



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

REGIONAL COALITION of LANL COMMUNITIES

City of Espanola – Los Alamos County – Rio Arriba County – Santa Fe County
City of Santa Fe – Taos County – Town of Taos – Pueblo of Ohkay – Pueblo of Jemez

City of Santa Fe Convention Center, Tesuque Room
Friday, March 20, 2015
9:00a-11:00a

Meeting Minutes

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Table of Contents

Attendance	1
Welcome and Introductions	1
Confirmation of Quorum	1
Approval of Agenda	1
Review of Strategic Plan.....	2
Review of 2015 RCLC Draft Work Plan	4
Review of Bylaws	8
Meetings at a Glance.....	14

Attendance

Alice Lucero (Chair RCLC); Los Alamos County Councilor Steve Girrens; Town of Taos Councilor Andrew Gonzales (Vice Chair RCLC), City of Santa Fe Mayor Javier Gonzales (Secretary/Treasurer); Santa Fe County Councilor Henry Roybal; Barney Trujillo, Rio Arriba County Commissioner; Governor Raymond Loretto, Jemez Pueblo; David Trujillo, Rio Arriba County.

JLH Media team member Alexandra Pratt.

Welcome and Introductions

Mayor Lucero called the meeting to order at 9:17 a.m. The public in attendance introduced themselves. All the attending coalition members introduced themselves along with JLH Staff.

Confirmation of Quorum

Mayor Lucero confirms quorum.

Approval of Agenda

1 Mayor Lucero suggests making Agenda items ‘d. Review Strategic Plan’ and ‘e. Discuss and
2 Review Draft Work Plan’ get moved up to the first items on the agenda, with ‘a. Review Bylaws’
3 and ‘b. Review Joint Powers Agreement’. Agenda is approved
4

5 **Review of Strategic Plan**

6 Brian Bosshardt (BB) gave a brief background on the RCLC’s history in order to inform new Board
7 Members of previous work. BB: ‘Our county council in 2005 developed a program called
8 progress through partnering. Our council’s goal was to reach out into the region to discuss
9 partnerships. The coalition was part of that, then went to individual communities to explain our
10 thoughts regarding this effort—got people on board to discuss how LANL’s role influences
11 Northern NM. Supporting people working for the labs and living in our communities. Provide a
12 forum for Department of Energy to provide facts on the issues—forum for elected officials.
13 Developed a joint powers agreement—taken to the state, approved by Dept. of Finance. Each
14 individual local government bodies approved it in joint councils. In a nutshell—it was about
15 understanding importance of LANL, with a specific focus on clean up.
16

17 Mayor Javier Gonzales (MG): That is broader than I thought. The priorities seem to be on
18 environmental management; progress/investment to be made in the communities on this topic.
19 Discussion on how economically small businesses and communities can participate in what the
20 Labs (LANL) are doing. Important distinction to understand the parameters of the Coalition. The
21 Labs and their presence in Northern NM then ok, let’s go through that conversation. If it’s about
22 environmental, which is my primary concern or priority, then I think we need to state it. In my
23 conversation with Mayor Coss (former Board Member) and others is that the driving force of the
24 Coalition was to make sure there was accountability and a voice regarding environmental
25 impact.
26

27 BB: Page 2 of the Joint Powers Agreement addresses this issue.
28

29 Commissioner Andrew Gonzales (AG): Mayor Coss was an advocate for economic development
30 coming from clean up initiatives. Much like I feel about Taos—we have a due diligence to make
31 sure we have clean air and drinking water in our communities. In that spirit, it’s important that
32 we continue to push that. We are not like Rocky Flats—cap and cover—my constituents think
33 that we are similar. I want to make sure we are doing what we say we are doing. Mayor Coss did
34 a great job of advocating for that. Articles really touted clean up issues were spearheaded by
35 Mayor Coss.
36

37 MG: Our work plan will help set priorities. The RCLC’s participation is not limited to clean up.
38

39 AG: Clean up priority is my number one. Any time we have ever lobbied it’s been with the
40 priority of clean up funding and initiative.
41

