE, Tucumcari Resident

Interstate Stream Commission Representative

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Flip Chart Notes

Logistics

Okay to invite public to all Steering Committee meetings
 Potential rules – Steering Committee makes decisions

Steering Committee conducts business

Advertising /Notice

Harding County:

- Union County Leader
- Tucumcari stations

Steering Committee minutes

- Send out with meeting announcement

Strive for balanced interests: Each County and SWCD can choose a representative, but municipalities might trump agricultural people so wearing many hats could be a good idea.

Want all stakeholders.

How to count votes? Regions can decide.

Can have quorum issues if too structured. If have only one vote margin, need to work harder on the issue.

Start with consensus; if it breaks down, have a fallback procedure.

34 entities total – each entity has representative if it wants – plus S&WCD has 1 member

- 1 entity one vote (could do)

If Richard is designated alternate? How many votes would he have?

Normally Steering Committee appoints a chair

[Richard Primrose – nomination to be chair / elected by acclamation]

[Joe Culbertson - Vice Chair]

News Sources:

- Quay County Sun
- KTNM
- KQAY
- Union County Leader
- KLMX Clayton
- Portales News Tribune
- Clovis New Journal
- KWKA & Others
- Roy Public Schools
- Fax to Village halls to post
- Designated Steering Committee members
- 93.9 Raton Radio

- Develop mailing list of attendees
- SWCDs lacking representatives
- Dump sites – 38 – got best response
- Municipal web pages (Terry Quay)
- School web sites

Responses to questions:

Question 1: What water issues are of most concern to you and why?

- Water quality
- Depleting aquifers
- Agriculture water
- Water for municipalities (ensure)
- Keep New Mexico water for New Mexico use
- Conserve limited supply
- Cost of enhancing availability
- No “beneficial use” credit for conservation
 - Only incentives for use
 - Are some exceptions → conservation plan: if accepted, OSE won’t forfeit
 - Do away with forfeiture clause
- Environmental - may have seepage / EDS concerns (Arkansas Shiner)

Question 2: What would you do to ensure that enough water is available for the future and why?

- Conservation of water, municipalities and agriculture
- Cooperation among all users due to shortage of water and increased population
- Stag involved in Ute water project
- Long-range planning
- More reservoirs
- Existing reservoirs need work (silt)

Question 3: If you could change how water is managed right now, what would you do?

- Meter all water use
- Declare all water basins
- End benign neglect – manage water
 - More studies of quantity to manage

- Regional plans should precede state plan
- Federal intervention in interstate rivalries (compacts extend to groundwater)
- Small changes in existing water law
 - i.e. – forfeiture law
- Need to look beyond selfish interest to general public interest
- More active management of toxicities and intrusions into groundwater (new wastewater regulations out re: septic systems)

Question 4: What will it take to make a successful regional water plan?

- Wide public support
- Good database
- Feasible implementation
- Everybody working together
- Rules and regulations that are enforced
- Well-thought-out plan for future water demand
- Educate public that there might be a problem

Question 5: What underlying values and priorities should drive overall planning for the future of the region? (e.g., preservation of agriculture, economic development, growth management, protection of natural environment, etc?)

- Preserve agriculture
- Economic development
- More population and less water
- Everything mentioned in the question
- Mutual benefit for all – not favoring 1 or more sectors
- Keep water within the region
- How to manage growth? Does it make sense to promote growth when don't have the water?
- We are not state line
- Ute water will go somewhere

Next Meeting: Issues Workshop

- Summarize issue papers
- 1989 plan – distribute for mind-jogging ahead of time
- Finalize list of Steering Committee members

- Develop goals and objectives
- 4 hours? 10:00 to 2:00 or 10:00 to 3:00 with lunch break
- Meeting scheduled for November 15

Northeast New Mexico Steering Committee Meeting Notes
November 15, 2004, 10:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Agenda

Introductions
Review Steering Committee Membership
Steering Committee Operations
Review Regional Water Planning Issues in Convening Paper
Regional Vision, Goals and Objectives

Materials

Agenda
September 7, 2004 Meeting Notes
Draft Steering Committee Member List
Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan, Phase 1 Scope of Work
Northeastern New Mexico Regional Water Plan, 2000-2040 excerpts (EPCOG, 2000)
Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan Convening Paper
Draft Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Planning Goals
Proposed Steering Committee Decision Process

Summary

After introductions, Facilitator Barbara Herrington of Sites Southwest led the group in reviewing the stakeholder chart, discussing the completeness of the steering committee, and discussing how decisions will be made among Steering Committee members.

Project Manager John Burkstaller, from Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc. (DBS&A), led the group in a discussion of water issues presented in the workshop convening paper to elicit opinions to help determine where consultants should direct their research efforts. The group broke for a buffet lunch and resumed reviewing the issues afterward.

Finally, the meeting broke into small groups to review goals and objectives extracted from the 2000 Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan and to decide whether they were still relevant, needed to be revised, or were missing important goals. The group adjourned until February.

Decisions

The steering committee agreed that an additional letter needs to be sent out to solicit further participation in the regional water planning effort.

The steering committee agreed that decisions should be made by consensus and not by voting.

The steering committee requests that Scott Verhines give a 20-minute presentation on the status of the Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Supply pipeline project at the next meeting.

The group tentatively scheduled the next meeting for Monday, February 7, 2005.

Attendees

Justin Bennett, Northeastern SWCD
Lino P. Paiz, Jr., Village of Roy
T.V. Hagenah, Quay County Sun
Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
Terry Turner, Quay County
Larry Wallin, Village of Logan
Joe Thomas, City of Clovis
Leo Pacheco, Village of San Jon
Joe Clark, Village of San Jon
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Scott Verhines, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Steve Bechtel, Union County
Glenn Briscoe, Canadian River SWCD
Shelly Carter, Union County
Cindy Wall, Central Curry SWCD
Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Richard Shaw, Mesa SWCD
John H. Mahoney, Village of Roy
Jimmie Joe Jester, Southwest Quay SWCD

Project Team

John Burkstaller, P.E., Project Manager, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Amy Ewing, Hydrogeologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Barbara Herrington, AICP, Planner and Facilitator, Sites Southwest, LLC
Mike Barnes, P.E., Tucumcari resident

Interstate Stream Commission Representative

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Notes

Completeness of Steering Committee

- Representatives lacking from Village of House, Border SWCD, Roosevelt SWCD, Llano Estacado RC&D, and Arch Hurley Conservancy District
- Add Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Supply project manager (Scott Verhines) and Conchas Dam contact (Julie Stone) to the stakeholder list

Decision Process

- Discussed that every effort needs to be made to reach a consensus and to have all entities represented in the planning process
- Discussed that if votes were cast as a last resort and there were disagreements over the outcome, the issue could be raised with DBS&A, and would again be brought up for discussion at the next meeting

Convening Paper

- Will draw on existing information in writing this plan, including the 2000 plan
- Working on the supply and demand sections now
- There may be some objections to declaring the groundwater basin in Union County over the fear of well drilling being limited and possible denial of well permits
- Basin declaration helps protect New Mexico from potential diversions by Texas
- Regional Water Plan will incorporate work of Ute pipeline group and won't duplicate that effort
- Water Trust Board fund discussed
 - Meant to fund large projects
 - Wasn't funded last year
 - Ute Pipeline resubmitted this year as one of 16 "priority" projects
 - Ute Pipeline asking for \$2 million from the Water Trust Board
 - Ute Creek Watershed Restoration may be included in the pipeline project
 - Total cost of the pipeline project exceeds \$210 million
 - Ute Pipeline Environmental Impact Statement has not been written yet
- Link to this Regional Water Plan could be posted on the ENMRWA web page
- Water conservation tax credit bill: Fear of forfeiture
- Union County: Conservation will not occur without cost sharing (expensive)
- If we don't take the water, someone else will (Texas)
- Interest in how fast groundwater moves (across border into Texas), permeability, amount of water in storage
- Ogallala Aquifer has no significant recharge; can extend supply with conservation, but still mining the aquifer
- Agreement that life of the aquifer is limited
- What to do if Ute pipeline is not built?
 - Retiring agricultural rights
 - Municipalities buying up water rights to secure supply (Clovis and Portales are already doing so)
- Bingaman: Joint management legislation from a few years ago (where did it go?)
- Need to emphasize consequences of conservation/forfeiture laws
- Suggest legislation to provide incentives for conservation (eliminating consequences)
- High Plains Water District is mandating metering on all wells by 2012

- Economics driving ability to pump
- Any return flow credits in eastern New Mexico?
 - Wastewater effluent
 - Irrigation (return flow worked into water right)
- Endangered species: Arkansas Shiner known, others will be considered
- Water quality issues
 - Septic tank failure (Ute Lake)
 - Cesspool contamination of shallow groundwater (Folsom)
 - Tukumcari wastewater reuse/treatment for water going into Ute Reservoir
- NMED trying for primacy over NPDES permits, septic systems
- Specific alternatives from 2000 plan
 - Clayton Lake: Water level up this year, may be viable
 - Perico Creek Dam: Not viable
 - Dry Cimarron: OSE came up with an estimate of 6,000 acre-feet
 - Running Water Draw: Pretty expensive, City of Clovis has looked at this
 - Canadian River (Harding County): Would need to purchase water rights
 - Watershed Improvements: 38,000 acres of salt cedar sprayed in Colfax County

Visions

- Protecting water quantity and quality
- Promoting conservation and beneficial use
- Meeting current demands and the projected needs of future generations
- Keeping water in the region
- Maintaining agriculture
- Economic development

Goals

- Identifying new water sources
- Creating healthy watersheds
- Intergovernmental cooperation
- Preventing seizure of water rights through eminent domain
- Regionalization of water systems, where feasible
- Promoting bi-state groundwater management

