

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

April 5, 2018

1. This meeting of the Santa Fe County/City Buckman Direct Diversion Board meeting was called to order by Commissioner Henry Roybal, Chair, at approximately 4:20 p.m. the City Council Chambers, 200 Lincoln, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

2. Roll was called and a quorum was present with the following members present:

BDD Board Members Present:

Commissioner Henry Roybal, Chair
Councilor Michael Harris
Ms. Denise Fort, Citizen Member
Commissioner Anna Hamilton
Councilor JoAnne Vigil Coppler [City alternate]

Member(s) Absent:

Councilor Peter Ives

Mr. Tom Egelhoff [non-voting]

BDD Board Alternate Members Present:

Mr. J.C. Helms [Citizen Alternate]
Ginny Selvin [Las Campanas non-voting alternate]

Others Present:

Charles Vokes, BDD Facilities Manager
Nancy Long, BDD Board Counsel
Kyle Harwood, BDD Counsel
Mackie Romero, BDD Financial Manager
Bernardine Padilla, BDD Public Relations Coordinator
Debra Harris-Garmendia, BDD Fiscal Administrator
Michael Kelley, County Public Works
Rick Carpenter, City Water Resource Department
Cheryl Vokes, Citizen
Bruce Frederick, County Attorney
Daniela Bowman, BDD
Nick Schiavo, City Water Division
Michael Dozier, BDD
Joni Arends, CCNS
Alan G. Hook, City Water Division

3. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Hamilton moved to approve the agenda as published. Councilor Vigil Coppler seconded and the motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

No items.

5. Approval of Minutes: March 1, 2018

Councilor Harris moved to approve. His motion was seconded by Ms. Fort and passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

6. Monthly Update on BDD Operations

Operations Superintendent Michael Dozier's microphone was not working for the first part of his report. He offered the following information: The BDD diversions and deliveries have averaged in MGD as follows: raw water diversion, 3.33 MGD average; drinking water deliveries through Booster Station 4A/5A, 2.73 MGD average; raw water delivery to Las Campanas at BS2A, 0.040 MGD average; and onsite treated and non-treated water storage, 0.20 MGD average. The BDD is providing approximately 45 percent of the March water supply to the City and County.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Do we have questions from the Board? Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Thank you, Chair. With such a significance difference in the March graph, the March numbers, do you have any kind of thoughts or explanation of what that may be?

MR. DOZIER: The March numbers this March there was some construction going on that our 4A pump station was not pumping for about two weeks of that month. They are putting in a dual pipeline from Booster 4 to the 10 million gallon tank so we were not able to run out of the 4A pump station. With that and the average, it did drop it down substantially but it's back on line again already and as of today we're probably a little more around 65 percent.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Okay, all right. That's my question, thank you, sir.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: So where did the makeup water come from? Where did the difference come from?

MR. DOZIER: The difference? We did less water.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Pardon?

MR. DOZIER: We were making less water this March as on average since we began by not using the 4A pump station we were only using the 5A pump

station so pretty much all of the water we were running this month was going out of that pump station only instead of the difference between --

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: So we actually delivered and there was less demand as well?

MR. DOZIER: No, the demand was still there it was just being accomplished by other City pump stations.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: That's what I was asking, where that difference came from.

MR. DOZIER: Yes, the City pumping stations and the Canyon Road plant.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, and was that it Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Yes, thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Any other questions from the Board? Seeing none, we'll go ahead and move on. Thank you, Mr. Dozier.

7. 2017 Municipal Reservoir Storage Rio Grande Compact Accounting and 2018 Projected Santa Fe River Streamflow

ALAN HOOK (City Water Resource Coordinator Assistant): Your Honorable Chair and BDD Board members, my name is Alan Hook. I work for the City of Santa Fe's Water Division in Water Resources and Conservation.

This is just basically informational update on our reservoir storage and how that relates to the Rio Grande Compact accounting from 2017 coming into 2018. I won't bore you with the details of the Rio Grande Compact accounting or all the graphics that's attached to this memo. The main thing I wanted to emphasize is that we went into 2018, the beginning of this year, with about 48 percent storage at our municipal reservoirs. But as you know, this year was a horrible year for our snowpack so we're not getting the same yield we normally would. I included the March forecast for the Santa Fe River. It showed about 26 percent of the 30 year average. That 30 year average runs from 1981 through 2010. So, again, it was a bad year for the snowpack and it's going to be a bad year for the streamflow yield. We just got the April 1st streamflow forecast for the Santa Fe River, it dropped to 17 percent of the 30 year average.

But no need to panic; we did have carryover storage. That's what the graphic shows for you. That third part on page 7 was just sort of our forecast to see what would the Santa Fe River look like. That's the orange line going all the way through July. We compared that to average years, that's the larger graph, which you see peaking in May and then as compared to 2006. So 2006 was another year we had a horrible snowpack. That's kind of the blue or teal line at the very bottom. We were barely getting 1 to 2 cfs coming out of our watershed at that time. We're doing a little better than that this year, we're doing 2 to 5 cfs. But the hope is that if you look at that second half of the 2006 hydrograph you'll see that there were some big monsoon events with streamflow. We are hoping that this year we could have a good average monsoon event and we actually begin to store more in municipal reservoirs. And with that, I stand for any questions.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, do we have any questions from the Board?
Member Fort.

MEMBER FORT: I wanted to ask about the Living River Ordinance and how that operates this year and the second part of my question is that the County has engaged in a big project extending the bike paths and actually doing plantings in the river channel, which as a gardener I wouldn't be planting now, do you have any idea how water will be provided for what has been done along the river restoration projects both the City and County ones?

MR. HOOK: Yes, Honorable Chair, Board Member Fort, so I do. I work on the hydrograph on the Living River initiative along with Melissa McDonald, she's our watershed coordinator, so this year would count as a critical year hydrograph type of living river. So the bypass flows out of the reservoirs would only equal 300 acre-feet as compared to an average year should be 1,000 acre-feet. So it's going to be a trickle flow out of the reservoirs about .15 cfs until we have a peak bypass about the third week of May and that's probably only going to be 5 maybe max 6 cfs. I believe the project manager Scott Kaseman and asked about that: do we get enough flow through that river trail area to supplement some of those plantings? That flow of 5 cfs would be about one week's period and then we would go back to .15 because we have to carry that 300 acre-feet from April 15, 2018 through April 14, 2019. So there's not going to be a lot of water but we are hoping that will supplement that project's planting for this year. At least get them into the monsoon season so that they can take root and make it through the rest of the summer.