42 Councilor Steve Girrens (SG): We would be short sighted if we zeroed in on one thing. The
43 pragmatic position is that this is the largest economic engine in the northern part of the state.
44 As elected officials we need to focus on creating a forum for this type of discussion. We then
45 should find out how to maximize for our communities ways to work together. We had as second
46 priority issue—subcontractors—which has gotten positive traction. The environmental is
47 important too—a year ago this time we were hearing that DOE wants to have some input into
48 that. These kind of gatherings are not that common that regions come together—communities

1 come together...there's a benefit to having more on our plate than environment. Economic
2 development is part of workforce. We have this opportunity to figure out how to maximize, so
3 we need variety.

4
5 Mayor Alice Lucero (ML): Clean up has always been the priority but economic development has
6 to do with the workforce and small business. We need to make sure that our communities are
7 still served and that we still benefit from LANL being here. Clean up creates jobs. Same thing
8 with local contractors. When they get a contract at LANL they hire from our communities—
9 those are the two main things; clean up and economic development.

10
11 SG: I do not believe that our role is to debate the mission of the Laboratory. Our role is to
12 advocate for our communities and figure out how to coexist with it and benefit from it. How do
13 we help it help our kids, education and small businesses? How do we increase the positive
14 outcomes?

15
16 Governor Raymond Loretto (RL): I have similar views to SG. I think the Lab has been here for a
17 long time; some of the tribal communities have been here for a lot longer. Legacy waste, the
18 dumping sites, prior to any laws—do we know where these sights are. We think about the
19 waters coming down, the migration of elk and deer that we harvest. These are some of the
20 concerns we have—on the flipside, we think of the welfare of our communities and job
21 opportunities. We are close but far—we don't have the contacts or forum to bring our concerns
22 to the table. How do we educate and motivate our youth? If that door isn't opened, it will
23 always be closed. At the same time, we think of economic development. We have only two
24 roads going into LA; one through Jemez, the other through Santa Fe. If there is an emergency
25 situation, which way will you go? We have been working on a bypass for the last 40 years so that
26 we are safe.

27
28 ML: We have the chance to take these items/issues to our governing bodies.

29
30 MG: just to build off of what my LA colleague has said—I agree. There are facts that are in place.
31 Santa Fe is a huge beneficiary of the Labs. There is an opportunity through the environmental
32 clean up efforts to develop jobs in clean up. The mission of the lab has generated waste and
33 legacy waste they are not addressing. We are moving backwards because of the mission that
34 exists there. How do we talk about the mission? How do we use a collective voice to get more
35 monies into environmental clean up; and 1) Take care of legacy waste that we know can cause
36 harm?; 2) That we are holding DOE accountable to the proper standard.

37
38 MG: They [the federal government] have gotten comfortable with funding with whatever they
39 feel is the capacity of the community to do the work. They are generating waste in pursuit of
40 their mission, so it's kind of one of those things where we have to hold them accountable to
41 match it with dollars to provide the proper clean up. The waste continues to be present and can
42 have an impact in the environment. I want to figure out how we can message that it's not
43 enough that you can just give what you gave last year. As part of our effort to provide
44 environmental review, we have to develop for each program a dashboard so we know what can
45 be properly funded so we can monitor and keep track of progress being made. We need to the
46 efforts to come to a conclusion. If they aren't fulfilling their mission here, we have to raise our
47 voices.

1 SG: that's a very good point, and again, that's the value of this group and this forum. Just look at
2 the turnover around the table. Being able to understand the nuances: legacy waste, the budget
3 that takes care of what's being generated that you don't even know about. We need to set up
4 these briefings and understand the money comes from Congress. We have to do our job to
5 make those appeal so our delegation and that has to be done in partnership—stronger if we are
6 with the citizens, Dept. of Environment, and go together to ask for priority. Do we know what's
7 happening with the chromium plume? This group, this work plan needs to have updates. So that
8 if we come and go, whoever sits at this table knows what is going on. These are complicated
9 activities. It's a complicated structure—more complicated when we start adding in the nuances
10 of NNSA and the environmental management office. I think DOE would come all the time to give
11 us the progress reports. No work gets done unless there's money to do the work. We want to
12 plug in where we can influence the agendas.