Alternatives

- Maintain watersheds
- Water banking
- Connecting nearby water systems
- Metering water use
- Backflow prevention
- Plugging abandoned wells to protect water quality
- Better well construction and repair practices
- Wastewater reuse

Northeast New Mexico Steering Committee Meeting Notes
February 7, 2005, 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Agenda

Welcome and Introductions
Update on Ute Pipeline Project — Scott Verhines
Population Trends and Regional Economic Development — Barbara Herrington
Overview of New Mexico Water Rights — Joanne Hilton
Update on Water Supply Study — Amy Ewing

Materials

Agenda
Meeting Summary from November 15, 2004
Copies of PowerPoint presentation slides
Goals and Objectives extracted from 2000 Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan

Attendees

Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Steve Bechtel, Union County
Shelly Carter, Union County
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Cindy Wall, Central Curry SWCD
Bobbie Rose, Village of San Jon
Leo Pacheco, Village of San Jon
Linda Lavender, Village of House
Rose Kelly, Village of Logan
Scott Verhines, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
Gary Watkins, City of Portales
Joe Thomas, City of Clovis
Franklin McCasland, Quay County
Robert Abercrombie, Llano Estacado RC&D
Glenn Briscoe, Canadian River SWCD
Tuda Libby Crews, Ute Creek SWCD
John H. Mahoney, Village of Roy
Mike Delano, Mesa SWCD
Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines
Carolyn S. Lutes, Union County rancher

Project Team

Joanne Hilton, hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Amy Ewing, hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Barbara Herrington, AICP, Planner and Facilitator, Sites Southwest, LLC
Mike Barnes, PE, Tucumcari resident

Interstate Stream Commission Representative

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Decisions

- The next meeting will be on May 2, in the afternoon.
- There will be a round of public meetings before the draft plan is circulated. Concern was expressed that folks around the region have a chance for input.
- OSE expansion budget has funding for second phase of this plan.

Summary of Presentations

Eastern New Mexico Rural Water System Project Update

Scott Verhines, Program Manager

Overview

- 12 Members of ENMRWA: 9 communities (and CAFB) and 3 counties
- Population served: 75,000
- Project cost estimated at \$296 million, in today's dollars
- Ute Water Commission (UWC)
- Eastern NM Rural Water Authority
- 1000 ft elevation difference between reservoir level and the top of the Caprock
- 40 year history

Purpose and Need

- Deliver up to 24,000 acre-feet annually to members
- Long-term, sustainable surface water resource
- Reduce dependence on High Plains aquifer
- Beneficial use - underutilized regional asset
- Future economic constraint of "no action"
- Economic resource for sustainability and growth

Challenges Going In

- Reservation basis
- Location and alignment
- Regional differences in need and priority
- Distribution of costs
- Ability and willingness to pay
- Ute Reservoir issues
- Financing and funding (and timing)

Key Project Assumptions

- Peak-day demand based delivery
- 24,000 acre-feet average annual availability
- Potable water delivered for residential and commercial use
- Water is centrally-treated
- Water delivered in bulk to members (wholesale)
- County portion available to unincorporated areas

- Infrastructure sized and costs estimated assuming “take or pay”
- Pipeline easements will be donated
- Water cost projection anticipates finding model

Recap of Work to Date

- Legislature appropriated \$2 million (2002)
- Federal legislation introduced in both House and Senate
- Testimony to congressional committees
- Financial planning for individual members
- Design consultant team selected (CH2MHill)
- Authorized to develop Environmental Request for Proposals
- 2005 Legislature bills - 3 primary

Key Project Features

- Lakeside intake and raw water pump station
- 1.7-million gallon raw water storage
- 39-mgd-capacity central water treatment facility
- Treated water pump station
- Elevated storage tank servicing Quay County
- 87.5 miles of 30-inch to 54-inch trunk line
- Booster pump station and base of Caprock
- 2.4 million gallons ground storage on Caprock
- Gravity flow to all members below GSTs
- 94.8 miles of lateral pipelines, 8-inch- to 36-inch-diameter
- Telemetry and control system
- Infrastructure security elements

CDR Development Team

- Ute Water Commission
- Quay Working Group
- Eastern Plains Council of Governments
- Bureau of Reclamation (USBR)
- Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
- New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission (ISC)
- New Mexico Office of the State Engineer (OSE)
- Smith Engineering Company
- The Sear-Brown Group
- Metric Corporation
- RBC Dain-Rauscher
- Armand Smith & Associates
- The Louis Berger Group

Cost Proration Model

- Common facility costs - reservation
- Specific infrastructure - associated member
- Fixed costs - prorata construction
- Transmission trunk line - reservation/location
- Operation, maintenance, and replacement (OM&R) - prorata construction & phasing

- 80% federal, 10% state, 10% local model
- Recurring (annual) costs to be borne by members

Elements of Annual Cost

- Raw water purchase from ISC (state) 4%
- Debt service on financed local share 16%
- Annual O&M 69%
- Annual replacement 11%
- ISC Ute Reservoir O&M fee 1%

Activities

- ENMRWA
 - Program Manager
 - Peer review of CDR
 - Revisit cost allocation
 - Washington D.C. trip
 - Federal authorization in 2004
 - Development of by-laws
 - Contribute to Ute Reservoir Master Plan
- State
 - Water Trust Board (WTB) application
 - ISC preliminary environmental work
- Federal
 - Authorization in 2004
 - Domenici's legislation
 - Cooperative agreement with USBR

Phasing Discussion

- Phase 1
 - Environmental
 - Preliminary Design All
 - Easements and right-of-way
 - Final Design Phase 1
 - Final Design Phase 2
 - Construct Phase 1
- Phase 2
 - Laterals South
 - Final Design Phase 3
 - Construct Phase 2
- Phase 3
 - Treat and Pump
 - South Capacity
 - Final Design Phase 4
 - Construct Phase 3

- Phase 4
 - Laterals North
 - Add Capacity
 - Construct Phase 4

Anticipated Questions

- “Peak-day” delivery system sizing
- Reservation basis vs. demand basis
- Elevated storage tank
- Groundwater as backup source
 - backup power
 - growth
 - drought years
- Raw water tanks vs. variable frequency drives (VFDs)
- Wholesale vs. retail
- Responsibility: ENMRWA and members
- Alignment

Challenges Ahead

- Revisit cost proration structure
- Member commitment
- Extend water purchase agreement with ISC
- Contribute to Ute Reservoir Master Plan efforts
- Protect Ute Reservoir water quality and quantity
- Federal authorization
- Continued State funding
- Funding and timing
- Overcome misinformation and mistrust
- Differences in need, priority, and focus
- Maintain momentum

On a Positive Note

- Conceptual design report completed
- Joint powers agreement forming the ENMRWA
- Hiring of Program Manager
- Potential state funding through WTB
- Washington D.C. trip
- Web site up and running
- Momentum
- Broad support

Lessons Learned

- Obtain commitment agreements early in process
- Address organizational behavior issues

Population and Economic Trends—Barbara Herrington, Sites Southwest

Union County

- Population trends and projections, 1910 – 2030
 - Union County population has declined since high of 16,680 in 1920.
 - It dropped to 4,177 by 2000 and has increased slightly since.
 - Population is expected to increase 30 percent by 2030 to 4,619.
- Clayton founded in 1888, served as railroad shipping point for large cattle drives. Recently purchased land with 12 wells capable of producing 3.5 million gallons a day; will support 14,000 additional people.
- Des Moines has a population of 200 people. Municipal wells are being relocated. Contact: Steve Kendall, Union Community Development Corp., 374-2285
- Economic base is agriculture
 - 3 million acres in crops and rangeland
 - \$130 million market value in agricultural products (89% is ranching)
 - agriculture accounts for 119 jobs
- Major employers
 - Clayton Municipal Schools
 - City of Clayton
 - Hospital
 - Clayton County Government
 - USDA
 - OXY Plant (?) CO2
 - Highway Department
 - Ekland Hotel
 - Clayton Lake State Park
 - Twin Mountain Rock Co.
 - Capulin Volcano National Monument
- Proposed business development
 - Prison, packing plant, possible wind farm, distribution center for retailer
 - Downtown Clayton revitalization
 - Senior housing/services (assisted/independent living)
- Canadian River water rights—purchase for possible use in Union and Harding Counties

Harding County

- Population trend and projections, 1910 – 2030
 - County's population has been declining since it was first formed in 1930 with 4,421 persons.
 - It reached 828 in 2000 and is projected to decline further to 676 by 2030.
 - County leaders are taking steps to reverse this decline.

- Economic base is ranching
 - 1.2 million acres in farms (ranches)
 - \$14 million market value in agricultural products
 - 99.5% ranching
- Major employers
 - Harding County government
 - Solano-Wagon Mound Ranch Supply
 - Honey Company
 - CO₂
 - Council of governments
- Proposed business development
 - Metal products manufacturing
 - Tourism (Mission churches, wild bird sanctuary)
 - Airport (searching for a site—only New Mexico county without one)
 - Salt cedar removal (leaders in this, offering tours)
 - Wind farm
- Scenic byway design for La Frontera del Llano, along NM 39 through Northeast New Mexico to connect Old U.S. 66 and Santa Fe Trail, and improvements to draw more traffic through the county.
- Trying to create jobs through public-private partnership.
- Preliminary work being done on water supply from Canadian River.

