



CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 4.26.17 TIME 1:30pm

SERVED BY Stephanie Lopez

AGENDA

RECEIVED BY Carmelone Spears

The City of Santa Fe And Santa Fe County

Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2017

4:15 PM

**COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
SF COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
102 GRANT AVENUE**

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 6, 2017
BUCKMAN DIRECT DIVERSION BOARD MEETING
5. REPORT ON MAY 2, 2017 FISCAL SERVICES AUDIT
COMMITTEE (FSAC)

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

6. Monthly Update on BDD operations. (Michael Dozier)
7. Report from the Executive Director. (Charles Vokes) **VERBAL**
8. Overview of the BDD Raw Water Quality Surveillance Programs.
(Chuck Vokes & Daniela Bowman)
9. 3rd Quarter Finance Report for Fiscal Year 2017. (Mackie Romero)

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, June 1, 2017 @ 4:15pm

ADJOURN

Executive Session

In accordance with the New Mexico Open Meetings Act NMSA 1978, §10-15-1(H)(7), discussion regarding threatened or pending litigation in which the BDDDB is, or may become a participant, including without limitation: Discussion regarding Diversion Structure issues. (Nancy R. Long)

End of Executive Session

**PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES IN NEED OF ACCOMODATIONS,
CONTACT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE AT 505-955-6520, FIVE (5)
WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING DATE**

SPD CLERK RECEIVED 5/24/2017

**MINUTES OF THE
THE CITY OF SANTA FE & SANTA FE COUNTY
BUCKMAN DIRECT DIVERSION BOARD MEETING**

May 4, 2017

This meeting of the Buckman Direct Diversion Board was called to order by Commissioner Henry Roybal, Chair, at approximately 4:15 p.m. in the Santa Fe County Commission Chambers, 102 Grant Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Roll was called and the following members were present:

BDD Board Members Present:

Commissioner Henry Roybal, Chair
Councilor Peter Ives, Vice Chair
Councilor C. Dominguez
Commissioner Anna Hamilton
Mr. J. C. Helms [Citizen Alternate for Denise Fort]
Mr. Tom Egelhoff [non-voting]

Member(s) Excused:

None

BDD Board Alternate Members Present:

Commissioner Anna Hansen [County alternate]
Councilor Michael Harris [City Alternate]
Ginny Selvin [Las Campanas alternate]

Others Present:

Charles Vokes, BDD Facilities Manager
Nancy Long, BDD Board Consulting Attorney
Mackie Romero, BDD Finance Manager
Daniele Bowman, BDD Staff
Michael Dozier, BDD Staff
Adrian Garcia, BDD Staff
Kelley Brennan, City Attorney
Marcos Martinez, Assistant City Attorney
Erminia Tapia, BDD Administrative Assistant
Rick Carpenter, City of Santa Fe
Kyle Harwood, BDD Board Counsel
Don Moya, County Finance
David Gorman, Sheehan & Sheehan Law Firm
Dan Gershon, Sheehan & Sheehan Law Firm

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Upon motion by Commissioner Hamilton and second by Councilor Ives, the agenda was unanimously approved as presented.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 6, 2017 – BDD Board

Commissioner Hansen noted that Commissioner Hamilton was not shown as present on page one.

Upon motion by Councilor Dominguez and second by Councilor Ives, the minute were unanimously approved as corrected.

5. REPORT: May 2, 2017 Fiscal Services Audit Committee (FSAC)

MACKIE ROMERO (BDD Financial Manager): Mr. Chair, members of the Board, a Fiscal Services Audit Committee meeting was scheduled and was held on May 2, 2017. Unfortunately, our meeting did conflict with the Board of County Commission meeting; therefore, attendance was limited to BDD staff and Jeanette Duran from the County. We discussed information number nine which will be presented at the end of the meeting. I do apologize for the meeting conflict and will do a better job at getting those scheduled.

CHAIR ROYBAL: So we have any questions from the Board? Okay, seeing none. Thank you, Mackie.

MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

6. Monthly Update on BDD Operations

MICHAEL DOZIER (Interim Operations Superintendent): Mr. Chair, members of the Board, the update on BDD's operations is as follows: an average million gallons a day, raw water diversions have been 5.39 million gallons, the drinking water deliveries that are already treated water is an average of 4.82 million gallons a day, Las Campanas has been drawing water for an average of .528 million gallons and our untreated or storage on the plant site is about .042 on average. Approximate deliveries at the time of the release on April 19th of this memorandum was at 68 percent. Today we are averaging about 50 percent of the total City supply that we are adding to and we did add the graph on the bottom for the year-to-date projections.