13
14 AG: Gov. of Jemez, thank you—we are miles away from our people who do not hold the tech
15 jobs at the Labs. From my constituency—are we going to move past the medium-level income?
16 Taos looks like a third world country compared to Los Alamos (LA), while a backflow of the
17 money stays in Los Alamos. I have nothing to point to...\$189M is what they [the federal
18 government] gave us last year for cleanup. How do I tell that the \$1.3B given to the Laboratory
19 budget is more important than what we get for clean up. We are the elected officials that can
20 step into the issues. Why isn't environmental clean up equally as important? Debate of the
21 mission should be included because the debate of the mission is vital to the continued
22 discussion. We are not big enough in population to take care of the environmental issues. I feel
23 like we [New Mexico] are an environmental dump. The \$189M from a standpoint of mobilization
24 barely mobilizes. We are not the Citizen's Advisory Board. We represent constituents. These are
25 the people we should be standing up for. I have a hard time justifying how LA is the richest
26 county in the state and the nation, while all around the county we are going broke. If LA gets a
27 hit they get a haircut, if our county gets a cut we are removing vital organs. We have to lobby for
28 clean up—there's more money in remediation than economic development.

29
30 **Review of 2015 RCLC Draft Work Plan**

31 This section initiated a review of a 2015 Draft Work Plan to guide the Coalition's activities,
32 sectioned off in a Short Term, Long Term, and Ongoing strategy to get items accomplished that
33 will be reviewed at the end of next year as an annual progress report.

34
35 MG: How do we get started on the work plan?

36
37 ML: Let's look at last year's draft.

38
39 Andrea Romero, Executive Director (AR): I've added a few items that will go into an additional
40 draft. As we have framed these strategic planning sessions—each of these ideas have been put
41 into this work plan per our one-on-ones. Some things I've added—adding to communications
42 strategy in item 3 talking about board outreach efforts, dollars specifically. Let me preface: short
43 term goals, grants to apply for, long term goals on page 2—this is over the course of the full
44 year, items we can...building into this year's goals. Ongoing work that we need to be doing for
45 every meeting that we host.

46
47 What I would hope—I've been collecting conversations to add to the work plan—I hope that we
48 can revisit in one year and measure the outcome next year. To make sure we've met our

1 objectives. I'll add in the conversations from today and then have this draft configured into a
2 doc in April. Any discussion that you want to have with this document; it's a living doc and we
3 can edit and add any items that come up throughout.

4
5 ML: We can add change and delete, next meeting it will be in final form.

6
7 MG: On the increasing of relationships which seems to be critical if we want to start more
8 funding for clean up and economic development and workforce growth—I know that the visits
9 have been once a year to DOE?

10
11 BB: Sometimes we've been back twice in one year.

12
13 MG: Is that enough? Can we figure out a way to be more in your face so they don't forget us the
14 second we leave their office. Communications where they get tired of seeing us—enough to the
15 point that we've been there enough in a way that actually makes an impact.

16
17 BB: They know who we are. We are making a difference. It's the board's call—driven by timing,
18 budget, Congress. I think the timing can be driven by you, the Coalition.

19
20 MG: Power map developed—who can message to them best. For instance I found out that one
21 of the Deputy Secretaries has a home in Santa Fe—we have to find a way that the Mayor goes to
22 spot her out. There are different ways to go at them beyond just a 30-minute meeting. Ask JLH
23 group to build a communications strategy that directly focuses on influencers of environmental
24 manager funds in a way that sets goals for us quarterly for how we are messaging and putting in
25 an effort to get more dollars into that place.

