

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE NEW MEXICO/TEXAS WATER COMMISSION
MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MAC) AND
THE REGIONAL SUSTAINABLE WATER PROJECT
STEERING COMMITTEE (SC)
LAS CRUCES CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
200 N. CHURCH ST.
LAS CRUCES, NM 88001
SEPTEMBER 10, 2002
9:30 a.m.

Welcome

Jorge Garcia chaired and opened the meeting. A copy of the sign-in sheet is attached as **Exhibit “A”**. Those members attending from the Commission’s MAC/SC were as follows:

Doug Echlin – IBWC	Jerry Leyendecker–DonaAna County
Jorge Garcia – City of Las Cruces	John Burkstaller, EPWU
Garry Esslinger – EBID	Karl Wood – NMSU
Anthony Tarquin – UTEP	Dr. Ari Michelsen – Texas A&M
Tom Bahr – NMWRRRI	

I. Review and Approval of Minutes from MAC/SC Meeting on 7/11/02 (MAC/SC).

A motion was made to review and approve the 7/11/02 MAC Minutes. Jorge Garcia asked if there was any discussion on the motion. There was no discussion and the motion was unanimously approved.

II. Progress Report by the Paso del Norte Watershed Council (PdNWC) (Ed Kosak, Sue Watts, Ari Michelsen).

Ed Kosak provided an update of the PdNWC activities:

* The PdNWC Annual Meeting is to be held September 28th from 2 to 4 pm at the Undergraduate Learning /Center at UTEP. He invited everyone to attend. The annual meeting is being held in conjunction with the Mission Possible Annual Conference on Sept 27th & 28th. The Paso del Norte Watershed Council is a co-sponsor of this conference and plans to display an exhibit at their event.

* The Coordinated Database Agreement has been signed by all parties (Ed Archuleta, Ari Michelsen, Conrad Keyes), and has already been forwarded to Texas A&M University. Work is continuing to gain grant funding for this project from the US Army Corps of Engineers Albuquerque District. This PdNWC draft proposal is complete and is in the review process. The Paso del Norte Watershed Council is moving forward on another draft proposal, due November 21st, for the EPA Watershed Initiative Grant Program. Copies of summary information on the EPA Watershed Initiative have been provided in the handouts. Drafts of the PdNWC educational brochure have been provided with the handouts. The final version of the PdNWC

logo for the brochures will be made de available to the general public at the annual meeting. An Educational Outreach Committee has also been established to disseminate PdNWC information to the public about the Watershed Council and its activities.

Ari Michelsen added that the EPA Watershed Initiative is a program with 21 million dollars worth of funding. The Watershed Council is preparing a proposal for that initiative and nominations of the proposal are required by both governors. Normally the program is limited to two initiatives per state, but since the Watershed Council's proposal is a multi-State proposal, it would not fall under that limit. They are working with the Texas and New Mexico governors and are proceeding with the development of the initiative. A 25% match of local funding is requested with the proposals, and EPWU's current funding for the Executive Director's position will qualify towards this commitment. A meeting was held among members of the Watershed Council and some members of the MAC this morning to discuss this proposal, and Ari asked the members of the Commission for support of this proposal in concept. Ari will return in October with the formal proposal and ask for a letter of support from the Commission at that time.

Ed Archuleta asked about the size of the grant application. Ari replied that it is a minimum of \$300,000 on the grant applications, and that the Council has to contribute a 25 % match. Bobby Creel added that they are anticipating the grants to range from \$300,000 to \$1.3 million. Ari Michelsen stated that the required 25% match can be satisfied by EPWU's contributions to the Coordinated Database Project as wells as by EPWU's contribution to other Watershed Council projects.

III. Report on the Final Scope of Work and Funding Agreement for the PdNWC-Coordinated Database Program (Ed Fierro/Chris Brown) PdNWC

Chris Brown presented a brief summery of the PdNWC coordinated database program. He mentioned that all the paper work been signed and received, and NMSU has established job numbers and hired staff for the project. They have drafted a brief outline of project tasks that came out of the task order that was signed between NMSU and Texas A&M, and he briefly reviewed the project tasks. These tasks are as follows:

- * They have some staff looking at other websites that are doing similar types of projects. Chris mentioned a few of these sites, and the type of information they are looking to obtain from these sites, such as format, structure, and content.
- * The next step is to actually come up with a draft structure for how the Project's site would function. They need to decide on the exact database model that will be behind the site and draft some template tables for people to inspect and critique. They also need to find out how to interface with the Hewlett Bi-national GIS map.
- * He is beginning to identify the datasets from NMWRRI, NMSU, Texas A&M University Research Center, and other sources that can be used by the site. The Hewlett GIS map is a natural choice for the first dataset, and the WRRI, NMSU, and TAMU datasets would be the next choice. Identifying datasets from EPA, IBWC, USGS, and other state and federal agencies would follow .

