

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
BOSQUE WORKING GROUP

December 16, 2015
3:35 p.m.
City/County Government Center
7th Floor, Room 7096
DMD Hallway, Large Conference Room
Albuquerque, New Mexico

REPORTED BY: Deborah L. Dickey, NM CCR #157
WILLIAMS & ASSOCIATES
1608 5th, NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

Mr. Richard Barish, Co-Chair of Sierra Club,
Ms. Camilla Feibelman, Co-Chair of Sierra Club
Ms. Mary Beresford, ADA Commission
Mr. Michael Hamman, Middle Rio Grande
 Conservancy District
Ms. Yasmeen Najmi, Middle Rio Grande
 Conservancy District

City Personnel:
Mr. Michael Riordan, City of Albuquerque Chief
 Operations Officer
Ms. Barbara Taylor, Parks and Recreation Department
Mr. Keith Reed, Parks and Recreation Department
Mr. Matt Schmader, Parks and Recreation Department
 Open Space
Ms. Rebecca Burke, City Council

1 MR. REED: I want to go ahead and get the
2 meeting started here. Thanks, everyone, for coming.
3 This is the Bosque Working Group meeting. Today is
4 Wednesday, December 16th, 2015, and it's
5 approximately 3:35 p.m. Let's go around the room
6 and introduce ourselves. I'm Keith Reed, co-chair
7 of the BWG.

8 MR. BARISH: I'm Richard Barish. I am here
9 on behalf of the Bosque Action Team and Sierra Club.

10 MS. FEIBELMAN: This is Camilla Feibelman.
11 I'm the co-chair of the Bosque Working Group with
12 Keith, and director of the Rio Grande chapter of the
13 Sierra Club and coordinator of the Bosque Action
14 Team.

15 MR. SCHMADER: And I'm Matt Schmader, and
16 I'm the superintendent of the City of Albuquerque
17 Open Space Division.

18 MR. HAMMAN: Hi. Mike Hamman. I'm the
19 chief executive officer for the Middle Rio Grande
20 Conservancy District.

21 MS. BERESFORD: Mary Beresford, ADA
22 representative.

23 MR. REED: I asked the guests to introduce
24 themselves as well.

25 MS. BURKE: I'm Rebecca Burke, policy

1 analyst for Councilor Brad Winter.

2 MS. TAYLOR: Barbara Taylor, Director of
3 Parks and Rec.

4 MR. RIORDAN: Michael Riordan with the City
5 of Albuquerque mayor's office.

6 MR. REED: Thanks, everyone. As everyone
7 can tell, we have a court reporter that's helping us
8 to take notes at the meeting today. So please,
9 let's try to speak one at a time, and speak slowly
10 and clearly so she can capture all the information
11 that needs to be captured.

12 So with that, the next -- that was the
13 introductions. Item 2 on the agenda is to discuss
14 the public process and the schedule for the Bosque
15 Multiuse Accessible Path, Phase 2 project, I-40 to
16 Campbell Road. And with that, I will let
17 Mr. Riordan talk to us about that.

18 MR. RIORDAN: Thanks, Keith. Our suggested
19 timeline for the Bosque Trail Extension, it started
20 before this. I'm going to start with where we've
21 been and then move forward. The first steps were
22 the bosque tours, the actual field tours, and we had
23 three of those. One occurred on November 15th, one
24 occurred on November 28th, and one occurred on
25 December 5th. That's correct?

1 MR. SCHMADER: Yeah, that was correct.

2 MR. RIORDAN: About how many attendees did
3 we have for all those?

4 MR. SCHMADER: Total, Mr. Riordan, were 83
5 for the attendees.

6 MS. FEIBELMAN: For the record, the members
7 of the working group were not consulted on the dates
8 of those.

9 MS. BERESFORD: Some of us were. That's
10 how I was there.

11 MS. FEIBELMAN: Yes, but not consulted on
12 the dates or the working group. We were just told
13 the dates.

14 MS. BERESFORD: Okay.

15 MR. RIORDAN: We're going to be finalizing,
16 in the alternative. We're going to -- based on
17 those working tours and the comments we had,
18 comments we received from that, in conjunction with
19 the environmental document from SWCA, we're going to
20 be finalizing alternatives from now to the end of
21 December.

22 MR. BARISH: Mike, I've got a question
23 about that.

24 MR. RIORDAN: Yes, sir.

25 MR. BARISH: Would you like to finish, and

1 then I'll ask my question?

2 MR. RIORDAN: Certainly.

3 MR. REED: Yeah, let's do that.

4 MR. RIORDAN: Thanks. We'll be having a
5 public meeting on January 7th to provide the
6 alignment alternatives that were developed in
7 December. From -- through the month of January,
8 we'll be doing MRGCD coordination. After the public
9 meeting, the SWCA final review and public comments
10 will be documented and released, along with a final
11 selected alternative. And then in February, we'll
12 be doing the construction layout and cost proposals.

13 MS. FEIBELMAN: I'm sorry, Mike. You're
14 not giving us dates with SWCA, the public comment
15 time.

16 MR. RIORDAN: Throughout January. So after
17 the public meeting 'til the end of January.

18 MS. FEIBELMAN: So SWCA would present the
19 final review at the end of January?

20 MR. RIORDAN: They'll be doing their review
21 throughout -- through the end of January, and at the
22 end of January, we'll be providing their public --
23 their final document or final review. The
24 documentation of the public comments and the
25 selected alternative.

1 MS. FEIBELMAN: All right.

2 MR. RIORDAN: Then we'll be doing our
3 construction layout and cost proposal plans from
4 February 1st to February 15th, and beginning
5 construction on February 15th.

6 MS. FEIBELMAN: Could you repeat what you
7 said from the first to the 15th. I didn't catch it.

8 MR. RIORDAN: Let me go over this from the
9 beginning again. We had three bosque walking tours
10 or field tours. November 15th, November 28th,
11 December 5th.

12 MS. FEIBELMAN: Okay.

13 MR. RIORDAN: We're using the information
14 from those tours to finalize alternatives through
15 the end of December. So December 31st, 2015. We'll
16 be presenting any alternatives at a public meeting
17 on January 7th, at the Los Duranes Community Center,
18 between 5:30 and 7:00. We'll be doing MRGCD
19 coordination through the month of the January. So
20 from January 4th is the first working day of
21 January, until January 30th.

22 After the public meeting, we will be --
23 SWCA, we'll be reviewing those plans in accordance
24 with the environmental document, and we'll be
25 developing the public comment record 'til January

1 30th of 2016. There will be the published selected
2 alternative on February 1st. There will be a
3 construction layout/cost proposal happening between
4 February 1st and February 15th.