26
27 AG: Our priorities are changing every month. The last time we were there we were addressing
28 subcontractors, but next month it could be something different. We likely can't send entire
29 board, but we get our voices out there some shape or form.

30
31 SG: We don't have to go to Washington to contact them. They have reps and boots on the
32 ground. I totally agree that we have to come up with some kind of strategy of laying out who is
33 making the decisions and where does the input happen as far as the budget is concerned. Right
34 now they are working on '17 budget. We're chasing the train that's left the station. If we show
35 up in February and ask for \$50M, at that time, that \$50M has got to come from someone else.
36 When we got the "plus up" two years ago that came from someone else's budget allocation,
37 which causes competition. We have to be realistic about how we can influence. We need to get
38 educated about the communication opportunities and calendar of staying in their faces and
39 communications.

40
41 MG: We should know who drives what decisions on funding from the program level in
42 Albuquerque and the Sandia Laboratory, all the way into Washington, so we can make
43 relationships and understand who's-who and who influences them such as the private sector
44 and research universities. Ultimately it will get to a political level, but we have to get in early to
45 address legacy waste, money for clean up and why increase \$189M to \$250M.

46
47 SG: We need to understand the nuances to understand the different pieces.

48

1 ML: JLH can come up with a calendar of when the best time to be in DC. Congress about to
2 adopt FY16 but when do they start putting numbers in. When is the best time? I think staff
3 would be the one to know (delegation staff members) in pointing those dates out.

4
5 AR: I've been speaking with our NM delegation who wants to commit to a relationship with
6 RCLC—Ben Ray Lujan, Martin Heinrich and Udall. Discussing issues and timing on issues so they
7 can provide input directly to board members and they have committed to a monthly discussion
8 to designate a collaborative agenda.

9
10 BB: I want to respond to MG—we met with a lot of the folks you mentioned. What that tells me
11 is that we as staff need to do a better job of communicating who the influencers are. We can do
12 some more on educating you on those specifics.

13
14 MG: Is the meeting enough?

15
16 SG: Has to be continual.

17
18 MG: They listened to us.

19
20 BB: It's the DOE side. We can help with the timing of that and talk with the lower level staff
21 about our needs.

22
23 ML: as far as our congressional delegation when they are on break from Congress, we need to
24 meet with them.

25
26 SG: We have to get out ahead instead of chasing budgets.

27
28 MG: the messaging becomes important. Governor, the pueblos with ancestral lands have a big
29 influence on this. Government to government relations can carry a strong voice as to why we
30 need to increase the amount of money. Do we show data? They'll allocate money then.

31
32 [gap in audio]

33
34 MG: we need to build the mechanism by which we know all the players and all environmental
35 projects that we are working on, plug what the budget is to clean it, how the funds are coming
36 in and what the outcome is so that we know what the measurable are. We need to delve into
37 being able to offer some type of recommendation as to what we think the priorities are. That
38 work plan has to involve how we want to become educated and set priorities so that when we
39 message into that influencer map we know what priorities we have—it's not just hey we need to
40 go to \$400M, this is exactly where the monies need to go.

41
42 SG: we need to put exactly what you need together; offices, contacts and projects, who does
43 what, decides what and says what to whom.

44
45 ML: they way we have been informed is through DOE and other officials as to the status of
46 various items. It's a matter of giving them the time ahead of time to get them in front of this
47 body.

1 MG: In our work plan—all of us our busy—all of us have tough calendars; in our work plan we
2 have to figure out how to split up into groups and take on different objectives and so that aren't
3 missing content from meetings. After we look at it maybe we focus on particular areas in
4 smaller groups. Need to make more progress.

5

6 AR: that's a great segue—the work plan and meeting procedure—breaking into different
7 committees and subcommittees' could be built in to the work plan depending on the issue—
8 financial, communications, clean up.

9

10 AG: We did that last Oct. considered the formation of committees. Now it's more imperative
11 because of new group members.

12

13 AR: JLH has begun mapping out a visual map starting with DOE. We'd like to work with you on
14 the visual side and the brass tacks.

