

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

May 5, 2022

1. CALL TO ORDER

This regular meeting of the Santa Fe County & City Buckman Direct Diversion Board meeting was called to order by Chair Carol Romero-Wirth at 4:07 p.m.

In accordance with the Public Health Emergency Order issued by the State of New Mexico, and pursuant to the New Mexico Attorney General’s Open Government Division Advisory during COVID-19, public entities are authorized to conduct virtual meetings. All votes were conducted by roll call.

[For clarity purposes, repetitive identification and confirmations of those on the line and their audibility have been eliminated and/or condensed in this transcript.]

2. ROLL CALL: Roll was called and a quorum was present as shown:

BDD Board Members Present:

Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth, Chair
Commissioner Anna Hansen
Commissioner Anna Hamilton
Councilor Renee Villarreal
J.C. Helms, Citizen Member [4:12 arrival]
Tom Egelhoff, Las Campanas [non-voting]

Member(s) Excused:

None

BDD Board Alternates(s) Present:

Commissioner Hank Hughes

Others Present:

Rick Carpenter, BDD Facilities Manager
Nancy Long, BDD Legal Counsel
Kyle Harwood, BDD Legal Counsel
Jamie-Rae Diaz, Administrative Manager
Antoinette Armijo-Rougemont, BDD Financial Manager
Randy Sugrue, BDD Operations Superintendent
Marcos Martinez, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Jesse Roach, City Water Division Director
John Blair, City Manager

Others Present (cont.)

Alexis Lotero, City Interim Finance Director

Ricky Bejarano, City Interim Assistant Finance Director

Bradley Fluetsch, City Financial Planning and Investment Officer

Jay Lazarus, Glorieta Geoscience

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda and Commissioner Hamilton moved to approve as published. Her motion was seconded by Councilor Villarreal and passed by unanimous [4-0] roll call vote. [Mr. Helms was not present for this action.]

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 7, 2022 Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting Minutes

There were no changes to the minutes. Commissioner Hansen moved to approve the minutes as published. Commissioner Hamilton seconded and the motion passed by unanimous [4-0] roll call vote. [Mr. Helms was not present for this action.]

5. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

Jamie-Rae Diaz, City Administrative Assistant, confirmed there were no inquiries regarding public comments.

6. PRESENTATION/INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

a. Monthly Update on BDD Operations

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: The first is our monthly update of the BDD operations, by Randy Sugrue; did I can it right?

RANDY SUGRUE (Operations Superintendent): That is essentially correct.

Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board, my report for the month of April for operations at the BDD consists of approximately 5.65 million gallons per day on average of raw water diversions. Our deliveries through Booster Stations 4 and 5A were approximately 5.06 million gallons per day. Our raw water delivery to Las Campanas, has resumed at about .35 million gallons per day. Our onsite treated and non-treated storage .24 million gallons per day. BDD has been providing approximately 71 percent of the water supplied to the City and County for the month. Our year-to-date diversions again for April are somewhat above the average for the past 11 years.

On page 2 we have our regional water overview. Daily demand mid to late April was about 8.1 million gallons per day. That has increased. Rio Grande flows for April averaged approximately 1,000 cubic feet per second. That brings it now to about 2,500 southern Colorado snowmelt runoff increased significantly. Abiquiu Reservoir is currently under what is called "flood operations." The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is releasing as much water as reasonable out of Abiquiu to maintain reservoir levels. It's under flood operations. All of that released water is considered native water. So at this

time BDD has not calling for nor can we call for any San Juan-Chama water until they are out of flood operations in a few weeks. As I mentioned the river is full of native water at this time. The storage for Canyon Road, Nichols is about 69 percent. McClure Reservoir around 16 percent. The inflow there at the end of April was about 1.9 mgd and I believe that is probably in the range today of 5 to 6 mgd which will recede as the snow is melted. I do not have an update on the total San Juan-Chama storage at this time past the end of the year and the El Niño summary for the middle of April was La Niña is certainly present. The tropical Pacific atmosphere consistent with La Niña and that's expected to continue at about 59 percent, although towards fall they are now moderating from 50 to 55 percent. So that's the extent of my report and I stand for questions.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you. Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Randy. Is our pool agreement in place and are you diverting County native water?

MR. SUGRUE: We are currently diverting native water. I would have to defer to Rick or Jesse or John with the County as to the status of the shared pool agreement.

RICK CARPENTER (BDD Facilities Manager): My understanding, Madam Chair and members of the Board, is that the shared pool agreement is in place and that we will be diverting only native water and then revert back to San Juan-Chama water later in the year when that is available. We do an accounting of that and report it back out.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay, thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to make sure that we were using the pool agreement and moving forward with that.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you. Councilwoman Villarreal.

COUNCILOR VILLARREAL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a quick question for Mr. Sugrue. I don't know why this doesn't stick with me but the regional water overview for reservoir storage, it talks about 69 percent storage for Nichols and 16 for McClure and then when you say 25.1 percent combined, could you explain that more in depth?

MR. SUGRUE: Briefly, Nichols then would be about 70 percent so more than half full. McClure is less than 20 percent full, however, if you combined all the storage in both reservoirs the amount of water adds up to about 25 percent of the combined total storage available if you combine both reservoirs.

MR. CARPENTER: Right. So both are on the same stream system and McClure is much larger. So we separate out the storage in each and then combine them for a total storage number.

COUNCILOR VILLARREAL: But that doesn't include what we actually use from that, right. We're not using all of the storage, right?

MR. CARPENTER: Madam Chair and members of the Board, that's correct. We combine those numbers and they seems a little low which is probably the reason for your question but this time of year we haven't received any snowmelt runoff yet.

COUNCILOR VILLARREAL: Okay, maybe that's why it wasn't sticking in my brain. But 25 percent combined storage that's not what it will be into the future when we have that runoff?