5 We'll be begin construction on February
6 15th. I'll expect that to last about six weeks. So
7 between February 15th and the 1st of April.

8 MS. FEIBELMAN: So when will -- Richard had
9 a question, and I had one.

10 MR. BARISH: I have a couple questions. In
11 the future Bosque Work Agreement, it was
12 contemplated and it's stated that the alternatives
13 would be developed by the working group, working
14 together. Is there going to be an opportunity for
15 us to work with the City to develop the alternatives
16 that will be presented on January 7th?

17 MR. RIORDAN: If you attended the bosque
18 walking groups, you were able to provide
19 documentation there, or through written comment,
20 which I believe was already published in a letter to
21 -- our publishing letter about the no alternative
22 action request or wanting to reduce access for
23 people in wheelchairs to save a section of the
24 experience.

25 MR. BARISH: We haven't submitted comments.

1 MR. RIORDAN: But you know how to in the
2 newsletter I saw.

3 MS. FEIBELMAN: Let me clarify what the
4 question is. Will we participate as stated in the
5 future works agreement in the development of
6 alternatives? It's a simple yes or no question.

7 MS. TAYLOR: The answer is it will be on
8 the agenda today. Matt will discuss them with you.

9 MR. BARISH: Matthew will discuss the
10 alternatives by us working together?

11 MS. TAYLOR: There will be alternatives
12 available for discussion today.

13 MR. BARISH: The question Camilla asked,
14 though, was in the future Bosque Work Agreement, the
15 procedure we agreed to was the alternatives would be
16 developed by us working together and not just by the
17 City. Is that not going to happen, that we will
18 develop those alternatives working together?

19 MS. TAYLOR: We're together, and we're
20 going to discuss alternatives.

21 MR. BARISH: So the alternatives that are
22 presented to the public, are we going to be able to
23 have some say in that? Some decision-making
24 authority.

25 MS. TAYLOR: We're together, and we're

1 going to discuss the alternatives.

2 MR. BARISH: You're still not answering my
3 question.

4 MS. TAYLOR: I'm absolutely answering your
5 question.

6 MS. FEIBELMAN. You already have the
7 alternatives set, and you're going to talk to us
8 about that, or do we have the opportunity to provide
9 something?

10 MR. SCHMADER: I have a range of proposed
11 alternatives for us to look at and discuss.

12 MR. BARISH: And we have what alternatives
13 that are presented to the public? Is that a
14 decision made together?

15 MS. TAYLOR: No decision will be made on
16 the alternatives until the public at large has an
17 opportunity to comment.

18 MR. BARISH: There are going to be certain
19 alternatives presented to the public.

20 MS. TAYLOR: You're not going to be
21 unhappy, so let's proceed and not beat this horse to
22 death.

23 MR. REED: I agree. I think we have a
24 tight agenda, and we need to move along.

25 MS. FEIBELMAN: Let's make a point of

1 record, which is that we would not be having this
2 disagreement if we were following the agenda.

3 The second question is when will the public
4 comment.

5 MR. RIORDAN: May I address that?

6 MR. REED: Yes.

7 MR. RIORDAN: This was something agreed to
8 in April. If this was passed in April, this
9 wouldn't be an issue, either.

10 MS. FEIBELMAN: When is the public comment
11 period?

12 MR. RIORDAN: The public comment period
13 started with the first tour of the bosque in
14 November, on November 15th, and it will continue
15 with a public meeting on January 7th, and public
16 comment will be able to be received through January
17 15th, where it could truly be incorporated all the
18 way up to the 30th, when the final document is
19 actually produced.

20 MS. FEIBELMAN: Have you published a formal
21 request for public comment in any public venue, like
22 the Albuquerque Journal online or your website?

23 MR. RIORDAN: Are we allowed to without the
24 consultation of the Bosque Working Group?

25 MS. FEIBELMAN: I guess we're working to

1 figure that out. I mean, you haven't consulted --

2 MR. RIORDAN: If that's what's decided
3 today, we can, but we're going to be publishing the
4 public meeting in the Albuquerque Journal for
5 January 7th, and at that meeting we'll be letting
6 people know that the comments we received up to that
7 point are being incorporated and any future comments
8 from that meeting forward, through January 15th,
9 will also be included into the public record.

10 MS. FEIBELMAN: One last question. When
11 people -- can you talk a little bit about what the
12 format will be at the public meeting?

13 MR. RIORDAN: It has not been determined.

14 MR. REED: I think the public meeting is
15 going to be -- what we discussed is there will be a
16 30-minute presentation, discussion about the
17 project, and the available alternatives, and then an
18 opportunity for public comment for the next hour
19 after that.

20 MR. BARISH: So prior to the January 7th
21 meeting, are the alternatives going to be available
22 for people to review and to submit comments prior to
23 that time?

24 MR. SCHMADER: We're working them through
25 the end of December. So if they are, it will be for

1 a couple of days, at that meeting. If that seems to
2 be a little bit ahead of the board, there are the
3 ones we determined could come out of that day. We
4 commented on them online. That depends on today's
5 meeting.

6 MS. TAYLOR: Yup.

7 MR. REED: If there's no more questions for
8 Mr. Riordan, we'll move to the next item.

9 MS. FEIBELMAN: If it's okay with you, I
10 want to make sure everyone at the table has had the
11 opportunity to express any concerns that they have
12 about the process. Mary or Mike.

13 MR. REED: Nobody is speaking up, so I'm
14 going to move to item 3, which is the alternatives
15 discussion for the Phase 2 project. And with that,
16 I'm going to turn the floor over to Matt Schmader,
17 who is going to give us a presentation on that.

18 MR. SCHMADER: Thank you, Mr. Co-chair.
19 Pursuant to the three hikes and the participation on
20 those, the discussions that happened in the field,
21 but particularly in receipt of the written comments
22 that were received, I've begun analyzing what the
23 public's comments are on trail alignment, primarily
24 to this point. We received about 20 written
25 comments since the comments started being received.

1 The alignments sort out into a set of
2 fairly logical groupings. And I'll pass these
3 around so people can look at them. I'll hold them
4 up first. I apologize. We probably could have put
5 them up on the white board.

6 But the first alternative is basically what
7 we would call no action, and so that is where the
8 existing trails are today, without any improvements
9 built on them at all. So that's sort of one logical
10 grouping of comments that we've received from the
11 public.

12 MR. REED: I've seen it. Maybe Mary and
13 Mike would like to.

14 MR. SCHMADER: The second alternative is
15 basically to build improvements only where there are
16 currently existing trails, which is the route that
17 we walked from the beginning of the trail near I-40
18 and ending at Campbell Road. It's about 5,800 feet,
19 about 1.2 miles or so. And so that is depicted here
20 with this pink line, and so that shows a proposed
21 trail that would go only where there's an existing
22 trail at this point.

23 The next set of alternatives, I'll call
24 them a set, basically uses existing trails north
25 from I-40 up to where -- there's the power lines, so

1 up to the power lines, and then goes away from the
2 bank of the river and leaves that second half, the
3 northern half, as unbuilt, and then proceeds on a
4 new trail that would be approximately halfway
5 between the levee and the river bank, and that would
6 extend from where the power lines are to Campbell
7 Road.

8 MR. BARISH: Can you describe a bit more
9 where the power lines are? I could imagine them.
10 What I understand is the bank lowering.

11 MR. SCHMADER: Yes, it's south of the bank
12 line lowering projects. And I'm sorry for the court
13 reporter, but the bank line lowering projects
14 occurred north of the power lines and along the bank
15 here. There was a restoration project that was also
16 done on this island.

17 MR. REED: Just for the record, you were
18 gesturing to a location that was south of the power
19 lines on that last statement. Do you want to repeat
20 that? I want to make sure that it gets captured
21 correctly.

22 MR. SCHMADER: Richard was asking, there
23 have been some habitat restoration projects that
24 have occurred. The bank line lowering has occurred
25 in this vicinity.

1 MR. REED: Can you describe for the record
2 in more detail, kind of where that's located.

3 MR. SCHMADER: It's approximately
4 two-thirds the way north from I-40 to Campbell Road.
5 In this vicinity (indicating). And then I made
6 reference to a habitat restoration project that was
7 done on an attached bar down here by the Interstate
8 Stream Commission.

9 So what these last maps show is different
10 places that the trail would take off from the bank
11 line and go to the interior. And each one of them
12 takes off at kind of a logical point, continuing at
13 various points further north. So there were
14 basically four different places where you could cut
15 over to the interior trail.

16 MR. REED: Matt, can you describe some of
17 the logic behind the deviation from the bank going
18 towards the center -- away from the bank in the
19 northern half and kind of what the logic was behind
20 some of that?

21 MS. FEIBELMAN: Why doesn't he answer
22 first.

23 MR. SCHMADER: There are two lines of
24 consideration there, and again, this is based on
25 public comment. So public comment made reference to

1 the narrowness and isolation and existing mature
2 bosque canopy in that area. So expressing a desire
3 to stay out of as large portion of that if possible.

4 And the logic for then routing towards the
5 interior is that that part of the bosque had been
6 burnt before, and so with the restoration work
7 that's occurred, there's fairly open canopy, and
8 there's a fairly easy route to be able to select
9 that would be away from the river bank, but would be
10 -- would provide good access into that part of the
11 bosque.

12 Also, the bosque is narrow at the south end
13 and then widens as it gets up toward Campbell, so at
14 some point you don't really have enough room to have
15 two parallel trails until the bosque is wide enough
16 in the vicinity of that power line crossing
17 (indicating). These were all basically factored in
18 from the public commentary and from the
19 on-the-ground existing conditions.

20 The interior route follows an old
21 restoration road that Open Space had established.
22 So it's kind of on a previously disturbed tract.

23 MR. HAMMAN: My recollection, too, in that
24 portion of the trail, it's fairly wide, used up,
25 until the bosque does start to widen out, then the

1 trail gets pretty small along the edge of the river
2 there. That's more primitive in nature, close to --

3 MR. SCHMADER: That's a good observation.
4 The existing trail itself widens the further north
5 you get from that.

6 MR. BARISH: On this last option, can you
7 explain where this is that the trail would leave the
8 river bank and go into the interior, because -- and
9 here are my landmarks. There's the bank lowering
10 project and this old restoration project, as you can
11 see. Then there's the bank lowering project and
12 this old restoration project that Matt mentions.

13 Then the bank lowering project continues
14 even in this very narrow stretch. Then you get into
15 that narrow, more intimate space that people really
16 enjoy.

17 MR. SCHMADER: Correct.

18 MR. BARISH: About halfway through that, to
19 your east, is still the burn area. Then halfway
20 through, you get into an area where there is a
21 cottonwood canopy all the way between the river and
22 the levee. So where is -- where are we leaving the
23 bank on this option in relation to those landmarks?
24 Is this still the burn area here?

25 MR. SCHMADER. Yes. The burn area is

1 basically a wedge that follows along like this
2 (indicating).

3 MR. BARISH: Where is the area that is the
4 continuous cottonwood canopy from the river to the
5 levee?

6 MR. SCHMADER: It's really only in this
7 last probably 200 feet or so that it goes from bank
8 to levee.

9 MR. BARISH: I think it's actually much
10 bigger than that. I think it's actually a much
11 bigger area.

12 MR. SCHMADER: I guess it depends on the
13 definition of "continuous."

14 MR. BARISH: It's still the cottonwood
15 trails and the trail through there that would be a
16 shaded space.

17 MR. SCHMADER: Right. That runs probably
18 maybe 300 feet or so before you hit the north end of
19 the berm.

20 MR. BARISH: I think it's longer than
21 that.

22 MS. FEIBELMAN: There's a quick question.
23 It talks about burn area to be removed.

24 MR. SCHMADER: Right.

25 MS. FEIBELMAN: Are you talking about a

1 drop-down that goes not from the river to along the
2 river?

3 MR. SCHMADER: The "to be removed," these
4 were notes from -- I'm using an older base map, so
5 there was a suggestion we might want to revegetate
6 underneath the power line, and this is -- Richard, I
7 don't know if you remember where this is, but
8 there's a service road that comes down off of the
9 levee and goes into the bosque here, and then
10 there's a labyrinth, and that labyrinth is somewhere
11 just a little bit north of that surface road.

12 So the to be removed, actually, the proper
13 label on these boxes should probably say something
14 like to be revegetated. In other words, when you go
15 in, drive in, you leave a footprint, and then as you
16 back out, you should attempt to revegetate.

17 So what we really have is we have a no
18 action, we have on-existing, and we have four
19 variants of a hybrid, which is partially along the
20 existing and then departs into the interior, and
21 each one of them is a slightly different take-off
22 point based on the kinds of views and access for --
23 primarily for wheelchair access if we can accomplish
24 that.

25 MS. BERESFORD: Not only wheelchair, but

1 also other people who want to make it more
2 accessible. For children, strollers, people that
3 have any kind of mobility issues. If you have an
4 older-population people who want to come down, needs
5 to be able to enjoy it.

6 I'll tell you right off the bat, I find --
7 I went on two of these walks, and I found some of
8 the comments really difficult, and these -- a lot of
9 these comments are the reason why the Americans with
10 Disabilities Act came into being because a lot of
11 people cannot think beyond their own framework of
12 experiences, and they say things like "The trail is
13 perfect just the way it is," and it's hard for them
14 to think beyond their framework of "It works for me,
15 so that should be good enough."

16 And I heard that from a few people that
17 said the bosque is their backyard. "Leave it the
18 way it is. We don't want more people in here."

19 I asked who gets to determine who gets to
20 enjoy this trail all along the bank, and who
21 doesn't? I find it extremely offensive, and I will
22 fight tooth and nail to have the path all the way
23 along the bank. I will not be put as a second-class
24 citizen and told "You people can be over here, but
25 only we who have mobility abilities can enjoy the

1 bank."

2 You talked about intimate space that people
3 enjoy. I like intimate spaces just as much as you
4 do, and I have the right to those intimate spaces,
5 just as much as you do. And I find it offensive
6 that you and others have said, "Let's build this
7 over there for you people, so you can be satisfied
8 with that."

9 The only way I would be satisfied with that
10 is if you close that entire thing down so even you
11 don't get to enjoy it. We all take that inner line.
12 If you get to enjoy it, I get to enjoy it.

13 The bosque trail is -- hang on -- the
14 bosque trail is 40 miles long. We're asking for a
15 couple of miles that we can get in there. Not only
16 people in wheelchairs. Families with children,
17 older folks, whatever can get in there and enjoy the
18 bosque, and I find it really annoying that you try
19 to put us off. Hang on. Hang on.

20 Under the ADA, it was stated that separate
21 is not equal. Separate trails are not equal trails.
22 Equal access, and the ADA allows for equal
23 enjoyment, too, and access, too, to what other
24 people in the general population get to have. That
25 means we're going to take the trail, and I want to

1 see it all the way up to Campbell Road like we
2 walked up on it. No reason why we can't.

3 MR. BARISH: Would a good compromise be
4 to....

5 MS. FEIBELMAN: Before we talk about
6 compromise, I want to make a point. I think your
7 points are important, and they need to be heard, but
8 when we talk about doing a public process, many more
9 than just we or you get to comment. Okay? So we
10 lead wheelchair outings monthly, and many people in
11 our outings say, "Well, why does it have to be a
12 six-wide trail? Why can't be it a three-foot wide
13 trail with outtakes for passing?"

14 When you look at Forest Service guidance,
15 which is what informed the Federal board on how to
16 handle accessibility in natural areas, those array
17 of options are provided to land managers to explore,
18 and it is my sense that if we want to deal with
19 accessibility in a way that gets lots of different
20 views, it would be worth actually getting a workshop
21 on what the best practices are, what the law says,
22 but also have real time for people to get feedback.

23 We can sit here and say, you know,
24 ultimately, it's a protective place, so first we
25 have to see what's good for the environment and if

1 closing that trail along the river is the best thing
2 to do and move everyone away from the river, that's
3 what we should do.

4 But I think our point here is that
5 everybody needs an opportunity to comment. People
6 in electric chairs and manual chairs and strollers.
7 I've walked that leg of the trail with a stroller,
8 I've propelled my godson and his wheelchair through
9 there. We were there together in your wheelchair,
10 and in his wheelchair, and so --

11 MS. BERESFORD: And he could not access it
12 independently. He had to have somebody push him.

13 MS. FEIBELMAN: He was 13, so he couldn't
14 access it.

15 MS. BERESFORD: If he was independent, he
16 couldn't.

17 MS. FEIBELMAN: Here's my point, Mary.
18 Your view is extra valid, but so is the point that
19 protected spaces need to be first cared for as
20 protected spaces and then dealt with for human
21 access. And so my point, and I think the next
22 question here is it seems like in addition to
23 alignment, we need to talk about width and service
24 alternatives.

25 So that -- you know, because, Mary, you

1 might say, "I like the six-foot wide trail. That's
2 the best thing." But the land manager might say for
3 nesting birds, nobody should be down there. Not on
4 your bike, not walking, not rolling.

5 Another wheelchair user might say, "I want
6 a three-foot-wide trail."

7 MS. BERESFORD: I understand that, but what
8 I'm saying is what's offensive is when people are
9 saying, as they did on both of those walks I was on,
10 "We don't need" -- basically they're saying, "We
11 don't need you folks on this trail. We want it as
12 it is and want a select few people to come down."

13 This is a State park. It's open and should
14 be accessible to all people equally, not just a
15 select few people.

16 MS. FEIBELMAN: Absolutely.

17 MS. BERESFORD: We're only asking for a
18 little bit of trail. It's a long bosque trail. And
19 I don't want to have to go with a group of
20 wheelchair people to go on a hike. I want to be
21 able to go on my own, independently. Take my book,
22 take my picnic lunch, and sit the exact same places
23 you go, in those nice intimate places. I want to be
24 able to access those.

25 MR. BARISH: I think if we thought about

1 different alternatives for trail design, maybe have
2 that as a three-foot-wide trail instead of a
3 six-foot-wide trail, you could have the same access.
4 But the problem is when you expand, you have to get
5 rid of vegetation, you lose some of that sense of
6 intimacy.

7 But instead, having a narrower trail that's
8 still accessible might be a way to get around that.

9 MS. BERESFORD: You lose vegetation when
10 you only have a three-foot-wide trail, and you have
11 bicyclists, hikers, whatever coming the other way.
12 And as a person in a chair, I have friends in a
13 wheelchair, if you walk in a three-foot-trail, you
14 can walk next to somebody. This means I have some
15 behind me, somebody up in front of me, and I lose
16 that sense of intimacy with somebody.

17 MR. BARISH: Even when you're hiking, you
18 can't walk side by side, next to them.

19 MS. BERESFORD: If they're wide enough, you
20 can.

21 MR. BARISH: If they're a three-foot trail,
22 you can't.

23 MS. BERESFORD: That's why I'm saying on a
24 six-foot trail, you can. I can go side by side with
25 another person in a wheelchair, and we can enjoy

1 everything the same way as you can when you walk
2 down the trail with an individual.

3 MR. BARISH: When I walk down those trails,
4 you can't walk side by side.

5 MS. BERESFORD: You can't now.

6 MR. BARISH: That's right. And that's part
7 of the experience that we get into with a trail.

8 MS. FEIBELMAN: Let's get back into this
9 issue. You get 50 people in a room and you're going
10 to have 50 different views, but at the end of a day,
11 a protected space, and first protecting the space
12 and then accessible people.