15

16 MG: Let's not forget the dashboard—all projects open, certain dollar amount, etc.

17

18 [Gap in audio]

19

20 MG: when you think of the investment that Taos is making, it's about having the technology to
21 take advantage of infrastructure. If it's true and there's a tax on accessing scientists that can
22 participate in economic develop initiatives or clean up business creation, then you're locking out
23 potential for local governments. We have to talk about the technology at the Labs that can
24 move off of the Hill (LA) and into the communities with infrastructure.

25

26 AG: there should be a community commitment plan guaranteed every year that we can take
27 back to our constituents.

28

29 SG: We need to understand how that's funded and where we come from.

30

31 ML: Let's wrap up the draft plan.

32

33 MG: Can you recap for us?

34

35 AR: I will add in all of the comments collected in this meeting, add to the plan, then ask for you
36 to review before the next meeting and then we can approve. We can approve by next session
37 and hopefully get started on these issues.

38

39 SG: I'm sorry to be such a pain this morning. One of the things I want to make sure that we have
40 priority on from our economic development point of view is that you should be moving full
41 speed on getting the grant proposal into DOE.

42

43 AR: that will go in on the end of April. Will present draft proposal at the April meeting.

44

45 SG: when was your meeting with the Sect. of Energy, Moniz?

46

47 ML: August 2014

48

1 SG: Remind us what he said to Kim Davis Lebak?

2

3 ML: He wanted her to make sure that we do get funded and that in order that the labs are
4 successful is via vibrant communities surrounding the Lab.

5

6 SG: The power of the ML having the Secretary's ear and he said let's get these people
7 funded...it's coming up on 12 months. It's urgent.

8

9 AR: We can pre confirm that that will be the first thing I am working on before our net meeting.

10

11 SG: So that you're not the only one on the barrel I will help pull together a map.

12

13 ML: AR has done pretty well—she started only 6 weeks ago.

14

15 BB: is there a need to bring the proposal to the committee or do we even need to see this?

16

17 ML: Send us the draft, if we have comments...

18

19 AR: everything we have in the work plan will go into the proposal.

20

21 **Review of Bylaws**

22

23 This time was used to review all Bylaws and address questions as brought up in the past month
24 for the new Director and Board Members to review what rules and bylaws they are governed
25 under.

26

27 First topic, reviewing the term 'tribal officials'.

28

29 ML: Tribal official. Normally in our governing bodies, I make an appointment and our tribal
30 council ratifies.

31

32 RL: I was thinking of this—as I look at my tribal council, the only way tot get to sit on the tribal
33 council is to come up through the ranks. In this particular case, if we have a governor that is not
34 doing any of this stuff a lot of our work is going to not be followed. I'm vouching that it would be
35 up to the tribal council regarding who they want to appoint to the Coalition.

36

37 ML: What this alludes to is that it needs to be a tribal official who brings it to council.

38

39 AR: Then someone on tribal council. With that tribal council member, we still allow them to be a
40 voting member on the RCLC? [Yes from crowd. Heads nod in agreement.] Great.

41

42 Another question—are we recruiting other tribal officials to be in the coalition? There has been
43 a question of that if we are recruiting additional communities that may want to participate.

44

45 ML: we have been recruiting Santa Clara Pueblo and other pueblos. As far as other cities are
46 concerned, the region is included. One time we talked about Las Vegas, but that never came to
47 fruition because they are a little far out.

48

1 SG: I think Santa Clara would be excellent.

2

3 Commissioner Barney Trujillo (BT): Interesting dialogue in terms of what the Coalition is—I'm
4 impressed with the uniqueness of the Coalition. I am still learning the ropes on our [Rio Arriba's]
5 direction. I agree with the Councilor [SG] I want to maximize our relationship with the Labs. It
6 will benefit our constituents. Collecting fees on a local level—that's a big task. We may never
7 conquer it but I'm impressed with the vision of MG on how to do that. As far as Rio Arriba's
8 concerned I want to grow that relationship I want to talk about what LA can bring to the table.
9 It's one thing that the Labs are so privileged. In Hobbs they have a lot of oil and gas—that was
10 luck. LA is a lab and it started and we are lucky to do business around them while protecting our
11 watershed. It's a big thing to get a hold of. I want our representation to be for the growth of the
12 communities. I'm open to working with Santa Clara. They are interested in relating globally.