MR. CARPENTER: That's correct. So the 25 percent is kind of a goal. Kind of like the flood ops conversation we just had where we create space behind the dams for what we hope is going to be the incoming snowmelt runoff.

COUNCILOR VILLARREAL: Got it. Thank you, that's helpful. Thank you both.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Mr. Egelhoff.

MR. EGELHOFF: I have a question and maybe it's for Rick or Randy. Have we had any precedents for like the ability for firefighting activities to dip into either one of the reservoirs – I guess Abiquiu? How does it work when they're using water to fight fires?

MR. CARPENTER: I'll start with that and I see that Dr. Roach is on the call and he may want to correct me or add to what I can add. So we have had for years ongoing discussions with the Forest Service on how they can access our reservoirs if there was a fire in our watershed and there are some precautions that need to be taken. But it's a protected watershed and, Tom, I know you know that so that would be a really high priority fire if there were to be one. We do manage the forest. We hope that it would never be a ground fire but if that ever came to be, I do not know currently because it's not job anymore but I don't know what the understanding is between the Forest Service and the City on how much access that they have to the reservoirs to dip their bucket and fight a fire. I don't know where we've ended up in the last two or three years. Dr. Roach, do you have anything to add to that? I think he's in an airport somewhere and may not be able to contribute.

JESSE ROACH (City Water Division Director): I don't really have anything to add. We do have an agreement in place with the Forest Service. Right now there's not enough water probably to dip out of McClure but they could dip out of Nichols. But as you mentioned there are issues. Mostly we don't want have a bucket that was in a watershed be dipped into Nichols because we'd have cross contamination between watersheds. But we do have an agreement in place and if the Board is interested in those details I can provide them but I don't have them at the tip of my fingers.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Part of the question is not just supply but where they're fighting, what water sources they're using the Calf Canyon, for the big fire. The aircraft that they're flying, the big aircraft, they're dumping water and they're filling it because they're landing and refilling and taking off at Kirtland Air Force Base. So they're taking it out of a different reservoir. The helicopters have to try and dip as locally as possible. So they're not flying as far with a loaded bucket. So they're probably using the lake up there and whatnot.

MR. CARPENTER: They may be. I hope they are.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: They may not be able to.

MR. CARPENTER: Today I was driving by the airport and I saw a very large helicopter with a bucket going to land at the airport probably to refuel but I don't know where they're getting their water source.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: It looks like Mr. Lazarus may have an answer. He's got his hand up.

JAY LAZARUS (Glorieta Geoscience): Thank you, Chairman, Commissioners; we're responsible for the post-fire water supply for the City of Las

Vegas. We've been working on the fire response ever since the fire started. Right now the buckets are dipping in Storrie Lake. We're trying to keep a sufficient enough pool in Storrie Lake which is a private irrigation project. They run their own deal. So they're dipping right now in Storrie Lake and using that and so far the City has successfully defended both Bradner and Peterson Reservoirs and the water treatment plant through this process.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you. If you'll take your hand down that will help. Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I just want it known for the record that J.C. Helms is at the meeting.

MR. HELMS: Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you and also if you could promote the City Manager. He's in the waiting room, please. Okay, I don't see any more hands on that.

b. Report from the Facilities Manager

MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the Board. This item I don't have a whole lot to report on. A couple of things. We have successfully on-boarded a new entry level operator and a new entry level maintenance and repairman. We are giving them orientation and their safe driving and specific safety training to the BDD. So that is ongoing. And we are excited to have those two new young energetic employees.

The other thing that I might remind the Board of, I think people probably already know this but just in case, the City seems to be headed towards back to having public meetings that are subject to the Open Meetings Act requirements in person. I think the public will still be invited to join via Zoom but my guess is that the next meeting that this Board has will not be via Zoom for us but we might be in person. And Jamie-Rae or Jesse if you have anything – if I have misspoken or I don't understand where we're at in the process – but I think that's where we are headed.

MS. DIAZ: That is correct. By June we do plan to be in person as that changes we'll give everyone a heads up.

MR. CARPENTER: With that, Madam Chair, that concludes my update and I would be happy to stand for questions.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to finish our last conversation on the fire, the Cerro Pelado they're dipping into Cochiti for that fire. Somebody just sent me a note. And then also do you have a new administrative assistant Rick and have we met her? Did I miss that last time?

MR. CARPENTER: Well, we on-boarded a new administrative assistant. She elected after I think about 10 days to not be an employee of the City anymore. Didn't give any notice. Anyways, we are in the process of readvertising that position and hope to get it filled with a new person.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay, thank you very much for that update. I know that it is very hard to find administrative help these days. I'm disappointed but I recognize that it is very difficult.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay, I think we're – I don't see any more hands up for Mr. Carpenter. So we'll go on.

c. Legal Settlement Funds and Formation of Technical Working Group

MR. CARPENTER: Yes, Madam Chair and members of the Board. I was directed to put this technical working group together. We were successful in doing that. And given the number of people and the levels of their titles it was hard to organize but we did that. We had our first meeting. I think we all feel that it was a good meeting. One of the things that we agreed to was to have weekly meetings; standing meetings that are pre-scheduled and those are going to be on Thursdays, every Thursday except for the Thursday that coincides with Board meeting day because those are busy. That could be amended going forward but we're organized and we have a pretty good team I believe.

The people that were on the meeting or who are the team includes Nancy Long for legal advice, John Dupuis from the County, Tom Egelhoff and I'm not sure if he was on the first meeting I did not hear him but he's invited, Jesse Roach, Shannon Jones, Antoinette for financial and accounting purposes, Mr. Sugrue which is our operations supervisor, and also Chris Encinias from maintenance and repair from BDD. We want their input because they are the boots on the ground guys. And then of course, the Chair and the Vice Chair for their input as well. So it's a pretty big group.

The things that we talked about at the first meeting was setting meetings which I just covered and another, it's actually an action item that came out of it, we have a subgroup of people and they're going to meet on Tuesday now to evaluate the efficacy and the way to about hiring or bringing on a third-party consulting engineer. The thinking of the group now is that time is of the essence because of the inflationary factor that will eat away at the \$70 million in settlement funds. So we'll be talking about engineering firms that have expertise and that are already under contract so we could just move rapidly and then report that back out to the larger committee and then report that back out to this Board at the next Board meeting with a recommendation to move forward at that time.

We talked about financial management and accounting and the need for transparency and a way to be audited and reporting out on billing and correct cost-sharing. And then Nancy did a very good job of summarizing the legal concerns as we move forward as there still are some.

There's a longer list of items that this technical working group needs to consider but hopefully going forward with the help of a managing consulting engineer that can guide the process. And then, Madam Chair and members of the Board, my intention is to have this standing item as a separate informational item from me to the Board at each monthly Board meeting going forward. With that, I would be happy to stand for questions.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Questions from the Board? Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I don't know if this is the appropriate time to ask but who is overseeing our money?

MR. CARPENTER: The City of Santa Fe's finance department is doing that. And there's a financial strategy that we've had a couple of meetings on already. So that is something that is parallel to this effort not necessarily the same effort. We need to just manage our budget but the City has taken a pretty close look at how to invest these

funds, keep them invested safely but earn a good rate of return and keeping things liquid if we need to. I think we've had two presentations already and I don't want to speak, Bradley for you, necessarily, if I am mischaracterizing that, please let us know.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: I think this will come up in the FSAC report because we did have a conversation so if we could just wait for that, Commissioner. We can discuss this as part of that report.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay, I'll be patient.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We did have a conversation about it. There is a presentation scheduled for next month and I know probably your biggest concern, the money we have so far is held in a separate account and I think we're still waiting for the second settlement piece. But we can talk about this more in the FSAC report.

Any other questions on the Technical Working Group?

d. Report on May 2, 2022 Fiscal Services Audit Committee (FSAC)

ANTOINETTE ARMIJO-ROUGEMONT (BDD Accounting Supervisor): Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Board. We did hold a FSAC meeting on Monday, May 2nd at 2:30. In attendance was Tom Egelhoff, Stephen Raab, Commissioner Hamilton, Jesse Roach, Nancy Long, John Dupuis, Rick Carpenter, Chair Carol Romero-Wirth, Brad Fluetsch and Alexis Lotero.

We discussed the 8 percent increase in salaries. This is the third time that we're bringing the budget before the Board for approval. The budget was approved at our April meeting on April 7th but on April 27th the City approved their operating budget which included an 8 percent increase in salaries and we had only included a 4 percent. So at the direction of the Chair we increased the operating budget to include the full 8 percent salary increase. And there's an item on that that we'll talk about.

And the second item was a presentation by Bradley Fluetsch and he talked about how we're going to maximize our investment for the settlement funds. Currently the \$36 million is sitting in a money market fund but he requested a spending plan which the technical working group will be working on. And, as Rick mentioned this is going to be an item that Brad will be reporting to the Board on a quarterly basis and as the Chair mentioned he will be beginning that at our June meeting. I'm not sure if Rick or Brad would like to add anything to that.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: I would like to just clarify. What happened at FSAC is that we did hear about how the money is held, how the City invests its money, how the BDD settlement money will be similarly invested and we will be bringing forward that particular presentation at the June meeting. But I don't know that it's going to be a monthly meeting. That was not discussed. So that's the piece I want to clarify. Rick Carpenter's presentation about the technical working group, will be a monthly presentation. But the investment of the funds will be probably as needed and it was discussed that the technical working group needs to as it develops a technical plan for the work that needs to go on, it needs to parallel the investments strategy and the liquidity of that money so that we are making sure that when we need to spend money we have the money to spend. And none of the investment decisions will tie the money up in a way that we won't be able to access them. But we can get into all those details in much greater detail with the presentation at the June meeting.

So if there are questions on that, Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I have a few questions. One, I'm concerned about the City's finances. I'm concerned about the City overseeing this money. I don't have a lot of faith at the moment after the State Auditor – your auditors have quit, and the State Auditor, I don't know what he's doing at the moment but I would like to hear what he plans to do for Buckman and I have invited him to the SWMA meeting to explain what he's planning to do. But I am concerned about these funds and that these funds remain separate and protected from anything that is happening at the City. That's part of my concern. I don't really know who Brad is, if he works for the City or if he's an independent contractor. Is it possible that we can have an independent fund and move this money to an independent fund possibly?

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner, if I can just clear up a few things. Brad is the investment officer for the City. He is a City employee and he invests the money, the City's money in the markets. He would be doing the same for the BDD settlement money which is being held in a separate account. It is not comingled with any of the other City funds. It has its own separate account and we are going to have a detailed presentation next about the City's audit. We do have the City's manager here. We have the acting finance director and the deputy finance director who is in charge of the audit and they will be speaking to you next and we will be talking at the next meeting about how the City invests its money and how the settlement money is being similarly invested and again, in a way that doesn't tie it up so that if we need to use it, it will be available as the working group develops the plan for what work needs to happen in what order.

BRADLY FLUETSCH (City Financial Planning and Investment Officer):
Madam Chair.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Brad.

MR. FLUETSCH: I just want to in order to sort of clarify some things all municipal governments, county governments are highly regulated by the state statutes. State Statute 6-10-10 stipulates exactly what we can invest in. The City has an investment policy which I have shared with the Deputy County Manager and I believe Mr. Dupuis and the other people that we met with. I've sent them our investment policy as well. The funds are invested in accordance with New Mexico statutes and the City's investment policy. And it is in a segregated account at Principal Group. I just mention that so you can put any concerns at rest.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: And we will again be having a dedicated presentation about this at the June meeting. We just wanted to let you know that we did have a preliminary conversation at the FSAC meeting. Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: I just wanted to add a small point that I honestly don't have all the details on but in my mind I'm thinking that it is possible that the BDD, these are technically BDD funds, right, that BDD might have slightly different regulations with respect to allowable investments than the City or even the County. Well, some cities are on home rule so that their regulations are different. But it's possible that there might be some subtle differences between what the City can invest in and what can be done with the BDD funds. They might be very subtle and they might not differ at all. Just to keep in mind and it may be something that we should check on.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We can certainly look into that and address it when we have the detailed presentation on this at our next meeting.

All right, other questions about the FSAC meeting?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Madam Chair.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: But we're going to have a presentation right now from your acting finance director and –

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, the next item.

e. The Buckman Direct Diversion Audit and the withdraw of CliftonLarsenAllen from that audit for FY 2021

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay, with that we have our acting finance director Alexis Lotero and we have our deputy finance director and audit – I don't know what I call you, Mr. Bejarano, audit supervisor and we also have with us tonight the City Manager and I believe we're going to – correct me if I'm wrong, are we starting with the City Manager or Alexis did you want to start it?

JOHN BLAIR (City Manager): Madam Chair, I'll start.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay.

MR. BLAIR: Madam Chair, members of the committee, good evening. Thank you for having me. This is my first BDD meeting as city manager and my first BDD meeting ever. So thank you for having me. I appreciate that.

So you might have heard that we've had some trouble with our audit. And more than anything else what I want to convey is that the team here that is working on our audit recognizes our mistakes of not getting it done on time and correctly. We own those mistakes as our own. We don't point fingers at anybody else. And we are working as swiftly as we can to ensure that we get it corrected and that we get it in and that all of our future audits are on time and clean audits.

I would be remiss if I didn't start by saying how grateful we are that acting director Lotero and acting deputy finance director Bejarano have been willing to step up and point our Finance Department in a new direction and really ensure that we're doing the work that needs to be done both to ensure that we're providing the necessary services for all residents of Santa Fe but that we're also getting our audit done.

To give you a quick update of where we are right now, I am going to speak a little bit on broad strokes and then I'll defer to both Acting Director Lotero and Acting Deputy Director Bejarano to give you specifics and speak more eloquently about the details of what's been done and where we are headed.

As you all are aware about a week ago Monday, we received a letter from CLA notifying us that the City's audit, your audit and the SWMA audit would all – they were pulling themselves out of the engagement contract. At that point, we began to meet with our team to get an assessment of what was going on and what did we believe to be the issues. On Wednesday of that week, so a week ago from yesterday, the Mayor, myself and the City Attorney we all met with some CLA leadership to talk a little bit more about what was going on and what led to their withdrawal. I will defer most of that to Mr. Bejarano who can speak significantly more eloquently on that than I can. So it's in the news already and you read about it and I know that we had a very lengthy conversation on our own City Council or City's Finance Committee so we're hopeful not to have to drag you through all of that detail that we had there. But we were put on notice last Tuesday. The State Auditor's

Office sent an email to then Director Mary McCoy, directing her to begin procurement of a new auditor. The team jumped. We reached out to the *Santa Fe New Mexican* to have RFP published over the weekend and that we were ready to go to have that RFP posted on our website on Monday.

At about 10 to 5 on Friday afternoon we received an email from the State Auditor's general counsel directing that we cease with the RFP until further notice and for additional guidance. And that's what we know. So we're still waiting to hear for official word.

While that is happening, I know that our finance leadership here who is on the call tonight has been working very directly in an effort to try and resolve some of the issues that we know exist today. We are hopeful that we will hear from the State Auditor soon with additional direction. We were asked on our meeting Monday night by a councilor, have we called the State Auditor – why are we waiting? We have. I spoke many times with the State Auditor last week. I actually sent a text a little bit ago to see if we have any sense of what's coming. I know that Mr. Bejarano has also been reaching out and some staff as well to get a sense of what's coming. We don't know. There are a handful of options of what the State Auditor can do with regards to our audit in terms of who conducts it. So we are waiting for that notice. As we understand it or at least we are expecting it to be the case, we believe to get some direction from or to be summoned to a meeting with both the State Auditor, the Department of Finance and Administration at the State level and their local government team to give us some direction on things that they'd like to see us doing.

Again, we don't know. That's speculation on my part. But that's what we believe to be the case going forward. That's the broad strokes of what we're doing. We are working swiftly both to get this fiscal year 21 audit done while we are actively currently working on the initial steps of the fiscal year 22 audit as well. Again, my intent as City Manager is that we will turn in our fiscal year 22 audit on time. And we are going to do everything that we can to get that done.

Madam Chair, with that I'll stop. I've taken air time on broad strokes and I'm happy to defer back to the Acting Finance Director Lotero and her team to explain more.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hansen, I'm going to ask you to wait just a little bit while we finish this presentation. I'd like to get some foundational information on the ground because I think it may help answer some of the questions that you have.

e. Buckman Direct Diversion Audits: Withdrawal of CliftonLarsonAllen LLP from Fiscal Year 2021 Audit Engagement.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Back to our acting finance director, did you want to take this up next please.

MS. LOTERO: I don't have a lot to say. I know that there are probably a lot of questions. We are, as the City Manager said, we are waiting instructions from the State Auditor's Office. We're kind of in a holding pattern waiting on that and I would defer now to Ricky Bejarano, he's our accounting officer and our acting Assistant Finance Director to make his comments in a more detailed way.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you. Mr. Bejarano, thank you for joining us tonight. You were also the point person on the audit; correct?

RICKY BEJARANO (Assistant Finance Director): Madam Chair, members of the Board, yes, in fact, I believe I am the point person on the audit.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: So you are the City's expert on all things that are happening inside and outside with regard to the audit. I really thank you for being here tonight to help the Board understand where we are. And with that I'll just let you launch in.

MR. BEJARANO: Thank you, Madam Chair. To lay a little bit of groundwork, the City had set essentially three deadlines for the 21 audit after the December 15th deadline which is the deadline for submitting the audit for municipalities. There was a deadline set of March 15th for the schedule of expenditures of federal awards. Then there was a March 31st deadline set for submitting a final trial balance. Then the third deadline was to have the audit submitted by June 30, 2022. The City submitted a schedule of expenditures of federal awards on March 16th I believe, the next business day after the 15th. And also submitted a trial balance to CLA on March 31st. The firm found both these, we'll refer to it as the CEFA, the schedule of expenditures of federal awards and the trial balance unacceptable because they began their testing and found gaps and informed us then that they would be withdrawing because the timelines had been so tight.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: If I can I would like to give the Board just a little bit more detail. One of the big areas in the trial balance, the reason why it failed, was that our cash was not reconciled. We have four almost \$5 million that is in the bank but not reflected in the general ledgers. So that is the work that is going on right now is to find out why there's 4 almost \$5 million in the bank that isn't reflected on the general ledgers. I think the newspaper reported that the cash wasn't reconciled but it left open the question of whether we were missing money or whether we had more money than our books reflected.

We are not missing money at this moment. We have more money in the bank than is on our general ledger. And, Mr. Bejarano, if you could just confirm what I'm saying is correct and then if you could also inform the Board of where you are in terms of reconciling that cash which was one of the big concerns for CliftonLarsonAllen.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, member of the Board, there was a \$4.6 million gap. There was \$4.6 million more at the bank, in the bank account, than had been recorded in the general ledger. Essentially, that indicates that money that was deposited into the bank was not recorded appropriately into the general ledger and it created that gap. But we have been doing, both staff and our main contractor, REDW, went back all the way to July 1, 2020 all the way – we're going all the way through June 30, 2021 doing a match item by item between what is at the bank and what is recorded within the general ledger.

The gaps appear to be because as deposits were entered into the bank, they weren't entered individually but in some cases they were batched when they were entered into the general ledger. In some cases it appears that they were not recorded into the general ledger at all thus creating that gap. So that needs to be reconciled. We're still going line by line. By tomorrow that match, the one-to-one match will be completed and then REDW will proceed with City staff to redo the reconciliation.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: And to date you have found some of that money as you've gone through that process?

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, members of the Board, as of this afternoon we were down to \$1.4 million from the \$4.6 million that was identified and it was indeed items that were either not recorded into the general ledger at all or that were transposed and were recorded too low.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: A couple of more things and then we can go to questions from the committee. The SEFA, the schedule of – tell me again.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, it's the schedule of expenditures on federal awards.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: You'd think that I heard that enough that I would know how to say it. But the acronym is weird to me. The problem there as I understand it, is that our SEFA did not reflect the \$17 million in CARES Act money that we pushed out at the end of last year. And Mr. Bejarano if you could just speak briefly to that so that the Board has the full information about the issues that caused CLA to withdraw.

MR. BEJARANO: Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board, the SEFA indicated – it did indicate the \$17 million from the CARES Act money in total but it didn't give the detail to the level that the auditors had expected. We have three major funds, airport transit and the Covid Relief Funds where they were having problems was with the Covid Relief Funds. In addition to that, they pulled back because with cash not being reconciled they couldn't tie the SEFA from a revenue perspective back to the bank.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay, thank you. And then I know one other concern that this Board has, one other interest is something that you and I spoke about earlier this week, Mr. Bejarano, about creating a separate chart of accounts for this Board, for this Board's resources so that we can stand independently of the City's audit and be audited directly without comingling with the City's money. And I may be mutilating how I'm explaining that but perhaps you can help the Board understand that in the long term that is a place we can get to.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, members of the Board that is correct. It was not mutilated. That is exactly what needs to be done. In my opinion, it should have been done from the very beginning. The funds should never have been – the funds that are comingled, again, to emphasize that the \$36 million from that settlement is in a separate investment account. So that is not necessarily at play here. What's at play is the operational funds, in my opinion, should never had been comingled with the City's funds. But we are talking years and years of comingle. That should be extricated from the City into a separate general ledger, separate bank accounts – it is a separate entity and should be maintained completely separately as should the account. I think that's it in a nutshell.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, and that is the direction we will move towards; correct?

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, members of the Board, yes, we will move towards that but the cutoff has to be at a good point. Let's say either July 1 or January 1 when we can cutoff clean. What it may require and I've done this before a number of times with these situations, what it may require is halting all financial activity for a week to two weeks. And determining when the best time to do that is going to cause some hardship and some difficulty because everything needs to come to grinding halt so that we know what we're moving over is adequate and accurate and so we know that we go in as clean as we possibly can. That is going to cause a lot of consternation.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you, and then just one more thing. If you could briefly help the Board understand, why you are the right man in the right hour for this task; that you have experience in this area. You have worked organizations through actually worse circumstances than the City finds itself and you know what needs to be done to move us forward.

MR. BEJARANO: Thank you, Madam Chair, those are nice words. What I can say is that I have experience with troubled entities, everything from embezzlement, going in after the embezzlements, to the situation that we have now where the books and records are behind and not up to scratch. The experience level that I bring is 44 years of accounting experience. I am a CPA by trade. I am certified. I've been issued a certification by the ASCPA for internal control expertise and simply put, I've been here before. I've been in the middle of this type of situation before and I've come out on the other end of it.

It is not going to be an easy situation. There is not an easy fix. But with hard work and the right people in place and cooperation we can move forward.

I think it's important to mention that we are the fiscal agent. This isn't our money. This is not our entity as the City and it's important to mention that the Board has and can obviously make the decision to acquire another fiscal agent if that's what the Board decides. I understand Commissioner Hansen's concern. I would say that the operational money is what we're talking here. We are not talking the settlement. I keep repeating that again because that's a \$36 million load of money which is not at all comingled.

With that, I guess I can stand for questions.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you. And then I would just tell the Board that the City's finance committee met Monday night as I think somebody mentioned, and we did spend a very good chunk of our meeting and every councilor on that committee asked very good constructive questions. We will continue to – we have been providing oversight in this process. I think there have been changes internally, including putting Mr. Bejarano in charge, and the finance committee will continue to provide oversight and will do so at a deeper level than it has done until this moment. I just want to assure this Board that the City takes this very seriously and very serious work is being done to correct where we are. Nobody wants to be here and there is unbelievable effort being placed on correcting this so we can move forward and get this ship righted. With that, questions from the Board? Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Mr. Bejarano, how long have you been with the City?

MR. BEJARANO: I joined the City on January 6th of this year, 199 days.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Ms. Lucero, am I saying your name right? How long have you been with the City?

MS. LOTERO: Yes, I have been with the City for three years.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay. The cash balances have been a problem for years and years and years as far as I understand from City finance. This is not something new that has happened. I don't have all the inside information so I could be wrong. But I am the chair of SWMA and I know from speaking with Randall that he has been concerned about cash balances for a very long time. This has been a constant, constant refrain from him every year when audits are late. So how can it be that if you go back to 2020 with the cash balances that you have faith that that is an accurate number?

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, at this point we're going line-by-line. We've done that already for disbursements. I can only speak for the year of audit. I can't speak for any prior years, those years are done and gone. But for this year what we've done with cash balances is we've gone item by item with disbursements and that work was done before the trial balance and the bank reconciliation was submitted. That was the focus at the time. At this point, we're going revenue item by

revenue item from every different source. We have numerous revenue items that come in, not just for Buckman but for the entire city and there are various methods of payment which adds to the complexity which is why we're going item by item, deposit by deposit. We are disaggregating deposits that were done in batch. So what I can assure is that for 2021 everything will have been scrubbed and we will know exactly where we are.

As I mentioned, we're down to \$1.4 million. By the end of tomorrow we should be even lower and at that point then the bank should be reconciled.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: If I can Commissioner. FY20, those numbers are audited numbers, correct. That audit is done. We have that. So that's why you're going line by line.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, we have added an extra month. We have gone all the way back to June of 2020 as far as the one-to-one match for both disbursements and revenues and we're bringing them forward to 6/30 of 21. So every item that has hit the bank, every check, every wire, every automated clearing house deposit, cash – we have a lot of coin, just the other day we had a deposit of \$8,000 in quarters that we did – all of these items, including the Buckman items are going one by one and that work will be completed, it probably is completed now but their deadline was close of business tomorrow.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: How much money are we talking about in the federal expenses like Councilor –

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: The SEFA.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Yes, the SEFA, how much money is in that that we're talking about?

MR. BEJARANO: What I have is the CARES Act money which is \$17 million. The other two funds I'd have to get for you. But they're significantly less. The big item is the \$17 million for the Covid Relief Funds.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: So the County has joined forces with you on a number of these things on CARES Act money. We have projects through the CONNECT Program that we worked on together so are those – are you telling me that those things are not reconciled at the moment? And is that why we –

MR. BEJARANO: No, Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, no. The schedule of expenditures of federal awards accounts for each disbursement that has been made and then each draw that is received from the federal money from the federal program. Those are accounted for. The reason the auditors had difficulties is because it has to tie back to the bank reconciliation which was not complete.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: City Manager Blair has his hand up, Commissioner, would you like to hear from him?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Sure.

MR. BLAIR: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, thank you very much, appreciate that. I just wanted to sort of get a sense of the scope of the questioning if this is related to BDD directly or if you are interested in us having a conversation but all portions of the audit? I just wanted to flag that for you, Madam Chair, just to get a sense of where we're headed.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: At the moment I am mostly concerned about BDD because I want to know how can we trust the City with, you know, BDD funds mostly

because this is a BDD Board meeting. I'm hoping that you will also show up at the SWMA Board meeting which is May 19th where I have invited Auditor Colón to come because I think the board members there also deserve to know what is going on with the SWMA fund.

MR. BLAIR: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, I think we'd be grateful to attend. I think we received a formal invitation or at least something that was forwarded to us through the committee chair. So, Commissioner Hansen, if you can send the details to us about the meeting we're happy to come and speak.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I am the Commission chair.

MR. BLAIR: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, I apologize for any confusion. We received notice of this meeting that we're on now via committee chair Romero-Wirth and so if there's some way Commissioner Hansen you could send us that information, I'm telling you we'd be happy to come on the 19th to participate on that.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay, I think that's important. Maybe you'll have more information by then. I'll give up the floor for now. Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you, Commissioner. Other questions?

MR. HELMS: Yes, I have one.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, Mr. Helms.

MR. HELMS: I would like to address to Mr. Bejarano and I'm sorry he can't see my face as to what sort of person I am, but I'm a klutz when it comes to computers and nothing really works on my computer including the camera.

I have one question and it may seem a little bit beyond BDD matters but it does in fact have quite a bit to do with BDD because of our confidence in who handles our money. You said, I believe, that of the \$4.6 million in the bank that was not shown in the general ledger that you had by now figured out what happened to about \$3 million. That left \$1.6 million out there still I believe that is what you said. And I would like to know if you found the reasons why the money didn't match and if there's a pattern in the reasons.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, Mr. Helms, yes. Essentially, one of the things that we're working on is how we account for – on a go forward, we need to restructure our whole cash receipts section, revenue account section. I could give any number of reasons, one of them being Covid, one of them being at one point we were down to one cashier at City Hall and I believe, I was not here at the time, but I believe the work was stacking up. The money was getting to the bank, that's usually everybody's focus was to get the deposits to the bank because under state statute there's a requirement to deposit by the next business day. That happened. But then the receipts to be recorded into the general ledger were stacking up essentially and there was catch up. As I mentioned, at one point, my understanding was that the City was down to one cashier due to either illness, separations from the City any number of personnel reasons. But the overall structure is being reexamined and once we do the restructuring we'll also relook at the internal control system all together to make sure that things are getting posted correctly.

MR. HELMS: I would like to say I thank you for that but it still hasn't really answered my question. Just because there's delay by work overload and the pandemic that we had and so forth and so on, how can you lose track of \$4.6 million if you're one person who does a job that's a lot of money. Maybe in a huge corporation a chairman might not notice it but someone down in the department, deep in the bowels of the department looking over numbers is going to -- \$4.6 million is a lot of money. I don't yet know or have not heard from you what actually happened? What leads to that kind of error? Is it systematic?

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, Mr. Helms, having been in the bowels of the department for only 119 days, I can only speak to what I've learned as I've gone along in this process. It does happen. As I mentioned, I've done this type of work before, and once you get behind with cash it's very difficult to get out of. Things pile up. They don't get recorded. In some instances they get lost. There are any number of reasons. Specific reasons, I really – unless I went back deposit to deposit with those people, I wouldn't be able to tell you.

What I can tell you is that this is a systemic problem and we're working to clean it up.

MR. HELMS: Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Other questions from the Board?
Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: In regards to BDD, you oversee our investment, our cash balances, what else do you oversee for BDD?

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, disbursements and payroll.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: And so unlike at SWMA where we take care of our own disbursements and payroll, if we start to move towards this idea of separation will that mean that Antoinette will be charge of the payroll and disbursements?

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: I think that may not be a fair question for Mr. Bejarano. That's a bigger question, but if you want to try and answer that.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, if I understand the question correctly, who BDD would assign to be responsible if you did extricate BDD from the City altogether that would be a BDD decision. We would not exercise any control over that.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Hold on. Commissioner Hansen, you still have the floor.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you. I'll yield to Commissioner Hamilton.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to respond to that point. It's my understanding that the process of having separate accounts for BDD doesn't take the other fiscal management out of the City's hands. They can still do payroll and stuff. But the accounts could be separated as the Chair and I discussed casually earlier in the week. We had pursued that concept of separating the cash accounts and whatnot so the audits could be independent. But there was no linkage of that to taking the other fiscal activities away. It's just that the accounts would be separate. I could be wrong. But that was my understanding at the time and I'm just putting it out there as is still my understanding of what we're pursuing. If I'm wrong, we can clear that up later.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hamilton, if I may. Yes, it would. It's not a pick and choose. The City either remains the full fiscal agent for BDD or it is no longer the fiscal agent for BDD. And then at that point, BDD would need to decide how it wants to handle those matters. I am not an attorney. I don't know what the agreement calls for, perhaps Ms. Long could comment. But it's not a pick and choose type

of situation. It's not a menu. The City is either the fiscal agent or it's not and that would actually, in my opinion, would complicate the situation even more.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: So now I'm really confused because I was never talking about a pick or choose situation. I thought at the beginning of this Chair Romero-Wirth said that you and she discussed being able to separate out so that BDD cash balances and all their accounts would be held separately and you even said, you thought that should have been done originally. But if that – what you're saying to me now makes it sound to me like you're saying if we go that way then we're basically choosing that the City is no longer the fiscal agent which doesn't make any sense to me. So I am very confused now.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hamilton, what I'm talking about with the pick and choose and perhaps that was not the right way to phrase it but if we disaggregate the BDD from the City then there has to be a complete set of books completely extricated from the City that includes your receipts, your disbursements, your payroll where it is standalone essentially.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: But, just to be clear, Mr. Bejarano, for BDD – for the City to continue to be the fiscal agent for BDD and for us to have a separate chart of accounts is possible. It's only if we want to no longer have the City be the fiscal agent then that's a whole different conversation.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hamilton, I think it is the same conversation. Essentially what I'm talking is that it needs to be – it should no longer be maintained in mutual. It's a separate entity. It would be standalone and that is different. We could have the City continue maintaining a separate set of books for BDD but I think part of the original intent was somewhat of an economy of scales. The City already runs a large payroll so the BDD employees are running with the City employees. The City has certain times when they process accounts payable, when they enter deposits and whatnot – all of that is being done essentially together. If we go down the path of extricating then we would need to dedicate resources to separately maintain everything BDD.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: You know, I have to say a couple of years ago when we asked what it would take, the year just prior to Covid, the City had a late audit, the Board asked what it would take, and admittedly that was me, to separate – what the problem was with the audit and it was the cash account thing, and the question was, what would take to separate the cash accounting for BDD so that the City audit didn't hold up the BDD audit. To clarify we asked for Mackie who was our accountant at the time and the rest of City finance to kind of answer that question of what it would take. And that's what they came back with. And they said it was possible to separate the cash accounting enough to do separate audits but they didn't want to do it right then because the City was moving over in the process of transferring like to a new accounting system, a software issue, a big transfer, etc., etc. And then Covid happened. Frankly, it's still an item, technically, an active item for the Board to think about.

So, Madam Chair, when you first talked about what it would take is this exact issue to maybe have a separate chart of accounts, I thought that was exactly responsive to what I had been thinking about previously. I mean, at the time, the audit, the fact that the payroll wasn't an issue – everything was reconciled except for the cash accounts. So all the other accounts the way they were managed were just fine to support, seemingly, that's what was reported out to support a separate audit.

So I think we still need to get some clarity. I don't have any desire to push the issue further or put anybody on the spot but I think it would be hugely helpful to pursue this concept because just for you know, Mr. Bejarano for your interest, BDD legally has very few -- you know, the City can be the fiscal agent, the County can be fiscal agent or the regional water authority can be the fiscal agent and since that doesn't exist -- right, Nancy, isn't that correct so far at the current time?

NANCY LONG (BDD Board Counsel): Yes, Madam Chair and Commissioner Hamilton. There are specified choices in the joint powers agreement establishing the Board as to what entity can be the fiscal agent as it stands now.

MR. BEJARANO: Madam Chair, just one more comment. Cash can't be extricated the way it's being described. You can't just go based on the cash itself as an account. Cash touches payroll, it touches the disbursements, it touches the purchase of assets. The notion that you can just separate the cash into separate accounts and everything is fine is not accurate. You would still need to pull in payroll. To keep things separate, if that's the desire, it would take a separate chart of accounts, separate set of books -- it would essentially need to be standalone.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Okay. I totally respect that. I was, as a non-accountant I was speaking at my level of understanding. I recognize the devil is in the details and that's really, really important which is why I finished by saying, I think it's valuable to pursue this further and not necessarily tonight. So I do respect that and you know I appreciate your input on that and I wasn't implying that it was simple but that it would be beneficial to think about what would be needed.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you, Commissioner. Other questions from the Board? I want to thank our guests for being here and helping with --

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Madam Chair.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: -- understanding what is happening. Commissioner Hansen, are you flagging me? Yes.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: So I just want to note for the record is that SWMA only has their cash investments, cash received and one other item that I can't remember at this time. [Poor connectivity/audibility] But because we've had a long enough discussion and we have the opportunity to have this discussion again next month and then we'll all be in person so I'll leave it there at the moment.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you, Commissioner. I don't see any other hands up.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We will be hearing more as we know more. With that we'll go on to our action item. Thank you to our guests for attending.

8. ACTION ITEMS: DISCUSSION AND ACTION

- a. Request for Approval and Recommendation to the Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners and the City of Santa Fe City Council to approve an amended Fiscal Year 2023 Buckman Direct Diversion Operating Budget, in the amount of \$8,235,780.00, and Other Fund Contributions, amended for the purpose of increasing the budget to include an additional 4 percent pay increase for employees for a total of an 8 percent pay increase**

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Mr. Carpenter, you are the staff on this.

MR. CARPENTER: Yes, Madam Chair and members of the Board. We have had several discussions about how to handle this. The original approach that Antoinette and I had contemplated taking was to try and absorb that within the budget. That would mean taking funds away from other things that we really do need. So this was at the suggestion of elected officials, including yourself, that we handle it this way but that would be that the item would have to come back to the Board to approve a new amount. The budget was already approved but this is a different amount so this is being brought back to the Board to approve that extra increment that 4 percent increase in the budget.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you. It's important that everybody understand that this salaries as we all know are reoccurring expense and that is why it's coming back in this form rather than just being absorbed. Questions from the Board?
Councilwoman Villarreal.

COUNCILOR VILLARREAL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to clarify, with that increase does that get taken from another place and where was it reduced from?

MS. ARMIJO-ROUGEMONT: Madam Chair, members of the Board, we increased the overall operating budget. So the budget that was approved in April included a 4 percent salary increase. So we amended the budget to include a total of 8 percent increase in salaries. The budget increased from \$8,097,000 to \$8,235,780 in the operating budget.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Councilwoman, it means that the partners pay more. It's not being moved – that's where Mr. Carpenter is saying rather than absorb it in the budget that we had taking it from another line item, that doesn't work because it is a reoccurring expense. It's better to just acknowledge that now and add the 4 percent that wasn't in there to get to the total of 8 percent which is what the salary increase was for City employees.

COUNCILOR VILLARREAL: Right and that's what we had anticipated in our own budgets with that money because nothing was changed in our budgets as much as some of us wanted to change. So on the County portion, you all had anticipated that as well, right, I'm assuming.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Not specifically. But we knew it was on your agenda. We knew there was talk about it so we recognized the possibility and we put it in the budget now and we'll be approving it soon. So that's accounted for at this point.

COUNCILOR VILLARREAL: Got it. Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hansen. Did your screen freeze?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you. Am I frozen?

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: That's alright, we can hear you

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I want to know where is the increase that you were talking about on the operating budget. I see we have \$8.7 on the page – are we looking at the increase? I see 8.8 – can you help me Antoinette?

MS. ARMIJO-ROUGEMONT: Sure, on page 8, table c, you'll see the salaries for FY 22 to FY 23 and note that the increase to FY 22 that budget did not

include the 4 percent salary increase for the current fiscal year. That's why it's a higher percentage of increase. We had to include the 4 percent plus the 8 percent but the 4 percent increase for the current fiscal year was already included in the other budgets that were submitted for approval.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay, thank you.

MS. ARMIJO-ROUGEMONT: You're welcome.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: This is an action item. Do we have a motion?

COUNCILOR VILLARREAL: Move to approve.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Second.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We have a motion and a second to approve the request for approval of this increased budget. Do we have further discussion?

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

8. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD – None were presented

9. NEXT MEETING: Thursday, June 2, 2022 at 4:00 p.m.

10. ADJOURN

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, Chair Romero-Wirth declared this meeting adjourned at approximately 5:35 p.m.

Approved by:

Carol Romero-Wirth, Board Chair

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Farrell, Wordswork

ATTEST TO

KRISTINE BUSTOS-MIHELIC
SANTA FE CITY CLERK