

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

**March 7, 2024**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

This meeting of the Santa Fe County & City Buckman Direct Diversion Board meeting was called to order by City Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth, BDD Board Chair, at approximately 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

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

**BDD Board Members Present:**

Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth, Chair  
Commissioner Anna Hamilton, Vice Chair  
Councilor Jamie Cassutt  
Commissioner Anna Hansen  
J.C. Helms, Citizen Member  
Tom Egelhoff, The Club at Las Campanas [non-voting member]

**Member(s) Excused:**

None

**BDD Board Alternate Members Present:**

Justin Greene, County Commission Alternate

**Others Present:**

Rick Carpenter, BDD Facilities Manager  
Nancy Long, BDDB Legal Counsel  
Bernardine Padilla, BDD Public Relations Coordinator  
Delfin Peterson, BDD Administrative Assistant  
Randy Sugrue, BDD Operations Superintendent  
Jesse Roach, City Water Division Director  
Peter Hunt, Glorieta Geoscience, Inc.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

**4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**7. ACTION ITEMS: CONSENT**

- a. Request for approval of annual payments to the Bureau of Land Management, Taos Field Office (BLM), in an amount up to \$77,409.82 for Right-of-Way rental fees**

Commissioner Hansen moved to approve and Commissioner Hamilton seconded. Upon unanimous [5-0] voice vote the consent item was approved.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. Approval of minutes from the February 1, 2024 Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting**

The following corrections were noted:

Page 3: “MR. SUGRUE: One hundred thousand to excavate and it’s not a ductile iron [inaudible] pipe...”

Page 3: “On the BDD rebuild project, the technical working group is working with City Procurement in developing the RF~~I~~Q/RFP process...”

Page 5: Kyle Harwood: “So that’s why the annual report says 202~~2~~3 because it was printed late last summer...”

Commissioner Hansen moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Councilor Romero-Wirth seconded and the motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

**5. PRESENTATION/INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

- a. Monthly Update on BDD Operations**

RANDY SUGRUE (BDD Operations Superintendent): Madam Chair, members of the Board, this is the BDD report on operations for the month of February 2024. Our raw water diversions averaged 3.38 million gallons per day. Our production out of Booster Station 4A/5A averaged 3.12 million gallons per day. Tom did not divert any water from Las Campanas that month. Our onsite storage variation was .17 million gallons per day. The City or BDD provided around 51 percent of the water supply.

On the graph, we had almost exactly average for the last 12 years in February of 104.75 million gallons. Regional water demand for the month of February was approximately 6.5 million gallons per day. The Rio Grande flows about 674 cubic feet per second. That is now increasing slightly. Storage at Nichols and McClure combined were about 68 percent of the capacity with an inflow at the time of about 1.8 million gallons per day. There is a slight change with SJC storage in Abiquiu now at about 8,660 acre-feet. There has not been any water yet allocated to City and County but I think SJCP will get in contact sometime in April with the first estimated allocation for 2024.

The El Niño/Southern Oscillation Summary dated February 20<sup>th</sup> is essentially the same with a transition from El Niño to ENSO neutral likely around April/June. I stand for questions.

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

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I was just going to make a comment. Does that mean it's going to be hotter this summer?

MR. SUGRUE: Last year was La Niña conditions and so that's generally warmer and dryer so we're a little more in a positive direction this year where one hopes, perhaps, a little cooler and a little wetter. But they're hedging their bets by saying it may be neutral. I'm a positive thinker.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I'm going to go with your positive thinking.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Any other questions or comments. Thank you.

MR. SUGRUE: Thank you.

**b. Report from the BDD Facilities Manager**

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We'll go to Rick Carpenter and also, Happy Birthday. I hope you're doing something fun after this since you have to spend a couple of hours with us.

RICK CARPENTER (Facilities Manager): Thank you. I am happy to spend those two hours with you and hoping my wife has dinner ready for me when I get home.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: And a cake!

MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Board, good evening. I have a brief memo in your packet. There are three topics in that memo. Update on Major Repair & Replacement Fund, the Facilities Manager is required to report activity on that. This month there has been no activity and there are no items to report. Next is the BDD re-build project progress, the Technical Working Group is working with Procurement to develop the RFQ/RFP process. And I'll give updates as available in future Board meetings. I understand that you, Madam Chair, will make a few verbal comments on that topic as well, and, an update on current vacancies. They consist of journeyman electrician, automation security technician, accounting supervisor, water operator intermediate and water system operator basic. And with that I will stand for questions.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Questions. Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: The accounting supervisor that has been published, right? Is that the term?

MR. CARPENTER: Madam Chair and members of the Board, yes, it was advertised. We received a short list that had two candidates on it. We've interviewed one of those candidates and the other candidate we will interview early next week.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Great, so that is some progress.