13

14 AG: I agree with 98.5% of your comments. The 1.5% that I disagree with is that LA is luck of the
15 draw. Unlike Hobbs it was a Conoco that invested, [in our case] it was the Federal Government.
16 Our tax dollars fund this [the Laboratory]. Luck of the draw put them in a region that should
17 benefit everyone because we all pay into that. I think it should be a spread of the wealth. And I
18 don't think we've seen enough of it. Legacy waste is going to sit on the hill and none of us will
19 benefit—if the Labs go away the waste stays.

20

21 RL: I want it noted here that I don't know how many years back that the Labs recognized 4
22 core—Cochiti, Jemez, San Ildefonso and Santa Clara Pueblos—even that group has begun to not
23 come together to make the requests that they should be.

24

25 AR: I have San Ildefonso, Santa Clara, Pojoaque and Cochiti that we are actively recruiting to the
26 Coalition.

27

28 AG: Pueblo of Ohkay is already on the Coalition.

29

30 AR: They still are. We have clarified appointees so now can reach out to Gov. Earl Salazar.

31

32 AG: Would it be beneficial to reach out to Pueblo Governors?

33

34 RL: Definitely.

35

36 ML: Let's move onto **dues**.

37

38 AR: The next proposed item for discussion is under expenses.

39

40 ML: I was thinking it was on the resolution...each pays a certain amount?

41

42 BB: Nothing ever put in writing. We can afford to provide the following. We've never enforced a
43 bylaw that "you shall give this" but rather give what you can afford.

44

45 ML: It's something we need to revisit. As far as Española, we are giving \$10,000 and we have a
46 \$10M operating budget. Considerable when we lost 15% of our revenue last year.

47

48 SG: I think we need to give a minimum to have skin in the game to create the pool [of funding].

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
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

ML: when we started providing monies from different entities we didn't have money coming in from DOE.

SG: We're asking for new from DOE; the last time we got money from DOE it paid a bill. We've been living off of LA. If we don't know what we are going to do, we all have to have some skin in the game. I totally understand the stress. That's .1% of the budget, and if we don't have to do it this year we figure out new work plan and budget and not collect any but we do need to have skin in the game.

AG: The skin in the game as elected makes us accountable to be here because our constituents are paying us to be here. The issue is that—perception is reality. LA, because they have a bigger contribution to the coalition has more influence. That's not the case, but those are the battles we face. I understand we can't use clean up money. We have to do something. Not sure about how our fundraising efforts are going.

ML: We should pay something it's not that that I want to get away with not paying anything at all. Santa Fe pays the same amount to the Coalition but their GRT is much higher. As far as LA is concerned they contribute the majority, however, that is their way of giving back to all of us. We don't have the luxury of the GRT they do. They are not paying for more of a say but their way of giving back to each one of us.

SG: It's not giving back it's a responsibility to the region to try to be a catalyst to improve on as many things as we can think of.

AG: What happens if the GRT goes to a non-profit. LA loses the windfall of GRT; the contribution level goes down.

MG: I have to excuse myself [from the meeting]. I think I owe it to our constituency to have a voice to influence what we collectively advocate for. I'm ready to pay whatever the fair share is that the board feels is appropriate. To the perception....what I think about LA or at least what I've seen, there's never been a case or point where the councilor or the staff has tried to move in a different way. There has been a respectful point of view. Just because they're paying 80% or 90% of the dues and we may disagree but we are all in this together. 20-30 years from now our kids will be raised in the environment that we are creating. We will participate how the board feels appropriate. If this dialogue...I will be back if possible.

AR: There's a proposed amendment on the table. I suggest a sub-committee to address these issues.