MEMBER FORT: It sounds like the remainder of my question should be directed to my County Commissioners then.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Member Fort. Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Thank you, Chair. So, Mr. Hook, in your presentation here there are two big ifs and it is associated with the storage – you know, the benchmark at Elephant Butte. Where does the storage stand now for capacity and what would that mean for the coming year and particularly how it applies to our situation?

MR. HOOK: Thank you, Honorable Chair, Councilor Harris, so right now we've been informed by OSE that we're still out of Article 7 and that's probably going to continue until about June. I don't think this year it is actually going to affect us especially the BDD project. But it will probably have an effect as Elephant Butte drops under that 400,000 acre-feet into next year. So there's sort of a lag time on the San Juan-Chama project and the stakeholders to where when you have a bad year it may not affect you during that year it's usually going into the following year.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Okay.

MR. HOOK: So this sort of leads into the next subject on our presentation for the City; what are we doing if we don't have Canyon Road necessarily our storage that we're utilizing as much, we'll probably be using, and we are, some of the City wells and the BDD this year, would maybe next year or during the middle of the summer if we can't utilize BDD what sources are we going to. So that's a good segue.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, any other questions from the Board? Thank you, sir, appreciate it, Mr. Hook.

8. 201 City of Santa Fe Water Operations Projections

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, thank you, sir.

MR. SCHIAVO: Nick Schiavo, City of Santa Fe, Source of Water Supply Manager. So, no mystery, it has been a dry year. We haven't received the precipitation and with that there are two challenges. One, without much precipitation we've seen demand go up. So we're going to probably end up with a higher demand for 2018 than we have seen over the last four or five years. As a matter of fact, we've already seen March go up year over year, probably about 20 percent. The second challenge is that without that snowpack, without precipitation, we are not going to be able to rely as heavily on our renewable sources; the Canyon Road water treatment plant, the reservoirs and, of course, the Buckman Direct Diversion. So I want to walk you through a few scenarios. The first is that we're anticipating, we're projecting a 10,000 acre-foot demand for this year in contrast, last year it was 8,626 acre-feet so it's about a 16 percent increase. And, no mystery, it's hot and people have already started to irrigate and that's why we're projecting a higher demand. Our intention is always to use surface water first, again, it's our renewable source. But this year it will probably go a little bit differently. We're actually going to end up using or being able to fulfill that 10,000 acre-feet with about 55 percent of it or 5,500 acre-feet coming from groundwater. Which, once again, is a real departure from where we've been over the last seven years. If you look at last year and some of the previous years, it's only been about 15 percent so it's more than triple the amount of water that will be coming from groundwater sources – and it could start to snow and these are just our projections.

The good news is that we have been resting our wells and we do have sufficient groundwater storage. Again, because we haven't been using our wells as much as we had prior to bringing the Buckman Direct Diversion on line, we've spent probably the last month and a half, exercising wells that we have to make sure that we can count on them for what's coming up. Examining how we would be able to – how the transmission will go from those well sites into the system and so far so good. The good news is that the wells are performing very well and we shouldn't have any issues meeting demand this year even with this greater increase in what we've seen over the last few years.

So the scenarios are in your packet or in the memo I should say. The first one is on page 2 and it's not as much of a scenario as much as it just what was used last year. So quickly, if you start from the bottom, the blue, that was actually what was coming from the Santa Fe River or from the Canyon Road Water Treatment Plant. The next one up is the Buckman Direct Diversion and then our City wellfields and you really can see how that contrasts to the other two sources, St. Mike's well and then the Buckman wellfield. The thin green line at the top is just the total demand. So we're projecting again for this year is 10,000 acre-feet about 16 percent more than we used last year and how we will get there is actually on page – and you can tell I've already switched to Andrew's because it's a little less smooth here – but on page 4, is the first scenario. You'll see again from the bottom up, Santa Fe River we're projecting at about 1.4, 1.35 million gallons per day that would be good through the month of September and possibly a little bit of October. We will depend on the Buckman Direct Diversion and the next one up is the purple, the City wells, and then you can see to hit that peak demand that

starts in early May and then settles down in September, end of October, we're going to be using the Buckman Wellfield.

The next scenario down is if we're not able to flow water down the Rio Grande. So as you know the City has over 17,000 acre-feet of water between the reservoirs in southern Colorado and northern New Mexico. So there's more than enough water to meet our demand. The challenge is going to be the carriage water. So this scenario assumes that – or one of either the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Authority or the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District won't be moving water. So if they're not flowing water down we won't have sufficient carriage water. If we try to flow water on our own without those two entities or without one of those entities we would likely lose 75 to 85 percent of what we put in the river. So if they do shutdown and – we are projecting again, and it's hard to say for sure, is that shutdown could happen at the end of June/ beginning of July and may not pick up until the end of monsoons, the end of September. But the takeaway, what I want to leave you with, of course, is that we do have the well, we do have the water in storage to handle that demand.

Let's see if there are any other points I want to go through before – I guess just one other piece of that is that the least expensive source of supply for the City and the County is the water from the Canyon Road Water Treatment Plant. It's just because it's gravity fed and it's a minimal input. The next one up is actually the City wellfield and without going too much into water rights and offsets, that is the least expensive with respect to water rights and offsets. Obviously, the Buckman Wellfield, well, not obviously, but the Buckman Wellfield pays a much larger penalty when we pump from that wellfield. In some cases, we have to pay back those offsets or payback the pumping that we've done over a period of 10 to 15 years to make up for that. So with that I'll stand for any questions.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Do we have any questions? Member Fort.

MEMBER FORT: There's obviously a lot of coordination with the City of Albuquerque, they're the big dogs, I assume, in the decision of when to take the San Juan-Chama and do you agree with their rationale about the likely months in which they might curtail that use?

MR. SCHIAVO: I just haven't been working that much with the City of Albuquerque. But to your point as far as coordination, absolutely. We will be on the phone with them weekly to make sure that we don't miss a chance to run water down the Rio Grande with them. I don't know – this probably would have been better for Andrew or Bill Schneider to field as far as what they're thinking.

MEMBER FORT: It surprised me that it would be at the period of – if we were to have monsoons that they would not take it. Is that because of turbidity?

MR. SCHIAVO: I don't want to guess –

MEMBER FORT: Okay, thank you. I probably have more questions, thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Member Fort. We're going to go to Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Thank you, Chair. Mr. Schiavo, sorry – this has been talked about for awhile just letting our wellfields rest and so it seems as though that strategy is going to work at least for a year's time. So 5,500 acre-feet, what kind of estimate does the Water Division have in terms of groundwater capacity or groundwater

— storage is not necessarily the right word — but how much groundwater is estimated in the various wellfields?