If you'll look at the year-to-day projects for April they show at the time for the 19th, April actually, final count for April was 192 million gallons. So it's a little bit above the average for the month of April. We did also add the extra sheets, if you flip to the next page, that do show all of the original spreadsheet items that were in the report before they were removed. So – they're going back between this year all the way back to 2012, we have up into that area.

And I stand for any questions if you have them.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, thank you for that report, sir. And for the record, can you identify yourself.

MR. DOZIER: Michael Dozier, I'm the interim operations superintendent

CHAIR ROYBAL: Any questions from the Board? Thank you, sir.

MR. DOZIER: Thank you.

7. Report from the Executive Director

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, Charles Vokes, I am the facilities manager at the Buckman Direct Diversion. In our report I have placed at everybody's station a photograph of a truck, a lift truck, the LED lighting project that we have discussed in the last couple of meetings has started today. So at the time I had left they had installed about 12 of those lights. They are doing the pole lights first and then they will do the wall packs. We expect it will probably take them four or five days because we're replacing 97 total high-pressure sodium lights with those. So the BDD will have a new view from Las Campanas. It will look differently. So I am waiting your report next month as to whether it makes a big difference or not. It will make a big difference to staff. It will be a lot safer. It will be really well lit and we're very excited to get this project, finally, off the ground. Any questions on that?

Vacancy report, which has kind of been a traditional report, unfortunately we've gone from five back to six vacancies because the mayor's office has stolen Erminia Tapia so this will be her last meeting and she will be at the Mayor's Office from now on. So we have a temporary staffer in her place while we go through the posting and the selection process for someone to attempt to replace her, I will say. So we are going to miss her and I thank her for all of her efforts in keeping me in line, I'm going to miss that.

We did have a couple of tours last month and Mr. Harwood and I also have continued our meetings with Los Alamos National Laboratory staff on the MOU that is expiring and the new MOU. So I will say a little more on that in my next presentation. I will stand for any questions or information that the Board would like to hear.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, first I'll go to Councilor Ives then to Councilor Dominguez.

COUNCILOR IVES: And not so much questions as a thank you to the BDD, it has been such a pleasure to see Erminia down at City Hall raring and ready to go in the mornings with a big smile on her face and ready to meet the challenges and I suspect that's exactly the quality that she brought to BDD. BDD's loss is definitely City Hall's gain and it's a delight to have her down there. So thank you for all the good work of training and sending on a wonderful employee.

MR. VOKES: Thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Councilor Dominguez.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't want to expend on that too much but thank you, Erminia, as a former chair it was a pleasure to work with you in that capacity and certainly I look forward to working with you in your new capacity. Congratulations and thank you at the same time.

Just a real quick question, Mr. Chair to Mr. Vokes on the vacancies, so, I noted something that we have talked about in the past and we have brought it to the Board and

it's a question that we quite frankly at the City ask even our police department and everyone else, do you ever expect to be at full capacity barring any absences because of unforeseen circumstances?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair, Councilor, I am an optimist, so, yes; I believe that we can get there. We need to continue to work with HR and their support in getting this done but we do have the fiscal administrator and the operations superintendent, both of those positions we should be scheduling interviews for this month. The other positions, the electrical position I believe we are ready to make an offer on that one so potentially we could be down to three by the next Board meeting.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Okay, thank you very much. Thanks.

CHAIR ROYBAL: All right, any other comments from the Board? I also want to say thank you to Ms. Tapia for all the hard work. You know, it has only been a short time since I have been on the BDD but you've always been really professional and a great employee. So even though it leaves a void in the Buckman Direct Diversion I wish you the best in your new position. Thank you.

Okay, no more questions for Mr. Vokes, for Chuck? Okay.

8. Overview of the BDD Raw Water Quality Surveillance Programs

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, I am presenting what I call an overview of the BDD raw water surveillance program. This is part of the MOUs that exist between the BDD and Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Department of Energy. I will say that this is a complex subject. I also have Mr. Kyle Harwood who has a lot of expertise and a lot of history with this program and Ms. Danielle Bowman who is our regulatory compliance officer here as we get into questions. If the Board seeks to really understand the program I think it's probably more than what we can do here. So that's why I'm going to present an overview and then hopefully answer a few questions to clarify.