MR. CARPENTER: We are making progress.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Great. Are any of the other positions posted yet or is it still in HR?

MR. CARPENTER: They are posted and those are the ones that I read. There's one we are working on which is warehouse planner tech and we hope to get that posted very soon.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Great, thanks. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Do we know when we will get the RFQ and the RFP to be published?

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: I have some information to give you.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay, thank you. I'll defer.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Any other questions on the facilities manager report?

**c. Update from the Technical Working Group**

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Since we have some new members, I think most of you are aware and for new folks, we do have a Technical Working Group and it was formed to address certain aspects of the repairs and renovations necessary at the BDD facility and of course we're using the settlement funds from the litigation. We have a number of members, myself, the Vice Chair, the Facilities Manager, the Board's attorney or attorneys because we have Dan Frost and Nancy Long, the Las Campanas representative Tom Egelhoff, the consulting engineer Wayne Lorens and representatives from the City and County's utilities and water divisions. We have been meeting regularly for more than a year from the focus of the group's work since bringing the consulting engineer onboard has been the development of the appropriate procurement process for the repairs and renovations in conjunction with the City's Procurement Office.

The project is proceeding as a design-build procurement. It will be a two-phased process with the first phase being the RFQ, request for qualifications, phase seeking firms to submit their qualifications to execute the repair project. And then as a result of the RFQ process it is anticipated that three firms will be selected to submit detailed technical proposals as the second phase of the procurement.

So to Commissioner Hansen and I'm sure everybody is interested in when that might be issued, we had originally heard possibly today. The latest I'm hearing is that procurement met with staff earlier this week and that staff is currently doing a final review of the document. It won't be issued today but it is very close and Travis in our Procurement Office is estimating that it could be issued as early as tomorrow or perhaps Monday. So we are getting very close which is good news because we're been doing this for awhile.

What else do I want to tell you about that? The Technical Working Group has prepared an RFP as well for an owner's representative to assist in managing the design-build process and assuming no delays from or issues with Procurement, that RFP is expected to be released this spring in order to get the owner's representative in place to assist with the design-build procurement and then during the design and construction process. The work on the RFQ has been complex and detailed with a great deal of input from interested parties and it's the result of many, many hours of work by the Technical Work Group, Dan Frost and the City Procurement Office and really being thorough about what's the right path and making sure that everybody is comfortable with how we are proceeding. That has taken some time but it's on the horizon. So that's good. Nancy, did you want to add anything or Rick or anybody?

NANCY LONG (BDD Board Counsel): Yes, Madam Chair, we did, as you noted in your report, have a meeting, Dan Frost and Rick and I with Procurement earlier this week. We got their document. They put the RFQ into the City's format and made some other changes. They had worked on it extensively. Dan Frost, as late as last night and this morning, has some additional revisions that he has made and run by Rick and by me. And we will get those suggested revisions to the Procurement office most likely tomorrow

morning. So I don't know that it would be released tomorrow but I'm hoping that we can get it straightened out and get it ready to go next week.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: And I think one other thing to note is that the entire process, both phases of this RFQ, the phase 1 and phase 2 submittals will be concluded near the end of this calendar year when the contract award is the goal. So there's still some work and some time ahead but it's getting closer.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: So you don't see it being finished until December?

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: I think that's what we heard.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: A year and a half, two year process.

MS. LONG: Madam Chair, we're trying to shave off as much time as we can on the procurement calendar. We were working on that yesterday. But we've got the first and then a selection of the finalists and then RFP will issue and firms will need adequate time to submit very detailed technical proposals along with costs and we want serious bid proposals, that's going to take several months. And then that evaluation committee will meet again to review those. So it is a long process but we're doing our best to shave off any time where we can.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Other questions. Yes, Mr. Helms.

MR. HELMS: Could you talk a little bit about the owner's rep and that position. What kind of person or company do you have in mind?

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Do you want to answer that?

MR. CARPENTER: The way it is currently being foreseen by us on the Technical Working Group is that the owner's representative will be an expert in delivering design-build projects and most likely a PE, civil engineer, and will guide the technical parts of getting this project off the ground and completed on time, on budget and making sure that the design makes sense and is what the Board wants. And overseeing the construction phase as well.

MR. HELMS: As you mentioned, is this more of engineering and would be an individual rather than a company? And as you say, it will probably be an engineer but would he also or she have manufacturing background or operational background or is this a standalone engineer?

MR. CARPENTER: It hasn't been determined whether it would be an individual or a firm. That entity would have to have engineering expertise as well as project planning and the various phases such as product acquisition and things like that.

MR. HELMS: Does this position go out for bid or do we pick someone on our own?

MR. CARPENTER: It would go out to bid as an RFP.