MR. SCHIAVO: Chair, Councilor, I don't know the volume off the top of my head. I do know that you can see on the pages that we've actually taken a look at the tables and taken a look at what the wells are able to produce, how many gallons per minutes, we'll be able to meet this demand. I understand the question that you're asking. I just don't know off the top of my head what kind of volume we have in storage.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Okay. I would think that at some point a study had been done whether it was internal or whether a consulting engineer and perhaps if you could ask staff just to see what kind of numbers have been assumed I think would be interesting information.

MR. SCHIAVO: Absolutely.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: It's just a subsidiary question to that because volume might be a slightly different estimate than what the estimated drawdown would be during the pumping so maybe — feet of drawdown.

MR. SCHIAVO: So, Chair, Commissioner, the drawdown is dependent on which wells we're using. As an example, well 1 in the Buckman wellfield has actually gone artesian so because it hasn't been pumped in so long it is now overflowing so we've been pumping it once a month. That's the extreme case. And I don't know about the City wells but it is very variable about what kind of drawdown we would see. I didn't go into the detail but the table in there shows that it is our intention not to pump every well at the same time. As a matter of fact to pump them for a period of either a month or two months and then rest them for one month to make sure that we're not doing any permanent damage.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Commissioner Hamilton. Are there any other questions from the Board. Member Helms.

Member Helms speaking away from a microphone asked about Albuquerque and what type of carriage cost and carriage losses might be expected.

MR. SCHIAVO: It's just the volume. They take 10 times what we take. So the carriage losses are minimal when we piggyback on them but if we're not running any water what we would need for demand down the river in a given month we will lose 75 percent to 80 percent because we'll some — because you'll have a relatively dry riverbed that's where we'll end up not to mention it's my understanding that there's some creative off takes that aren't legal along the way that we'd be penalized —

CHAIR ROYBAL: Is that it, Member Helms? Thank you, sir. Any other question from the Board.

MEMBER FORT: Mr. Chair, I'm not sure, if we could be reminded what cfs Buckman closes off with respect to operations.

CHARLES VOKES (BDD Facilities Manager): Mr. Chairman, Member Fort, I believe the number is around 300 when we start getting concerned about that.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Member Fort. Any other questions from the Board? Okay, seeing none we'll move on to the next item. Thank you, Mr. Schiavo.

9. Update on Raw Water Lift Station Modifications for Vibration Issues

MR. VOKES: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. I have included – I'll have to get used to the new sound system. I have included a memo of explanation as part of our on-call contract with Deere & Ault Consultants. One of the task orders, number 4, is a review of the raw water lift station looking at the refurbishment of the pumps included in this task order is vibration testing and then plans to mitigate that vibration. We have received the initial proposed plans which are on the next page which consists of putting two braces from the pump stand over to the mezzanine, the concrete mezzanine that exist in the pump station. This work is all being coordinated between Deere & Ault and a vibration engineer and so it's pretty simple work. The BDD staff has the capacity to do the installation of these pump stands. One of the things we're attempting to do is before we get the refurbished pumps 2 and 3 back from Alpha Southwest is have these braces in place, that way when we start the pumps we will immediately be able to verify that this indeed has dampened the vibration issues with the pump stands.

A side note is that we've been contacted by some engineers with Morris Pumps. They are the manufacturers of the original pumps and they are very interested in helping us now with our issues that we have been having. It was my understanding that they were going to meet with Deere & Ault, I believe this week, and compare notes. They want to make 100 percent sure that their pumps are performing the way that they're designed to perform. So that's also very encouraging news. I have not heard back from Deere & Ault what the results of that meeting are but I can bring that back to the Board if you'd like. So I'll stand to answer any questions at this point.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Do we have questions from the Board? Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Thank you, Chair. I'm glad to see – well, in reviewing the minutes I was reminded I asked about this last month. So I'm glad to see we have a design. So a couple of questions. Did you receive the email that is sent? I sent it very late in the day. This has to do with just contact information with a company called J.D. Inspections. And I don't know, do you permit the work like this, such as this, Mr. Vokes? Does the City typically permit this repair work?

MR. VOKES: No.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: We're probably okay but at any rate Chapter 17 of the UBC, when you have this type of work and I'm looking at the notes so there's various ASTM standards, certifications and I'm going to ask that you contact J.D. Inspections. This is a company out of Albuquerque that really provides the inspections on all of the work associated with the notes that you have here. And I think it's a very important step. I know that my company has used them several times over when we work on behalf of the Opera and other places like that and they will work with people. They are very responsive in terms of timeliness but I know you have a lot of confidence in our own staff but this is not their day to day job either. And so I want to make sure that any work that we do is inspected and meets the standards that are noted here. Okay. So I think that if you don't have that information let me know. But I think I just forwarded it out of their website, their contact information.

MR. VOKES: Certainly, Councilor, we will look into that. My expectation is also that Deere & Ault is supposed to be here to perform some other work in the next two or three weeks and they're going to meet with staff and of course then once their work is complete they will be onsite to oversee the vibration testing. But I will certainly contact these --

COUNCILOR HARRIS: That's all well and good but that's not a consulting engineer's job. Quite frankly, when you have a project like this you have engineers, consulting engineers, structural -- and so they put the requirements, the specifications in place but it really, to be in compliance, when you talk to them about the special inspections found in Chapter 17 of the UBC, the Uniform Building Code, they should understand what I'm talking about and they will also understand the importance of having this work done and documented, okay.

MR. VOKES: Certainly.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: And J.D. Inspections, it's a guy named Jesse Sparrow. It's a small outfit but they're very responsive, very good. It's not terribly expensive and I think it will provide a level of insurance for all parties including this Board.

MR. VOKES: Certainly.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Councilor Harris. Commissioner Hamilton, did you have a question?

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Yeah, I did. And can I ask just a clarifying question?

CHAIR ROYBAL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: That's a good idea to review these vibrational -- the correction for the vibration, the design of the mounts.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: No, they're not engineers. They're certified inspectors. So they will inspect the wells. They will inspect the torque on the bolts and they will verify that -- so for instance, it's very specific in what it is called out for in terms of size of diameter for instance on the hilti kwik bolts. So they'll verify all of that. They'll look at the work and they will write reports. They'll have a nonconformance category if something needs to be corrected and it shows up ongoing and so until it's corrected it is nonconforming.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: That's great. So they would come in and do the inspection after the work is actually done.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: During the work, actually. During the work.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Right, right, of course. Right. Okay, is it the kind of thing that we're required to put out to bid?