Quay County

- Population trends and projections, 1910 – 2030
 - Quay's population was 14,000 in 1910, at population high, and 10,142 in 2000. It is projected to decline to about 9,000 by 2030.
 - Logan is growing due to Ute State Park.
 - San Jon has water and is looking for development.
- Economic base is agriculture and tourism
 - Agriculture
 - 1.8 million acres in farms
 - \$41 million market value in agricultural products
 - Tourism accounts for 483 jobs
- Major employers
 - Presbyterian Healthcare Services
 - Tucumcari Municipal Schools
 - Community College
- Proposed business development
 - Railway truck terminal is proposed (Interstate Distributor committed to large working truck terminal in Tucumcari)
 - Ethanol plant (new lease, when renovated will put facility back into production)

- Wind power (Cielo Wind power in late summer began to construct 80 new wind turbines on Caprock overlooking San Jon, but held up by bad weather)
- Natural gas drilling
- Logan economy is increasing: assisted living, school, trucking company, super stop, Ute Lake

Curry County

- Population trends and projections 1910 – 2030
 - Curry population has been increasing since 1920. It was 11,236 then, reached 45,085 in 2000, and is projected to increase 6.8% to total 48,168 by 2030.
 - It is the most populated county covered in the Northeast New Mexico Water Planning Region.
 - Seventy percent of the population lives in Clovis; Clovis had a population of 32,667 people in the 2000 Census.
- Economic base
 - Agriculture
 - 948,000 acres in farms
 - \$195 million market value in agricultural products
 - Generates 1,150 jobs
 - Cannon Air Force Base
 - Generates 3,281 military and 900 civilian jobs
 - Base closure proposals not expected to affect Cannon
 - BNSF Railroad
 - Generates 525 jobs
 - Allsup's Headquarters
 - Generates 200 jobs
- Major employers
 - Cannon Air Force Base
 - Clovis High Plains Hospital
 - Clovis Municipal Schools (Melrose, Texico, Clovis)
 - BNSF Railroad
 - Wal-Mart
 - Community Homecare
 - City of Clovis
 - Eastern New Mexico University
- New economic activity
 - Southwest Cheese Company—ground breaking for facility in Clovis on Feb. 6, 2005; plant is expected to be commissioned in 4th quarter of 2005.
 - Processes 2.4 billion pounds of milk
 - \$350 million in sales
 - Will generate 220 jobs; related development may bring an additional 150 to 200 jobs.
- Clovis is the retail hub for area about 75 miles in all directions.

- Ute pipeline project (\$270 million) expected to have a major regional impact on Quay, Curry and Roosevelt Counties in terms of construction jobs and tax revenues.
- Clovis Industrial Development Corp. strives to market and develop business opportunities and recruit new businesses.

Roosevelt County

- Population trends and population projections 1910 – 2030
 - Population has been growing since 1920 when the population was 6,548. Reached 18,075 in 2000 Census and expected to reach 23,773 by 2030.
- Economic base
 - Agriculture and ranching
 - 1.4 million acres in farms
 - \$128 million market value in agricultural products
 - Ranked 3rd in state in milk production: 31 dairy producers with 32,000 milk cows in 1999
 - Also peanuts, alfalfa, corn, cotton
 - Generates 852 jobs
 - Eastern New Mexico University
 - 3,600 students
 - 525 faculty and staff
- Economic development efforts
 - Purchased 126-acres for industrial park in 1962
 - In 1992 community leaders donated 477 acres to Dairy Farmers of America, which built a \$7 million milk-processing plant
 - Is developing a second, 200-acre industrial park (only 28 acres left in first one)
 - Efforts to attract a call center
- Major employers
 - Eastern New Mexico University
 - Portales Public Schools
 - Dairy
 - Schools
 - County and city governments
 - Wal-Mart
 - Hospitals
 - Ethanol plant came to industrial park in 1985; produces 40,000 gallons per day
 - Milk plant condenses skim milk and sends it to cheese plants.
 - Milk transport process
 - Heartland (Hartland?) Nursing
 - Motels (one new motel being built, older one being renovated)
 - Possible construction of 50 homes Portales/Roosevelt County
 - Southwest Cannery Inc. has 165,000-SF building in industrial park, added 100,000 SF in 1984. Ships 17 million cases of beverages to seven states.
 - Wind farm

- 50-house subdivision at edge
- Center for senior citizens
- Number of water taps increases 3% every year, so growth may be larger than indicated by Census.

New Mexico Water Rights

Joanne Hilton, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

Water Law and Regional Water Planning

- Ownership of water is not affected by regional water planning.
- Alternative selection and implementation can be limited or affected by legal and water rights issues.
- Regional water planning helps water suppliers manage water resources and identify the need to acquire additional water rights for future use.

New Mexico Water Law

- Sources: New Mexico Constitution Title XVI
- New Mexico Statutes Chapter 72 (surface water and groundwater)
- Chapter 73 (special districts)
- Case law

Water Right Ownership

- Declaration of a water right is based on beneficial use prior to OSE jurisdiction.
- Application to appropriate (surface or groundwater)
- Process:
 - Submit declaration
 - Submit application
 - Notice, protests, and hearing

Water Right Ownership

- OSE must determine whether:
 - Unappropriated water is available
 - Proposed appropriation is contrary to the conservation of water or public welfare
 - Proposed appropriation will impair other water rights holders
- Priority date is based on date of application or date of beneficial use (for declared rights)

Water Right Transfers

- Water right sale or lease: Notice, opportunity to protest, conservation, public welfare, impairment
- Loss of water right can happen through
 - Forfeiture
 - Abandonment
- No OSE approval required within conservancy districts
- Acequias can limit transfers under certain conditions

Loss of Water Rights

- Non-use for four consecutive years when water is available can result in forfeiture of the right.

- OSE must issue a notice to the water right holder, who then has one year to correct
 - If non-use continues, water right is forfeited
 - Exception: 40-year plans. Municipalities can hold water rights for the future.
- Abandonment: Discontinued use and intent to abandon the right
Example: Irrigated land is turned into a parking lot

Adjudication Process

- Lawsuit to determine the ownership and amount of water rights in a stream system
- Hydrographic survey
- Lengthy process
- New water regulations allow for water management in absence of an adjudication
- Northeast New Mexico region is largely unadjudicated, and it probably is not a priority for the OSE.

Administration of Groundwater and Surface Water

- In OSE-declared groundwater basins, one has to apply for a permit to use the water. If undeclared, people can take what water they want.
- Surface water in the State of New Mexico is fully appropriated, so no new requests will be approved.
- Conjunctive use—interconnection of surface water and groundwater—is considered in management of resources
- Appropriation of surface-connected groundwater is not allowed unless surface water rights are purchased and retired (offsets)

City and County Regulation of Water

- There are County requirements for subdivision approval (typically 40 to 70 years)
- Municipalities regulate water supply and location of domestic wells within 300 feet of municipal water lines
- Condemnation of water rights

Reserving Water for Future Use

- Eligible entities can acquire water rights and reserve them for future use if done under a 40-year water plan
- Eligible entities include
 - Municipalities
 - Counties
 - Water user associations
 - Public utilities
 - Community water systems
 - State universities

Federal Issues

- Federally reserved water rights
 - When U.S. government sets aside land for specific purposes
 - If water is needed to fulfill that purpose, then a federal water right may exist
- Federal “regulatory” water right (controversial)
 - Endangered Species Act: Minimum flows may be required to protect species from harm. Critical habitat for the endangered Arkansas Shiner exists below Ute Reservoir.
- Water quality

Water Supply

Amy Ewing, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

Local Surface Water Resources

- Major surface water features
 - Dry Cimarron River
 - Canadian River—no new appropriations allowed, but can transfer water rights
- No surface water features in
 - Southwestern corner of Quay County
 - Southern half of Curry County
 - Roosevelt County

Surface Water Gage Locations

- Annual water yield for the following stations:
 - Dry Cimarron River near Guy
 - Dry Cimarron River near Folsom
 - Bennett Spring near Capulin
 - Tramperos Creek near Stead
 - Ute Creek near Logan
 - Canadian River at Logan
 - Revuelto Creek near Logan
- Ute Creek, Canadian River, and Revuelto Creek have the largest yield

Local Groundwater Resources

- Ogallala Formation (Union, Harding, Quay, Curry, and Roosevelt Counties)
- Sandstone units (Union and Harding Counties):
 - Dakota Group
 - Morrison Formation
 - Entrada (Exeter) Sandstone
- Dockum Group (Quay County):
 - Chinle/Redonda Formations
 - Santa Rosa Sandstone

Changes in Depth to Groundwater by County

- Union County shows decline
- Harding County a little decline
- Quay County shows decline
- Curry County shows decline
- Roosevelt County shows decline

Water Use and Groundwater Recharge

- Surface water supplies less than 25 percent of current demand in the planning region.
- Much of the surface water use is evaporation from Ute Reservoir.
- Groundwater withdrawal rates greatly exceed aquifer recharge rates.
- By 2020, saturated thickness in New Mexico portion of High Plains (Ogallala) aquifer is projected to be less than 50 feet.
- An aquifer's usable life is considered to end when its saturated thickness is 30 feet or less.

Northeast New Mexico 4th Steering Committee Meeting
May 2, 2005, 1:00 pm to 3:30 pm

Agenda

Welcome and Introductions

Project Status/Water Use Update - Amy Ewing/Mike Barnes

Population and Economic Development Update - Barbara Herrington

Alternative Selection Process - Barbara Herrington and Amy Ewing

Materials

Agenda

Sample Water Users Survey Form

Example Simplified Alternatives Evaluation

Example Scoring Matrix Alternatives Evaluation

Attendees

Robert Abercrombie, Llano Estacado RC&D

Antonio Aragon, Village of Mosquero

Steve Bechtel, Union County

Justin Bennett, Northeastern SWCD

Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines

Glenn Briscoe, Canadian River SWCD

Shelly Carter, Union County

Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County

Marty Garcia, City of Tucumcari

Mike Hannagan, Texico

Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority

Carrie Lindsay, SW Quay

Mary Mayfield, City of Tucumcari

Franklin McCasland, Quay County

Kendyl Monroe, Union County

Lino P. Paiz, Jr., Village of Roy

Wesley Shafer, Village of Grady

Cindy Wall, Central Curry SWCD

Gary Watkins, City of Portales

Project Team:

Amy Ewing, hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

Barbara Herrington, AICP, Planner and Facilitator, Sites Southwest, LLC

Mike Barnes, PE, Tucumcari resident

Interstate Stream Commission Representative:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Decisions

The next meeting will be on Monday, August 22 [*subsequently revised to August 29*].
The simplified method for alternative selection will be used.
Alternative selection will begin at the next meeting.

