

EXAMPLE 1.1

When conducting any policy analysis, it is essential to identify the stakeholders and their various interests that propagate an intense central value conflict. In this particular case involving the use of groundwater from the Navajo Aquifer by the Peabody Coal Company, there are various stakeholders whose values incline on the scale of competing interests. A large stakeholder in this policy issue is the group of Native Americans living in villages located near the Southern edge of the Black Mesa above a portion of the Navajo Aquifer. Members of this group include the Hopi, Navajo, Acoma, and Zuni tribes. As major stakeholders in this policy issue, these groups highly value the land on which they live and contend that Peabody's groundwater pumping for the slurry lines used in the transportation of coal to produce electricity is drying up the springs at a rate that exceeds any recharge. This, in turn, has become a severe threat to the tribes' spiritual connection with their heritage, as indigenous people believe that water is for all living things and contributes to the spiritual beliefs that serve as primary tools in shaping their identities and values as Native Americans. This has left an ambiance of despair and hopelessness for the future, as their value system is being ruined in the name of maximizing profit. As stakeholders, Former Hopi Tribal Chairman Vernon Masayesva (now the director of Black Mesa Trust), the National Resources Defense Council, and the approximately 4,000 petition signers hold similar values to those of the Native Americans, as they are proponents of conserving underground water supplies that exist as finite resources for an infinite population of people.

Holding a system of values that conflict with those of the above mentioned group are the stakeholders that see the drawing of water for the transporting of coal as an efficient, necessary process that has "negligible impact on the aquifer." The Peabody Coal Company believes that using the underground water to transport millions of tons of coal each year is the cheapest method, thus an innovative idea to maximize profit. Proponents of the Bush Administration's federal energy policy, the Mohave Generating Station, the two major power plants built in the 70s to meet the power needs of rapid-growing southwestern cities, and the citizens of such fast-developing southwestern cities as Phoenix, Las Vegas, and Los Angeles are stakeholders who share these values as well, being direct recipients of the coal being transported using a mixture of water known as slurry.

In addition to the conflicting values presented by the two previous groups of stakeholders, other important stakeholders in this policy issue are those that have the direct influence and power to change or implement policy. As described in the article from the New York Times, Native American groups are utilizing collective lobbying tactics to influence Secretary of the Department of Interior Bruce Babbitt and

EXAMPLE 1.2

Secretary of Bureau of Indian Affairs Gale Norton, whom exist as stakeholders holding much salience in this issue with access to change or preserve existing policy involving the Navajo Aquifer.

In order to understand the policy that was enforced in the 1970s and the policy that may emerge in the 2000s, the following questions may be asked: *What benefits became available to the Hopi and Navajo Tribes upon signing leases with the Peabody Coal Company? Specifically, how did Attorney John Boyden lead the tribes to agree to sign such a lease? What alternative methods to transporting coal through slurry lines exist? What additional coal resources are available to the cities of Phoenix, Las Vegas, and Los Angeles? Other than coal, what resources are available for the production of electricity in the region? What are the costs and benefits to using these alternative resources? What other avenues of funding are available to the Hopi tribe that could take the place of the royalties provided by the mining company? How could Secretary Gale Norton utilize his experience as Attorney General and the influence of his former constituents in Colorado to "strike up a deal" to aim to implement a win-win policy?*

Even though the policy process is a nonlinear and continuous process, this issue best fits into the agenda setting stage of the policy process. The issue of Peabody Oil Company utilizing water from the Navajo Aquifer has been subjectively determined as a societal problem and alternative decisions are the next step in the agenda setting. The issue has met the criteria that indicates its attainment of agenda status. The issue has reached a point of urgency in which the use of the finite underground water supply on the reservation can no longer be ignored. Larger issues have come to the forefront, as the spiritual and cultural beliefs of the Native American tribes are at stake and have created a human interest angle. In addition, this issue is seen as having a significant impact on not only the Native American tribes, but on major industrial companies such as Peabody Oil Company, Mohave Generating station (employees and their families), contracted power plants (employees and families), citizens of major southwestern cities, and local and federal government policies and officials (the Bush Administration and the federal energy policy; Department of Interior and head secretary Norton). Thus, we see that this is clearly the agenda setting stage of the policy process.

I contend that policy must be implemented to halt further use of the Navajo Aquifer for the purpose of using slurry lines to transport coal. In addition, policy should promote alternative methods for transporting coal and for supplying electricity to surrounding southwestern cities.