COUNCILOR HARRIS: It's a small amount of money and I think that under your own authority, procurement authority, I mean I'd be -- this is a small job and it really is a function of how many times they have to come back but certainly \$5,000 would be a high estimate in my opinion.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Okay.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: And given the expense of everything and the length of everything that has been done and Deere & Ault will understand and they'll appreciate this as well. Okay, as well as Morris Pump.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I was also going to ask, if Morris Pump – are they the company that we're getting the replacement and refurbished pumps from as well?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner, Morris Pump was the original manufacturer of just the raw water lift station pumps. The new pumps that are being built, that have been built, are from Simflo, a different manufacturer.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: So Morris Pump, it's very – it actually seems beneficial that they're wanting to come in and work with the guys who developed the vibration –

MR. VOKES: Deere & Ault.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Deere & Ault, these vibration corrections but the pumps that are now going to be mounted on these new stands are going to be completely different; is that true? So is there a little gap here between the way, you know, the other pumps performed where we had the original vibration problems and what – is that a material difference to the design of this vibration correction?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair and Board member, the current work that is being done on the pumps. We're replacing pieces of the original pumps. We have done some small modifications to the pump stands and this will continue those modifications to the pump stands to settle down the vibration issues that we've found. Again, we've talked about some of the original work orders from when the pumps were first installed and there were some vibration issues and we continue to see the effects of those vibration issues over time. But, again, these are the same pumps that we've always had. We are just replacing components of those pumps and as a result of the vibration tests we've run, we've seen some areas of vibration as the pump runs it through certain rpm(s) and that's what these stands are supposed to do is dampen that vibration which is breaking supports and damaged pipes and other things.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: So I think to clarify for myself so I apologize for us having to ask the question. But last month we approved – there are two pumps that are out and are being refurbished. So those are going to still be largely the same ones and Morris is coming in and their technical input will be valuable. But didn't we approve replacement of one pump or just refurbishment of a third pump? So, that's my question. So if that replacement is from a different company is the same fix going to work in both cases or am I confused?

MR. VOKES: What we're looking at is we have five pumps at raw water lift station. One of them has already been refurbished and is in service. We have taken number 2 and 3 out and they're with Alpha Southwest who is our pump contractor and they are refurbishing those. Morris has also met with that company. The engineering oversight for doing the repairs, making sure that Alpha is doing the right things and that we're doing the right things is part of Deere & Ault's task order. So once we have 2 and 3 in, the vibration issues we're seeing numbers 4 and 5 will have to come out and have similar repairs done. So that's what we're doing. We're repairing those four pumps, essentially putting in new seals and new bearings and those type things in those existing pumps and they're also looking at the motors and refurbishing anything that needs to be done in the motors. So once those are refurbished they're put back on the same stands and those stands will have these supports on them and once we start them up we'll have our vibration expert come and retest the pumps and make sure that that vibration has

gone away. Deere & Ault has an engineer that has looked at the vibrations and he's confident that this stand or these supports that we're putting on the stands will be dampen the vibration, those areas of vibration that we're seeing.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, do we have any other questions from the Board; Councilor? Okay, thank you, Mr. Vokes.

10. Report from the Facilities Manager

MR. VOKES: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. I don't really have a whole list of items. Normally in this report I've given you a vacancy report and currently the vacancy at the BDD stands at five positions. We've had a charge operator who has moved to California to be closer to his family so now we have two open charge positions. We have two what we call advance water treatment operator positions open and then one other position that is open. The AWT, advanced water treatment operators, the interviews for those positions should start next week. So we anticipate getting those filled. We've submitted the request to advertise for the charge position. I think that this week it just went into the HR Department. So we continue to work on those positions and it is our expectation that possibly these positions will be filled internally. We'll have lower level staff that will be able to move into these positions and then, of course, we'll have to turn around and grow some more. So other than that the plant is making a lot of water right now, as much as we can. Any questions from the Board?

CHAIR ROYBAL: Do we have any questions? Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Am I correct; does the Santa Fe Community College have a particular training program, certification program that provides some of the credentials and expertise that BDD is looking for?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair, Councilor, you are correct. In fact, I am actually participating in that training program with them. It is a small number of students. I would say that there's less than 10 in the program but the goal is, obviously, to provide that training and then allow those positions to fill both the Canyon Road and our positions.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Okay. Do we have as part of that program any kind of internship that is available through BDD that I think would be helpful for both parties.

MR. VOKES: Councilor Harris, we are looking into both the City and the County have internship programs that we could tie into and that's on our list of things to do, to try and establish – we've had some interns over the years but not like a permanent intern position. That would be my goal to somehow set up some permanent intern position so then, again, they're trained, ready to go and able to be hired and move up the chain.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Right. Particularly an internship program that is connected to the educational side, the academic side, that's being provided at the Community College I think could be really very good and gets people much better prepared than not. Either coming in cold as a straight intern or just coming out of the classroom and trying to go to a facility. So anyways I will be curious overtime how that can develop.

MR. VOKES: Councilor, let me just mention that also part of our pay bands that the operators have requires them to go to that training. So if they don't already have it, we have several staff members that are attending the courses right now so they can go through the pay bands and be prepared for those higher level positions.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Good. Okay, very good. Thank you, sir.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Member Fort.

MEMBER FORT: Mr. Vokes, could I ask about – as we think about the declining levels in the river, I'm assuming the Conservancy District is calling for water now, but wants the river running – how does this work in terms of your participation with the City of Albuquerque and other entities that are using the river? Are you a direct participant?

MR. VOKES: Member Fort, we are probably running in the 7 to 800 cubic feet per second. The water quality is extremely good right now which is nice. The design of the BDD is that the City and the County provide the water rights and their staff tracks the water rights, and so I know that the City has a group, Alan participates in that group, Rick Carpenter also meets with the Water Authority and the government officials I know on a monthly basis. So the tracking really is done by the City and the County and then they call the BDD and they say, We need this much water and we need you to use these water rights as the documentation for the water. So that's really how the existing system works. The BDD staff as a whole are not involved in those conversations. It is more the City and County staff.

MEMBER FORT: Mr. Chairman, a follow-up question. Have we ever been closed down for two or three months?

