



Buckman Direct Diversion



AGENDA

**The City of Santa Fe
And
Santa Fe County**

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 3/25/15 TIME 9:35am

SERVED BY

RECEIVED BY *Shirley K. K...*

Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 2015

4:30 PM

CITY HALL

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

200 LINCOLN

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 5, 2015
BUCKMAN DIRECT DIVERSION BOARD MEETING
6. MATTERS FROM STAFF
7. REPORT ON MARCH 31, 2015 FISCAL SERVICES AUDIT
COMMITTEE

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

8. Update on the Diversion Structure inspection and repairs. (Charles Vokes)

CONSENT AGENDA

9. Monthly Update on BDD operations. (Mike Dozier)
10. Drought, Monsoon and Water Resource Management Update. (Rick Carpenter)
11. Request for approval of Amendment No. 4 to the Professional Services Agreement with GeoSystems Analysis, Inc. for the BDD Habitat Restoration Project for the amount of \$49,000.00 exclusive of NMGRT. (Rick Carpenter)
12. Request for approval of a Budget Adjustment to the FY 2014/2015 Operating Budget. (Mackie Romero)
13. Request for approval of procurement from Hach Company for equipment used to monitor Chlorine and pH for compliance purposes. (Michael Dozier)
14. Quarterly update on Environmental Compliance. (Daniela Bowman)

DISCUSSION AND ACTION

15. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair. (Nancy Long)

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, May 7, 2015

ADJOURN

**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.**

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

April 2, 2015

This meeting of the Santa Fe County/City Buckman Direct Diversion Board meeting was called to order by Councilor Joseph Maestas, Chair, at approximately 4:30 p.m. in the Santa Fe City Council Chambers, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Roll was called and the following members were present:

BDD Board Members Present:

Councilor Joseph Maestas, Chair
 Commissioner Liz Stefanics
 Ms. Consuelo Bokum
 Commissioner Miguel Chavez
 Councilor Carmichael Dominguez

Member(s) Excused:

None

Others Present:

Nancy Long, BDD Board Consulting Attorney
 Charles Vokes, BDD Facility Manager
 Stephanie Lopez, BDD Staff Liaison
 Mackie Romero, BDD Finance Manager
 Bernadine R. Padilla, BDD Staff
 Erminia Baca, BDD Staff
 Michael Dozier, BDD Staff
 Daniela Bowman, BDD Staff
 Carole Jaramillo, County Finance Director
 Allan Hook, City Staff
 Sandra Ely, County Staff
 Todd Caplan, GO System
 Bryan Armstrong, BCC
 Rick Ulibarri, LANL
 Jim Steele, CDM Smith

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

[Exhibit 1: Agenda]

CHAIR MAESTAS: Are there any changes from staff on the agenda? Any changes at all?

CHARLES VOKES (Facilities Manager): No, no changes from staff.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay. What's the pleasure of the Board?

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: I'll move for approval.

MR. VOKES: I'm sorry, sir. We did not have a FSAC meeting so take number seven off.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay, and I'm sure that's a friendly amendment.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Yes.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Any discussion on the motion?

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

CHAIR MAESTAS: Are there any changes from staff regarding the Consent Agenda?

MR. VOKES: No changes, sir.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay. Any changes from the Board? Do you wish to pull any items from the Consent Agenda? If not --

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: I'll so move.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Second.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Any discussion on the motion?

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 5, 2015

CHAIR MAESTAS: Are there any changes to the minutes from staff, any corrections?

MR. VOKES: No corrections, sir.

CHAIR MAESTAS: No corrections, okay. Members of the Board, what's your pleasure?

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: I'll move for approval.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Second.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay, we have a motion and a second to approve the minutes of the March 5th meeting. Any discussion on the motion?

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

6. MATTERS FROM STAFF

CHAIR MAESTAS: Any Matters from Staff?

MR. VOKES: Yes, Mr. Chair, and members of the Board. Mackie Romero has a couple of items she'd like to share with you.

MACKIE ROMERO (BCC Finance Manager): Mr. Chair, members of the Board, I just wanted to give the Board an update on the audit of BDD operations.

On March 11th an entrance conference was held with Accounting and Consultant Group. We are currently waiting for a revised engagement letter. This letter will detail timelines and prepared by client listing. I talked to the auditor today and we should receive this by tomorrow and they are anticipating preliminary work to begin sometime next week.

I will continue to provide updates to the partners and to the Board. Do you have any questions?

CHAIR MAESTAS: Any questions for Ms. Romero?

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for your work on this. My question and I had spoken to the director about this as well, is the timing of this audit going to put us behind so that we will not be eligible for some grants and some government funding because we are behind?

MS. ROMERO: Commissioner Stefanics, members of the Board, it should not because BDD is not technically a govern – a legal entity. We are still part of the City and given that the City audit is on time we would typically get grants and loans through either the City or the County and then it would be passed through BDD. So it should not affect that.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Thank you for that response. Mr. Chair and Mackie, the other concern I had because we are a part of the City I would not want our portion of the audit to be minimal. Could you comment on what is going to be covered? Are we going to have a full, a partial, a mini audit? What are we having?

MS. ROMERO: Commissioner Stefanics, members of the Board, we are going to have a full audit. They will do a full financial statement audit of BDD and it will not be minimal.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Thank you very much.

MS. ROMERO: And that was discussed.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Okay, I was concerned about that, Mr. Chair, and I just wanted to make sure our operations were being fully scrutinized. Thank you.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay. Any other questions regarding the audit for Ms. Romero?

MS. ROMERO: I also wanted to give an update the BDD Support Entity and Advisory Group. Our first meeting was held on March 24th to discuss the Board approved recommendations and course of action and preparation of the new Support Entity and Fiscal Services Agreement. We are currently working on scheduling a second meeting with City staff to discuss the requirements of the current agreement. We are working toward separating responsibilities between City staff and BDD staff as a means of clarification. This will enable us to move forward in the drafting of a new agreement

as well as to develop and implement a transition plan about structuring BDD as a standalone entity.

Our goal is to continue to meet monthly until these tasks are complete and we will continue to provide an update as we progress. Do you have any questions?

CHAIR MAESTAS: Any questions? Yes, Councilor Dominguez?

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Do you have an anticipated timeline of when you think that will happen assuming that everyone –

MS. ROMERO: I do have a timeline and I think the original timeline said that we would possibly have a draft agreement; I think it's in July, but I can double check that for you.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: So by then both the City and the County will have completed their budget process and have budgets submitted, so on and so forth?

MS. ROMERO: Correct.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Any other questions on the transition? When does the current agreement expire?

MS. ROMERO: So the current agreement expires December 31, 2015 and we are going to extend that to 2016 so the agreement will be effective July 1, 2016, just to get us back into the fiscal year.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Can you just remind us who is on the group?

MS. ROMERO: It is made up of BDD staff, myself, Mr. Vokes, and then City staff, finance director, public utilities director, and then I think it's the County same thing, finance staff and County utilities director.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay, and other questions on that? Okay, what else you got, Ms. Romero?

MS. ROMERO: That's it, thank you.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Thank you. Any other matters from staff, Chuck?

MR. VOKES: No sir, thank you.

7. REPORT ON MARCH 310 2015 FISCAL SERVICES AUDIT COMMITTEE
[Removed from agenda]

8. **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

Update on the Diversion Structure Inspection and Repairs

MR. VOKES: Thank you. Mr. Chair, members of the Board, you should have a written document under section 8. There should be a memo at the start of the document and then a couple of contracts, the schedule, and then an excel spreadsheet outlining the costs to date.

If you look at your memo we've already discussed items one and two in the previous meeting. That is the mapping of the river and the no cost agreements with the engineering firms of CDM Smith and CH2M Hill to provide some oversight for the inspection and repair of the diversion structure.

Item number three, I would like to give you a short power point presentation so you can visualize what's going on with that and then I'll entertain any questions after that.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Mr. Chair.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Commissioner Chavez.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: While Mr. Vokes is setting that up I just want to be sure that item three in his presentation corresponds with the material that is in our packet.

MR. VOKES: Is that the cofferdam information?

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes.

MR. VOKES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: So the scope of service and everything has not changed?

MR. VOKES: No, it hasn't, sir.

Okay, so Monday of last week the contractor, ASI, out of Colorado arrived and started constructing the cofferdam. It's a very interesting process they put these I-beams in and then weld beams to the side and in putting those in they basically have this apparatus on the top which is just a vibrator hammer and it just slides the I-beams in. And then you see the plates that are interlocked to actually form the dam there. The staff is held over the river with this bucket in order to do the work. And this is more progress on what the cofferdam looks like.

Why are we doing this? Well, what we want to get to is – this is the original cofferdam and the original diversion structure when it was first put in. You can see the level of dirt there. That's about where the river bottom is. And you can also see the screens in the cofferdam. Beneath those screens there is the airburst system to distribute the air to clean the screens. You can also see the valving – the hoses that are underneath there. One of the maintenance items that staff has to do is literally block off that screen with a blank, pump out the water and then get under the screen. In other words, under the water level to do the maintenance on these valves and these hoses. And we have been doing maintenance on those throughout the years.

This picture shows the grids that hold the air piping and so those are in place and then the next thing that happens is the screens are placed on top of the airburst system.

Why are we doing all of this? This is an example of what we found on one of the screens. You can see where the screen itself has been separated from the frame. You can also see in this photograph, there is blue level there that is a straight line and you can see the curvature of the screens and that's from the inside out. You can also see some notches on the supports of the screen. They were modified at some point during the process.

So the reason we're spending all this money is to get in there and make sure that we've got screens that are intact and ready to go that will keep the sediment and rocks out of our pumps. And also determine what has happened with the screens.

That's kind of where we are and an update on it.

CHAIR MAESTAS: All right. Any questions for Mr. Vokes? Yes, Commissioner Chavez.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: So, Mr. Vokes, the photographs that you showed us on your presentation were those taken during the original inspection of the diversion project?

MR. VOKES: Yes, Mr. Commissioner, they were. They were taken – the shots of the screens were just recently taken.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Okay, I want to go then to the material in our packet, Mr. Chair, if we could. And I guess staff can tell me if I'm off mark or not.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Where are you at Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: I'm on the first page of the agreement for construction services between the Buckman Direct Diversion Board and ACI Contractors Incorporated. The second Whereas read, "Whereas the BDD Board wishes to have a cofferdam constructed at the Buckman Direct Diversions Intake Structure in order to inspect the structure for damage and design issues and to perform maintenance." Okay, so I want to hold that thought for a minute and go down to the scope of work where it says, "Contractor shall perform all of the work as provided in Exhibit A attached hereto," and that's the work. And if you look at task 3, cofferdam removal, under – the first paragraph on the second page, it starts, the paragraph starts, "under a separate change order to this original work ASI will remobilize to the site at an as yet to be determined date to reinstall a cofferdam so move extensive repairs can be completed." So what I'm reading into this is that we're doing some maintenance that was – that is part of the original system but then the scope of services includes more extensive repairs that would deal with the concrete components and the screen openings and placement of the screens, and size of the screens and things like that; right, Mr. Vokes?

MR. VOKES: Commissioner Chavez, members of the Board, the design of the cofferdam contract is really two parts. One is we needed to get a cofferdam up so that we could do the inspection and essentially get our three new screens back into place. If we can repair some of the existing screens, get them in place, and repair the airburst system. The concern for down the road is that if we find any serious damage to the cofferdam or to the diversion structure then what will happen in approximately three weeks is we will remove a small section of the cofferdam so that we can bring the plant back into service. During that time we'll work with our engineering firm to determine what the ultimate fix is to the project to make sure that it's done right and that we can maintain it and the structure is sound.

So part of the contract is a bit confusing because there's some flexibility built in there. If we go into the structure to the inspection process and we just find the issues are only with the screens, then our intent is to do those repairs and then get the plant back in service. However, if we did go in and find, say, structure issues or major redesign needed to be done, then we needed the flexibility to this fall when the water demands drop back down, put that section of the cofferdam into place, pump it back down and at that time we should have a plan for the ultimate repair of the structure. Again, we don't know what those are because we haven't been able to see it. We've tried fiber optic camera divers to see what's going on, but at this point we just don't know. So that's why there's some flexibility in the contract. If we go in and in three weeks we are satisfied that we've done what needs to be done then the cofferdam in its entirety will be removed. If we have concerns about structural issues or redesign issues then this allows us to leave a portion of the cofferdam in place. At that time ASI we'll have to re-contract with them because obviously, they have to remobilize, bring their staff back and put those sections into place. So there may be an additional fee at that time. Again, it just depends on what we find during the inspection process.

CHAIR MAESTAS: So this is really more of a contingency.

MR. VOKES: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair, it is contingency. It depends on what we find in the inspection process and what the recommendations of the engineering firms are.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Commissioner Chavez, you still have the floor.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: No, that's fine. I think it's kind of a fact finding mission if you will. But it's in two pieces and I just wanted to make sure that we were clear on that. It was a little confusing to me. But I do have just one clarifying question. So then in the maintenance part of the work that will be done here shortly, you will also be working on the air system that will help clean the screens and maybe alleviate the problem hopefully in the future. Were any of those system – was that system down completely?

MR. VOKES: The airburst system, Commissioner Chavez, members of the Board, the airburst system currently is partially operational. There are some valves that are not operating correctly. We can run this system manually currently. But it's not in auto as we speak. Again, the issue is the design, is to remove the screen, put a blank in that's a solid piece, and then be able to pump it out. We haven't been able to slide those screens in and out nor the blanks in and out to be able to accomplish that work. So right now what staff has been doing is manually cleaning the screens in order to continue operation.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Councilor Dominguez and then Ms. Bokum.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Just real quick, Mr. Chair, thank you.

This may be somewhat of a naïve question but if the dam that is put up the first time is not satisfactory, are we obligated to use the same company to do it the second time if need be?

MR. VOKES: Councilor Dominguez, members of the Board, I would say no. The contract basically specifies that once they leave we could bring someone else in. However, they are a highly competent firm. The construction of the cofferdam was scheduled to take two weeks. They called us on Thursday afternoon four days into it and asked us if they wanted the dam completed. So they did it in half the time. And at that time we told them, we're not ready yet you're going to have to wait until actually tomorrow to complete the dam.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: I know nothing about cofferdams or what it takes to put them up or remove them. I just – I can understand why you want to do this so that if you need to do it a second time you already have an agreement in place. I just don't – you know, if there are any complications to the removal of it and we decide we want to use someone else for whatever reason that we still have that flexibility to do that. All right, thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Sure. And just to clarify now, the base piles, the foundational piles will be permanent from this point forward that way if we need to do any future dewatering we can use those foundational piles or if we don't require any extensive design beyond repairing the intake screens then the piles will be removed in their entirety because I thought we were going to leave them in kind of as a permanent feature of the new facility to do future dewatering and maintenance. Can you clarify that?

MR. VOKES: Certainly, Mr. Chair, members of the Board. The intent all along was the cofferdam would not be a permanent structure. I do not believe that we would get the permits from the necessary entities to be able to do that. This is, to me, is a one-time fix it right. And, again, had we had more information had it not been the start of the high summer time uses we may have done things differently. But as it was we designed the contract to be as flexible as we can so that we can ensure that the Buckman Regional Water Plant will be available for the summer demands and then if there are major repairs down the road we can do that. But the permitting is for a temporary cofferdam.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Do the permits allow us then future flexibility to go in and re-establish the cofferdam if more significant modifications need to be made?

MR. VOKES: We would have to take that on a case basis. Again, our intent is, if there are major modifications that need to be done, we would do those during the fall when there was low water demand. If there is something beyond that then it would just be speculation on my part as to what the approach would be at that point.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay. Ms. Bokum.

MS. BOKUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It seems to me that the problem has two main possibilities for what caused it. One is an engineering/design problem and the other is something to do with the way the river operates. In the conversation I had with Dr. Thompson was about how powerful sediment is and they've had the same problem down in Albuquerque I think with their diversion down there. It seems to me we're in a good place to have some understanding as to whether or not the problem is structural in design but I don't – do we have besides the fact that maybe Mr. Thompson will be around to help, are we doing anything to figure out whether there's something going on in the river itself that is causing the problem? I think sediment is – it turns out sediment is much more of a destructive force than most people have understood.

CHAIR MAESTAS: So maybe if you could summarize Tetra Tech's conclusions of their study regarding the river and how we need to consider that going forward.

MR. VOKES: Yes, Ms. Bokum and members of the Board, our task one that we took on was the actual mapping of the river. We have been mapping sections of the river since the project started. There is an indication right now that there is some additional sediment in front of the structure but who is to say if we have another major flooding event that that all won't disappear.

I have been in contact with Dr. Thompson and one of his colleagues. One of the things that our diversion structure expert, that we'll talk about later, has suggested is that there is a scientist that actually puts vanes in the river to encourage the river to clean the sand out of the way. One of the – the expert that I talked to that Dr. Thompson recommended, that's with UNM, stated that the City of Albuquerque has those and they're called Nakato Vanes and their Nakato Vanes were totally silted in, so they did not work.

That was one of the reasons, again, that we needed a diversion structure expert and also hope to have Dr. Thompson and his colleague come down and give us some ideas as to what we can do with the sediment on the screen. It may be that just operationally we just have to do things different. We may have to develop a method of

moving that sand off the structure before we do the maintenance. At this point, we just don't know. But we are considering that aspect of the problem.

MS. BOKUM: Thank you very much.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Could you please maybe expand on the role of Dr. Thompson. Is he just going to give us informal advice? What's his role?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, at this point I felt like we would bring Dr. Thompson in and he's willing to come down and look at it and give us some advice. If it looks like a scientific study is warranted or additional work is warranted, then certainly I would bring that back to the Board and have that discussion. But, again, at this point, I don't think we have enough information to really know what's going on or Dr. Thompson probably doesn't either at this point.

MS. BOKUM: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Yes, Ms. Bokum.

MS. BOKUM : When I first talked to Dr. Thompson it was just at an event, he said that Albuquerque had contracted with somebody in Colorado to do a major sediment study that cost \$250,000 and that was before they built the Albuquerque diversion dam. It may well be that we don't understand what's going on in the river but it's great that he's willing to come down. I don't know that he would do the work himself, but it is great that he's willing to help us think that portion of the problem through. So, thank you.

CHAIR MAESTAS: I think on that point if we can conclude the screens have been not working properly that could explain while we're entraining a lot of the gravel and sand in the raw water. I imagine we'll find out after we repair the screens and see how this operates going forward. Certainly, that's going to be an issue as well. Sedimentation, what is the river doing that is impacting our operations.

Could you touch a little bit on the budget. We authorized you with I think \$500,000 and I think your total budget of all contracts to date are under the \$500,000. Do you anticipate exceeding that at this point?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair and members of the Board, you were provided a budget sheet. It should be at the end of your packet behind the schedule. And I do not anticipate, at this point, us exceeding that in any fashion. Again, staff has been gathering the materials on hand and, again, until we do the inspection we just don't know but I do not anticipate us spending the whole allotment that the Board provided.

CHAIR MAESTAS: I see we have a handout here of Deere and Ault Consultants. I know we had talked about the need to maybe incorporate an objective third party professional to help us with the inspection and maybe affirm or confirm what's going on with the intake structure. And at the last meeting, Mr. Vokes, you gave us a responsibility matrix that was very helpful I think to all of us, well, to me anyway and it kind of showed what everyone was doing. But it didn't incorporate this consultant yet. So can you maybe just briefly explain what Deere and Ault are going to do? I think we kind of know, their contract is in here so I know their product but I think just for the purposes of the audience and the Board if you could briefly summarize what Deere and Ault are going to do and how they fit in to all the rules and responsibilities with all the other consultants and the contractor.

MR. VOKES: Certainly, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Based on conversations of the Board and actually conversations with Mr. Eldridge after the last

Board meeting, one of the things that he insisted on is that he needed to be involved in this project and he needed to be involved before the cofferdam went up. It was very obvious to me after spending an hour talking to him his level of expertise with diversion structure and handling unusual problems. So I discussed the possible role of Deere and Ault which would come in and basically review documents, participate in the inspection and make recommendations.

He has already been on site. He was here last Monday and Tuesday before the cofferdam was built. That was when we were in the process of finalizing his contract. He had finalized the scope and the fee but the ink wasn't dry on his contract. He spent several hours brainstorming with staff, discussing what the issues they were having, both operations and maintenance, and he has sent a memo already to the BDD which I have shared with both CDM and CH2 and asked for their comments on. He has listed about eight different recommendations of things we need to be doing during the repair not waiting until after the inspection and repair is done.

So, again, I hope that he will be an integral part of the entire team. He will be providing an independent report of his findings and then be available to the Board, however the Board chooses to use him in the future. He was recommended to me by a national engineering firm that I have worked with for a long time as an expert and my interaction and staff's interaction with him to me has confirmed that he knows a lot. He has been through a lot and he's solved a lot of unusual situations. Did that answer your question?

CHAIR MAESTAS: It did and I think ideally when we talked about this before we finalized the contracts with the consultants it would have been I think ideal to maybe have formal mutual recognition that we would bring in an acceptable, objective third party that could write such an independent report that all parties would recognize as truly independent and objective so now since we hired this consultant after the fact, after the agreements, would you say that they're maybe more of like an advisor to the Board than part of the team? As you said mutually recognized as being that independent objective voice to determine just exactly what is going on. How would you – would you agree with that characterization?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair, yes, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, I would characterize it as Deere and Ault and Mr. Eldridge are at the Board's service. He has nothing invested in this project. There's no reputation or anything to protect here and again I think just from my interactions with him, my conversations with him and the recommendations that come with him, he will serve this Board extremely well. And, again, I expect that at the end of his scope of services part of his scope is to provide that report. Here's the documents. Here's what I see. Here's my recommendations. And then as far as if we need additional information from him then certainly he will be available to do that.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Well, I'm pleased to see that we are adding this consultant to serve in this capacity so I'm personally very pleased about that.

I just wanted to maybe finish on the schedule. I see that the shutdown is scheduled to start on the 3rd of this month and it would reopen on the 24th. Is that still the case?

MR. VOKES: Mr. Chair and members of the Board, that is my plan, that we are not down for more than three weeks. If we can get the work done in two weeks

we will do that. My original intent – the current schedule is Monday we will start pumping the water from behind the cofferdam. We expect that to take about half a day. Then the engineering firms are all scheduled to be on site Tuesday and Wednesday or as long as they need to be to do their inspection. One of the things we'll probably be doing most likely is pulling the screens off and putting them back on and see how they fit. Again, looking at all the components of the structure. There will be multiple cameras there taking pictures and taking measurements. So once that is done, again, staff is prepared to make the repairs, ensure that we get the airburst system back in service. Get the screens intact on the structure and, again, we're hopeful that we can get five screens on. If we can only get three screens on then we will get through the summer on that. But, again, there's the question of does the design of the screens need to be modified? Does the design of the airburst, the cleaning system, does that need to be modified? So we will have more answers but, again, staff is prepared. We even reached out to the City of Santa Fe for some additional support if that is needed.

CHAIR MAESTAS: It's just unfortunate that we're having an early snowmelt so this is when the discharges are at their highest. I haven't seen the river flow like that in a while. But those are all the questions I have. Commissioner Stefanics.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Thank you very much. First of all, I am actually happy that Deere and Ault are on to advise us because there is a possibility that they're going to advise us that there was something done wrong in the first place. And specifically I'd like to know what CDM and CH2 are actually doing.

MR. VOKES: Commissioner Stefanics and members of the Board, currently there have been interaction between CDM and CH2 with staff. They have established what we call an eRoom so that we can post documents there. We're having weekly conference call meetings to discuss the status of the cofferdam and the projects. They have not been providing specific recommendations as of yet. They have basically told me that they are waiting till the inspection is done and then they'll make a determination or recommendations as far as if modifications to the screen need to be done or anything like that. But mostly it's been an information gathering couple of weeks and that's what has been happening.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: So, Mr. Chair and Mr. Vokes, what can be our expectation of those two companies to produce, modify, be involved with in a non-report manner?

MR. VOKES: Commissioner Stefanics and members of the Board, I can only go by what the letter agreements that these firms have given us which is basically they are committed to working with the Board and for inspection and coordination of the needed repairs.

It is my hope that they provide those recommendations to us and that we get clear, concise reports at the end of the inspection process. Again, I have not worked personally with these firms in New Mexico, but, again, I see no reason to expect anything than a clear, concise report from both of these firms at the end of the inspection process and hopefully with some good recommendations as to how to proceed.

Again, we will have Mr. Eldridge's recommendations also and there will be coordination among all of those with staff.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Commissioner Chavez.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So just my own observations: when we first started talking about this we thought that it could be four to six weeks. Three weeks would be better, I think.

I want to talk a little bit about dollar amount that were specific because in Exhibit B and these pages aren't numbered, but in Exhibit B, just for the cofferdam you have an anticipated cost of \$382,500, right? That's the number that we're going off of.

MR. VOKES: That's correct. There is a number in there of \$35,000 which is the materials that will be available to be resold at the end of the project. So essentially, it's approximately \$350,000 if you remove the \$35,000 for resale of materials.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Okay, and then for the independent consultant, another Exhibit B, under their contract, there's a fee schedule that has a project total of \$47,850. Is that a good number?

MR. VOKES: Yes, sir. That's the agreed to amount.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Okay. So I guess that's all I had, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the questions about the timeline. I think that the independent consultant right now I don't think there's any other way around that and so we have – we have the design team, we have the consultant team and everything in place to do what we need to do. We have budgeted the dollar amount. We have a time frame. I think all of that needs to be pretty tight. So if we have a contractor that is willing and able to do the work and have the time. I hope we don't slow them down moving forward. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Ms. Bokum.

MS. BOKUM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we're all going to be anxious for the next couple of months or weeks. I hate to ask you this but could you send us email that are three sentences long saying something went right, something went wrong during the next couple of weeks because it would be nice not to wait four weeks what's going on?

MR. VOKES: Certainly, Ms. Bokum and members of the Board. I will keep you posted.

MS. BOKUM: Just three sentences. I would really appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. VOKES: And, again, you all are certainly welcome if you want to put on a hardhat and a vest to come out and visit the site also. But, again, there will be many, many photographs taken and a lot of information gathered. If we see anything significant as far as damage to the structure or even don't see anything significant I will send something to the Board.

MS. BOKUM: I would be very appreciative.

CHAIR MAESTAS: I want to reiterate that I encourage the Board to go over there now. This is a really unique time. This hasn't happened since this facility went on line. I'm going to get my vest, my steel-toed boots and my hardhat and head down there sometime next week but I'll let you know. But I encourage all the Board to do that.

MS. BOKUM: If any of us go, you might want to let others know so that we don't show up four, five, six times. And actually I would like to go out when Dr. Thompson comes if it works out.

CHAIR MAESTAS: All right we'll do that. Any other questions on the update on the diversion structure inspection and repairs? Thank you, Mr. Vokes, appreciate that.

Consent Agenda [Approved on page 2]

9. **Monthly update on BDD Operations**
10. **Drought, Monsoon and Water Resource Management Update**
11. **Request for approval of Amendment No. 4 to the Professional Services Agreement with GeoSystems Analysis, Inc. for the BDD Habitat Restoration Project for the amount of \$49,000. Exclusive of NMGR**
12. **Request for approval of a Budget Adjustment to the FY 2014/2015 Operating Budget**
13. **Request for approval of procurement from Hach Company for equipment used to monitor Chlorine and pH for compliance purposes**
14. **Quarterly update on Environmental Compliance**

DISCUSSION AND ACTION

15. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

CHAIR MAESTAS: Ms. Nancy Long can you give us just a quick explanation of our election process before we proceed.

NANCY LONG (Board Counsel): Yes, Mr. Chair, members of the Board, pursuant to your Rules of Order as those were amended and revised this past February you do have elections for your chair and vice-chair in April now. So we are in April and it is time for your elections and as you know, according to your rules and also the Joint Powers Agreement you alternate between the two entities for the chair and then the vice chair is from the opposite entity. So this year your chair will be from the County Commission. So, Mr. Chair, you can take nomination and a vote.

Vice-Chair

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay. I want to start with vice chair. I nominate Councilor Dominguez for vice chair. I guess you're it, buddy. Do I hear a motion to close nominations?

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Second. All those in favor of closing nominations say aye.

The motion passed by unanimous 5-0 voice vote

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay, nominations are closed. Now, let's elect this guy.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a nomination to appoint Commissioner [sic] Dominguez to serve as vice chair.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay, we have a motion on the floor. Do I hear a second? I'll second that.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Mr. Chair. I do think if the Councilor wants to speak against that he should be able to. He does chair a couple of other things.

CHAIR MAESTAS: You're willing to do this, Councilor, aren't you? We aren't coercing you in anyway. [Councilor Dominguez laughs and accepts] So that's your acceptance speech. Any other discussion on the motion?

The motion passed by unanimous 5-0 voice vote.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Congratulations.

Chair

CHAIR MAESTAS: I'm going to open the floor to nomination for chair. Do you want to nominate? Okay, yes, Commissioner Chavez.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: Yes, Mr. Chair. I would nominate Councilor Stefanics. [Laughter]

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: I think I would rather keep my salary.

COMMISSIONER CHAVEZ: That's in jest. But I nominate Commissioner Stefanics for the chair position.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: I'll second.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay, we have a motion and a second.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: I have a question.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay, under discussion, Councilor Dominguez.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: I'm sure that this has already been resolved but all this stuff at the County with regards to committee assignments and everything else have all been taken care of?

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Well, Mr. Chair and members of the Board, the County Commission doesn't agree with what we voted on here so how it gets handled in January we'll have to see at the County. The County does actually identify – the County Commissioners individually identify committees in January and we usually respect the roles that people are holding on committees and so they were not happy to learn about his change. So really this change here accommodates the City. It does not accommodate the City.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: So this is every year?

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Every year the County Commissioners identify what committees they would like to sit on.

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Okay.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Okay, we have a motion and a second to close nominations. All those in favor.

The motion passed by unanimous 5-0 voice vote.

CHAIR MAESTAS: I move that we elect Commissioner Stefanics as our next chair person. Do I hear a second?

COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ: Second.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Second by Councilor Dominguez. Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: I thought we did that.

CHAIR MAESTAS: No, that was for nominations. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Congratulations.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Thank you.

MS. LONG: Customarily, Mr. Chair, members of the Board, we have the current chair finish out the meeting. All you have are comments from the public and adjournment and that makes it smoother and you'll start next meeting.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Thank you.

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

CHAIR MAESTAS: Are there any matters from the public? Any matters that people want to address the Board? Going once, twice. All right, let's move on.

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

CHAIR MAESTAS: Any matters from the Board? I'd just like to say a few things as the outgoing chair. I wanted to acknowledge everyone. I think we're an incredible team here at Buckman. I sat down this afternoon and just wrote out a few highlights of what we've done over the past year and I'd just like to mention them. We negotiated and approved an MOU with San Ildefonso Pueblo. We re-negotiated the MOU for the early warning stormwater system. We developed and awarded a contract to improve the access and management of data of our stormwater early warning and water quality testing program. We successfully filled the facility manager position. We selected a new support entity. We completed the procurement of a new consolidated legal services contract that is going to take effect soon and we undertook this significant assessment of the surface water intake structure. So we've done a lot of things in a very short period of time.

I just want to thank everyone for pulling together and getting all of these things done. The folks at Buckman are just completely professional and I really appreciated all of their support.

Yes, Commissioner Stefanics.

COMMISSIONER STEFANICS: Mr. Chair, I would ditto your thanks to the staff and to our attorney and also to you for your leadership for this group for the year. Thank you very much.

CHAIR MAESTAS: Thank you. Any other matters from the Board?

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, May 7, 2015 @ 4:30 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT

Having completed the agenda, Chair Maestas declared this meeting adjourned at approximately 5:25 p.m.

Approved by:

Joseph M. Maestas
Joseph M. Maestas, Board Chair

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Farrell
Karen Farrell, Wordswork

FILED BY:

Geraldine Salazar
GERALDINE SALAZAR
SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK

ATTEST TO:

Yolanda G. Vigil
YOLANDA G. VIGIL
SANTA FE CITY CLERK

6-5-2015



COUNTY OF SANTA FE)
STATE OF NEW MEXICO) ss

BUCKMAN DIRECT DIV MIN
PAGES: 18

I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for
Record On The 5TH Day Of June, 2015 at 04:29:40 PM
and Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 1766317
In The Records Of Santa Fe County

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

EXHIBIT

tabbier

1