I'd like to begin this presentation with letting you know that all the reports and all of the information that I'm discussing are on the BDD Project Website. There are two MOU reports that have been created and those MOU reports both start out explaining our program. So that's an excellent source of information but I wanted to share with the Board and also with the public how you get to these reports and it is simply a matter of going to our website under quality, under monitoring and testing and then you'll see stormwater reports. And under stormwater reports you'll see a list of reports at the bottom of the screen and those are where all the reports are and the presentations that have been presented to the Board. Also, further down the screen there is an explanation of the Intelius database, how to log on and retrieve information. Intelius, of course, is the database that contains all of the water quality monitoring information not only from the BDD but the New Mexico Environment Department and from the laboratory itself.

Going back a little bit in time and this is before I got here, in 2007 the Buckman Direct Diversion Board requested a written agreement with the Laboratory to outline the water quality testing program. This written agreement was then rolled into the 2010 MOU. The 2010 MOU started – it was signed in May 2010, it covered four seasons of sampling program and the objectives I've listed here in our program. The most important objective was the Early Notification System. As you know, when we have significant

SPC CLERK RECEIVED MAY 24 2017

rainfall in the LA and Pueblo canyons we do get contaminants that do flow into the Rio Grande and this Early Notification System allows us to cease diversions until those contaminants go by. The original program had three monitoring stations and I've given you a handout of those monitoring stations which is this one right here and it is on page 11 of this presentation also. But the original stations were classified as Station E60 in Pueblo Canyon, E50 in Los Alamos Canyon, and originally a station called E110, that was later renamed as 109.9. This was the main objective of the Early Notification System. The second objective was the monitoring of Los Alamos Canyon and Pueblo Canyon to provide water quality contaminant sampling data from flow events, to provide this information to the BDD and to others to characterize what those contaminants were.

The next objective there is the stormwater monitoring at the Buckman Direct Diversion itself. That program was triggered originally the 109.9 monitoring station. So when the flows exceed 5 cubic feet per second at those stations then we start sampling at the BDD.

Also part of the program was something called the Contaminant Fate Analysis where they were looking at the contaminants as they came – what was being returned by the sediment removal system and what the fate of those contaminants would be. And that was a short program. It was funded for one year.

The rest of the MOU was, I would call, the details – who does what, biannual meetings and who was responsible for that. Again, it's about a 10-page document and it is on our website.

The results of the MOU program, one of the charges that the BDD Board made of staff was that we look at all of the water quality data and put it in a report. So that took some time to get going. The first report was actually for 2011 through 14 and that was done by Daniela Bowman our compliance officer. We also hired a consulting engineer to come in and review the information and make sure that she was doing a good job on that which he concurred that she was. A summary of that report was presented to the Board on March 3, 2016 and the presentation and the report are posted on our website. The report used BDD, the Los Alamos National Laboratory water quality information and also the NMED information so it was a compilation of all the information that we could gather. I can say that the summary of the results from the report were that concentrations of some contaminants exceeded the Rio Grande background levels. In other words, when there were rainfall events at Los Alamos we did see contaminants and those were above what's normally in the river. There were also exceedances, the New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission Surface Water Standards that we saw. The results also helped us to understand the complexity of these systems and the need to review the results and then modify sampling based on the results. I can say that the first MOU was successful in that it did establish that relationship with the Laboratory and the BDD staff. We were able to collect a lot of information and begin to understand those systems. Parts of the MOU weren't successful because of the nature of the MOU. There were times when we wanted to modify, either increase or decrease sampling or do other things and because they were spelled out in black and white within the MOU we would have to go back and get the Laboratory's agreement as well as the Board's agreement to make those changes and not that it couldn't be done but, again, as we were studying things we said, Well, it would have been nice had we done this instead of doing it that way. So we have learned about that.

The other issue that we had, of course, is that we lost 109.9, that monitoring station in the flood of 2013. Because of its location on the Pueblo of San Ildefonso replacement of this station was difficult. We did, however, the BDD took the initiative on our own to seek permission of the Pueblo to put a radar station in its place. We did that last monitoring season and began to see results at the radar station. This season we are actually going to install a flow meter and we have been able to get permission of the Pueblo to do both of those items. So we feel like it is an important monitoring station and that it needs to function and we're going to continue to make it happen.

The next MOU was dated – was signed in 2015, January, and it was a three season MOU. The goal was to continue the relationship between DOE, LANL and the BDD. To determine the second goal that was listed in this MOU was to determine whether the LANL legacy contaminants from Los Alamos and Pueblo canyons warrant operational constraints at the BDD intake and with the goal of reducing the long term need of the Early Notification System. At the time, the Early Notification System was redefined because of loss of 109 and it included the 50, 60, the 62 site and 099 site. In this MOU one of the things we attempted to do was shift more of the responsibility for the BDD monitoring to the staff at the BDD so we could make those modifications in the program as we saw fit. I will say that the MOU is a cost sharing program where the Lab provides funding for that, 80 percent of the cost for the analysis for this MOU was provided by the Lab. The rest was provided by the BDD Board. Taking on the responsibility, again, allows the BDD to have some control over that. We contracted with the Laboratory for the results. The results would come directly to us and that flexibility, I think, is important to maintain in the program.

Another program that was set forth in this MOU was what we call our TREAT Study. The TREAT stands for The Removal Efficiency and Assessment of Treatments. In other words, we want to know how effective the BDD is at treating contaminants that come from the Rio Grande and down those canyons. It is a three year study. We're doing two events per year. These samples are extremely expensive. They run in the thousands of dollars per sample because we are looking at a whole suite of things. The objective of this is to look what's in the river and then look at it as it goes through all the processes at the BDD. The rest of the MOU contains the logistics; who is going to do what, when, where, how. And I'll say that the results that were presented to the Board, I believe, December 1, 2016 were consistent with the earlier results. When we get significant rainfall we do see contaminant in the Rio Grande. Contaminants that are above background level and some of the contaminants were over those water quality standards.

Again, I've included the map of the ENS stations and I believe Commissioner Hansen was asking the condition of those sampling stations and so we have some recent photographs of those stations. The first one is the E50 dam and gage, so you can see that they are being well maintained even after the flood events that the Environment Department mentioned they have been put back and are in good condition. This next slide is our radar station at 109.9 that we have installed and the 060 gage. So those are what things look like out there. I would say that they are in very good condition and again the 109 station we are going to put a flow meter on that so we can receive additional information.

So moving forward, again, Mr. Harwood and I had meetings –

CHAIR ROYBAL: Mr. Vokes, I believe Commissioner Hansen had a question.

MR. VOKES: Sure.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Will you be able to collect samples at the 109.9 site?

MR. VOKES: No, we have not received permission to get sample collections there. We have kind of been working one step at a time with the Pueblo to get those permissions. I don't know – I can give you a brief history. When the flood took out that station I believe that when we went back to the Pueblo then they had some concerns about that station, the data collection, video monitoring and sampling. The Environment Department I believe does get some samples there but I can have Ms. Bowman address the specific of that. I've got about this much more in my presentation and then we can forward.

I just wanted to talk about where we go from here. We've had meetings with the staff at the Laboratory. They have a new manager, Doug Hintze, he is very interested in improving the relationship between the BDD, the Board, and the Laboratory. So we're having discussions on what future MOUs will look like. I believe absolutely that the Early Notification System is not ever going away until the complete cleanup is going on, I think the information is too important. So we are discussing that. We are also discussing the surveillance that takes place in the river, the sampling, the monitoring. It is our hope that we can bring something to the Board in July and say these are the things we have in common and we think we can do because I think that that relationship is there and that desire to have the relationship and the recognizing the importance of the program to the City and the County of Santa Fe as well the Laboratory and it's a good thing.

That was, again, my very brief overview. Mr. Harwood is here for more specifics. Ms. Bowman can answer other questions that you have so at this point I will take questions. Did you have additional information that you wanted on that question?

CHAIR ROYBAL: Commissioner Hansen, did he answer your question?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Yes, thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Is there any other questions from the Board? We'll go to Councilor Ives and then Councilor Dominguez.

COUNCILOR IVES: Chuck, just one question: the MOUs, both of them, as well as the agreement, are they all on the website as well?

MR. VOKES: Yes, they are.

COUNCILOR IVES: And what tab are they under?

MR. VOKES: I believe that the MOUs are on that same tab that I showed you in the middle of the page, I think it says Memo of Understanding and it would be highlighted in blue and I believe you can select that and it will take you to those MOUs.