MR. VOKES: To my knowledge, no, we haven't. Other than the fire incidents that we've had, no, not for volumes.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: This may not be relevant but it's follow-on to Member Fort's question. It raises interesting things like we've had other technical issues having to do with periods of shutdown, that were design flaws, like the biofilters and whatnot. They were much shorter shutdowns than two or three months. So what special operations planning do you feel you have to do if we have, you know, no drought relief from monsoons and you have to shut down?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair and Commissioner Hamilton, we are looking at those preparations, the restoring of the biofilters and how we're going to do that. Staff has been working really hard, in fact, we've initiated a study to look at how the biofilters decline, what the time period is on the decline of those and most likely if we were to have a two to three month shutdown, then we would be looking at a two to three week startup of the biofilters by circulating water through the plant and getting them ready to go into full production.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I assume maybe you're looking at constant low-level recirculation to keep them primed or might that be too long a period of time to maintain that. One of the fixes you talked about was having that recirculation for the shorter period.

MR. VOKES: Yes, Commissioner. I think a two to three month period would cost a lot in electricity and staff time in trying to keep them alive. Biofilters have

been shown to be pretty robust as far as their recovery period. So two to three weeks is the normal recovery period. So that's what I would expect we would do.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Thank you.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Commissioner Hamilton. Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Thank you, Chair. So among the other things that we've talked about are the valves. I know that a couple of months ago, two to three months ago, you were very concerned if we had a situation with other valves similar to what happened in the one that locked open, I believe. And so there were some options that just were discussed conceptually and maybe we don't need to go into it right now but perhaps next month would be a good time to talk about – are we using a coffer dam, a more expensive solution? Are we using our existing coffer box? Again, how we're going to approach the valves. There were, again, some conceptual solutions discussed. You raised a red flag appropriately. I guess I would like to know if that red flag is still up and really what we're doing about it. But I don't need a full answer right now.

MR. VOKES: Okay. Well, I can give you a brief answer. We put the coffer box in this week to do some repairs to the diversion and also change out some of those valves with new valves. We are investigating other options but we are working on that and part of that did happen this week.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Okay, well, good. So you can give us a report because there is also the issue of access of being able to get to it without having to resort to a coffer box or worse than that, a coffer dam. Again, I'm glad to hear you're moving forward and let's talk more next month. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Councilor Harris. Any other questions from the Board?

DISCUSSION AND ACTION

11. BDD Raw Water Quality Discussion and Scheduling of a Possible Board Study Session including Topics and Participants to be Included

KYLE HARWOOD (BDD Counsel): Good evening, Board members. This is a continuing topic from the October Board meeting where we discussed sending NMED a letter concerning Rio Grande water quality questions that we had, and then we've reported out both in December and I believe again in February. We've had a continuing Board agenda item on this topic and at the February Board meeting there was a request from, I believe, several Board members to look into doing a study session, which would be a separately scheduled meeting outside of this time slot. There's been some discussion, I think among Board members and certainly among staff about how to set that up.

So just the topics I think we're looking for guidance from you on tonight, so we can proceed to set this up, is both a day and time of day, a location. Just on the day and time of day I think we've already looked at some calendars and we think we're into May sometime at the least to schedule this. Time of day, of course, is important, whether it's to be an evening meeting or something scheduled during 9:00 to 5:00 or 8:00 to 5:00 work hours. There's a question of what location. I know there's been at least one

comment that some of the spaces that we used for executive sessions may be too small and we might want to see if a room at the Convention Center is available. Again, these are just brainstorming thoughts for you to consider as you give us direction on how to do it. Three to four 15-minute presentations, perhaps.

We've talked about inviting the New Mexico Environment Department which would be followed in a 2 ½ hour study session, that would allow for about an hour of policy discussion to follow, and then potentially a half an hour of public comment at the end, to be shared amongst whatever members of the public attend. So again, that's not meant to be proscriptive; that's just sharing with you some of the thoughts we've had about how to do a study session. I think it's been a long time since the BDD has done a study session. We used them early on, 12 years ago, to deal with certain big-picture questions for the Board and I think this is also a big-picture question and hence the request for a study session.

I don't know how well I summarized that. I hope that helps, but we are looking for feedback from the Board members on how to put this session together.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Any suggestions from the Board. Member Fort, and then I'll go to Commissioner Hamilton.

MEMBER FORT: Sorry to be sitting to the right and so quick. I apologize to the other members.

I would just make – I'm agnostic on the questions of when, where and so on. I would say with respect to comments from the public that I would hope that we would have participation from citizens in the presentations, definitely interested groups would include CCNS, Amigos Bravos and conceivably other groups of which I'm not aware. So if we're looking at 15-minute presentations and so on I'm assuming we'd have a presentation from LANL, from the labs themselves, as well as the Environment Department.

But I'd like to talk a little bit about entities which do presentations. And then I would say that comments after we've had our policy discussions for me are not nearly as useful as comments before we have them. I don't know if it's possible for a study session to be so informal that we could actually have the Chair recognizing people and actually having stakeholders at the table with members of the Board and then have something close to a real conversation, but that would be more educational for me, rather than putting the comments off until afterwards. Thank you.

MR. HARWOOD: If I can just add to that a couple of other thoughts. The meeting would be noticed to be compliant with the Open Meetings Act. There would be no decisions listed on the agenda, consistent with study session format, and I think as far as how you wished to do, like air traffic control between all the participants, I think that there's a lot of flexibility there and Nancy and I can talk about any sideboards that we think are appropriate but I think it's fairly – fairly open as to how you want to set up a study session.

I would also say that if we do invite those three – if we invite these four groups and we have sort of a table setting by staff, BDD staff, that would be five groups right there. Perhaps we'd ask everyone to limit their comments to ten minutes. I know it's a complex issue but if people come prepared and they know what issues we'd like them to speak to, ten minutes of an uninterrupted presentation can cover a lot of material knowing that we have a discussion to follow.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: I have an opinion just on how it would be organized. You know, my concern would be, I mean so the various groups, the stakeholder groups oftentimes have a lot of history with either NMED or with the lab, and my concern would be that we would fall in the same old pattern if we just had kind of an open-ended discussion between the two. We would have point-counterpoint and I tend to – I tend to not track those discussions as well. I would be more I think, better informed if we could have a presentation by whomever NMED and then at some point also certainly have – I think it's a good idea to have focused presentations from CCNS or Amigos Bravos or whomever it may be, and then, I mean there obviously will be – I'm thinking about the session we had in Commission chambers. You know, there were other just members of the public who wanted to express their opinion, and they were not necessarily related to a formal group.

But that'd be my own, again, observation. I've been in a few sessions where it just is point-counterpoint by – I hesitate to use the word antagonists, but I'm going to use it, by old antagonists. So that's my thought.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Councilor Harris. Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: So I think one of the things we definitely want to do, and we've started that, but I want you to refresh my memory on how much we decided on what we want this study session for. It seems to me there were a few things discussed but I think we want to focus that enough that it actually drives what we're asking the people to present on, and so that we're getting the really most relevant inputs. So I think our discussions around having this study session had to do with – were they just general water quality issues? At some point we also went off into questioning, you know, development of new water quality standards for designated uses having to do with drinking water supply. What are you thinking – what are we thinking about now?