SG: If we struck it right now it doesn't change the way we are proceeding. This is just discussion today, so whatever comes back for adoption will do so in April. This may not be necessary. Good. Start the clock again.

AR: The next item: **E. Conflict for interest...**

ML: I feel this is not a topic we need to discuss. We have so many people employed by the Labs.

1 AR: Item F., the Sec. Treasurer should perform these duties as follows....question: shall we
2 amend bylaws that the ED and her team, items of administrative duties.
3
4 ML: Sec. Treasurer doesn't need to actually take the minutes.
5
6 AR: The way it's stated we can keep it.
7
8 AG: When it comes to items on the Treasurer...is he the only one who can give approval?
9
10 BB: Practice in the past ED can approve anything unrelated to a JLH invoice.
11
12 AR: Item 2—shall have oversight of the RCLC assets—
13
14 SG: Is there a problem with how things have been happening? Is this to fix something or to make
15 it cleaner?
16
17 AR: Currently we are not operating on a clear budget. As part of a work plan that would be us
18 asking for a clear budget so when talking about oversights and assets....
19
20 ML: We should have a budget and then LAC
21
22 SG: We don't need either one of these for more clarity at this time? I think we are fine.
23
24 AR: Item 3, shall provide cause...
25
26 SG: I see your positions with figureheads—their job is to come together as 3 when the rest
27 can't—not giving them stuff to get done.
28
29 ML: what we need to develop is a spreadsheet with our budget on it so that when MG gets
30 report he sees our balances. I don't see any problem with delegation of duties...let me go back
31 to something. Bi monthly.
32
33 AG: We should still work monthly and do action items bi-monthly. Monthly comes quick it
34 seems like there are still items to do.
35
36 SG: If we get it together we can get back on our schedule of having/being able to keep track of
37 what's going on. Monthly is still plenty. We do a better job of getting things done.
38
39 ML: we need to change quarterly to monthly.
40
41 SG: I'm ok with this amendment.
42
43 *All parties agree to the amendment to change meetings from 'quarterly' to 'monthly' and it is*
44 *approved.*
45
46 ML: The amendment goes in. Special meetings I think is fine. If ever the Secretary of Energy
47 comes to town we call a special meeting.
48

1 AR: Basically pursuant to NM Open Meetings Act, all agendas are posted three days prior to the
2 meeting. If we want to pursue an item we can set an agenda week prior to the Tuesday so we
3 can on or offline get feedback.
4
5 SG: Leadership tees them up and whatever's in there gets passed all at one time. Our
6 responsibility to look at the content.
7
8 ML: As far as rules of procedure. AR and I will work on that and then we'll bring it to you as a
9 draft for consideration. As far as posting AR, we post on the website and then when you send to
10 everyone we post on you websites. We have an archaic website but we're working on it. Most
11 cities are doing that.
12
13 SG: We had something come up yesterday: archiving—webpages get loaded but not a good
14 place to archive something. We can volunteer to help with archiving documents so we don't
15 depend on websites that have an ebb and flow.
16
17 BB: We have our own separate open meetings act that outlines our specific scope of meetings
18 act.
19
20 ML: We may need to revisit it.
21
22 AR: OK.
23
24 ML: I think that covers it. Committees?
25
26 [Gap in audio]
27
28 SG: I'm happy there's more people here....to me it's kind of like it's good for us to know what's
29 in it but it's not good to change it because I don't want to lose anyone who's here today.
30
31 ML: Maybe we can have a Memorandum of Understanding...it will be easier to manage. The JPA
32 would have to go back to DFA and then go to all the entities again.
33
34 BB: We don't have to address this.
35
36 ML: It's a separate document all together.
37
38 SG: I didn't see any problem with our JPA.
39
40 ML: I think it's in good shape.
41
42 AG: With our focus being environmentally driven, we have the issue of the legacy clean up and
43 enhanced missions of the Lab. I think there is room in here that we should evaluate...I don't
44 want to hinder. If we are going to be transparent with our constituents, we have to be cognizant
45 of the fact that the mission is contrary to everything we've talked about today.
46
47 ML: Alternative energy, research. I support LANL. Nuclear is just one of them. How does the
48 board feel about revisiting this.