COUNCILOR IVES: Okay, I'll do some exploring but really I just need to wade into the information before I'll have any other questions. Thank you.

MR. VOKES: Thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Councilman Dominguez.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple of things, Chuck.

I just want to clarify and make sure I understood this or heard you correctly. Site 109.9 is the radar there in lieu of the fact that that's not operable?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair, Councilor, when Los Alamos lost that site and they went back to the Pueblo to reestablish the site there were some hurdles that were presented at that time. And for whatever reason the Laboratory said we're not putting it back. You can use these other sites to monitor and that was the direction we went. That was right at the time that I came onboard here and it became very apparent to me that, one, the need for us to have some autonomy with the program, to be able to make some of the decisions without having to go through the Laboratory was very important for us to adept. So part of it was, let's do our own sampling program. Let's get a grant, pick out our own laboratory, decide which analysis we need to do based on what we're seeing.

The other thing we did was we spent about six months negotiating with the Pueblo, asking can we put a radar station out there. And Ms. Bowman received a phone call one morning at 8:30 saying we want you here at 9 o'clock and we're going to sign this and give it to you. And our relationship with them has been pretty solid since then. Since then, we've asked if we can install the flow monitoring. Again, part of the MOU, I would like to see the Laboratory step up and take partial ownership or at least use all their really smart people to help us run that station so that we have clear information.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: The radar station. I'm kind of going in a certain direction, Chuck, so bear with me. So do we know like what that radar station cost to maintain and operate?

MR. VOKES: The cost of the radar station wasn't that significant. I would say it was under \$5,000.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Because I have no idea what a monitoring station would cost of -

MR. VOKES: That particular one was a simple station. Part of the issue with that part of the canyon is that it is really wide and the water can choose to go down a number of different points of the canyon. So to get it to go through say a flume as the other canyons would take some infrastructure modifications to direct it to those things. So we felt that the radar which just looks for motion in there was a good alternative.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: So what does it cost to maintain it? I imagine that there's -

MR. VOKES: Other than staff going out there and checking on it there's not really any -

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: There's no like software upgrades or -

MR. VOKES: No, no. It's just a signal that is broadcast to the diversion site and then up through our fiber. So it is a low cost. Even adding the flow monitoring I suspect that that was less than a few thousand dollars. It's a pretty simple technology. As Commissioner pointed we don't have samplers there that are triggered any longer. But I think the important thing for us is there flow going by there or not.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: So in July - and this is the last question, Mr. Chair, in July when you kind of bring us the report and I agree with you that we need to look for some autonomy because I think if we depend on, with all due respect, LANL there's not only the bureaucracy you have to go through but there's the whole finances and everything else. So I think the more we move towards that autonomy and I say that not only as a member of the Board but as a consumer of the water as well.

Do you anticipate that in July when you bring that report forward that there's going to be some sort of fiscal analysis about what it would cost to implement a totally

autonomist early detection system based on what the bear minimums are and I guess the extreme in the screening program? Do you anticipate to give us some of the costs and what it might take to do that?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair and Councilor, we will certainly look at that as part of that because, again, I think we absolutely need a functional, an absolutely functional station there and whatever that takes to do. And, again, part of that is the negotiation with the Pueblo for permissions to if we decide we need additional technology there, then we have to go through the Pueblo and receive that information because it is data that is streaming from their land.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: So, Mr. Chair, if it would be fair to maybe give some direction to staff. I don't anticipate to have a recommendation on that sort of system in July but to least have some baseline data to kind of start looking at. You know, what's it going to cost? What does it mean to the ratepayers? What does it mean to the partnering organizations? You know, what does E060 Buckman Direct Diversion-owned system cost and that sort of thing. I think that it is important that we start to move in that direction. Thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: I would agree.

MR. VOKES: Yes, yes, we will certainly bring that. Thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Mr. Vokes. Was that is Councilor Dominguez?

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Yes, thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, sir. We're going to go now to Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Quite a few of my questions might have actually been answered especially with this last agreement but to bring more information later. One thing I want to clarify, in the negotiations with San I, is that to put additional sampling there or to be able to have access to do sampling beyond just the flow that is being done by radar?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair and Commissioner, we would have to, again, notify them that we are seeking to do sampling there and get their permission. That would be in our permit to do. Anytime we visit the radar station we have to notify them that we're going up there to check it and do maintenance. That is part of the requirements. And, again, I feel like our relationship with San I like Los Alamos has taken a turn for the better. But I cannot predict whether we can upgrade the technology to what was there with camera and samplers.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I was just actually wondering if you think we need more sampling including water quality sampling or do you feel – I just want to get an idea of what level of something you were currently trying to pursue. I understand the negotiations are stilling going on.

MR. VOKES: Yes, certainly, Mr. Chair and Commissioner. It is my belief that the absolute most important thing is that we have that early notification. The complexity of the system and the understanding of the levels of contaminants and when they come down and when they don't, to me, that is useful information but having a clear understanding of that I don't know what that does for the BDD because it is my belief that we absolutely should not divert during those events. I think it is a question of public trust and even if we could demonstrate that the BDD takes out 100 percent all of the time,

again, I think simply the decision should be made and of course this is the Board decision that we don't divert and we continue to have some sort of surveillance program to understand is it continuing to look the same or is it changing. But the true understanding of those different flows, it's really expensive and really complex.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, do we have any more questions from the Board? Seeing none, we'll go and move on to the next item. Thank you, Mr. Vokes, for the overview.

9. 3rd Quarter Finance Report for Fiscal Year 2017

MS. ROMERO: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. We are pleased to present our 3rd quarter financial report. This report is to inform the Board and our partners on our financial position in current and future costs. So if you go to page 3 of your packet I will briefly go over the report and then I'll see if you have any questions.

In our report we have our budget, which is our budget overview. The first column includes our adopted budget and any approved adjustments. The next columns are our expenditures through the 3rd quarter. Then we have our projected expenditures and total projected available budget balance. And I'll go ahead and highlight some of the line items as we're projected to spend about 90 percent of our budget. So in our salaries and benefits category we are projected to spend 86 percent of our budget with six vacancies. In our chemicals and solids, you see that there is a projected shortfall in those categories so we do intend to come back to the Board next month and request a budget amendment resolution to go ahead and add funds to those line items so that we can continue with the chemicals and solids as needed.

The next category is our materials and supplies. We are projected to spend about 90 percent of our budget. As you can see from the column under projected encumbrances we still have about \$404,000 of encumbrances that need to get expended between now and the end of the fiscal year. So I did want to break that out for the Board so you can see how we're going to reach that goal. So we have about \$80,000 of that that is for parts, new equipment and supplies that have been ordered and are arriving and will be paid by the end of the fiscal year. We have about \$170,000 in projects such as the LED project, the security project and those projects are getting started and will be completed by June 30th. I have about \$150,000 of on-call contracts; contracts such as Alpha Southwest, we have an AEG contract for HVAC maintenance, so work orders have been issued and maintenance is projecting that they're probably going to spend \$100,000 worth of on-call contracts just getting things done and projects completed around the plant. We do feel confident about meeting the 90 percent goal there.

Our next line item is other operating costs. We are projected to spend about 96 percent of our operating budget. That particular line item includes professional service contracts, all of our benefits assessments, operating supplies and as you can see it's pretty close to our 3rd quarter expenditures which we've already incurred.

I did separate our litigation costs this time. It is separate from our other operating costs category. That was a \$1.1 million budgeted line item. We've spent about \$177,000 from that contract and we have about \$900,000 remaining in that contract. That leads us to projecting that we will spend about 90 percent of our budget.

The next section in my report is our billings and I know last meeting it was reported that BDD was behind in the billings and we are happy to say that we are now caught up through December. So bills from July to December for fixed variable cost and pre-bill for project wide have been submitted to our partners and we have been starting to receive some cash flow from those bills. We have about \$1.6 million of our 3rd quarter expenditures that still need to be billed. I'm projecting that those will be completed by the end of the month. Are there any questions about our operations? Then I'll move onto our other funds.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Councilor Dominguez.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mackie, very much for giving us the percentages. It's something that at least for me it helps. But one other request if it's possible.

MS. ROMERO: Sure.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: The salary and benefits, is there a way to separate those two and get the numbers on those?

MS. ROMERO: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, yes, in the future I will separate salaries from our benefits.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: It is probably something similar to what the City – since they're technically City employees, correct – so the –

MS. ROMERO: That is correct.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: So the benefit package is the same. So, I'd like to see that, Mr. Chair, if we can just to get a clearer picture.

MS. ROMERO: Absolutely. In the future I'll make sure to break that out.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, do we have any other questions from the Board?

MS. ROMERO: Okay, then I'll just briefly go over our next page which is page number four which is the other funds. Here, again, the report just shows our major repair and replacement fund which has the yearly contribution of \$411,000. I did show our cash balances and I do also have a budget overview for major repair and replacement fund. Again, these are funds that were authorized by the Board for expenditures. It does include our on call engineering contract, the replacement of our VFDs and our pump purchase. So of the almost \$1.2 million that was authorized by the Board we've spend a little bit over \$300,000 and we have about \$881,000 still encumbered to get those purchases in and projects completed.

If there's any more questions, that's the end of my report.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Do we have any more questions from the Board? No, okay, thank you, Mackie.

MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

CHAIR ROYBAL: Is there anyone from the public here today that would like to address the Board? Is there anyone would like to address the Board? Seeing none, we're going to close matters from the public and move on.

SEC CLERK RECORDED 55/24/2017

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

CHAIR ROYBAL: I have something I would like to read into the record: I will state for the record and our minutes that the only matter discussed during the executive session from our last Board meeting on April 6, 2107, was the matters as stated in the motion to go into executive session and no action was taken.

And that's all I have. Is there anything else from the Board?

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, June 1, 2016 @ 4:15 pm

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NANCY LONG (BDD Board Counsel): Mr. Chair, if we could do a motion to adjourn and to go into executive session for the purpose stated on the agenda and then take a roll call vote.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay. Do I have a motion.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: So moved.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Second.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Any discussion? Then we'll call roll.


The motion to adjourn and meeting in closed session in accordance with the New Mexico Open Meeting Act NMSA 1978, § 10-15-1 (H)(7), the motion to discuss threatened or pending litigation in which the BDDDB is, or may become a participant, including without limitation: discussion regarding the diversion structure passed by unanimous [5-0] roll call vote as follows:

Chair Roybal	Aye
Councilor Dominguez	Aye
Councilor Ives	Aye
Commissioner Hamilton	Aye
Board Member Helms	Aye

ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda, Chair Roybal declared this meeting adjourned at approximately 5:15 p.m.

Approved by:


Henry Roybal, Board Chair

Respectfully submitted:


Karen Farrell, Wordswork

FILED BY:


GERALDINE SALAZAR
SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK

ATTEST TO:


YOLANDA Y. VIGIL
SANTA FE CITY CLERK



ATTEST:


GERALDINE SALAZAR
COUNTY CLERK

COUNTY OF SANTA FE)
STATE OF NEW MEXICO) ss

BUCKMAN DIRECT DIV MIN
PAGES: 15

I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for
Record On The 24TH Day Of August, 2017 at 11:30:53 AM
And Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 1834493
Of The Records Of Santa Fe County

Witness My Hand And Seal Of Office
Geraldine Salazar
Deputy  County Clerk, Santa Fe, NM





Buckman Direct Diversion

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 4-26-17 TIME 1:30pm

REMOVED BY Heather A. Dorn

RECEIVED BY Chanelene Spears

EXHIBIT
1

AGENDA

The City of Santa Fe And Santa Fe County

Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2017

4:15 PM

**COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
SF COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
102 GRANT AVENUE**

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 6, 2017
BUCKMAN DIRECT DIVERSION BOARD MEETING
5. REPORT ON MAY 2, 2017 FISCAL SERVICES AUDIT
COMMITTEE (FSAC)

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

6. Monthly Update on BDD operations. (Michael Dozier)
7. Report from the Executive Director. (Charles Vokes) **VERBAL**
8. Overview of the BDD Raw Water Quality Surveillance Programs.
(Chuck Vokes & Daniela Bowman)
9. 3rd Quarter Finance Report for Fiscal Year 2017. (Mackie Romero)

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, June 1, 2017 @ 4:15pm

ADJOURN

Executive Session

In accordance with the New Mexico Open Meetings Act NMSA 1978, §10-15-1(H)(7), discussion regarding threatened or pending litigation in which the BDDDB is, or may become a participant, including without limitation: Discussion regarding Diversion Structure issues. (Nancy R. Long)

End of Executive Session

**PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES IN NEED OF ACCOMODATIONS,
CONTACT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE AT 505-955-6520, FIVE (5)
WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING DATE**