MR. HARWOOD: That's a great question. So in light of where we've been the last six months, I feel like part of the role of the study session might be – if this is what you want to accomplish, is just to make sure all the Board members, particularly since we have some new folks who've joined us recently, make sure that everyone has a chance to kind of understand the landscape of water quality regulations on the Rio Grande, so that we get a chance to understand, for example, that the BDD is not a regulator; it's a regulated entity, and the cleaner the water, the easier it is for Chuck to treat and produce. And just sort of review some of those base – obviously we don't need a study session to review those two things but there's a lot of other related stuff. And then we've touched upon presentations on NMED's regulatory structure, and I think a presentation from NMED – they've indicated that they're prepared and happy to come and speak to the Board. So that would be a chance to hear from them, not from me about their programs, but to hear from them about their programs.

When we start to mention advocacy groups, I feel like perhaps they can provide some insight in what role they've played over the decades in monitoring this issue and what they see as priorities going forward in general. They may also have specific suggestions for the Board. LANL, I suppose, could be asked to report on their programs. So the Board can get in one sort of focused session a complete picture. I don't have any

sense of where the policy discussion is going to go from there. And if there is a direction from the Board on more on that then that could help inform and focus the conversation but when I've been part of City-County study sessions in the past, for example when we set up the JPA that established this Board, it was a chance to present on how other water authorities around the country were structured, how they had cost-sharing provisions, how they had governance provisions, how they did cost accounting provisions. And so we would report on examples from elsewhere so that you the appointed and elected officials here could decide how you wanted to structure such a thing for the Santa Fe project.

So that's how we've used them in the past, a chance to focus on an area of topics and in those it was mostly staff. We did not invite advocacy groups. It was a set of staff presentations on all the ideas and the pros and cons of various ways of doing something, addressing some topic. So I don't know if that's helpful.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: It's helpful. You know, right off the – my first response to the, my first thought about that is if we're talking about trying to get everybody on the same page of what the regulatory structure around the Rio Grande and where the intake is and so – and how NMED implements Clean Water Act mandates having to do with, you know, water quality and what the different advocacy groups do in terms of trying to watch out – you know, what they've done historically. I'm not sure how that will contribute to informing decisions having to do with the way with either the LANL MOU, or how – how BDD wants to look at, you know, supporting the different kinds of sampling programs that are going on. I mean it's important for everybody to understand it for interpreting data, but do you guys envision, or does anybody else on the Board envision having for instance, LANL and then some of the advocacy groups, and NMED – because they all have data, present their data and what they think the current issues are?

Do we see NMED not just talking about the regulatory structure but what triggers they have seen in those areas, you know, that are relevant to BDD and upstream? That kind of thing, actual data-related history. What they see as the water quality problems and when things have been triggered and what regulations apply to that so it's a little bit content oriented as well as process oriented? Does that make sense also or am going too – because otherwise, I mean, frankly, some of those issues are what NMED is responsible for and what the advocacy groups are concerned about; right? So that kind of gets to the heart of some of the issues. Kyle, your response?

CHAIR ROYBAL: Kyle?

MR. HARWOOD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I thought it was going to be a longer response. Never mind. Sorry.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Kyle. Member Fort. Let me go to Councilor Harris and then I'll go to –

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: And I'm fishing partly, you know.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: I mean, just thinking about – and I'd actually marked up in reviewing the minutes so in an exchange between yourself, Mr., Harwood, and I, you know, what we talked about was a process, education process, to unpack the regulatory program that was already in place. And that's kind of where I was focused because it was really in response – and I actually have last month's agenda, Update on

the Rio Grande Quality Issues – and this was actually a good set of minutes, by the way. Appreciate it. It talked about there were no numeric standards for public water supply and then it had the whole non-supporting. So I mean we've had – we've had LANL present and DOE present on the chromium plume and kind of part and parcel of that and I know there's still questions on the monitoring stations. I've seen the recent email from Ms. Arends. But from me, if we have to prioritize, I'd like to see us really focus on the regulatory program and that side of things. I continue to be – I mean certainly the radionuclides that perhaps come out of the Los Alamos site, but I always have questions about the waste treatment facility in Española and what comes out of that site, and do we really not have standards – that we're not looking at some of those constituents?

So that's my own view and that's what I hope we can accomplish.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay. Thank you, Councilor Harris. Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Yes, just in response, I would – that makes sense, and I would support that and then I think like the presentations from other parties in addition to NMED should be perceived to be – constructed to be consistent with that.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Commissioner Hamilton. Kyle.

MR. HARWOOD: One approach would be to prepare a set of questions that we would ask all the presenters to answer.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: That's great.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Along with any advance material, I think is always helpful, so that would be great.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, so do we have any other questions from the Board? Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Not a question, but to go to the other details, I'm going to be at some science meetings the week of May 21st, that whole week, so I'm unavailable then. If that throws a complete wrench in all the other options, you know, I'm not the only member of the Board.

MR. HARWOOD: I think once we identify our invitees I was going to suggest that we do – unless this is unpalatable – that we actually do a Doodle Poll.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: That's a good idea.

MR. HARWOOD: So that everyone can kind of get into their calendars and figure out chunks that they're available and try to find something that works for everyone, and if it's a month out, hopefully people can defend it.

CHAIR ROYBAL: I agree with that. Is everybody else on the Board okay with that?

MR. HARWOOD: We do need to decide on the invitees. Are we – I think NMED is easy.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Top of the list.

MR. HARWOOD: Board members and staff. Then it's really the two advocacy groups that have been referenced and LANL itself, if that's –

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Yes, for myself, I think that's sufficient.

CHAIR ROYBAL: I'm fine with that as well. Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I wonder if Member Fort has an opinion on this, but with regard to the regulatory environment that we have to deal with, we've

talked about drinking water, your not have designated criteria for drinking water, and I would like to see some – a group in addition to NMED, because they have not implemented that sort of criteria. So maybe we can ask the people at NMED, like Shelly Lemon or whoever it is you're going to talk to at NMED, whether they feel that they are versed in that sort of thing. Otherwise we might consider somebody at like the Water Law – like your old group, or at UNM, or somebody who maybe has dabbled in this. I mean, we could get somebody from another state but then that's kind of a long way to go.