Process

Following introductions, Amy Ewing, hydrologist with Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc., and Mike Barnes, project engineer, gave an update on responses to a survey sent out to water systems in the study area. Barbara Herrington, planner and facilitator from Sites Southwest, then noted that, using funding that became available at the last minute, her firm is working on updating the population forecasts and collecting more information about potential economic development that could affect the demand for water in the study area.

The meeting then moved on to discuss various methods of prioritizing and selecting alternatives for meeting future demand in the region. Ms. Ewing and Ms. Herrington explained and reviewed the pros and cons of several methods. These ranged from simple multi-voting (each person receives a certain number of dots to place on his or her top choices and then the top ten alternatives from all the meetings and top six from each individual meetings are included) to a complex decision matrix (in which each alternative is scored on 10 or more criteria and that score is then multiplied by a criteria weight assigned by the steering committee to achieve a final numerical score). The team noted that, in their experiences with other regional water planning efforts, the processes produced similar results.

For the remainder of the meeting, Ms. Herrington led the attendees in a “magic board” exercise in which each table was given time to brainstorm alternatives and write them on large memo cards. These were then read aloud, clarified by the author(s), and grouped on the wall by category. The resulting list of alternatives, as well as other potential alternatives, is included below.

Alternatives

Possible alternatives to be explored, as brainstormed at May 2 meeting:

Water Development:

Ute Pipeline
Infrastructure upgrades
Desalination/salt water utilization
Enhanced recharge, using playa lakes
Cloud seeding
Dam construction (Canadian, Dry Cimarron Rivers)

Water Conservation:

Municipal water conservation
Agricultural water conservation, including evaporation controls

Water Management:

Watershed management, including removal of non-native vegetation
Groundwater management, including monitoring, creation of districts
Water rights protection
Creation of permanent recreation pool in Ute Reservoir
Declaration of groundwater basins
Strategic placement of snow fences
Tucumcari and Chicosa Lake management

Water Quality:

Wellhead protection
Septic tank replacement/monitoring

Possible alternatives to be explored, as developed by 2000 Northeast Regional Water Plan:

Development of local water security plans
Creation of special water and sanitation districts/local groundwater control districts
Ute Pipeline
Monitoring annual/cumulative groundwater depletions
Identify and designate groundwater conservation areas
Agricultural conservation
Municipal conservation
Declaration of groundwater basins
Wellhead protection plans to protect municipal supply
Use of Clayton Lake water for municipal supply
Reconstruction of Perico Dam to provide municipal supply
Dry Cimarron River Project
Lining the minimum recreation pool at Running Water Draw
Canadian River supply for Harding County
Playa lake enhanced recharge
Watershed basin improvement, including control of broom snakeweed
Creation of county water cooperatives/mutual domestic water systems
Rangeland conservation and management
Water reuse
Water quality protection

Other possible alternatives, as developed by other regions:

Water banking
Data collection, metering, measuring, monitoring, and management
Groundwater management plans
Improve efficiency of surface water irrigation conveyance systems
Improve on-farm efficiency
Control brush and weeds along water distribution systems and drains

Remove exotic vegetation on a wide scale
Make water rights a non-condemnable resource
Identify and protect areas vulnerable to contamination
Adopt and implement local water conservation plans and programs, including drought contingency plans
Develop county and city ordinances for conservation
Develop and implement county and municipal septic tank and other water quality control ordinances
Recycle municipal wastewater for agricultural and recreational use

Northeast New Mexico 5th Steering Committee Meeting
August 29, 2005, 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Agenda

Welcome and introductions
Population, economic growth and water use presentation
Project update, moving into Phase II
Alternative selection and public meeting discussion

Materials

Agenda
PowerPoint presentation hand-outs
Population count and projections maps
Wall-size print-outs of proposed alternatives

Attendees

Antonio Aragon, Village of Mosquero
Justin Bennett, Northeastern SWCD
Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines
Paula Chacon, Union County
Tuda Libby Crews, Ute Creek SWCD
Randy Crowder, Clovis
Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
Harry Hopson, Ute Creek SWCD
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Linda Lavender, Village of House
Franklin McCasland, Quay County
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Wesley Shafer, Village of Grady
Kathy Wright, NM American Water

Project Team:

Joanne Hilton, Hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Amy Ewing, Hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Barbara Herrington, AICP, Planner and Facilitator, Sites Southwest, LLC
Mike Barnes, P.E., Tucumcari resident

Interstate Stream Commission Representative:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Decisions

Four public meetings will be held this fall to gather public input into the alternative selection process. These will be held in Clovis, Logan, Clayton, and Mosquero.

Process

Following introductions, Barbara Herrington gave a PowerPoint presentation on updated population forecasts and additional information about potential economic development that could affect the demand for water in the study area. Joanne Hilton then reported on water use in the region and project status. She noted that the project team is finishing Phase I analyses of water demand and supply. The team will now begin work on Phase II, which includes developing water budgets for sub-areas of the region.

The team then reviewed the list of alternatives proposed by the Steering Committee at the previous meeting to clarify the meaning of each and offer an opportunity for additions to be made. Participants then were given green and red sticker dots to vote for the alternatives they considered most important to evaluate in the plan or against alternatives they did not want included in the plan. The list of alternatives follows, as well as the number of votes each received. The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing several alternatives that received negative ratings.

The meeting ended with a short discussion of where and when to hold the first round of public meetings. The purpose of these meetings will be to present a project status report to a larger audience and to get additional input into prioritizing proposed alternatives. Participants suggested holding meetings in the Portales-Clovis area, Mosquero/Roy (at the County courthouse), Clayton, and Logan.

Alternatives Prioritized Through Multi-Voting Process by Steering Committee

Numbers represent “yes” votes unless designated as “no”

Water Conservation:

Municipal water conservation (10)

Agricultural water conservation, including evaporation controls (9)

Water reuse (10)

Water Management:

Watershed management, including removal of non-native vegetation (11)

Groundwater management, including monitoring, creation of districts (7)

Water rights protection (5)

Creation of county water coops/mutual domestic water systems (1)

Development of local water security plans (4)

Creation of permanent recreation pool in Ute Reservoir (3) (4 no)

Declaration of groundwater basins (6)

Strategic placement of snow fences (1)

Tucumcari and Chicosa Lake management (1)

Lining the minimum recreation pool at Running Water Draw (0)

Water Quality:

Wellhead protection (9)

Reclamation of abandoned CO₂ plants (5)

Improve trash disposal (e.g., address creek dumping) (5)
Septic tank replacement/monitoring (8)

Water Development:

Ute Pipeline (19) (9 no)

Infrastructure upgrades (14)

Desalination/salt water utilization (5)

Enhanced recharge, using playa lakes (6)

Cloud seeding (9 no)

Dam construction (Canadian, Dry Cimarron Rivers, Ute Creek reconstruction of Perico Dam) (5) (4 no)

Use of Clayton Lake water for municipal supply (3)

Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Planning Public Meetings
October 19-21, 2005

October 19, 2005, 6:00-8:00 p.m.
Clovis, New Mexico

Attendees

John Widmark, Clovis
Wesley Shafer, Village of Grady
Gary Watkins, City of Portales
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority (ENMRWA)
Wesley Myers, Clovis
Joe Thomas, City of Clovis
Marlena Hartz, Clovis News Journal
Kathy Wright, NM American Water
David Lansford, City of Clovis
Lee Tillman, Eastern Plains Council of Governments
Orlando Ortega, City of Portales

October 20, 2005, 10:00-12:00 p.m.
Logan, New Mexico

Attendees

Peter Tatschl, farmer
Don Lopez, farmer
Clay Koontz, ENMRWA
Larry Wallin, Village of Logan
Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Franklin McCasland, Quay County
Tom Bruhn, farmer

October 20, 2005, 4:00-6:00 p.m.
Clayton, New Mexico

Attendees

Shirley Brooks, Village of Des Moines
Judson Davis, Town of Clayton
Byron Wagner, Clayton
David Kyea, rancher
Shelley Carter, Union County Commissioner/rancher
Sam Bennett, cattleman
Bill Watters, rancher
Justin Bennett, Northeastern Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD)
Clay Koontz, ENMRWA
Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines
Eugene Podzemny, Sedan

W. C. McElhannon, Gladstone
Ben Creighton, NRCS
Charles and Frida Hoeffner, ranchers
Burl Brown, rancher
Damon Brown, rancher
Barry Poling, rancher/farmer
David Sowers, rancher/farmer
Joyce Sowers, Union County Clerk
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Darien Brown, rancher
Bill Berg, rancher
Mike Running, Town of Clayton
Violet Brockman, Union County
J. M. Poling, Clayton
Paula Chacon, Union County Manager
Ron Seaman, Clayton
Fred Like, Folsom
Roger Schmitz, Clayton
Deanna Richardson, Sedan

October 21, 2005, 1:30-3:30 p.m.
Mosquero, New Mexico

Attendees

Mary C. Gonzales, Bueyeros
Chester Gallagher, Bueyeros
Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
Sharon Callahan, Mosquero
Richard Shaw, Mesa SWCD
Robert L. Casados, Union County Commissioner
Pete Callahan, Harding County
Paula Chacon, Union County Manager

Agenda

Welcome and introductions
Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan Public Meeting Presentation
Alternative explanation, discussion, and selection

Materials

Public meeting PowerPoint presentation handout
Fact sheets: Regional Water Planning Process
Population by County
Water Supply
Current regional Water Demand
OSE *Declaring and Extending Underground Water Basins* handout

Process

Following introductions, Amy Ewing gave a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the regional water planning process, regional water supply and demand, and the alternatives selection and analysis process. After a question and answer period, focus turned to the list of potential alternatives to be addressed in the *Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan*. Each group had an opportunity to add to the existing list of potential alternatives.

Potential alternatives added at each of the public meetings are as follows:

- ◆ Metering agricultural water use (Clovis)
- ◆ Add elevation of 3765 feet to the recreational pool alternative (Logan)
- ◆ Planning for growth (Logan)
- ◆ Development/completion of a sewer and collection system for Logan (Logan)
- ◆ Fire protection (Clayton)
- ◆ Water quality analysis of potential coal bed methane drilling re-injection water (Clayton)
- ◆ Add restricting out of county water transfers to the water rights protection alternative (Clayton)
- ◆ Add to the groundwater management alternative (1) monitoring depletions along the Texas-New Mexico border and (2) Canadian Compact review regarding whether the hydraulic gradient is increasing water delivery to Texas added (Clayton)
- ◆ Add alternative crop selection/research to the agricultural conservation alternative (Mosquero)
- ◆ Reclaiming wastewater added to the water reuse alternative (Mosquero)
- ◆ Development/construction of a Harding County agricultural and municipal water system (Mosquero)
- ◆ Commercial water conservation, specifically dairies and feedlots (Mosquero)

To prioritize the alternatives, each participant at each of the meetings was given 10 yes votes and 2 no votes to cast for the alternatives; a table of the voting results at each of the meetings is attached. Each meeting concluded following a discussion of the voting results.

Northeast New Mexico 6th Steering Committee Meeting
November 7, 2005, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Agenda

Welcome and introductions
Public meeting report, finalize alternatives
Future water use projections

Materials

Agenda
Results of Alternatives Discussions
Prioritization of Alternatives
Future Water Use Projections: Methods and Assumptions

Attendees

Justin Bennett, Northeastern Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD)
Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines
Glenn Briscoe, Canadian River SWCD
Peter Castiglia, SWCA Environmental
Tuda Libby Crews, Ute Creek SWCD
Randy Crowder, City of Clovis
Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
Isidro Garcia, City of Clovis
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority (ENMRWA)
Franklin McCasland, Quay County
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Bobbie Rose, Village of San Jon
Bob Sandoval, City of Clovis
Wesley Shafer, Village of Grady
Joe Thomas, City of Clovis
Scott Verhines, ENMRWA
Cindy Wall, Central Curry SWCD
Larry Wallin, Village of Logan
Gary Watkins, City of Portales
Kathy Wright, NM American Water

Project Team:

John Burkstaller, P.E., Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Amy Ewing, Hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

Interstate Stream Commission Representative:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Decisions

The next Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Planning Steering Committee meeting will be held on Monday, February 27, 2006 from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. in the Liberty Room of the Tucumcari Convention Center, 1500 West Route 66.

Alternatives to be analyzed in full in the *Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan* include:

1. Municipal conservation (including water reuse)
2. Agricultural conservation (including well metering)
3. Groundwater management (including wellhead protection plans)
4. Rangeland conservation and watershed management
5. Water rights protection (restricting transfers out of county/out of region)
6. Eastern New Mexico Rural Water System (including creating a new minimum recreational pool in Ute Reservoir at an elevation of 3765 feet)
7. Infrastructure upgrades (including the development of a sewer and collection system in Logan, development of a Harding County water system, development of water systems in Des Moines, Folsom, and Capulin, and addressing San Jon-Logan pipeline issues)
8. Planning for growth (making certain that water is available)
9. Dam construction (legal analysis on whether there is water in the region that could be impounded by a new dam)

Process

Following introductions, Amy Ewing referred attendees to the table summarizing the results of previous discussions of potential alternatives for meeting projected regional demand with available water supply. This table lists all the potential alternatives that have been discussed for the region, along with the number of positive or negative votes received by each alternative at each of the five meetings where votes were cast. The prioritization of alternatives handout listed the 16 potential alternatives that received half or more votes in at least one of the five meetings where alternatives were voted on. Discussion followed, with the purpose of selecting 12 or fewer alternatives to be the focus of the regional water plan alternatives analysis.

Further discussion was focused on proposed methods and assumptions for developing future water use projections. The steering committee provided insight on possible growth areas that will be used by DBS&A to refine methods and assumptions used in the analysis. Much of the proposed regional economic development is to be supplied by public water supply systems. The steering committee expects increased self-supplied water demand to come from the expansion of feed lots and dairies in Curry and Roosevelt Counties and carbon dioxide drilling in Union County.

Summary of Discussion

Notable aspects of the discussion to select priority alternatives for analysis in the regional water plan include:

- ◆ The group decided to add a discussion of metering agricultural wells to the agricultural conservation alternative. There was further discussion of agricultural metering and the priority areas in New Mexico where metering orders have been issued. Mary Helen Follingstad mentioned that the OSE Active Water Resource Management program information is available online for those interested in learning more (http://www.ose.state.nm.us/water_info_awrm.html).
- ◆ There was a consensus to remove the septic tank replacement and monitoring alternative from the list of potential alternatives, as NMED is working on this.
- ◆ The group decided to combine rangeland conservation and watershed management into one alternative, as most of the region is rangeland. The Playa Lake Joint Venture was mentioned (information available at <http://www.pljv.org/>) for possible incorporation into the rangeland conservation/watershed management alternative.
- ◆ There was extensive discussion on infrastructure upgrades and the alternatives that address them. The group decided to keep the Eastern New Mexico Rural Water System (ENMRWS) as a separate alternative, but to include the Logan sewer, Union and Harding water systems, and San Jon-Logan pipeline issues as components of the infrastructure alternative. It was stated that DBS&A will not duplicate the efforts of the ENMRWA. The group discussed adding an alternative to address infrastructure needs in Des Moines, Capulin, and Folsom, but decided to address this under the infrastructure improvements alternative.
- ◆ The group decided to combine wellhead protection with the groundwater management alternative.
- ◆ A question arose about the planning for growth alternative, which was added at the public meeting in Clovis, over how this alternative came to be: was its impetus restricting growth? It was clarified that no, this alternative was added to make sure that adequate resources are available for growth. Discussion followed over whether this was already being done adequately; nevertheless, the group decided to keep this alternative.
- ◆ The group discussed whether there is water in the Northeast Region that could be impounded by a new dam and agreed that a legal analysis of this issue will be necessary. The Canadian and Dry Cimarron Rivers, Revuelto, Ute, and Tramperos Creeks, and Perico Stream were discussed as potential watercourses for impoundment. The group decided to keep dam construction as an alternative, focusing on a legal analysis to determine if water is available.
- ◆ The Ute Reservoir lake level was discussed. The Ute Water Commission voted in favor of raising the minimum pool to this new level and plans to send correspondence to the ISC recommending this change. Larry Wallin (Village of Logan) requested that the meeting notes reflect that the mayors of Clovis, Portales, and Logan are in favor of adopting this new minimum lake level. Discussion ensued on whether the higher minimum elevation would reduce yield, and the group agreed that this will be

addressed by the Ute Reservoir Master Plan, but decided to address the creation of a permanent recreational pool as a part of the ENMRWS alternative. Concern was voiced that by raising the minimum lake level, recreational use would take priority over municipal and industrial uses. Questions were also raised as to the potential consequences if the ENMRWS is never built, and it was agreed that the regional water plan should address this point. Scott Verhines mentioned the existence of a reservoir model that can simulate various scenarios. Those interested in learning more about this model should contact Scott Verhines (505-830-1400, pm@enmrwa.com).

- ◆ A question was raised over the effectiveness of salt cedar removal. John Burkstaller indicated that the answer depends upon who you ask and what takes the place of removed salt cedar.

A discussion of the proposed methods and assumptions for developing future water use projections followed the discussion of alternatives:

- ◆ For the public water supply projections, one participant commented that conservation should be taken into consideration when multiplying historical per capita use by projected population.
- ◆ The group recommended that the trend in irrigated agriculture be looked at by county rather than by the region as a whole. Groundwater availability differs widely within the region, and in Quay County much of the water used for irrigation is surface water (provided by the Arch Hurley Conservancy District using water from Conchas Reservoir).
- ◆ Many of the assumptions used in the preliminary water use projections overestimated projected self-supplied water use and underestimated future public water supply needs. These assumptions will be changed.

Northeast New Mexico 7th Steering Committee Meeting
February 27, 2006, 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Agenda

Welcome and introductions
Water demand projections
Vision, goals, and alternatives
Public welfare
Second round of public meetings, next steering committee meeting

Meeting Materials

Agenda
PowerPoint handout on projecting water demand
Vision and goals
Public welfare
Alternatives fact sheet

Attendees

Leandro Abeyta, Village of Vaughn
Rachel Armstrong, NRCS, Clovis Service Center
Justin Bennett, Northeastern SWCD
Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines
Glenn Briscoe, Canadian River SWCD
Pete Callahan, Harding County
Sharon Callahan, Harding County
Tuda Libby Crews, Ute Creek SWCD
Randy Crowder, City of Clovis
Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
Bill Curry, Quay County
Mike Delano, NRCS, Roy Service Center
Mary C. Gonzales, Harding County
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Carrie Lindsey, Southwest Quay SWCD
Don Lopez, Quay County
Robert Lopez, Quay County
Franklin McCasland, Quay County
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Wesley Myers, Curry County
Kay Nickols, Village of Elida
Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Wesley Shafer, Village of Grady
Terry Turner, Quay County
Scott Verhines, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Cindy Wall, Central Curry SWCD
Gary Watkins, City of Portales

John O. Wright, City of Clovis
Kathy Wright, NM American Water Co.

Project Team:

Joanne Hilton, hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Amy Ewing, hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Barbara Herrington, AICP, planner and facilitator, Sites Southwest, LLC

Interstate Stream Commission Representative:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Decisions

A second round of public meetings will be held in Portales, Tatum, Clayton, and Mosquero April 3 through 5, 2006. An analysis of each strategy being developed by the regional water plan will be presented, and input on the political feasibility and social and cultural impacts will be solicited for each strategy.

DBS&A will draft a public welfare statement based on input from this meeting and will e-mail it to a subcommittee of the Steering Committee for comments. This statement will be brought back to the larger group for approval at the next Steering Committee meeting.

The next Steering Committee meeting will be scheduled in May 2006. The results of the second round of public meetings will be discussed at this meeting.

A draft regional water plan will be available for Steering Committee review by late summer. Following revisions, public comment, and local government approval, it will be submitted for adoption by the Interstate Stream Commission in December 2006.

Summary

Barbara Herrington began the meeting by reviewing the progress to date. In the early meetings, the Steering Committee identified issues regarding water use and supply. Regional vision and goals were drawn from the original regional water plan and modified by the Steering Committee for use in the plan. Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc. (DBS&A) analyzed the existing water supplies, and Sites Southwest analyzed the existing demographics and economic situation by county. Population numbers and potential economic development were projected into the future.

The Steering Committee identified and discussed potential alternatives (or strategies) to how water is now used and supplied in the region. DBS&A held a round of four public meetings in October 2005 to present the analyses of supply and demand, and to receive input on the selection of strategies for meeting projected demand with available supply. Based on these results, the strategies that will be developed in the plan were selected by the Steering Committee. DBS&A is now in the process of analyzing the selected alternatives according to their technical, political, and financial feasibility; social and cultural impacts; and hydrologic and environmental impacts.

Following Barbara Herrington's summary, Amy Ewing summarized the methods that are being used to project future water demand for the various sectors: public water supply, domestic supply, commercial, industrial, irrigated agriculture, livestock, mining, and power. She also demonstrated how estimates of reservoir evaporation were determined. During the presentation Steering Committee members asked for clarifications and suggested other factors to consider or alternative methods for calculating water demand.

Following a short break, participants reviewed the vision and goals developed early in the planning process to check whether they needed further modification. One participant suggested that Goal J, "*Ensure that sufficient technical assistance and funding is available to farmers to make infrastructure improvements*" be broadened to include all water users. Others thought farmers should remain the focus of the goal. [Note: Goal I addresses funding for general infrastructure improvements.] The addition of the related alternatives to each goal also created confusion, as participants were unclear about use of the term "alternative" and descriptions were very general. Following clarification that "alternatives" as called for in the regional water planning guidelines could be viewed as "strategies" or "actions" that would implement the region's goals, it was suggested that one of those last two terms be substituted for the term "alternative" in the plan.

Joanne Hilton presented the history and legal basis for the concept of "public welfare" and had participants review examples of public welfare as defined by other New Mexico water planning regions. A 1987 U.S. Supreme Court ruling prohibited New Mexico from banning water exportation to El Paso, but indicated that the state could prevent "uncontrolled" water transfers out of the state based on conservation and public welfare considerations. The New Mexico legislature subsequently amended water statutes to give the State Engineer authority to deny an application if it was contrary to conservation or detrimental to the public welfare. Public welfare has not been defined on a state level, but a number of regional water plans have incorporated statements defining what constitutes public welfare in their region.

Participants broke into three groups by county (Union/Harding, Quay, and Curry/Roosevelt) to discuss public welfare. Each group reviewed public welfare statements that have been adopted by other regions and defined what should be included in a statement for the Northeast region. Important concepts to each group included:

- Union/Harding:
 - Not using public welfare negatively (e.g., eminent domain)
 - Maintaining agriculture
 - Keeping rights in their area of origin watersheds
 - Promoting economic development, funding
 - Good land stewardship
 - Water quality protection
 - Rural community development
- Quay:
 - Satisfying the needs of the region before considering outside transfers
 - Preventing eminent domain and protecting private property rights

- Sustainability
 - Surface water protection and management
- Curry/Roosevelt
 - Conservation
 - Water quality
 - Sustainability and long-term protection of water resources
 - Making decisions within the region
 - Planning to sustain growth
 - Identifying who owns the water (adjudicating water rights)
 - Considering the impact of water projects and policies on existing water uses and the local economy

Amy Ewing will synthesize these results into a public welfare statement and will send it for review by e-mail to a volunteer subcommittee composed of Scott Verhines, Joe Culbertson, Pete Callahan, Glenn Briscoe, Kendyl Monroe, Karen Bray, and Richard Primrose.

The project schedule was discussed, and is summarized below:

- The second round of public meetings will be held April 3 through 5 in Portales, Tucumcari, Clayton, and Mosquero. Analyses of the alternatives or strategies will be presented in order to obtain input about the political feasibility and social and cultural impacts of each strategy.
- Results of these public meetings and further discussion of the strategies will take place at the next steering committee meeting on May 15.
- The draft Regional Water Plan will be available for comment in June or July.
- A steering committee meeting will also be held in August or September to discuss comments received and to finalize the draft document.
- The plan will be presented to various County governmental bodies for endorsement and will be submitted for ISC approval prior to December.
- The process and schedule for review will be further discussed at the May meeting.

Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Planning Public Meetings
April 3-5, 2006

Agenda

Welcome and introductions
Regional water planning process
Northeast region technical overview
Public welfare
Regional Water Plan strategies

Materials

Agenda
Draft public welfare statement
Public welfare comment sheet
Public meeting PowerPoint presentation handout

Attendees

Portales, New Mexico

April 3, 2005, 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Randy Crowder, City of Clovis
George Hay, Roosevelt SWCD & El Llano Estacado
Michael Jacobs, Village of Melrose
Irene and Bob Jones, Bosque Farms
K.C. Jones, Village of Melrose
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Debi Lee, City of Portales
Orlando Ortega, City of Portales
William Thompson, Portales News-Tribune
Gary Watkins, City of Portales

Tucumcari, New Mexico

April 4, 2005, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Michael Hannagan, Village of Texico
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Carrie Lindsey, Southwest Quay SWCD
Franklin McCasland, Quay County
Sam Monoa, Mesa Real Estate, Village of Logan
Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Wesley Shafer, Village of Grady
Larry Wallin, Village of Logan
Juanita Wallis, Village of Quay
Kevin Wilson, Clovis News Journal

Clayton, New Mexico

April 4, 2005, 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Justin Bennett, Northeastern SWCD
Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines
Shelley Carter, Union County Commission
Paula Chacon, Union County
Tom Davies, City of Clayton
Nick Diller, Farmers and Stockmen's Bank, City of Clayton
Billy E. Dugan, Village of Sedan
David Kyea, City of Clayton
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Barbara Monroe, Village of Seneca
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Bob Podzemny, Village of Sedan
E.D. Romero, NRCS
Betty Sayre, Village of Seneca
Ron Seaman, City of Clayton
Jimmie Taylor, City of Clayton Trustee

Mosquero, New Mexico

April 5, 2005, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

Pete Callahan, Harding County
Sharon Callahan, Village of Mosquero
Mury Libby and Doug Campbell, Yesterday's Valley Ranch, Inc.
Jack Chatfield, Canadian River Riparian Restoration Project
Blair Clavel, NMSU Cooperative Extension Service
Tuda Libby Crews, Ute Creek SWCD
Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
Annie Ficarri, Village of Roy
Sherrita Fluhman, Ute Creek SWCD
Chester Gallagher, Village of Bueyeros
Mary Gonzales, Village of Bueyeros
Richard Shaw, Mesa SWCD

Process

Following introductions, Amy Ewing gave a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the regional water planning process, regional water plan technical overview, and public welfare. After a question and answer period on these topics, the PowerPoint presentation continued with a discussion of each of the selected Regional Water Plan strategies and solicitation of comments, especially regarding the social/cultural impacts and political feasibility of each proposed strategy.

Summary of Discussion

A summary of discussion for each of the nine strategies at each public meeting follows.

Eastern New Mexico Rural Water System

Portales

- Concern was raised over the costs incurred for studies of the proposed pipeline and not on its implementation.
- The ENMRWS cost was cited to be less than the “no project” alternative.
- Concern was raised about operation and maintenance (O&M) costs: how much these costs will be and how small communities (specifically Melrose) will pay for O&M.
- There was discussion in favor of municipal water reuse and recycling in addition to supplying demand with water from the pipeline.

Tucumcari

- Concern was raised over the total project cost and how pipeline costs seem to continue to rise.
- O&M costs are also a concern.

Clayton

- No comments were received on the ENMRWS strategy in Clayton.

Mosquero

- Concern was raised over project spending to date and with how long it is taking to implement the project.
- There were comments on the importance of the project, and the complexity of funding and planning issues was discussed.
- The group felt that it is important to be aware of the watershed yield above Ute Reservoir and discussed the possibility of adding a stream gage further upstream on Ute Creek to measure this.
- The group discussed whether or not a cost benefit analysis had been performed.

Infrastructure Upgrades

Portales

- Concern was raised over Ute Lake water quality and the need for a sewer system in Logan.

Tucumcari

- There was consensus that building a Des Moines water system is critical.
- Discussion of the Logan-San Jon pipeline infrastructure identified that the expansion in the number of customers served and fire control are needed.
- In addition to the current and future projects covered in the presentation, Tucumcari is also currently upgrading their wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) using a rural utilities service (RUS) loan, and it plans to reuse effluent.
- Water tank and water line upgrades are needed in the Village of Forrest.

Clayton

- The group felt that it is important for the Des Moines water system project to get funded. Current (2006 capital outlay) funding will be used to upgrade existing water

lines, and additional funding will be sought for the water system. The water plan should reflect the importance of this project.

- Additional infrastructure upgrades that the group feels are necessary include upgrading water lines in Clayton and adding wells to the distribution system in Clayton. Clayton has purchased land with many wells that have not yet been tied into the distribution system.

Mosquero

- The group was curious about what the 2006 capital outlay funding that was earmarked for the Arch Hurley Conservancy District is for.
- The need for a Harding County water system was discussed, and the group would like to see that the full discussion of this from the October 2005 public meeting in Mosquero makes it into the draft plan. Construction of this water system would first involve obtaining Canadian River water rights, and this was discussed.
- Water storage tanks for fire control were identified as an additional infrastructure need.

Dam Construction

Portales

- There was interest in building a dam below Ute Lake when the lake is silted in.
- Members of the group were concerned that there seems to be insufficient water to impound with a new dam.

Tucumcari

- Dam construction is not seen as feasible, unless Ute Reservoir is silted in.

Clayton

- No comments were received on the dam construction strategy in Clayton.

Mosquero

- The location of a dam, if one is built, was discussed, and the group was interested in whether this location would be below the Harding County line.
- The group was interested in the Ute Lake Ranch water rights, and this is being checked into.
- The possibility of impounding water above Conchas Reservoir was discussed, and the group felt that there must be some way to capture water that flows through Harding County. Concern was raised over the willingness of the ISC to reduce the storage at Ute Reservoir in order to accommodate storage at another dam upstream.

Agricultural Conservation

Portales

- Concern was raised over the amount of evaporation from ditches and the reduction in recharge when ditches are lined.
- There was consensus that LEPA systems provide a great benefit at low cost.

- Comment were made that monitoring of double cropping may be needed, and there was concern that Farm Service Agency policies support double cropping.
- A comment was made that further decline in water levels will eventually shut irrigators off completely.
- The group discussed metering agricultural wells to ensure that actual diversions do not exceed what is allotted.
- Dairies' use of high water use feed and the distances that this feed can be transported were discussed.
- There was consensus that hydroponic crops are not feasible on a large scale.
- The group discussed that irrigation improvements (replacing cement pipes with PVC, for example) would be an effective conservation measure.

Tucumcari

- The potential reduction of recharge is not seen as a deterrent to lining ditches, as the primary irrigation method in Quay County is flood irrigation, and recharge takes place on the fields.
- The group is not sure that hydroponic greenhouses are feasible and have concerns over the area that would need to be enclosed and the costs.
- A comment was made that the region needs to look at more options for forage.
- The group felt that the recycling of water by dairies should continue.

Clayton

- The group discussed removing vegetation along streams and irrigation canals as an important conservation measure.
- There was consensus that all salt cedar eradication programs should be supported.
- The group felt that LEPA systems are both efficient and practical. One member of the group estimated that it costs approximately \$45,000 to \$50,000 to convert the irrigation method on a 125-acre section to a LEPA system.
- The importance of developing lower-water-use crops was discussed.
- Concerns were raised about applying hydroponic greenhouses on a large scale.
- The group feels that education is an important part of the agricultural conservation strategy and thinks that outreach to the Future Farmers of America should be a focus, as these kids will be the future of farming.

Mosquero

- The group was adamantly opposed to metering livestock wells. There is very little irrigated agriculture in Harding County, and metering is not seen as a viable conservation measure in Harding County.
- There was consensus that the hydroponic greenhouses seem impractical on a large scale.
- The group discussed initiating incentives for cattle growers to reduce evaporation from stock ponds as a viable conservation measure. The possibility of issuing conservation stewardship awards on the local level was discussed.
- The regional water plan should credit the industry for the improvements that have been made so far.

- The reuse of graywater on farms and ranches was discussed as a viable conservation measure.
- The group would like the distinction between ranching and farming to be stressed, as ranchers use much less water.

Municipal Conservation

Portales

- The new Clovis conservation ordinance that has been passed was brought to the group's attention, and there was discussion of ordinances being an effective method for achieving conservation. This new ordinance targets new construction, in addition to other measures.
- Rebate programs for conversion to xeriscape and appliance replacement were discussed as an effective conservation measure.
- The group commented that municipal reuse is viable for this area.
- City of Alamogordo conservation efforts were discussed, and the group discussed using Alamogordo as a model for municipalities in this area.

Tucumcari

- The group was interested in graywater regulations and would like for them to be discussed in the plan.
- There was consensus that larger communities should reuse water for irrigation of parks and other common areas. This is not feasible in smaller communities (Grady, for example), where they do not have wastewater treatment facilities.

Clayton

- A comment was made that increasing water rates would be the most effective municipal conservation measure.
- Limiting the construction of golf courses, especially in critical management areas, was discussed. The group felt that recycled water should be used to irrigate golf courses, parks, and medians.
- Developing incentives for graywater use was discussed as a viable municipal conservation strategy.
- The group felt that replacing lines and meters in Clayton as a means for achieving municipal conservation would be more effective and viable than applying conservation methods on an individual basis.

Mosquero

- There was consensus that education is the key to municipal conservation. The group felt that people in Harding County do not need mandated measures to force conservation.
- The group thinks that municipal system maintenance and individual responsibility are the keys to conserving municipal water in Harding County.

Groundwater Management

Portales

- Concern was raised over the City of Lubbock pipeline that pipes water from New Mexico into Texas.
- The group felt that increasing the number of wells that are monitored is viable. They felt that monitoring could be more intense and that monitoring efforts could be more regional.
- Identifying areas vulnerable to contamination was declared important.
- The group felt that it is too late in the game to implement a groundwater protection policy. This group was not in favor of more regulation and its associated costs.
- Metering of agricultural wells was the favored groundwater management method.

Tucumcari

- The group felt that groundwater is already well regulated (by the State Engineer) and monitored (by communities as required by NMED).

Clayton

- There was consensus that groundwater restriction should be placed at the county (not regional) scale.
- Concern was expressed over the differences in state regulations (between Texas and New Mexico). The group requested that the plan discuss dairy projections for the Dalhart area in Texas.
- There is concern over OSE response time now that the Clayton groundwater basin has been declared. The group feels that additional OSE personnel are necessary to process paperwork in a reasonable amount of time.
- The group is interested in the OSE applying consistent policy. A specific case was discussed where new irrigation circles were being broken out when OSE paperwork requirements had not been met, while an individual with an existing irrigation well was waiting for a request to be processed.

Mosquero

- The group felt that dictating agricultural policy by metering agricultural wells is wrong. It is expensive to run wells (cost of natural gas, etc.), and so the consensus is that farmers are not applying more water than is necessary. Different crops need different amounts of water, and the group felt that there should be room for farmers to switch what they're growing without being limited by new policies.
- The potential need for local ordinances in urban areas was discussed.
- Education should be an important component of this strategy.

Rangeland Conservation and Watershed Management

Portales

- The group felt that there are legal issues with applying conservation easements on a large scale.
- Removal of exotic vegetation was discussed as important and viable.

- Private property rights are a concern. There was concern over the expense of administration, and the group felt that government supervision of rangeland would not be feasible. The group felt that metering agricultural wells would be a better alternative as a method of management.

Tucumcari

- The group feels that tamarisk (salt cedar) eradication is important.

Clayton

- There was consensus that all salt cedar eradication is a priority, and eradication programs should be supported.
- Adopting grazing practice regulations was not favored, and significant private property concerns came up with the suggestion of this type of regulation.
- Education was favored as the best method for management.
- Concern was expressed over the OSE regulations on small impoundments.
- The group prefers localized policies over regional or state regulations.

Mosquero

- Exotic vegetation removal projects are important and should be supported.
- Managing watersheds to enhance recharge was discussed as an important method of rangeland conservation and watershed management.
- Methods of material removal following restoration were discussed, and concern was expressed that material left in place could cause damage in flooding.
- Water salvage data following restoration projects involving the removal of vegetation were discussed.

Planning for Growth

Portales

- The group was in favor of adopting legislation that requires water to be available prior to approval of new subdivisions or other growth.

Tucumcari

- The group felt that water rights protection (as sought by communities in their 40-year planning) should be used to plan for growth and that existing regulations are adequate. They want to see growth in their communities and are proactively addressing it.

Clayton

- Large-scale, high-water-use development is a concern (dairies, especially in the Dalhart area).
- Concern was expressed that new demands (such as breaking out new irrigation circles) be created responsibly, without harming existing users.

Mosquero

- There is concern over maintaining existing services in Harding County, as the population is shrinking.
- Sustainability is important, and the available water supply should be used for maintaining the existing culture.
- There was consensus that no additional regulation is needed.
- The possibility that tourism could provide additional use that would be beneficial to Harding County was discussed, and water conservation is seen as the appropriate measure to support growth.
- The group feels that a Harding County groundwater study is needed. A study done near Roy a few years ago was cited in the discussion, but this study was not comprehensive. Harding County could plan for growth more effectively if the limits of the source were better defined.

Water Rights Protection

Portales

- There was consensus that out-of-region transfers are not favored, and the group was interested in imposing limits on the distance that a water right could be transferred.

Tucumcari

- This group sees water rights protection as very important.
- The requirements for out of basin/region transfers were discussed, and this issue needs to be clearly discussed in the regional water plan. It was mentioned that the burden of proof for water rights transfers falls on the individual requesting a transfer and not on a protestor.
- Concern was expressed over the OSE changing its policies.
- Water rights holders want the freedom to buy and sell their rights without any additional regulations.
- Maintaining local control over water is important.

Clayton

- The group discussed the requirements for out of basin/region transfers and wants this issue to be clearly discussed in the regional water plan.
- The group was interested in keeping water within the basin of origin, but does not favor adding regulations to mandate this.

Mosquero

- The group felt that the current system for water rights protection (OSE) should be allowed to work.
- There is hesitation in precluding water transfers in an effort to keep water within a particular region, as Harding County may need to transfer water in at some point.
- The group is strongly against the condemnation of water rights.

Northeast New Mexico 8th Steering Committee Meeting

May 15, 2006, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Agenda

Welcome and introductions
Public welfare
Legal issues
Draft regional water plan review process

Meeting Materials

Agenda
Public welfare
PowerPoint handout on legal issues

Attendees

Barrett Beard, Gladstone
Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines
Bill Brockman, Clayton
Mike Burns, Tucumcari
Sharon Callahan, Harding County
Joe Culbertson, Jr., Harding County
Mary C. Gonzales, Harding County
Michael Hannagan, Village of Texico
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Don Lopez, Quay County
W.C. "Dub" McElhannon, Gladstone
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Joe Thomas, City of Clovis
Gary Watkins, City of Portales
Mildred Williams
Kevin Wilson, Quay County Sun

Project Team:

Joanne Hilton, hydrologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Amy Ewing, hydrogeologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Susan Kery, attorney, Sheehan, Sheehan & Stelzner, P.A.

Interstate Stream Commission Representative:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Decisions

The draft regional water plan will become available for review by the steering committee at the end of June, and a steering committee meeting will be held to discuss comments on the plan in early July. The draft plan will be available for public review after the July meeting, which will not be open to the public. The next regular steering committee meeting will be held in August or September to discuss comments on the draft plan.

Summary

Following introductions, Amy Ewing presented the draft public welfare statement and the group commented on it. Comments included recommendations for changes (indicated in italicized text) to three of the bullets:

- Planning for *sustainability and growth*
- Protecting water rights and ensuring that all current and anticipated future needs are satisfied prior to considering any *out of state or out of planning region* water transfers
- Adjudicating all water rights and preventing *abuse of eminent domain*.

The draft public welfare statement will be revised and included as a part of the draft regional water plan.

Susan Kery presented legal issues to be discussed in the regional water plan. Water rights transfers were discussed and defined as the transfer of a water right to a different owner or location, no longer to be used at the original location. There was a comment that the current \$25 application fee for protesting a water rights transfer is much more reasonable than the former \$300 fee, which discouraged people from protesting transfer applications.

As groundwater in some of the areas in the Northeast Region (including most of Union and Roosevelt Counties) was declared in September 2005, the group felt that the water plan should stress that people in the newly declared areas need to declare their water rights, and the group recommended that applicable Office of the State Engineer forms be appended to the plan to familiarize people with them. The necessary order of actions was discussed, including the need for declaring a water right before an application for transfer can be made.

There was a comment that domestic water rights are not transferable, and that the discussion of transfers is most applicable to irrigation rights. In response to questions, Susan Kery said that while municipal rights can be transferred, they usually are not. Also, a water rights lease is considered to be a transfer if the place of use is being changed. Even a temporary lease would require OSE paperwork, as well as published notice.

A question was asked about how a person would tell the difference between irrigation and stock wells. Ms. Kery advised referring to the water rights declaration for the well, which states what the well is used for. One participant commented that it is important to indicate what water has been used for in the past when declaring pre-basin wells in the newly declared basins. The point was also made that people need to be sure that they are turning in the correct OSE forms. If an incorrect form is filed, it will be returned and not processed by the OSE.

The group discussed where the water in Ute Reservoir originates compared to where it will be used. Concern was raised over Harding County not being able to use the surface water that originates in that county. Residents of Harding County and of Gladstone in Union County commented that whereas they would benefit from using water from Ute Creek, adding storage on Ute Creek is not feasible due to the storage limits that have been set by the Canadian River Compact (Ute Creek is a Canadian River tributary). Further comments were that the interests of Harding County do not seem to have been taken into account when plans for constructing Ute Reservoir were made and, in response, that fairness is not a consideration in western water law.

The dam construction strategy being developed for the Northeast New Mexico regional water plan will address water supply issues for Union and Harding Counties. There has been interest in developing a Harding County water system, and prior to doing so, water rights would need to be obtained. Harding County could purchase Canadian River surface water rights and dam water above Conchas Reservoir without violating the Canadian River Compact, although the Arch Hurley Conservancy District would likely object to adding storage on the Canadian River. Another option would be to lease a portion of the water rights held in Ute Reservoir, build a diversion upstream of the reservoir, and take water from Ute Creek or the Canadian River before it reaches Ute Reservoir.

A participant commented that water level monitoring is needed, especially in New Mexico along the Texas-New Mexico border. The regional monitoring that Texas does through its groundwater management districts was discussed, and the question of whether regional regulation was going to be proposed as a part of the water plan was raised. Creation of groundwater management districts will be mentioned as a part of the groundwater management alternative; however, feedback from numerous stakeholder meetings has indicated that people are not interested in additional regulation.

The draft regional water plan review process was discussed. A draft plan will be ready at the end of June, and the group decided that they would like for the steering committee to have a chance to review the draft document before it is released to the public. The steering committee will be notified by e-mail when the draft is available, and a meeting to discuss steering committee comments on the draft plan will be scheduled for July. When the draft plan is released for public review, it will be available on the DBS&A web site and at public locations to be determined by the steering committee. The entire mailing list will receive an announcement when the plan is available for public review.

A potential New Mexico to City of Lubbock pipeline had been discussed in the last few meetings; however, the issue has been researched, and no such pipeline appears to exist. The City of Lubbock has numerous supply wells, and they do stretch west from Lubbock to the border with New Mexico; however, the City of Lubbock does not have any wells in New Mexico and no pipeline is transporting water from New Mexico to Lubbock.

Northeast New Mexico 9th Steering Committee Meeting

July 11, 2006, 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Agenda

Welcome and introductions
Implementation recommendations
Discussion of any preliminary water plan issues
Preliminary regional water plan review process and schedule
Public review locations
Resolutions in support of the plan

Meeting Materials

Agenda
Preliminary implementation schedule and recommended actions table
Executive summary
Example resolution

Attendees

Justin Bennett, Northeastern SWCD
Karen Bray, Village of Des Moines
Shelley Carter, Union County
Randy Crowder, City of Clovis
Clay Koontz, Eastern New Mexico Rural Water Authority
Carrie Lindsey, Southwest Quay SWCD
Franklin McCasland, Quay County
Kendyl Monroe, Union County
Richard Primrose, City of Tucumcari
Bobbie Rose, Village of San Jon
Wesley Shafer, Village of Grady
Terry Turner, Quay County
Larry Wallin, Village of Logan
Gary Watkins, City of Portales

Project Team:

John Burkstaller, P.E., Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.
Amy Ewing, hydrogeologist, Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc.

Interstate Stream Commission Representative:

Mary Helen Follingstad, Regional Water Planning Program Manager

Decisions

The steering committee decided to release the preliminary plan to the public and agreed upon the locations for public review. Hard-copies of the preliminary plan will be mailed the week of July 17, and written comments are due by Friday September 8, 2006.

Summary

Following introductions, the group reviewed a preliminary version of the implementation schedule and recommended actions table. Revisions and additions to the table that were identified included:

- Considering the implementation of green-building codes was added under the municipal conservation strategy.
- For the preparation of summary reports on groundwater declines strategy:
 - Seeking funding was added as an action.
 - The priority was changed from 4 to 10 years to 1 to 3 years.
 - The responsible party was expanded to include counties, municipalities, OSE, and the New Mexico Rural Water Association (NMRWA).
- Under the infrastructure upgrades heading, wastewater treatment facility improvements in Des Moines, Tucumcari, and Portales and reuse infrastructure improvements in Clovis were added as strategies, with seeking funding added as actions for each.

The revised version of this table is included as Table 8-23 in the preliminary regional water plan.

Population projections were discussed, and the steering committee requested that Sites Southwest check to be sure that the high population projections cover the impact of the new Cannon AFB mission on Curry and Roosevelt Counties and of Ute Lake Ranch on Quay County.

The deadline for comments on the preliminary regional water plan was set for Friday September 8, 2006. All comments should be directed to Amy Ewing at Daniel B. Stephens and Associates, Inc. In addition to being posted on the Daniel B. Stephens & Associates, Inc. web site (www.dbstephens.com), a total of 16 preliminary regional water plan hard copies will be available for public review. These will be placed in the following locations:

- Capulin Store
- Clovis City Hall
- Clovis Library
- Des Moines City Hall
- Folsom Village Hall
- Village of Grady Office

- Harding County Courthouse
- House Co-op
- Logan City Hall
- Village of Melrose Office
- Portales City Hall
- Portales Library
- San Jon City Hall
- Sedan Post Office
- Tucumcari Library
- Union County Courthouse

In addition, one copy will be mailed to the Eastern Plains Council of Governments.

Resolutions in support of the *Northeast New Mexico Regional Water Plan* will be necessary for ISC approval, and so an example resolution was handed out and discussed (it had also been e-mailed to members of the steering committee). Members of the steering committee will use this example resolution to gather support of the plan from counties, municipalities, and SWCDs.