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
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

SG: I like ii. What’s under new missions—it’s all in how you interpret what “Mission” means. Again, I don’t know how we want to address this without going through the hold mechanics of disrupting our JPA. The question: how hard would this be if this did change? I’d like to leave this alone for 6-12 months and address within the communities. There are other things in here that capture what we’re trying to accomplish.

AG: If I take it back to our governing body [in Taos], and see what the indication is about pushing the language. There are people within our community that are supported by the Labs. For me, the feeling personally is the fact that we continue to push the clean up but we make more waste in order to clean it up. Clean up what’s legacy and what’s there. We can set another time and place in 6 months. I don’t think my constituents have ever seen this, in full transparency.

SG: Don’t want to replace the words but eliminating “I” altogether. We all want it to be stable.

AG: We are given credit for more power than we actually have. Our federal delegation is responsible for steering mission. If we’re talking about the subject then we should have some kind of a stance on it. How they operate at the Fed level b/c they hear you for 30 minutes and 6 to 8 months of the year we are ancillary. I would like to revisit.

ML: Steve, I’d like to see “i.” remain.

[Gap in audio]

ML: I don’t think it needs to be addressed because we are not going to change public nature of our meetings.

SG: What I think I just heard you say is we do have public comment and we don’t necessarily need this under new words under 5e.

ML: I don’t think so.

AG: Have we adopted separate rules?

ML: That’s what Andrea and I are working on.

AG: I think I’m on board with public comment but discretion of the Chair—they set the tone on how heavy the agenda is. Public outburst or disruption is to have a presenter like Sec. Flynn and then be engaged with taking public comments. Time and place for public comments. Discussion during a meeting not a good idea.

ML: Only allow public comment during public comment meeting. Not going to do that to a presenter. Unless for some reason we have a need to call on someone but that’s at the discretion of the board.

AG: AR can put up a sign up sheet.

1 Fabian Trujillo (Alternate for Mayor Gonzales): rules about how the public should act in a public
2 setting. There is a statement that they read every time during a board meeting so that the public
3 knows how to comport themselves when they are speaking. Basically that they should be
4 respectful, not interrupt speakers as they are speaking to the board, they should try to have
5 solutions and also they say that the board may discuss what is on the discussion/agenda but not
6 go off of that. It seems to work really well regarding controversial issues.

7
8 ML: Please get that to AR. Thank you.

9
10 FT: My pleasure.

11
12 AR: Our lunch should be here any moment now. We have a few announcements on the
13 meetings at a glance.

14
15 ML: This is where usually at the end of each meeting we discuss what we'd like to have for the
16 following meetings.

17
18
19 **Meetings at a Glance**

20 Agenda item E.a. in the packet. Next meeting is in the Española City Chambers on April 10th from
21 9-11a. All meetings have been henceforth moved from the third Friday of the month to the
22 second Friday of the month. The next meeting will contain presentations from Pete Maggiore of
23 DOE EM and an update from the LANL Community Programs office. The Draft Work Plan will be
24 reviewed again, pending all revisions and additions and will be discussed for approval. Also,
25 billing the Coalition members will also be discussed and voted upon. A Budget will be crafted by
26 AR and BB and will be subject to the Board's approval to close out FY15 and start FY16.

27
28 Kathy Keith of RDC is to be invited to present on May 8th in Taos on the issues pertaining to the
29 LANL Major Subcontractors and other issues.

30
31 The June 12th meeting is now to be held in Jemez Pueblo.

32
33
34 **Meeting Adjourned**

35
36 **OPEN MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:04a.**

37
38
39
40 **ATTEST:**

41
42
43 _____
44 Mayor Alice Lucero, Chair

45
46
47 _____
48 Andrea Romero, Director