MR. HARWOOD: There are good resources at New Mexico Environmental Law Center.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Yes. That's what I was wondering. That would be my other suggestion.

MR. HARWOOD: The other thing is the history behind the non – the last of numeric standards for public water supply I think is actually going to be a fairly simple story once we have the NMED staff present that answer to you.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Oh, good. Okay.

MR. HARWOOD: So I think that's actually going to go down on the list of sort of glaring loose ends that we might ask be addressed once the context is – I'm not prepared to go into that today and I don't know we want to take any time today to go into it but I think that that's going to not be a – feel as much of a loose end after you hear the explanation around that.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Okay. Do you see any value of having somebody from the Law Center?

MR. HARWOOD: Yes, of course. They're real professionals. I'm trying to think exactly – I can reach out to them and report back.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Okay. Only if they contribute to the body of – you know, to the understanding of the regulatory – we want to bring everybody up to speed on.

MR. HARWOOD: They're very good across broad environmental law issues. I'm not sure they're going to be repetitive of Amigos Bravos, which is also a group of attorneys at an advocacy group that are focused on water quality. So that would be the only question. Not that they wouldn't be great additions or great speakers but we don't want to –

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: We don't want – I agree.

MR. HARWOOD: We don't want multiple speakers from a perspective.

MEMBER FORT: Mr. Chair.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Member Fort.

MEMBER FORT: I agree. I should say I don't have enough experience with study sessions. So Councilor Member Harris about how that proceeds is something I would defer to how that's done after the presentations. I do think we heard a presentation at the very end of our last meeting with concerns about the lack of a sampling section, a sampling device and I think that should be part of what we look at when we're looking at the questions of the intake water quality. So I just want to make sure that's on the agenda or on the meeting agenda.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay. So is that – is there any other comments from the Board? Is that enough direction, Kyle?

MR. HARWOOD: Just confirming that the Convention Center might be a good space and I believe those were the – and perhaps a public comment section is not necessary if we – or did you want to have a public comment section. I wasn't sure, Board Member Fort, whether you wanted a public comment section maybe after the presentations but before the Board's deliberation, or you didn't want one at all.

MEMBER FORT: Well, Mr. Chair, I'd like members of the public who have something to say to be given an opportunity while we're talking, but I'll defer to those who have chaired such meetings to ask how that would be done. So at the very least after the short presentations, but not at the very end would be my only comment.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: You know, I think this will be an informative discussion for all parties. I would think that members of the public would learn something just as we would, and that they –that would inform the comments that they may have. So, I'm kind of inclined to let the process, let the forum kind of work it's way through and then have public comment, but I'm open to suggestions. I'm not hard and fast on any of that. I do think, since I have the microphone, that we should try and meet in the afternoon, if we could.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I was just thinking.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: If other people have schedules. But I'm pretty flexible. I think people are fresh in the afternoon rather than try and do a full-on evening session.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: What kind of timeframe are you thinking about in the afternoon?

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Well, if we think it's overall three hours, did we say? Two to three hours; 2 to 5? Depending on what we look at for an agenda; 2 to 5 or 3 to 5, something like that?

CHAIR ROYBAL: Yes, 2 to 5 or 3 to 6, but I don't know if there's any other comments.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I mean, you know, splitting the difference makes it a little easier. I do have some flexibility, but 3:00 to 6:00 would be a little better.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: That's fine. I didn't want to start at 6:00, or yet another one at 5:00.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Not only am I with you, it's way harder to get NMED people here after hours.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Yes. Exactly.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: But if necessary, 2:00 or 2:30 to 5:00 is do-able.

MR. HARWOOD: And we would want minutes taken.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Absolutely. Okay. So are we okay now, Kyle? Do you have everything you need? Thank you, Mr. Harwood. Appreciate it.

12. Election of Chair and Vice Chair of the Buckman Direct Diversion Board

CHAIR ROYBAL: First of all, I would like to say that it has been honor chairing the last year. I do appreciate the opportunity. I'll go to Nancy.

NANCY LONG (BDD Board Counsel): Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. Every April the Board elects a chair and vice chair. Those positions rotate between the City and the County entities each year. So this year your chair will be a City Councilor and your vice chair will be a County Commissioner. So it is appropriate for you to take nominations and select your chair and vice chair.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Do we have nominations?

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Chair, if I may, I would like to nominate Councilor Ives to serve as chair. He has, I believe he has seniority. He definitely has seniority. So that's my nomination.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Second.

CHAIR ROYBAL: It wasn't just because he wasn't here, right? [laughter] Okay, we have a motion and a second. All those in favor.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote and Councilor Peter Ives was elected Chairman.

CHAIR ROYBAL: So we have a new chair, Councilor Peter Ives. Next we're going to go on to our vice chair. Do I hear a nomination for vice chair and this would be from Santa Fe County.

MEMBER FORT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to nominate Anna Hamilton as vice chair.

CHAIR ROYBAL: We have a nomination of Anna Hamilton.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Second.

CHAIR ROYBAL: We have a nomination and a second. All those in favor.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote and Commissioner Anna Hamilton was elected Vice Chair.

CHAIR ROYBAL: I'd like to say congratulations to our new Chair and Vice Chair. And once again, it has been an honor serving as a chair. Since Councilor Ives is not here, should I finish the rest of the meeting?

MS. LONG: You should finish the meeting, yes.

13. Appointment of Committee Members for the Fiscal Service Audit Committee (FSAC) of the Buckman Direct Diversion Board

MS. LONG: Mr. Chair and members of the Board, the Board has one committee, that's the Fiscal Services and Audit Committee and it meets prior to the Board meeting each month to consider fiscal and audit issues. The composition of the committee is appointed by the Board Chair so you can still do that. The current members are Commissioner Hamilton and Councilor Ives. The last time committee appointments were made was in 2016 so it would be appropriate at this time to appoint or reappoint committee members to the FSAC committee, as we call it. One member from each entity on this committee. Others attend the committee as well but the official committee members are just two comprising the City and County representatives.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, and who did you say was the City representative?

MS. LONG: At this time it is Councilor Ives.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, so I'll go ahead and appoint Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Thank you very much.

CHAIR ROYBAL: You're welcome.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: Thank you, I'll be happy to.

MS. LONG: And then for the County, we also would need an appointment or reappointment.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay. Commissioner Hamilton, do you want to stay on the FSAC?

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I'm happy to or I'm happy to give it over to you if you want to do it. So I find it to be very useful but I have absolutely no problem if you want to move into that.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Would it be appropriate for me to appointment myself?

MS. LONG: Yes, it would.