* These initial tasks would all involve research and inventory type work. The next step for the project would be to put everything together and develop a pilot website that is functional and that serves the needs of the users.

* To pull this together, they envision a series of meetings. The first would be with NMSU staff to finalize the draft outline of tasks, then other meeting with TAMU, the Watershed Council Technical Committee, and finally with EPWU. Subsequently, they will meet with local and regional data providers to get their input on their requirements for providing data, and on the type of information they would like to access from the website.

Ari Michelsen added that the agreement that provided the funding for the watershed council through NMSU also establishes the server through the NMWRRRI. Bobby Creel and John Kennedy are working on that task. A large amount of the effort is going to be in developing the data base and acquiring the data. That is part of what the Council's Technical Committee will be working on within the next several months. On the financial side, the money for the project is being provided by the EPWU, and both universities have agreed to zero indirect costs. Bobby Creel added that NMSU and NMWRRRI are contributing in-kind services such as the web server and maintenance of this server.

Kevin Bixby asked how this database will enable the watershed council to better manage water resources and to improve the Rio Grande ecosystem. Ari Michelsen replied that collection of water data in a central location and making this data accessible to the public is an important first step in studying and subsequently managing the Rio Grande and its watershed. Conrad Keyes added that the commitment to this database will be a big plus for the group in requesting EPA funding.

IV. Presentation on the Final Report of the Tri-Regional Planning Group (TRPG)

Paul Gorder (CDM)

Paul Gorder advised that he would revisit the introductory material and then talk about the recommendations and costs from the Feasibility Study. He added that the work is essentially finished but that they haven't published a final report because of the change in administration and staff from the Junta Municipal de Aguas y Saniamento (JMAS). The success of the program depends so much on their support and participation that he believes they should hold off another month or two a let them provide constructive input into the process. In this manner, they will feel they are participating in the process, rather than being handed a final report telling them what the TRPG is proposing to do.

Paul proceeded to provide a PowerPoint presentation describing the TRPG Feasibility Study Report (copy attached as **Exhibit "B"**). After the presentation, an extensive question and answer session took place. The following is a summary of the discussions:

* Mr. Jaime Iglesias of TAES asked whether all of the agricultural land retired for the project would be from the Mexican side. Mr. Gorder replied that the plan begins with converting only some of the Mexican water. However, subsequent phases of the Sustainable Water Project would convert water rights from New Mexico and Texas for use in their respective water plants.

* Ari Michelsen asked how the implementation of the project would affect the water rates in Cd. Juarez. Mr. Gorder answered that they haven't yet determined the rate impacts for Cd. Juarez. He does know that the current rates in Cd. Juarez are very close to what EPWU charges its customers. However, the actual rate impacts would depend on how much grant funding is obtained to defray the capital costs.

* Sue Watts commented that loss of water from distribution system leakage in Cd. Juarez had been estimated to be from 35 to 50%, and asked if there was any discussion of improvements to their system. Mr. Gorder replied that it wasn't their mission to try to tackle these problems, but added that he's certain Cd. Juarez would take some steps to decrease their leakage if they had the money. John Burkstaller asked if reducing leakage was part of the Cd. Juarez Master Plan. Mr. Gorder answered that, yes, it was, but that they didn't have any immediate plans for implementation.

* Someone asked about the treatment processes envisioned for the water plants. Mr. Gorder replied that it would be a fairly conventional water plant, and include processes such as pre-sedimentation and ozonation.

* Tom Bahr stated that Mr. Gorder had said they were going to try to produce the same quality water as is produced for El Paso. He asked if the same applied to the water quality in the distribution system as well. Mr. Gorder replied that it would not, because they can't control what happens when the water leaves the treatment plant and enters into Cd. Juarez.

* Mr. Iglesias asked if the supply of new surface water to Cd. Juarez resulting from this project would replace the use of some groundwater, or would consumption simply increase without a substantial decrease in groundwater pumping. Mr. Gorder replied that both conditions are probably true. He thinks total use in the system will increase to some extent, but that it would be very gradual, so that initially Cd. Juarez would have to reduce their groundwater pumping in those areas receiving surface water. However, in the long term they would still depend on the Hueco as their primary source of water, probably even after the water turns somewhat brackish. Cd. Juarez will likely not try to save the Hueco for times of drought. They will need to develop other water projects besides this one before they can appreciably cut back on their Hueco pumping.

* Ed Archuleta thanked Mr. Gorder for the excellent presentation and recommended two changes to Mr. Gorder for future presentations, especially for the one he will give to the JMAS tomorrow: (1) He thinks that, in order to sell it, the project ought to be shown as a project in which both Federal governments are making an investment in an international complex. (2) He doesn't think the plan ought to be presented as if Juarez would have minimal investment, because it is a big assumption that somehow the US is going to pick up the entire tab. He thinks it ought to be shown more as a joint US/Mexican effort, with both federal governments having to provide capital investments.

* Ari Michelsen asked Mr. Archuleta about the next step was for the project. Mr. Archuleta answered that the next step would be the joint presentation tomorrow to the EPWU and JMAS Boards. Then, based on subsequent discussions, the MOU would be modified, hopefully without a lot of bureaucracy, to indicate that there is a willingness to proceed in accordance with the Feasibility Study's recommendation. The next step would be to apply for funding for the detailed engineering for the project. Subsequent steps would include changing the point of diversion and amending the SWP EIS.

* Sue Watts asked whether there was some reason why the Canal Plant could not be expanded to provide the treated surface water to Cd. Juarez rather than building a new plant in El Paso's

Upper Valley. Mr. Archuleta replied that it was basically an issue of there not being sufficient space for an expansion of the Canal Plant. However, EPWU has offered to provide the water to Cd. Juarez across the border from the site of the Canal Plant, or across from the Jonathan Rogers Plant.

* Kevin Bixby stated that one environmental impact he saw was the reduced flows in the river downstream of the Upper Valley WTP due to the diversions at the plant. He asked if they had looked at measures to mitigate for that? Mr. Gorder replied that they had. He stated that this topic has always been a concern, and that this has been one of the objections to the siting of the water plant in the Upper Valley. A method to mitigate for these conditions may be to treat a quantified amount of drain water upstream of the plant to offset increases in salinity that would otherwise occur.

* Conrad Keyes asked Mr. Archuleta if he knew whether CNA (Commission Nacional de Agua) and CILA now agree that this would be a feasible project. Mr. Archuleta replied that he did not know whether CNA had been involved the project. They are relying more on the CILA and the JMAS to coordinate with them, but he understands that they are in strong agreement with the project. Mr. Gorder added that CNA will have to take an active role in making a change in the type of use and water diversion point. Mr. Keyes asked if they (CNA) had asked CILA to start drafting the binational Principal Engineer's report yet. Mr. Gorder answered that no, they had not.

* Tom Bahr asked if the Project called for year-round delivery, and if so, wouldn't that decrease the average flows in the river? Mr. Gorder replied that changing the water delivery schedule is not something that is proposed in the 1st phase. However, it is an option in subsequent phases of the SWP and is something that should be considered. The potential impacts of year round delivery are discussed in the SWP EIS.

* Someone asked if the Project had considered the impacts of a Rio Grande drought. Mr. Gorder answered that they hadn't factored in how a drought might reduce Mexico's 60,000 acre feet annual allotment.

V. Update on the Tularosa Basin Desalination Research Center (NMWRRI)

Mike Hightower advised that during this past year there had been congressional funding for Sandia Labs to work with the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct a feasibility study for a Desalination Research Center in the Tularosa Basin which would specifically address inland desalination. He originally assembled the presentation that he will give today for the New Mexico Water Research Symposium, which was held at New Mexico Tech this August. The symposium was attended by about 175 people and went very well. After the introductory remarks, Mr. Hightower proceeded with the presentation slides (copy of this presentation is attached as **Exhibit "C"**). A question and answer session followed the presentation and is summarized below:

* Tom Bahr asked how close the proposed plant location will be to source waters of various qualities, which would enable it to draw waters of different salinities. Mr. Hightower replied that the location of the plant was selected to be within about 2 miles from a region that has a high variability in saline groundwaters. He pointed out the location of the two alternate wellfields selected for the project - they are both located on State Lands and have adequate access. Both

sites should supply saline groundwater with TDS values ranging from 2,000 to 15,000 ppm, and will be able to furnish both sulfate and carbonate type waters.

* Mr. Iglesias asked about the cost of desalination. Mr. Hightower advised that, depending on location, these costs can run anywhere from two to three dollars per thousand gallons up to about six dollars per thousand gallons. He added that care must be taken in citing unit cost figures, because some of the lower unit costs cited are from coastal desalination projects that share the inflow and outflow structures of a nearby power plant, and make use of off-peak power. Inland installation, on the other hand, can be from six to seven dollars per thousand gallons. El Paso's desalination costs are expected to be between two and three dollars per thousand gallons.

* Tom Bahr asked whether the brine injection research would include studies concerning chemical compatibilities between the injected water and the receiving aquifer, and whether the brine injection would be done at the plant site or a remote site. Mr. Hightower replied the brine injection research envisioned would indeed look at chemical compatibilities, and that the plant is set up to have a disposal well at the plant site. The cost of the injection well has been included in the project cost figures. He added that some States, such as Arizona, don't allow brine injection at all. That is one of the reasons why representatives from Tucson and Phoenix have expressed an interest in the facility – they would like to test disposal technologies.

* Gary Esslinger asked if they were considering doing research on the use of saline waters for growing cotton and pecan crops, because he had heard that they planned to produce saline waters of around 1,800 ppm TDS. Mr. Hightower replied that the best quality water produced would be at about 2,000 ppm TDS. He stated that he doesn't think pecans will grow very well with that quality of water, but that he knows of some grasses that will grow well in 5,000 to 6,000 ppm TDS water. Mr. Esslinger commented that it would certainly help if they did this type of testing, because in times of drought, saline water may be the only type of surface water available to grow crops. Mr. Hightower stated that he is trying to coordinate this type of research with NMSU and has also talked to people in Farmington that are doing exactly this type of research.

* Conrad Keyes asked whether Mr. Hightower had taken the Projects Executive Committee to a tour of the desalination research facility in Israel. Mr. Hightower replied that he had not. Mr. Keyes added that the Israel facility has modeled the brine disposal capacities of evaporation ponds and strongly recommended such a tour be considered. Mr. Hightower explained that Tom Jennings of the USBR is on the Executive Committee. Mr. Jennings has extensive experience with the desalination facilities in Israel and Saudi Arabia and is providing the Committee with input on these and other international facilities. However, he is receptive to any insights or ideas on this topic and thanked Mr. Keyes for his recommendation.

* Ari Michelsen asked about the number and types of personnel that the Research Center is expected to utilize. Mr. Hightower answered that he expects 3 to 4 different research projects to be on-going at the same time, utilizing 6 to 8 outside researchers. He expects that 10 to 12 people will be required to operate and manage the facility in addition to the researchers. The intent is to enable researchers to do research on a broad range of water qualities at one location.

* Mr. Archuleta asked about who was going to provide funding to operate and maintain the research facility. Mr. Hightower replied that the facility itself will cost about \$4.5 million. They will be working to assemble a design-build package for the facility and hope to get federal funding by next February. If they get the funding, they should start construction shortly thereafter. The operation and maintenance functions will take additional funding. They are hoping that funding for desalination research on a national level will increase to about \$15 million per year, and expect that part of this funding would be used for operation and

maintenance of this facility. The operating budget for the facility is estimated at \$1 million per year. It has not yet been determined who will own and operate the facility. It could be the USBR or the Department of Energy, depending on who gets the funding for the facility. The Executive Committee has recommended that, regardless of who the owner turns out to be, that the facility be operated under a technical services contract with a local entity or private contractor.

* Mr. Archuleta advised that the EPWU desalination project was not seeing the unit costs of six to seven dollars per thousand gallons cited by Mr. Hightower for inland desalination. EPWU unit capital costs are more in the vicinity of two dollars per thousand gallons. Mr. Hightower replied that the higher costs he cited may not include blending back to a higher TDS product water.

VI. Summary for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) Funding Initiatives Currently in Congress (Bureau of Reclamation)

David Allen gave an update on USBR funding initiatives. USBR has a wide range of activities involving Water Resource Management. USBR is involved with the Tularosa Basin Desalination Research Center, the purple pipe project in El Paso and even with some wetland projects in the area. Mr. Allen stated that USBR has the authorization to be involved in a wide range of water resource projects and that he would personally like to see the border area and NM get its fair share of funding. However, even though USBR already has the authorization to work in these areas, it still takes congressional action to authorize funding for specific projects. There is an amendment to Public Law 106, which is referred to the "Lower Rio Grande Rehabilitation Act", to help rehabilitate irrigation systems. This amendment is out of the Congressional Committee, and is now before the House of Representatives. It would provide approximately \$50 million for rehabilitation of irrigation systems and water management improvement projects, and includes funding for the two irrigation systems in the El Paso area. The Bureau of Reclamation is also working with the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB). The TWDB is already providing funding for the final design of two projects involving structural modifications to irrigation canals. One such project is for the lining of the Riverside Canal. This program requires a fifty percent local cost share and USBR hopes that it gets authorized.

USBR has another program called "Water Conservation Field Service Program" which provides grant funding and technical support for a wide range of water management activities including water management planning, educational programs, research and demonstration projects, and also application of water management and conservation programs. For example, some of the research programs include drip irrigation and other research in the Middle Rio Grande near Socorro, and with the Soil and Water Conservation District. The USBR also has projects with the Elephant Butte Irrigation District, the El Paso County Water Improvement District #1, and with Texas A&M. They have agreements and projects in effect with 50 different entities in New Mexico and West Texas. This gives the USBR a wide range of territory and groups to work with. The USBR also has a Border Water Festival coming up this October which brings in over 10,000 students from Cd. Juarez, El Paso, and Las Cruces. If anyone is interested in setting up a booth or having a display at the Festival, please contact him or anyone else at the Bureau's El Paso office.

Mr. Allen stated that USBR is way under their research budget for the 2002~2003 fiscal year and is preparing to send out requests for proposals. Anyone with projects involving water

conservation planning, education, and research is invited to apply for funding. For example, one of the projects that USBR has previously funded was an EPWU program promoting the use of the purple pipe water. These grants range from the \$10,000 to \$25,000 each.

VII. Status of the EPWU-Ft. Bliss Joint Desalination Project (Ed Fierro).

Ed Fierro stated that the desalination project is scheduled to be completed by December of 2005. He gave a brief update, summarized below, on the status of the EPWU Desalination Project.

RO Plant

- * The RO Plant preliminary analysis and design is about 60% complete. The preliminary architectural plans have been developed.
- * The RO Plant Analysis Report, which includes preliminary process flow diagrams, is essentially complete. This report will not be completed until later this year when sufficient water quality data has been compiled for the proposed test holes and monitoring wells.

Existing Groundwater Production Facilities

- * Water quality testing at the McCrae Montana Wellfield was completed in early August. Silica content was the controlling design parameter limiting RO process efficiency.
- * Mechanical and electrical system analysis have been performed and recommendations developed.
- * Material analysis for new collector line have been developed. Findings indicate all existing pumps will need to be replaced.
- * The Technical Memorandum for the Existing Groundwater Production Facilities was submitted in August.

Monitoring Wells and New Production Wells Design and Construction

- * 11 monitoring wells and 10 temporary test wells will be drilled to provide modeling data and long range monitoring of aquifer conditions.
- * The bid package for the monitoring wells was awarded in mid-August. Drilling should start in one or two weeks.
- * The preliminary design of the new production wells (16 estimated) will start once data from monitoring wells has been obtained and analyzed.

RO Pilot Plant

- * Pilot Plant was delivered the week of August 12. Training of designated EPWU personnel has started.
- * At least 3 different membranes will be evaluated in the pilot plant.

Brine Disposal Deep Well Injection Program

- * UTEP will soon start on gravity survey studies at the proposed injection. UTEP is under contract to LBG Guyton for this work.
- * The U.S. Corp of Engineers (COE) will be responsible for construction of the test holes following completion and evaluation of the gravity survey. Tetra Tech is the contractor responsible for test hole drilling.

* Data collected from these studies will be used in the well injection permit application to TQEC. All permitting work for this the injection wells is being handled by LBJ Guyton.

NEPA Studies

* SAIC will do the EIS studies under contract with the COE.

* The contract with SAIC has been finalized and initial work on the EIS has started.

Overall Schedule Status

* As of July 31st, 50% of the work under Task Order 2 (the design task order) had been completed. Elapsed time was 37%.

* The work for Task Order No. 2 started in January of this year and is scheduled for completion in July of 2003.

VIII. Voluntary Updates on the Status of Drought Management Planning by all MAC/SC Member Agencies (MAC/SC)

Mr. Archuleta reported that El Paso has already gone into Phase 1 of the Drought and Water Emergency Management Response Plan (Drought Management Plan). Implementation of Phase I was approved by the City Council last week. Mr. Archuleta stressed that they still need to fine-tune their Drought Management Plan which had been adopted three years ago. He explained why the modifications to the Management Management Plan were necessary and added that EPWU is preparing for the worse. He cited the City of Denver's ban on outdoor watering during the month of October as an example of how serious the drought situation is in Colorado, and noted that El Paso is headed for a similar situation.

Jorge Garcia reported that the Las Cruces Water Utilities is developing a first draft of their drought management plan after finally getting permission from City Council to go forward with it. They are using the drought management plans of El Paso, Denver, and Colorado Springs as examples. They still have about three months of work ahead of them and hope to bring it to the City Council by the end of the year.

Gary Esslinger stated that work on developing their plan is in progress. Their main concern involves moving water through their system and meeting their delivery obligations. One of their planning concerns is setting up their drain system to determine whether or not drain water can be re-used for agricultural irrigation. Also, they are looking at "neighbor-to-neighbor pumping" for some of the farmers who don't have wells. This concept involves having the District work out agreements with farmers who have wells and arranging for an exchange of surface water and ground water. They are also planning to continue their metering program so that hopefully by the time their season starts next year, they will have all their wasteways and spillways monitored with telemetry. They want to determine whether any water that is spilled can be picked up and reused. They are also planning to meter some of their large arroyos that come into their system so that they can account for these flows, even though most storm flows may only last four or five hours. Most of the metering will be done on arroyos that come in between Caballo Dam and Las Cruces. The intent is to try to capture this water for agricultural use. Mr. Esslinger closed by stating that he hopes that by next month they can have a first version of their drought management plan ready for review.

Ari Michelsen announced that the EL Paso Water Improvement District is holding a meeting at their Research Center tomorrow at 2:00 pm to discuss the 2003 water allocation.

IX. Other Business (Silvery Minnow DEIS)

Mike Fahy advised that EPWU had drafted some comments to Fish and Wildlife on the Proposed Silvery Minnow Critical Habitat Designation and Draft EIS. Copies of these comments were included in the handouts. The deadline for comments is October 2nd. Mr. Fahy added that EPWU's main concern is the possibility for introduction of the Silvery Minnow at locations where it currently does not exist, and on the water demands which would be associated with such introductions.

Ari Michelsen introduced two new employees of Texas A&M, West Texas Region. The first is Dr. Kenneth Markham, who is working here in El Paso. His area of expertise is urban landscape water conservation. The second is Mike Mecke working at the Ft. Stockton offices. Mr. Mecke is a Water Resource Extension Specialist.

Carlos Rincon mentioned the North American Development Bank's (NADB) August 20th Board meeting, at which they authorized \$80 million dollars for its water conservation fund. These funds can be use for agricultural water conservation projects. He suggested that interested parties visit the NADB website for more information and that they provide positive comments to NADB on this authorization. Mr. Rincon also mentioned the 6th Annual Mission Possible Conference to be held September 27th and 28th at the UTEP Undergraduate Learning Center. The topic this year is Water and Health. Three different panels sessions have been assembled and a number of Senators will be speaking at the conference – Senators Jeff Bingaman and Silvestre Reyes; Senator Jeffrey Jones from Chihuahua; and Representative Elliot Shapleigh. He also announced the Water Festival on October 7th , which will have the Mayors from El Paso, Las Cruces, and Cd. Juarez as speakers.

Ed Archuleta informed the group of the ribbon cutting ceremony held yesterday for the Jonathan Rogers WTP Expansion. The plant has been treating up to 60 mgd since June. Total surface water treatment capacity is now up to 100 mgd. He also mentioned that EPWU is working with the Keystone Heritage Park people on its wetlands project, which will also include a botanical garden. He and his staff have had a couple of meetings with them and he thinks that there is a way EPWU can assist them with the purple pipe water for the project. He doesn't have the specifics yet, but he thinks it's the type of project that fits into the environmental watershed management concept. Lastly, he suggested that someone from the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission (NMISSC) or State Engineer's Office address this group at its next meeting in connection with the NMISSC's application for the appropriation of 100,000 acre-feet per year of water from the Salt Flats area north of Dell City, Texas. Perhaps they can explain the purpose of this application and how the recent modeling of the Salt Basin by Shoemaker and Associates ties into the application.

X. Schedule Next Meeting/Location.

Mr. Archuleta requested that EPWID#1 or EBID give have an update at the next meeting on the water allocation for next year. Gary Esslinger stated that he thought it would be too premature to give this update in October, since the irrigation districts will not have a enough information by then to determine the initial allocation. He suggested the December as a better time to present this information.

The next meeting was scheduled for 9:00am Tuesday, October 15th at the PSB Boardroom.