13 It seems to me for each of these alternate
14 routes, there ought to also be proposed a series of
15 alternate routes and alternative surfaces. It seems
16 to me none of us have done the due diligence of
17 looking at what the National Accessibility Board's
18 best practices are for ADA accessibility to the
19 bosque. It's not actually ADA. It's the Alternate
20 Practices Act, which is being used for trails by the
21 Federal accessibility trails.

22 If you look at what ADA says, recreational
23 trails are not applicable to ADA, which in some ways
24 sends us over to the best practices for Federal
25 trail accessibility, which is kind of nicer and more

1 appropriate stuff anyway. I've circulated the
2 resources and links to that information, but it
3 seems to me like widths and surfaces ought to be
4 based on the Federal accessibility board best
5 practices.

6 MR. REED: We have other items on the
7 agenda. I also want to make sure that Yasmeen has
8 joined us, as well. I want to make sure that's on
9 the record. She didn't have the chance to introduce
10 herself earlier. Welcome, thanks for coming. Do
11 you want to introduce yourself?

12 MS. NAJMI: Yasmeen Najmi, a planner with
13 the Rio Grande Conservancy District. I apologize
14 for being late.

15 MR. REED: Thanks for coming. To close on
16 the alternatives discussion, because we do have two
17 more agenda items that we need to get to today, and
18 I'm noting we have about 20 minutes left in the
19 scheduled meeting that's supposed to end at 4:30, so
20 if there's other -- if you want to note some
21 specific widths and surfacing types of things you
22 want to have entered into the record, if you could
23 please do that quickly, then we would be able to
24 entertain that, then.

25 MR. BARISH: I didn't have specifics. I

1 want to ask Matt, is that contemplating that there
2 will be different widths and surfaces?

3 MR. SCHMADER: At least in some. If you
4 start doing a whole suite of widths and materials
5 for each one, we'd have about 12 or 15 alternatives.
6 So we've got to --

7 MS. FEIBELMAN: There will be some measure.

8 MR. SCHMADER: Yes.

9 MS. FEIBELMAN: I'll recirculate that.

10 Maybe when things are a little bit calmer, Keith, is
11 there a way that you and I could set up a meeting
12 focused specifically on that topic?

13 MR. REED: I don't believe so. I think
14 we're going to meet as the Bosque Working Group, and
15 there's not going to be any side meetings.

16 MS. FEIBELMAN: Actually, Sierra Club will
17 set up a workshop, and anybody who wants to
18 participate....

19 MR. REED: Barbara, did you have something?

20 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, I would like to make one
21 point on that subject. First of all, we have a
22 laboratory, and it's the path between Central and
23 I-40. I would make the point this is not
24 wilderness, this is a high-density urban area, and
25 if you haven't been on that path, if Mary were on

1 that path the other day when I was out with Robert
2 Ramirez, when the bike at 15 miles an hour came
3 flying down the path, Mary would have been toast.

4 So there is a -- everything a thousand feet
5 won't cut it because if she's between the thousand
6 feet, she's toast. So her wheelchair, as I think
7 she pointed out at the last meeting, is 30 inches
8 wide. I have a picture, which I brought in a file
9 here, of two women walking side by side, very
10 heavily, with strollers on the six-foot path.

11 So I think the City has said continuously
12 that the width and surface of the path is the width
13 and surface of the path as we go forward. Our
14 experience between Central and I-40 validates, and
15 smile at me, Camilla, but the fact is --

16 MS. FEIBELMAN: Matt has said there will be
17 widths and alternatives, and you're saying no.

18 MS. TAYLOR: I'm correcting. The width and
19 surface of the path have been decided.

20 (Ms. Feibelman speaking at the same time,
21 unheard by reporter.)

22 The route of the path and the network of
23 paths, because I think we will have some
24 pedestrian-only paths and some accessible paths,
25 just as we do between Central and I-40, have -- are

1 the cut-off points or the way the path meanders or
2 -- that is not yet decided, but the width and
3 surface of the path and our experience with the
4 durability of the degree -- the paths survived all
5 of our summer storms, with --

6 MS. FEIBELMAN: Why not let the public
7 comment, Barbara. In the future works agreement, we
8 said we would have an opportunity --

9 MS. TAYLOR: The future works agreement was
10 vetoed --

11 THE REPORTER: Wait, wait, wait. One at a
12 time.

13 MS. FEIBELMAN: -- alignment with and
14 surface. What is the fear of allowing the public to
15 comment?

16 MS. TAYLOR: The Future Works Agreement was
17 vetoed by the City -- and the veto was upheld by the
18 City Council. The continual reference to the Works
19 Agreement was not, in my opinion, constructive.

20 What we are doing now is providing lots of
21 opportunity for public comment. We are here today,
22 discussing alternatives, as you wanted to do. How
23 the route will go.

24 MS. FEIBELMAN: We're discussing them with
25 no opportunity to go further.

1 MS. TAYLOR: But we have a laboratory that
2 has told us that the widths and surface of the path
3 works and is consistent with the Indiana study.

4 (Ms. Feibelman speaks inaudibly.)

5 THE REPORTER: Wait, wait, wait. One at a
6 time.

7 MS. TAYLOR: I will give it to you. You
8 once told me you gave it to me, but it was actually
9 Terri O'Hare. I will be happy to give you the
10 Indiana Trail Study.

11 Are we going to move on?

12 MR. REED: We need to move on. Richard,
13 one final thing.

14 MR. BARISH: Just a couple. You say that
15 the path that you have south of I-40 works, but we
16 also don't know that there aren't other kinds of
17 paths that would work and that would also have other
18 advantages. That's what Camilla is talking about,
19 in terms of best practices of the architectural.

20 MS. TAYLOR: Well, the Indiana study is
21 eloquent on this topic.

22 MS. FEIBELMAN: That is not the law.

23 MS. TAYLOR: None of that is the law.

24 MS. FEIBELMAN: That is what concerns me,
25 is we're here, that you have said we built a

1 six-foot wide with this surface and this surface,
2 and some people like it. We have said why not allow
3 the public to comment.

4 MS. TAYLOR: Huge numbers of people have
5 commented.

6 THE REPORTER: Wait, wait. One at a time.

7 MS. FEIBELMAN: Seriously, I just don't
8 understand why it is an issue to allow people to
9 comment. You can choose the six-foot-wide crusher
10 fine trail. It's fine. Just build it. But allow
11 people to comment.

12 MR. REED: On that, we're going to move on.
13 So item number 4 is the update on the restoration
14 activities, and I'm going to turn the floor over to
15 Barbara Taylor to discuss the restoration
16 activities.

17 MS. TAYLOR: So we -- as we said we would
18 do at the last meeting, we have prepared a scope,
19 and I signed a contract yesterday with Geo Systems
20 Analysis, and Geo Systems Analysis will be
21 evaluating the entire bosque from Central to
22 Montano, and they will be developing priority
23 restoration areas.

24 MR. BARISH: When you say "evaluate,"
25 evaluate what?

1 MR. SCHMADER: What they're going to do,
2 they're going to document the existing vegetation
3 communities, they will test the depth to
4 groundwater, they will characterize the soil
5 texture, and based on that, they will be able to
6 identify areas of highest restoration need and be
7 able to present habitat restoration targets for the
8 existing communities.

9 MR. BARISH: Good. So maybe we'll find out
10 that there are better opportunities than the green
11 blobs and then....

12 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Better
13 opportunities than the....

14 MR. BARISH: Than the green blobs.

15 MS. TAYLOR: That actually means something.
16 Sorry.

17 MR. SCHMADER: That's a term of art.
18 Richard is exactly right. They may determine that
19 some of our preselection of a couple of restoration
20 sites was not the highest priority or the exact
21 shape.

22 MS. FEIBELMAN: So then you won't?

23 MR. BARISH: What's the time frame for that
24 report being done?

25 MR. SCHMADER: They will work for the

1 months of January through April.

2 MR. BARISH: So can -- am I correct, then,
3 that restoration work will happen there either in
4 the summer, if it can be done without disturbing
5 nesting birds, or in the fall?

6 MR. SCHMADER: Generally we don't start
7 restoration work until the first week of August, and
8 the schedule for restoration will have to depend on
9 funding and consultation with the administration.

10 MR. BARISH: That's a question I have.
11 Will there be funding in the fall to allow the
12 restoration work? The reason I'm concerned about
13 that --

14 MS. TAYLOR: We don't know what restoration
15 work was going to be recommended. I can't value it.

16 MR. BARISH: Whatever it is, will there be
17 funding for restoration work involved? The reason
18 I'm concerned is this administration has one more
19 year after -- starting the fall, it would be one
20 more year.

21 MS. TAYLOR: I know why you're concerned.

22 MR. BARISH: I want to make sure it gets
23 done, obviously.

24 MS. TAYLOR: Me, too.

25 MR. BARISH: So can we get a commitment

1 that funding will be available?

2 MS. TAYLOR: You can get a commitment that
3 the Parks & Recreation Department and the Open Space
4 Division is determined to do restoration work in the
5 bosque. I cannot give you the timing, I haven't
6 seen the report, I don't know how extensive it will
7 be, I don't know how expensive it will be.

8 We can always do something, Richard. Maybe
9 we can do a big something if it's not expensive,
10 maybe we can do a little something if it's
11 expensive. But I think the question you asked needs
12 data to be answered.

13 MR. BARISH: There's always more that can
14 be done, and so can we get a commitment that
15 something will be done this fall?

16 MR. REED: I'm going to interject now
17 because the Open Space Division and Parks & Rec
18 Department are continually committed to doing
19 restoration work in the bosque, perpetually.

20 MR. BARISH: I think that's true, and I
21 appreciate that. But we do -- as part of the Phase
22 1 of this plan, there was a commitment to restore
23 the green blobs, and I don't care if it's an
24 (inaudible) area, but I would like a commitment that
25 something will be done.

1 MR. REED: The Parks & Rec Department and
2 the mayor have already had the youth initiative
3 through last summer doing quite a bit of --
4 extensive amount of restoration work that is not
5 insignificant in the least.

6 To continually focus on the green blobs,
7 we've already been doing work in the green blobs and
8 outside the green blobs. So there are going to be
9 other activities that are going to come out of this,
10 we expect, from the Geo Systems report, and we don't
11 know what that entails yet, but once the report is
12 available and we have a chance to evaluate it, we'll
13 be looking at what funding we have available and
14 what other work we can continue to do in the bosque
15 this fall, next year, and for years to come.

16 So Barbara, is there anything else on the
17 restoration?

18 MS. TAYLOR: And hand work doesn't have to
19 wait until the fall. We can do hand restoration in
20 the summer.

21 (Ms. Feibelman speaking inaudibly.)

22 THE REPORTER: Wait, wait. Stop.

23 MR. REED: Barbara is speaking, so you all
24 have to --

25 MS. FEIBELMAN: Let me make sure I

1 understand. So the three blobs at this point are
2 being set aside. Let me just ask Keith, I'm not
3 trying to say anything. I'm trying to make sure I
4 understand. So will the Geo Systems -- is the Geo
5 Systems study meant to get at that fourth
6 restoration that we talked about and we're going to
7 be analyzing through the different documents, or is
8 it meant to totally reevaluate what restoration you
9 do in general?

10 Like are you going to say we want this
11 restoration about the three blobs and what else, or
12 is it let me take a fresh look at it?

13 MS. TAYLOR: I understand the question.

14 MS. FEIBELMAN: What is the answer?

15 MS. TAYLOR: The answer is we're not going
16 through multiple documents. We're going to let the
17 professionals evaluate the bosque from Central to
18 Montano, and based on sound scientific principles
19 recommend priority projects for restoration. That's
20 what we're going to do. We're not going to sit
21 around and say, "Maybe this is a good idea."

22 MS. FEIBELMAN: You're not starting on the
23 green blobs, then.

24 MS. TAYLOR: No.

25 MS. FEIBELMAN: You're waiting to see what

1 they say about the whole idea. Okay.

2 MS. TAYLOR: No, I'm paging through this
3 because I thought I had a list, a comprehensive
4 list, but I seem not to. But this demeaning the
5 work that was done by the mayor's Summer Youth
6 Program --

7 MS. FEIBELMAN: We have no --

8 THE REPORTER: Wait, wait.

9 MS. FEIBELMAN: We have no problem with the
10 work done by the youth. We're happy they did it.
11 We have students that are paid to do it. We're
12 lauding you for your work with the youth. I hope we
13 can see the rest of the restoration.

14 MS. TAYLOR: I hope that that continues to
15 be true in the emails that you don't send me.

16 MS. FEIBELMAN: We don't criticize those
17 youths' work. It's not restoration. It's debris
18 removal. We have no problem with that. It's just
19 not the whole job.

20 MR. REED: We're not going to continue
21 getting into the semantics of that. We're moving to
22 number 5, which is the update of the other bosque
23 projects, and with that I'll turn that over to
24 Barbara Taylor again.

25 MS. TAYLOR: So that's restoration.

1 Yasmeen wanted to know where we were with the three
2 projects, and that is expanding the parking north of
3 Central, by the Rotary park, expanding parking and
4 access to the Corps of Engineers bridge south of
5 Central and the bridge over the siphon. And as we
6 noted in the last meeting, the parking has been
7 deferred because the difficulties of expanding the
8 park -- the parking north of Central seemed to
9 outweigh any gain that we would have.

10 So for a refresher, the easy way to expand
11 the parking north of Central is to go north, but
12 that would have people parking their cars, crossing
13 the paved Paseo del Bosque bike path, and that's
14 obviously a really bad idea.

15 We can provide substantial parking on the
16 south side of the bridge, and I want to be perfectly
17 clear, because this has been miscommunicated. There
18 is a mutual interest between the Parks Department
19 and the Department of Cultural Affairs, Cultural
20 Services, in improving that parking area, and so
21 there will probably be mutual funding between the
22 two departments to accomplish that task.

23 MS. NAJMI: Do you have some idea when that
24 coordination and that kind of project improvement is
25 likely to happen?

1 MS. TAYLOR: I don't. Michael, do we --
2 we're working with -- I believe that there is a very
3 big planning effort going on with the Bio Park in
4 general and that this piece is part of that
5 planning. I don't think it's years, but I don't
6 think it's weeks, either.

7 MR. RIORDAN: The hope of that tax money,
8 there's a plan out there on the Bio Park tax money,
9 has civic priorities. Those are the priorities.
10 This is a project that the Bio Park staff has said
11 if funding is available, they would like to do some
12 enhancement over there.

13 So it's not something that's going to
14 happen in the first six months of the funding. That
15 funding does not come available until July of next
16 year. I just -- I hesitate talking about that
17 funding because it's used. That will not be part of
18 the project we're talking about today, any of the
19 trail or the parking lot improvements that we're
20 talking about today.

21 What might happen is when we do what I call
22 the rotary park parking lot, that's also an entrance
23 to the zoo and the Bio Park area and the aquarium
24 area. There might be a joint project that would
25 affect our design, using the trails and parks.

1 MS. TAYLOR: Yeah.

2 MS. NAJMI: I'm interested, since we have
3 that area there, and I would -- my question is just
4 is the City planning to coordinate with the Bio
5 Park, find out what they're doing, and find
6 something way to make this happen, this ADA
7 connection from an improved parking lot to the board
8 walk and platform.

9 MR. RIORDAN: The Bio Park is the City, and
10 we're meeting weekly in preparation for the funding
11 becoming available. And I sit on both sides of that
12 aisle, so I will be able to jury that.

13 MS. NAJMI: I want to make sure someone is
14 making that happen, make that connection.

15 MS. TAYLOR: We haven't abandoned that.

16 MS. NAJMI: It's a missed opportunity and
17 leaves a missed connect. I see it as a priority.

18 MS. TAYLOR: It's very important to me,
19 personally, that we are able to provide the
20 opportunity for Mary to get down to that deck,
21 because it is really a wonderful experience.

22 MS. BERESFORD: You're talking about the
23 water, the deck?

24 MS. TAYLOR: The deck? The deck.

25 MS. BERESFORD: I've been to the deck, but

1 it's been pretty rugged getting over things. It's
2 very difficult. A manual chair couldn't do it. And
3 if I fell, I'd hate to get hurt.

4 MR. REED: Can we move on?

5 MS. TAYLOR: So the third thing on that, of
6 course, is the bridge over the siphon.

7 MS. BERESFORD: That's what I was going to
8 ask.

9 MS. TAYLOR: That project, I have nothing
10 new to say from the prior meeting, but we do have
11 the engineers who work for Dekker Perich designing
12 that bridge. They have been coordinating with MRGCD
13 and the Corps and all the appropriate people. That
14 project will have to go to Open Space Advisory
15 Board, that is an extraordinary facility, and be
16 approved. So we're not -- we're doing it.

17 MS. BERESFORD: When do you anticipate it
18 might go to the advisory board?

19 MR. SCHMADER: We could put it on the
20 January agenda.

21 MS. TAYLOR: Okay. That's good. Let's do
22 that.

23 MS. BERESFORD: There is a beautiful trail,
24 so it would be nice to connect it.

25 MR. REED: Mike.

1 MR. HAMMAN: One thing, I know we're
2 getting close to the end of the day. I want to make
3 a comment with regard to the MRGCD available, where
4 we're at, and it's difficult to get a word in
5 edgewise because of the tension in the room.
6 Unfortunately, it's still with us.

7 And the District in general, I've talked to
8 our board members that represent Bernalillo County,
9 and I think it was unfortunate that the Future Works
10 Agreement process fell apart when it did. We were
11 hopeful it would kind of keep us together, moving
12 forward, and we would have an appropriate
13 partnership.

14 With that said, we understand what you're
15 up against, what the City would like to do, and
16 we're very pleased that the District's being
17 consulted on this, and we really want to have a
18 strong, you know, engagement here with the trail
19 choices and where those particular alignments are
20 going.

21 The one thing that I'm hoping we can get
22 to, and I think our board members have indicated
23 that they wanted to work at the political level with
24 the City to try to get the Future Work Agreement
25 strategy kind of implemented in our future piece of

1 legislation, and I think that's going to be
2 forthcoming.

3 As far as what the District is appreciative
4 of here is that there is going to be a public
5 process, and I think we're going to be heavily
6 engaged in helping that be a success, and also the
7 segment of the trail as well.

8 So we think, you know -- we understand the
9 rationale behind the fast tracking, what you guys
10 are up against, as far as that goes, but we
11 generally feel like we're in the middle of this, and
12 we're hopeful that we can somehow pull the Bosque
13 Action Team in with the Bosque Working Group
14 strategy when we start working on future segments of
15 the trail.

16 So that's important to us, that we have a
17 good partnership, which includes the folks around
18 this table and the Bosque Working Group, as well as
19 some others that are outside the process, looking
20 in. So that's kind of where we're hoping we can
21 guide this, going forward.

22 MR. REED: Thanks, Mike. I wanted to state
23 that all the members of the Bosque Working Group,
24 including MRGCD, are more than welcome to attend the
25 public meeting, and we encourage you to do that.

1 And that's Thursday, January 7th, at Los Duranes
2 Community Center at 5:30 p.m.

3 MS. BERESFORD: Where is that located?

4 MR. REED: Rather close to the project area
5 as well. It's off of -- north of I-40 and west of
6 Rio Grande Boulevard.

7 MS. BERESFORD: Thank you.

8 MR. REED: Of course, any of the MRGCD
9 board members, we encourage them to attend, as well,
10 and it would be fantastic.

11 MS. FEIBELMAN: I would like to make one
12 quick point before we end. One is maybe a last
13 thing, can we try to set a general week that we'd
14 like to meet again, just so people are thinking
15 about it.

16 And then, secondly, I've heard a couple of
17 statements of people being concerned that we email
18 our members, and I'd just like to clarify that point
19 a little bit. As an organization that aids people
20 in taking action to protect natural places and other
21 parts of the environment, we view it as our job to
22 keep our members apprised of stuff.

23 And emails that we send out, we don't have
24 any problem if you see them, if you read them.
25 That's why we send them. The E message that we sent

1 to people asking them to comment was with the
2 understanding that the comment period had actually
3 opened, but, you know, I think we also feel like
4 there's information that we're not getting.

5 You know, you said that there's this public
6 process now, and now we know what those dates are,
7 but the public process began with no formal
8 initiation, no indication of what the dates would be
9 or times or when people could comment.

10 And so, you know, my sense is we have to
11 send out an email telling people to comment because
12 that email didn't come out from the Working Group,
13 and it didn't come out from the City.

14 We've understood that it's begun because of
15 the dates of the outing, but it seems to me like
16 typically in a public process, there's a formal
17 statement of the public process that says, "This is
18 the question at hand, this is the timeline," and
19 absent that, we felt that it's important to
20 communicate to people that they communicate to Matt
21 their views since it was said on the outings that
22 that input was being requested.

23 And throughout the whole process of the
24 bosque vision, we have regularly informed our
25 members that's what our job is, that's why we have

1 members, and I'm sorry that sometimes our message
2 doesn't feel like what you would like us to say, but
3 I think we also feel the same.

4 And so I think to the extent that this
5 public process can be formally written out and
6 published to the public, that would be helpful.

7 MR. REED: Okay. Anybody else? Mary?

8 MR. RIORDAN: If I could. Mary, go ahead.

9 MS. BERESFORD: I would like to make a
10 quick comment. I really appreciate the support of
11 the mayor's office and the City of Albuquerque in
12 supporting public access to places like this, so we
13 can get to them. I have fought under the ABA, I've
14 done a lot of work on it, and it's because of a lot
15 of unfortunate attitudes towards access that we've
16 had to fight and demonstrate and boycott just to get
17 the ADA in, just to be equal to what everybody else
18 is. Nothing special. Equal.

19 The best comments I have on the ADA is the
20 ADA has people with disabilities to boldly go where
21 everybody else has gone before. Boldly be able to
22 enjoy the bosque, boldly be able to go. I
23 appreciate people understanding because when I went
24 on these walking tours, people don't get it at all,
25 and I walked away very frustrated. Thank you very

1 much.

2 MR. REED: Mr. Riordan.

3 MR. RIORDAN: As far as the communication
4 coming out of the group, I believe the
5 mischaracterizations of some of conversations we've
6 had before has led to a lot of tension. So I do
7 request the court reporter recording this, after the
8 Board has reviewed it and concurred with the
9 statements in that, that that's what the official
10 public record of the communication that happened
11 today, not any additional mischaracterizations.

12 MR. REED: Anybody else?

13 MS. FEIBELMAN: Actually, Michael, when you
14 talk about mischaracterization, I think we can both
15 say mischaracterizations, but you're on the City
16 Council recording, agreeing to the agreement in
17 April.

18 MR. REED: Okay.

19 MS. FEIBELMAN: When we talk about
20 mischaracterization, it always helps when there's an
21 agreement in writing, to please the working group,
22 and Matt, I'm sorry to interject, but I'm asking as
23 co-chair of this working group that there be a
24 published description of the public process, and I
25 do not think that is too much to ask.

1 MS. TAYLOR: I think the meeting is
2 adjourned, and --

3 MS. FEIBELMAN: I'm sorry, I'm going to
4 request of the members of the working group, which
5 apparently you and I, Barbara, that there be a
6 published communication.

7 MS. TAYLOR: We're going to publish the
8 court reporter's notes so that there is a verbatim
9 record of what we've discussed today, because the
10 funding has been mischaracter- -- because there have
11 been mischaracterizations.

12 MS. FEIBELMAN: On both parts. On both
13 parts.

14 MS. TAYLOR: Now that we're adjourned and
15 we're off the record --

16 MS. FEIBELMAN: You have not adjourned the
17 meeting.

18 (Ms. Feibelman talking at same time as Mr.
19 Reed and therefore not audible.)

20 MR. REED: I'm going to adjourn the meeting
21 because this isn't productive.

22 THE REPORTER: Wait, wait, wait. One at a
23 time.

24 MS. FEIBELMAN: I want an agreement from
25 the group that there will be a public communication

1 of the public process. Counselor Winter asked for
2 it and others. I would like to -- if we don't
3 agree, then we will vote, but I want out of this
4 meeting a formal communication of this public
5 process.

6 MS. NAJMI: Is that your intention? Are
7 you planning to do that? And if not, why not?

8 MS. TAYLOR: Michael read into the record
9 before you got here today exactly what the public
10 process is going to be.

11 MR. REED: Correct.

12 MS. FEIBELMAN: And you expect the public
13 to read the meeting transcript?

14 MS. TAYLOR: We'll put the schedule on the
15 web today.

16 MR. REED: Yes.

17 MS. NAJMI: You're going to publish the
18 meeting and what the process was?

19 MR. RIORDAN: I handed Mary the proof of
20 the ad that will be in the paper. The ad will be in
21 the paper three times.

22 MS. BERESFORD: Three times?

23 MR. REED: Correct.

24 MS. FEIBELMAN: And should we also see the
25 proof of the ad? When do you share this

1 information?

2 MR. RIORDAN: It says there's a meeting.
3 Look at it. This is a standard ad that the City
4 puts in the paper all the time when we have a public
5 meeting. Nothing nefarious. There will be a public
6 meeting, and here's what it will be, and these are
7 the times.

8 MR. REED: With that, I'll move we adjourn
9 the meeting.

10 MS. FEIBELMAN: Okay.

11 MR. REED: Thank you all for coming, and
12 with that, we're closed.

13 (The meeting was concluded at 3:19 PM.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2 I, Deborah L. Dickey, CCR #157, DO HEREBY
3 CERTIFY that I did report in stenographic shorthand
4 the proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing
5 is a true and correct transcript of the proceeding
6 had upon the taking of this hearing to the best of
7 my ability.

8 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
9 employed by nor related to nor contracted with
10 (unless excepted by the rules) any of the parties or
11 attorneys in this case, and that I have no interest
12 whatsoever in the final disposition of this case in
13 any court.

14
15
16 _____
17 Deborah L. Dickey, CCR, RPR
18 WILLIAMS & ASSOCIATES
19 1608 5th, NW
20 Albuquerque, NM 87102
21
22
23
24
25