CHAIR ROYBAL: I'll go ahead and appoint myself but I'm going to ask that Commissioner Hamilton be my alternate.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: That's great.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you. Is there any other comments from the Board?

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

CHAIR ROYBAL: Is there anybody from the public that would like to address the Board? Please come down. Anybody else? So we have one. Can you state your name for the record, and address?

JONI ARENDS: Hi. Good evening. My name is Joni Arends and I am cofounder and executive director of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. We started 30 years ago to address community concerns about the proposed transportation of radioactive and hazardous waste from Los Alamos National Laboratory to the then proposed Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. We've been active in a number of issues and took the lead in terms of the advocacy groups with respect to the Buckman in 2002 when the National Environmental Policy Act process began, with regard to a draft scoping meeting and then the draft environmental impact statement.

I wanted to start – I've got seven different items and I'm going to go through them really quickly, from the simplest to the more complex. So first of all, I'd like thank – I've been in California, back and forth, for about five years taking care of my dad, so I'm just getting back into the Buckman work. So please forgive me if I'm not up on all of the details that have happened during this period of time. I did want to thank Stephanie Lopez and Bernardine for helping me come up to speed with the minutes.

My second point is in trying to come up to speed there's still unapproved minutes on the website from October and so coming up to speed, I didn't know if there had been changes on some of the minutes. Later minutes said that they were approved and so it's kind of – it's confusing, and I think it's important that whatever's happening with that

needs to get fixed. So there's October, December, February and well, you just approved the March minutes today. But it's six months worth of minutes that need to be brought up to speed.

And then with respect to my email that I sent as a result of preparing for this meeting and reading Ms. Bowman's comments, I'm going to be meeting with Kyle Harwood to talk about those things over the next couple of weeks. And I may have comments, further comments, for the May meeting.

With respect to the forum that you're planning, I think it's going to be important to film the presentations so that new members – it seems like there should be a packet or something for new members to come up to speed, because it's a very complicated history in terms of the regulatory part and I'm concerned that you're not talking about bringing EPA here to talk about the National Pollution Elimination Discharge System for putting the sand back into the river, because that seems to be a water quality issue as well, for those people that are downstream. So that permit is issued by the EPA and it may be up for renewal pretty soon as well.

And then also to talk about putting together a history book or a handbook for new members to be able to come up to speed on this complex history would be helpful I think.

Then I just wanted to give one piece of background. With regard to the radionuclide standards that are for this segment of the river, that was a result of Amigos Bravos, who was represented by the Western Environmental Law Center during the triennial review in 2006, where they brought Dr. Arjun Makhijani to Santa Fe to testify about why there needed to be protective standards for radionuclides in this segment of the river, and that's why those are there. So that's work by advocacy groups in a positive manner for protection of public health and safety.

And then my last point is that I wanted to let you know that in 1996, CCNS and Tewa Women United both asked for a public hearing on a groundwater discharge permit

—
COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I'm sorry. Could you repeat who? I just didn't hear.

MS. ARENDS: I'm sorry. So in 1996, CCNS and Tewa Women United asked for a public hearing with regard to a draft permit for the radioactive liquid waste treatment facility at LANL. That permit has now been scheduled for April 19th and 20th at Fuller Lodge in Los Alamos, and it may be of interest to the Buckman Board because that discharge is directly east of the Buckman. Directly east of the Buckman wells. And millions of gallons were discharged every month in the early days of this facility that began operations in 1963. It's never been regulated by the state and it may be something that you all are interested in and I'd be happy to send you a notice about that.

So those are my comments. If you have any questions or – I thank you very much for being here and I appreciate the quality of the questions that have been asked today.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Joni. Appreciate it. Is there any other comments from the public? So we'll go ahead and close public comments.

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

CHAIR ROYBAL: Is there any matters from the Board? Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I don't actually have a matter. I have a thought about at least one of the Joni's comments and the thing about filming the presentations. I don't know that would probably be not that easy to arrange if we were at the Convention Center but it would be very easy to achieve at the County Commission Chambers. Not that the – the County Commission Chambers are structured a little differently, maybe it's a little larger than this. But when we had, remember when we had the joint City-County meetings, you know, we didn't use the dais. We just set up like a fairly nice in the center – so that we were all level looking at each other and talking and then there is still audience and it's easy to film there. So we might consider that. It's just a thought. And the – you know the question of bringing someone from EPA. You know it's EPA Region 6 I assume, Dallas and that's – I don't know what the possibilities are. I mean if that's something that could be discussed I wonder about even Skyping somebody in because we do have the facilities to at least for calling in. I don't know about doing a presentation, you know, they can always email a presentation and do next slide, next slide, and so even if it's not remotely controlled it is still would function as a remote presentation.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: I think that's probably appropriate. I always am a little bit concerned over us not trying to put 10 pounds into a 5 pound deal – that we're overloading ourselves. If Mr. Harwood has comments on that I think I'd be interested to hear what he has to say.

MR. HARWOOD: Thank you. So in my mind and this may not be how you want to do it, we are not presenting on BDD Board permits. So the NPEDS permit that Joni referred to is the sediment return NPEDS permit. That is a whole other kettle of fish and it may be one that you all would like a briefing on. I think Ms. Bowman could perhaps, you know, we could do some kind of orientation for you about what that permit is and its renewal cycle. But I would suggest to the Board that in a two or three hour study session we are going to have our hands full talking about the regulatory that we operate in without getting into the many permits that we operate under.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: That was my concern.

MR. HARWOOD: If that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Totally. I think that makes sense and Councilor Harris's comment on having to keep a mindful eye for the content for time is really valid.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Okay, Councilor Harris.

COUNCILOR HARRIS: So I want to thank Ms. Arends for her comments on the unapproved minutes and if staff could follow up on that as well as some of the other comments. I just want to say, I think any type of material that could be put together for training, for background would be valuable. I know that it takes a while whether it is this board or the Commission or full Council, it just takes a while. So as time allows and to pull some things together – and there probably are available, I think would be great. And then if you would send through Mr. Vokes notice on the hearings at Fuller Lodge up on the hill I think that would be interesting as well, if it is possible to attend. I think that would be good. So thank you, Ms. Arends.

CHAIR ROYBAL: Thank you, Councilor Harris. Any other comments from the Board? We'll go ahead and close matters from the Board.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, May 3, 2018@ 4:15pm

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hamilton moved to adjourn. Councilor Harris seconded and having completed the agenda, Chair Roybal declared this meeting adjourned at approximately 5:55 p.m.

Approved by:

Board Chair

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Farrell, Wordswork

ATTEST TO:

GERALDINE SALAZAR
SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK