



Agenda

DATE 4/8/13 TIME 1:37pm
SERVED BY Brian Drypolcher
RECEIVED BY [Signature]

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION
Thursday, April 11, 2013, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
City Councilors' Conference Room, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, NM
505.955.6840

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 14, 2013
4. INFORMATION

NO ITEMS

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- a. Discussion: Current projections for snow pack and 2013 season runoff. (Brian Drypolcher)
- b. Discussion: Recent and pending activities related to the Santa Fe River Conservation Fund; including preliminary list of future River Fund projects. (Brian Drypolcher)
- c. Discussion and Action: Consideration of a letter from the River Commission to the Governing Body (via the city manager), regarding a request by the River Commission for the City of Santa Fe to seek the approval of the Office of the State Engineer to acquire and use water rights for release in the Santa Fe River; and to confirm that the water may be released for river flows; and retain special counsel to prosecute the application for such approval. (Commissioner Richard Ellenberg)

6. MATTERS FROM COMMISSIONERS, MATTERS FROM SUB-COMMITTEES

7. MATTERS FROM STAFF

- a. Discussion regarding plans for the May 9, 2013 meeting of the River Commission. Staff liaison will be absent.

8. CITIZENS COMMUNICATION FROM THE FLOOR

ADJOURN

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodation, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

**Index Summary of Minutes
Santa Fe River Commission
April 11, 2013**

<u>INDEX</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
Cover Page		1
Call to Order/Roll Call	Call to order by Acting Chair, Phil Bové at 6:00 pm. A quorum was declared by roll call.	2
Approval of Minutes March 14, 2013	<i>Mr. Ellenberg moved to approve the Minutes of March 14, 2013 as presented, second by Ms. Melinda Romero-Pike, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i>	2
Approval of the Agenda	<i>Mr. Ellenberg moved to approve the agenda as presented, second by Mr. Buscher, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.</i>	2
Discussion Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discussion: Current projections for snow pack and 2013 season runoff. (Brian Drypolcher) b. Recent and pending activities related to the Santa Fe River Conservation Fund; including preliminary list of future River Fund projects. (Brian Drypolcher) c. Consideration of a letter from the River Commission to the Governing Body (via the city manager), regarding a request by the River Commission for the City of Santa Fe to seek the approval of the Office of the State Engineer to acquire and use water rights for release in the Santa Fe River; and to confirm that the water may be released for river flows; and retain special counsel to prosecute the application for such approval. (Commissioner Richard Ellenberg) 	The Acting Chair summarized that the commission members would brainstorm, put together their ideas and suggestions, and prioritize those items that are doable and create the list going forward. It was suggested to contact the City Engineer to see if there were any CIP projects that this could be incorporated in to a project.	2-11

Matters from the Commissioners	Informational	11-12
Matters from Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discussion regarding plans for the May 9, 2013 meeting of the River Commission. Staff Liaison will be absent. 	Staff Liaison to work on an alternate date for May meeting.	12
Citizens Communication from the Floor	Informational	12
Adjournment and Signature Page	There being no further business to come before the Santa Fe River Commission, Ms. Romero-Pike moved to adjourn at 8:00 pm, second by Mr. Ellenberg, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.	12

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

MINUTES

Thursday, April 11, 2013 - 6:00p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
City Councilors' Conference Room, City Hall
200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, NM

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting of the Santa Fe River Commission was convened by the Chair at 6:00 pm, City Councilors' Conference Room, Santa Fe, New Mexico. A quorum was present at time of roll call.

Present:

Phillip J. Bove, Acting Chair
Richard Ellenberg
Dale Doremus
Jim Cutropia
John R. Buscher
~~Dale Doremus~~
Melinda Romero-Pike

Not Present

Jerry Jacobi, Excused
Sam Gerberding, Excused

Others Present:

Claudia Borchert, Staff
Brian Drypolcher – Staff Liaison
Felicity Broennan, Santa Fe Watershed
Anna Serrano for Fran Lucero,
Stenographer

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

No Changes

Mr. Ellenberg moved to approve the agenda as presented, second by Mr. Buchser, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 14, 2013

Mr. Ellenberg moved to approve the Minutes of March 14, 2013 as presented, second by Ms. Melinda Romero-Pike, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

4. Information

No Items

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- a. **Discussion: Current projections for snow pack and 2013 season runoff. (Brian Drypolcher)**

At the last meeting Sam Gerberding had talked about bringing a lap top to eliminate so much paper; unfortunately he was unable to be here with the equipment. Mr. Drypolcher did provide a thumb drive to the members who had their lap tops available at this meeting.

- i. Santa Fe River. Forecast and press release from NRCS was sent to the commission via e-mail and their chart form reports. Headline is we are 32% of the 30 yr. average (1981-2010) or approximately 1,210 acre-feet for April thru

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

July. Last year at this time we were at 60% and warm, windy weather descended upon us at even greater force, and even the 60% crashed quickly. Despite this nice cold weather we have had in the last few days, we may be in that kind of pattern again. This is roughly what we were looking at in 2011.

- ii. Another reminder is that we have the snow pack which is impacting what may or may not come down the river and we have the infrastructure work we talked about at our last meeting.
- iii. Reminder is that we have the work on the 24 inch pipeline below Nichols going to the Canyon Road Water Treatment Plant and actually that pipeline, parts of it, are due for delivery either tomorrow or early next week. Work to begin week of April 15. Mr. Drypolcher reiterated that his hope the install will happen quickly with a window of opportunity before the next project, (iv. mentioned next).
- iv. River structure repair work at the Bishops Garden Diversion, East of Delgado to begin first or second week of May. The hope is that between finishing the pipe job and starting the structure job there would be enough days in there that we can send a pulse of water down the river.
- v. Current plan is to provide target flow “pulses” as the timing “windows” permit. And those windows being between the infrastructure work and the channel and as the in-flow of permits us to do our outflow.

Q: What are we restricted to this year with the target flow being at 32%?

A: It would be 320 ac. ft.

The other thing that staff has talked about, we are not sure how Council would respond to as a policy matter, we are 60 ac. ft. short for the preceding target flow year. There is at the staff level, an intention to bump the 320 ac. ft. plus 60 ac. ft. and get it to 380 ac. ft. Q: What are the chances of getting that? Staff feels that the chances are very good administratively; we would need to work harder in terms of managing against the inflow to make that come true.

b. Discussion: Recent and pending activities related to the Santa Fe River Conservation Fund; including preliminary list of future River Fund projects. (Brian Drypolcher)

- i. City is running ads in the paper for SF River water rights acquisition. There will be six of the, running on Friday's and Sunday's. So far, no phone calls.
- ii. First quarterly report made to Public Utilities Committee on April 2 at the request of Councilor Calvert on the status of the River Fund.
 - PUC expressed their concern about the inability to acquire Santa Fe River rights, we will try real hard. Part of that concern is, at least coming from Councilor Calvert and others on the PUC. Here is my understanding of what he has been expressing. Even though the ordinance says that it is for Santa Fe River water rights and Rio Grande water rights, that probably most people who donated to the fund expect it to be spent on the Santa Fe River. If that is true, then we should work harder to have that money spent on the Santa Fe River. If it can't be spent on water right acquisition for the Santa Fe River then we should look at other things to spend on the money on for the Santa Fe River which is why we amended the ordinance. Legal so far has been saying, “We asked Councilor Calvert and that is fine, but we feel that we can't repurpose or change purpose of funds already collected.” A question

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

from PUC was a request that staff attempt to identify the customers that have donated and the amount they donated to the Santa Fe River fund.

- Requested further update regarding attempts to acquire SFR rights, e.g., money spent on ads, status of potential to lease from Acequia, other opportunities and activities.
- Mr. Drypolcher said that there are still avenues to pursue that have to do with acquiring Rio Grande water rights that result in some benefit to the city. The City of Santa Fe is now a major participant in flows that we benefit from the Rio Grande. If the city were to acquire rights to put in to the strategic water reserve with the idea that it is taking pressure off the whole realm of allocated water rights within the Rio Grande Basins we participants in those basins.

The direction from the PUC is to go back on a quarterly basis and they are going to want a report on the money that we have spent on Ads, how many Ads, the potential to lease from the Acequias; which is something that is being pursued and any other opportunities or activities we are pursuing with the river funds. This will take place in July.

- PUC requested clarification of the pros and cons of acquisition of surface water rights on the Rio Grande.

- iii. With the river fund going forward and “new monies in the fund” that can be spent on expanded activities besides water rights acquisition, what might those activities be? Mr. Drypolcher sent out an e-mail with a list of items that Ecotone, Jan-Willem Jansens generated. *[This information was sent to the commission prior to the meeting for review and comment.]*

Mr. Ellenberg asked for clarification from Jan-Willem Jansens comment; capture water from run-off, maybe use to generate power. Capture may be stored underground with sort of above ground middle stream and release it over time so it is a better flow of water down river and it happens with a storm rush. This is a pretty interesting idea, any idea of a feasibility cost?

Mr. Drypolcher said there are a couple of things, 1) is his idea of re-circulating water so storm water, run-off water or even river water, could be our target flow water that goes to some point down river but then is captured by some means a vault, reservoir or basin and then pumped back up for recycling; and 2) feasibility – of course engineering wise it is feasible, legally it is an impoundment. You are stopping the water from moving down through the system. Even though it is re-circulating and moving it is just a moving of reservoir, it is a reservoir on a conveyor belt. Comment: Even though it is run-off water? You are still impounding. Mr. Cutropia said it would be worth looking in to how they do it in San Antonio. They had problems with filtration like everyone else, but it is a very vibrant downtown. Mr. Ellenberg stated that he did not see re-circulation in this. The Vice Chair asked staff if they knew the issues surrounding impoundment and the likelihood we would get that permit.

Mr. Drypolcher said that the city now has permits for its reservoirs and theoretically we can get a permit for another reservoir somewhere.

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

Ms. Borchert said that if it is less than 10 ac. ft. of storage there are some kind of exceptions to the rule. (The rule could not be expressed at this meeting.)

Acting Chair Bove said that less than 10 ac. ft. is a fact that it does not require a Corp. Engineer or anybody involved. Ms. Doremus asked if this was a question or a statement. Mr. Bove said that this is a statement; he remembers when they were talking about 2 miles and what could be done with the amount of water they hold back. The other problem could be with the State Engineer, as far as he is concerned, once the water goes in to the river it is his. Ms. Doremus said that there are probably water quality issues as well.

Mr. Drypolcher said that if he was reading this right one of the things that he found intriguing is that if you think of the downtown river channel and you say, "I know, let's just raise it," raise it up so we can see the river that is there, touch it, see it and hear it better. Next time it floods, people won't like that idea so much. If you could have an elevated river channel, if you had the engineering in place so that the river channel you raised up is the river channel you see and that water volumes of a certain amount go in the upper river channel, but then if you got in to flood stages they would drop to this underground safety valve and it would divert to the invisible river underneath the pretty river. "I imagine there is a way to do that engineering wise, making the first water go on top of the second water and the second water go under...." Mr. Ellenberg said they do it up in the reserve it is just a matter of how you set the gauge. Mr. Bove said the tricky part is hiding the rest of it; it would be an expensive proposition. Ms. Pike asked, how costly would it be? Acting Chair Bove said that if the lower channel is already there, the Corp. of Engineers can give us a good idea of what they will require. That should be the first step, talk to them and see if it is even feasible. Mr. Drypolcher said this is a huge infrastructure undertaking but it was good to read this report and think about it.

Mr. Buchser said that the idea of essentially putting in Acequias in the River Park and places where you have enough width would actually be a way to raise the visibility without going in to huge cost. You are not storing it; you are helping water with parks, making it more visible. Mr. Bove said that they have about 600-800 ft. of the Acequias Agua Fria which is the one that takes out by the Land Office. That would be a simple one to start with.

Mr. Drypolcher asked if there were any additional comments or questions from Jan-Willems list.

Mr. Ellenberg said that he felt there needed to be a catchy idea to follow up on the change of the River Fund before we lose the momentum. Mr. Drypolcher said that as stated below, he is asking the commission for help on refining, selecting and promoting these ideas.

Images from Calle de Jose, water comes out of the storm drains and cascades in to three infiltration basins, two of the infiltration basins have lateral drains that come out of sub-surface drains and then there are all kinds of plants there. There is new planting there and behind the storm drains you can see the fence structure where we have installed a temporary irrigation system, there is a 500 gallon tank and drip system on a timer. So the new plants have two or three years of

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

irrigation off that gravity feed system. Then that system can be portable, you can lift the tank out of there, you can lift your timer out of there and do this in another location and have sort of gravity fed, automated irrigation for the establishment period of plantings. That is an example of what could be an interesting project for the river fund.

The other example the commission recently discussed, the work at E. of Delgado, the storm water Acequias isn't complete yet. There will be three curb cuts to divert water in to the storm water Acequias, this thing is a little over 18 inches deep and the bottom of it is a bed of pumice rock in it, on top of that is a few inches of cobble. When you look at this, the storms along the street side are grouted in place; the storms around the river and landscape side have a very minimal amount of grout in them so water can move through them. Water can move downward through the cobble and can move laterally through the leaky stone work on the river and landscapes side of the dish so there is infiltration going on. This terminates in a couple of stone line bowls that had been a location on the river where there is already a curb gut to take storm water off the street and then it dumped on to what turned out to be a very thick asphalt pad, because we tore it all out of there. Very thick asphalt pad, we should slide over the pad and go in to the river and disappear. So now at this location where the stone two lined infiltration bowls there. That is another example.

Mr. Ellenberg asked how much of the storm water do we think would be infiltrated by use of these things.

Mr. Drypolcher said it was hard to be exact. Estimating, if it is a small event, all of it, if it is a medium event probably all of it, if it is a gully washer it is probably going to fill the ditch and flow down and go back in to the river. Once it gets to the river it is a little bit cleaner, it is a little bit less aggressive and it is also in a stand still mode. It is going to get to the river later, so whatever pulse or flow that is caused by a re-invent, the pulse that arrives via this ditch will be a little bit behind the other pulse.

Mr. Ellenberg asked if this is funding that could be used on bigger stakes to capture and control a lot of the run off ditches that we have.

Mr. Drypolcher said, not being an Engineer or Drainage specialist, he said that to some extent it would have to be scalable. More water, bigger ditch, more water, longer ditch.

Mr. Ellenberg asked if these needed a permit. Mr. Drypolcher said, no, they did submit these designs to OSE to get their opinion and they said we were not capturing or storing the waters flowing through the structures we were building and it was ok; a letter from the OSE is filed administratively.

Mr. Ellenberg said that this would be a great project to do all over the place if it is going to handle substantial portion of the run off. ***Mr. Ellenberg would like to have this question researched and reported back at the next meeting.***

Ms. Doremus asked staff if there were examples from other cities that may have done this. Mr. Drypolcher said that he wasn't sure about this parallel ditch, there

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

are other structures they city is building based on work that has been done in other places including very visible, big deal kind of books about it in Tucson.

Mr. Drypolcher said it would have been good to have 2 years of data on pre-construction as to what happens at existing curb cut that would have been a place to collect some data about how much water is dumping in the river across the asphalt pad. But we didn't do that so we won't have any valuable pre or post data.

Mr. Bove said that several years back he was dealing with the City Engineer regarding a sub-division off of Montano Street and they were talking about doing drops, we were making negotiations on where that water would go because it is along that section of the Acequia Madre. The City had a design and they said, and I don't know where this stands in the clean water practices that we have a double type drop in where a part of it is actually designed to capture hydrochemicals. Is there any of that conversation up on this design?

Mr. Drypolcher responded, yes. What is happening with this particular feature, with this basin there is 18 inches of wood chip mulch and 18 inches of cobble. What some people are claiming through study's they have done is that wood chip mulch will get some sort of critters growing in there that help clean the water. It wasn't known how long they do that, maybe at some point you ask if there is anything toxic and how much can those critters consume before those wood chips and the capability of those creatures to eat it become overwhelmed. There are people doing that kind of work. We are for example, at the storm water Acequia there is a curb cut, and there is a basin that the water goes in to first that is meant to be a sediment trap, and maybe get some grasses growing there too so that in theory the water is passing over a little sand basin and then thru some grasses that are catching floaties and then it is going in the channel. But that means that someone has to go back and clean out that sediment trap every so often to keep it viable.

Mr. Bove said that this was part of his conversation with the City Engineers. If you are going to put this special rock around it and who is going to maintain it after every storm and get the stuff out and do something with it. Of course they said the city would; I don't see that the city has the manpower or a way of disposing of those real toxic oils if you concentrate it. You wonder about some of the requirements coming down from the Federal Government as to whether or not this has been thought out.

Mr. Drypolcher said; the other question I am asking and maybe it is a good reason to go slowly with these things so we see what happens over time, but a street like Alameda gets a lot of salt on it in the winter. We talked about snow melt in the winter tends to be at lower volumes so maybe at the curb cuts you put a little speed bump in there so that low flows aren't getting in to your channel and what you are getting is the summer monsoon bigger flows. Again, this is just a speculation, as I don't have the hydrology to support that. Also offered as a speculation, thinking, probably unless we learned that we are poisoning things with salt by doing it, probably this is a more beneficial course for the water to take than for it to flow down the gutter and dump it in the river. We may learn that there are problems like this in this location.

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

Additional example of a project: Camino Rio – drawing was shown – goes into a channel and dumps in to the Santa Fe River. There is an opportunity to capture it and direct it up river across this bench and hydrate this bench and get it in to the river.

Other places where the city owns the property and can do some things; Torreon Park west of Camino Alire and that parkland could be a great spot for garden, there is some property that was donated to the city by the Archuleta's – access point down the river where the Arroyo Torreon comes in and another idea is Alto Park. *(All items above had descriptive drawings to follow).*

- Mr. Drypolcher said that these projects are all mostly about storm water management, storm water infiltrations, storm water cleaning; that is one family of ideas.
- Everything that we have done up and down the river is planted which he feels is beneficial to the river for green armoring, hepatite improvement and for cleaning and for slowing storm waters down and controlling the reservoir with green things instead of grey things.

Mr. Drypolcher said, if built storm water interventions is one type of project and maybe planting is another type of project, what other types of projects might there be that would be eligible for the newly approved ordinance that says, projects that will improve the flow of the Santa Fe River in ways that improve the habitats long standard. We may not answer this right now, but if we could expand our thinking to improve the flows and eco-systems.

Mr. Drypolcher asked for input and comments from the Commission members. Maybe having some poster promotion, getting to a point where we have a list of projects as you may recall that we have to vet through the City Council in some sort of outline.

Mr. Ellenberg said that he would think a run off Acequia that turns in to erosion and some plantings would be a high intensive and visible project. There would be a need to know more about how they work. To work on a quarter mile of eroded area to a place where there is a nice Acequia and some nice banks would be highly visible. Mr. Drypolcher said that is where the other issue comes in about where is the real estate on which to install these. It needs to be city property. Ms. Doremus commented that Mr. Drypolcher has identified some of those areas. Another would be other places along the River Trail. Mr. Bove said to look at the area between Guadalupe and St. Francis Drive, on the north side. From two angles, it would be reachable as something that would be obvious if you wanted to divert water from the river up to an Acequia running along that can't reach storm water, either one. Because at that point, especially at that area by DeFouri Street it is not very deep.

Mr. Bove asked Mr. Drypolcher if he would like the Commission Members to e-mail him all of their ideas and thoughts. Yes, that would be appreciated, thank you.

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

Mr. Ellenberg reiterated his interest and obtaining expert comments on infiltration rates. Mr. Drypolcher will seek that expert and gather the information.

Mr. Cutropia would also like to acquire information from other cities that have done these types of projects and acquire their lessons learned on how they did this, was it cost effective, etc. It would be good to come up with 3 or 4 solid suggestions and feel confident that they would work.

Ms. Doremus said that there is a fair amount of cities who have worked on better ways to deal with storm water and I know the Northwest have been looking at infiltration and water quality, also Oregon has done a lot of work. It will be good to gather as much information from as many resources as possible.

It was noted that Aaron would be consulted. He has done work with the city and is quite knowledgeable. He actually shared information with us on the wood chips.

Next Steps to generate the project list:

- 1) Information needed. It is uncomfortable to make recommendations without having comparable information.
- 2) What specificity is needed in putting forward some ideas on using storm water in a way that will benefit the river and put some examples out? Ms. Doremus said she would not like to get too bogged down before we move forward with details.
- 3) Mr. Ellenberg stated that they need to know what types of things work and don't work and at that time the commission can conceptually propose from the types of things that have worked. It is hard to not know the engineering side of it to know all those things to absorb how much water, etc., but we need to know if we had 100 feet, what would we do, we need more information.
- 4) Mr. Cutropia echoed that if they could come up with these conceptual things and then discuss where we want to go and then doing the study afterwards and gathering the information once there is an agreement on the conceptual things that we want to do. Let's narrow it down to a couple of conceptual areas and present that and say this is what we want to study and this is where we want to go with it and if in the process it becomes less hot, we can cross it off the list and replace it with something else.
- 5) Ms. Pike asked what types of pollutants we should be concerned with in our part of the country when it comes to the infiltration of the storm water before it goes in to the channel. Pet waste, eco-li.

The Acting Chair summarized that the commission members would brainstorm, put together their ideas and suggestions, and prioritize those items that are doable and create the list going forward. It was suggested to contact the City Engineer to see if there were any CIP projects that this could be incorporated in to a project.

Mr. Drypolcher again reiterated that if there are any other things beside constructive storm water intervention and planting, there may be some other things that we haven't

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

articulated. It was also mentioned to do something like scale, do we want to do something bigger and more visible or have things that are distributed. We haven't talked about the locations, are there some other opportunities that we aren't familiar happening in other parts of the city or along the river corridor. In some areas we cross over in to Santa Fe County. We need to look at things regionally and geographically. Mr. Drypolcher said he believed he heard that it is worthwhile to identify the people in town who are practitioners and have gone to school on this, and have experienced building some of these and could share their knowledge with us. If we could identify a person and have them come to do a presentation to us we could learn a lot. Formalizing this request; would you like someone to come and talk to us?

Mr. Ellenberg said that if there are people in town or in Durango who want to share ideas on what has worked and hasn't worked, we would like to hear from them. Also consider the resources at UNM.

It was noted that there are new water quality standards in this part of town that we need to comply with.

- c. **Discussion and Action:** Consideration of a letter from the River Commission to the Governing Body (via the city manager), regarding a request by the River Commission for the City of Santa Fe to seek the approval of the Office of the State Engineer to acquire and use water rights for release in the Santa Fe River; and to confirm that the water may be released for river flows; and retain special counsel to prosecute the application for such approval. (Commissioner Richard Ellenberg)

Mr. Ellenberg stated that the above topic has been an on-going conversation with the City Attorney's office for the last 4-years on how do we release water rather than just by-passing it. The Mayor said he would support private counsel to help with this; commission was to draft a letter to the City Manager asking for that, and Mr. Ellenberg then ended up with a meeting with Mr. Zamora and Marcos Martinez from the Legal Department and Brian Egolf. This meeting was to talk about what is it we need to do and present to the State Engineer's office that if granted the city would feel comfortable releasing rather than just by-passing water. That meeting at this point not reached a conclusion. Denise, Brian Drypolcher, Mr. Zamora and Mr. Martinez will toss it around and figure out exactly what it is that Mr. Ellenberg should be asking the City Attorney to present to the City Council. Mr. Ellenberg has talked to Chris Calvert, he is agreeable to having Brian Egolf do the work as special counsel, so it is moving very slowly.

Mr. Bove said the case in point is the Audubon Center has water. Mr. Ellenberg said they do and the acequia probably has additional water of interest in this. The question is whether they are back to an application that is granted by the State Engineer would let the city be comfortable in releasing water discovered by its permit. Otherwise it may be just leasing water to the city but it doesn't address that issue. Mr. Bove said we need to look at how the OSE looks at it now because if you left the water in the river and you are changing the point of diversion, how would we quantify the water. OSE is going to quantify by applying it to the run that is so much water to get from the diversion off river. I am just wondering how much of that kind of thing we need to cleared.

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

Mr. Ellenberg said that Audubon thinks we can just do it. We have three water attorneys and Mr. Zamora working on the other questions. I don't know if Audubon is correct or not, but we have memos from them say that we can release the water from the river safely without changing the point of diversion. It is best to wait for the legal decision on how the city is comfortable doing it. Mr. Ellenberg said that MIS is supposed to talk to him soon about releasing water from the Acequia to the River without dealing with the bypass.

This matter is on-going.

6. MATTER FROM COMMISSIONERS

- Mr. Buchser talked about the parking along the Santa Fe River Park improvements going on. As part of the Sierra Club as a good urban design issue did not have parking along Don Gaspar to Don Diego along Alameda. He said about a year ago one of the designers said you can't see that the river is there, you look down the street and all you see is a line of cars; it looks like any other street anywhere else. If you took the cars away you could see the greenery along the river. Mr. Buchser contacted Councilor Bushee and Councilor Calvert who are his district Councilors. He never heard back from Councilor Bushee beyond that she would look in to it and Councilor Calvert basically hit on what it is going to turn in to which is that if you are eliminating parking somewhere you are either going to start looking at how much broader, it becomes more than 12 spaces on one block even though it could be offset by the parking garage that the legislature built. That will end up being used by the new County Courthouse so there will be some pressure on that from that use. Who else is going to think about if you aren't providing parking here where else are you providing the parking. It is going to turn in to a very broad discussion at Council and it isn't known if you can contain that discussion to just the issue of raising visibility in the downtown area. As far as this entity is concerned, we should think about what values would be improved down the river and once it gets to council the discussion goes how the discussion goes and basically the question for this group is; how do you think we should proceed? Clearly now that it is supported by a larger organization, the Sierra Club members could contact their City Councilors so it isn't directed just to the two councilors that cover that part of town. There may other Councilors who would consider the discussion. Another comment was the cost of the meter tally, it was asked that possibly the Parking Department could also attend a meeting to discuss this matter. 12 spaces in question. Mr. Buchser said he was not looking for a conclusion but feels that this topic merits further discussion and he will continue to pursue dialogue with Councilors Bushee and Calvert.

Secondly, due to our 30% snowpack as of a week or so there is not much flow past St. Francis, not too sure if it ever made it past St. Francis. A lot of planting and trees from there to the commons that are at risk. The folks at the Commons are pulling together and watering trees but it isn't clear what other residents around there are doing. One of the concerns is that if you suggest this to folks, water out of the tap is no longer very cheap, and if you water trees for an hour or two, your water bill is going to up a little bit. Residents may well have some resistance with the hoses out of their back yards because they know it is going to cost them more. The Sierra Club has decided to offer \$25 to anyone who takes a picture of themselves with a hose watering trees along that stretch. It becomes a

SANTA FE RIVER COMMISSION

publicity opportunity, it is good for the trees, and it is good for the people because they feel good about saving the trees that might otherwise die. I was asked to just let folks know that this is an offer, possibly once we have enough pictures we can post this in the newspaper. Ken Hughes and other folks in the Commons are interested in helping. It is word of mouth right now to the people in that area. It was suggested putting a sandwich board along the trail.

7. MATTERS FROM STAFF

- a. Discussion regarding plans for the May 9, 2013 meeting of the River Commission. Staff Liaison will be absent. Options would be to have other staff be present or change the date for the next meeting. It was suggested that the date be moved to May 16th. It was also recommended that if we didn't have any presentations the meeting could be cancelled.


8. CITIZENS COMMUNICATION FROM THE FLOOR


Felicity introduced the new Adopt-a-River Manager – Marty. She worked for the Watershed Association about 5 years ago in the same position. She is back in this new generation organization in this role and everyone is thrilled to have her. In the interim she has been all over the country and up in the great northwest. Introduced Kira from El Canon, west of La Cienega. *(Name spellings will need to be corrected and add last names.)*

9. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Santa Fe River Commission, Ms. Romero-Pike moved to adjourn at 8:00 pm, second by Mr. Ellenberg, motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

Signature Page:


Phil Bove, Acting Chair


Fran Lucero, Stenographer