MR. HELMS: Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Other questions. Okay.

**d. Information and Discussion on proposed additional of \$55,000 per year to BDD Budget for partial funding of a new Operations Superintendent position working part time at BDD**

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Welcome, Jesse.

JESSE ROACH (City Water Division Director): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Since I came to the City almost five years ago there have been different efforts to try to provide expertise from the Canyon Road Water Treatment Plant to BDD and vice versa and prior to then we had instituted a sort of informal operator exchange where – especially we were sort of going from the bottom up, entry level and basic operators would spend time at one plant and come back. This current proposal that I want to talk to you about this evening relates to a higher level attempt to create capacity in the entire Public Utilities Department.

The City of Santa Fe staffs three different treatment plants. Two are for potable water and one is for wastewater. And in each of those plants there are a number of operators. So the idea here is essentially to create one more position which is the same as the position that Randy holds but that position will move through all three plants. So the idea is likely – the current thinking is that that position would spend the winter months at the wastewater treatment plant, so November, December, January, February. And then spend the spring runoff months at Canyon Road, March, April, May, June. And then spend the monsoon season, high demand months at BDD, July, August, September, October. However, also, when vacancies come up, that person would also be in a position to fill that vacancy fulltime until the position is backfilled.

And one of the key ideas to this is the creation of capacity and understanding of all of our facilities to essentially train future facility managers. I will read one sentence verbatim from the memo and then I'll stand for questions. "In an effort to provide backup, cross training, idea transfer, and experienced employees with good understanding of Public Utilities Department treatment plants who are positioned well to step in to manage any of the three facilities either temporarily or as candidates when those positions are vacated, Public Utilities Department has added a floater Operations Superintendent who will spend approximately four months per year at each plant and can provide supervision at any plant when the primary Operations Superintendent at that plant is absent."

This is an informational item but the \$55,000 estimated cost for this, one-third of this position, is included in the budget that you will be considering later in the agenda. With that, I will stand for questions.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Madam Chair, Dr. Roach, thank you. So I think it's really important to have backup. I've used words here that people don't like and I'll try and stay away from those words but capacity building is a good word. So what I'm concerned about is let's say the operator at Canyon Road is gone for six months and then what happens if this operator can't fulfill their role at BDD? Is it then not taken out of our budget? Is there a way to track this that he will be or she will be at the BDD for those three/four months that we're paying for?

DR. ROACH: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, I think that is an excellent question. And to be honest with you, this is new ground for us having multiple divisions within the Public Utilities Department pay for a single staff member. So my intent would be exactly as you said is that we would like approximately one-third from each plant to cover this position. But in a situation where BDD doesn't use the position or BDD uses the position for six months, we would want each plant to pay their fair share. That would be the intent and I don't know exactly how the mechanics are going to work out.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I understand. I think there is a way to track where the person is and make sure that the appropriate agency is being responsible for that additional staff.

DR. ROACH: I believe so.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: So I think that that's an important part of the agreement. Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: From a slightly different point of firm but on a similar line of question, it seems like you're doing one logical thing which is picking times when you assume the demand, the need for the extra coverage would be greatest at each facility. And that makes sense. I have no problem with that. But do you envision a certain amount of flexibility? I'm just wondering if, like during the fixing process there are times when double coverage at BDD is also useful or some similar things at other facilities. So you get my point, right. And you wouldn't want to run a person ragged but would they have the flexibility to operate for you to have them operate on a different time schedule?

DR. ROACH: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hamilton, that also would be the intent and I think it makes sense that if they would be a third of their time at each facility if all three facilities were fully staffed and nothing exceptional is happening at any facility. But absolutely the intent of the added position would be building capacity and understanding of the full system and also providing extra help when it is needed at a particular plant.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Other questions? I'm a little worried about the administrative nightmare that could be created by having to track time. It's one thing if it is like months but if we're getting into – starts being portions of it. Really, it is about developing depth across the system which we all benefit from. So I guess I would disagree a little bit about the tracking by the hour or the month or day or whatever. It's a benefit to the whole system and I think that's what you're trying to build is to think of it as a system and having the depth and expertise across the system. And, again, I do worry about the administrative requirement of trying to track and how that breaks down. If we get into – if they're not there a full month, if it's only three weeks and then how do we deal with that. And if we have to breakdown to the days and the hours; I don't know. It seems like a slippery slope. I don't know if you'd had any thoughts about that.

DR. ROACH: Madam Chair, I think this is a little bit cutting edge and a little bit experimental and we'll have to see how it works and come back to the Board for ideas. I do think that there will be some explicit tracking. I think because the supervisor of this person will change. I think by default it will be Rick for four months of the year and then source of supply facility manager for four months and then the wastewater so we would probably set that up by default. But if it looks like this person needs to be on special assignment to BDD for a month or to wastewater for four months, at the end of the year we could change the supervisor accordingly at the end of the year and we would have that method of tracking. But your point is well taken. Even if everything is working well there is probably going to be a day when they're reporting to Rick where they might go to another facility. Tracking it down to the days, certainly the administrative burden would be too much and we're going to have to find the middle ground there between making sure the different facilities are paying their fair share and benefitting their fair share and that we're not overwhelmed by the administrative task of keeping track of that.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, it's a balancing thing. Oh, that generated comments. I'll go to Mr. Helms and then I'll circle to you and go on down.

MR. HELMS: I guess I'm going to be weighing in with Commissioner Hansen's point about tracking. I've had to track time, allocate time all my business life. You know, are you working on this project? Are you working on that project? Who's doing this and who's doing that? I do it all day long and I've done jobs on the basis where I had to keep track of this or that. And it seems to me that every single day you can have a sheet of paper and say, I allotted so many hours to this and so many hours to that. It might take 30 seconds of time and then there's a piece of paper and somebody can add it all up at the end of the month. I really don't think that that's a problem. If we want to track it and maybe we don't but if we do, it's pretty darn easy. I don't see it as a big deal, I really don't.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Yes, I think there's kind of two pieces of the question. So I don't know if you guys keep your timesheets on paper but we do them electronically at my office and so one possibility is to just have the codes and tell them where you are. But I think that's – Dr. Roach brought up the issue of supervisors, so there's kind of an overarching management thing that we don't want to go crazy with. I'm wondering if it's possible to – if you had something planned some of the other needs are going to come up as you go along. So by definition you can't totally anticipate them. I can see that happening any place. Maybe there's a process where if we're talking about the day or the week and you wait until the end of the year and look at the total time to true things up. If somebody really spent six months at BDD and only two at wastewater but it didn't really negatively impact the supervisory relationship because it was just here-there. Or if somebody is out at one of the plants for six months for whatever reason and it's a plant thing, maybe we can handle it more formally. But you can true things up at the end of the year using electronic information according to the timesheets.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, and we certainly wouldn't want to be paying for something we're not getting utilization from. So if there were some sort of hiccup where this person ended up being predominantly at one of the other two places and not really having any benefit to BDD that wouldn't be good.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: But if we hit some threshold, your point is also valid. There is some system wide benefit and maybe it is just a threshold issue.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you. I wasn't thinking of taking this down to the minute or the day. I was thinking the broad terms of three months, four months, and you get paid every two weeks so you have a basis to find out where the person is. It seems relatively simple to me and I don't think we have to be so minute in our detailing of where this person is as long as he's actually at the facility that he's supposed to be at. If for some reason there's an emergency at the wastewater plant and he needs to go there because somebody was sick or something like that happens then, I think there needs to be flexibility. But I also think there needs to be some kind of tracking and I know that Commissioner Greene has had his hand up.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Sorry about that. You've got to wave at me or something. Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Thank you. I didn't want to interrupt you but thank you very much, Madam Chair. I want to on the tracking thing, I want to make sure that



my concerns are one, that if somebody is dispatched or on assignment to BDD for four months that if there's not that much time in travel, right, because people can basically spend time running between three organizations and not get anything done. So half-days are pretty ineffective, right. So if somebody goes somewhere, they go for the day. To have something so that there's not so much really emergency, emergency, emergencies could be dispatched in between but if there's somebody who has to be dispatched and have it in the day in advance so people know where they're supposed to be.

Second concern is time-off accrued, so if somebody decides they're going to take their vacation, three weeks of vacation in the middle of BDD season that we're either compensated or some other way of managing that so that that happens to be managed properly. And, lastly, I think audits now take timesheets into consideration and this could be a complication when an audit comes and somebody's timesheet – and I know they don't audit everybody's timesheet but imagine if they pull randomly this person's timesheet and this becomes a complication. So I'm just thinking about how we can make sure that this doesn't become something that complicates our life more than necessary. Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yeah, I think this is good input and food for thought for Dr. Roach as you think about how we implement this idea. And this is new territory and we haven't done this before. These are the kinds of things that will have to be worked through. And I think it is also good for the Board to understand so that we have this conversation so that we recognize that there's a balance and we do need to keep track at a certain level but we also need to have some flexibility.

Any other questions, thoughts, comments? Thank you, Dr. Roach.

**7. ACTION ITEMS: CONSENT [Approved - see page 2]**

- a. **Request for approval of annual payments to the Bureau of Land Management, Taos Field Office (BLM), in an amount up to \$77,409.82 for Right-of-Way rental fees**

**8. ACTION ITEMS: DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

- a. **Request for approval and recommendation to Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners and City of Santa Fe City Council to approve the Fiscal Year 2025 Buckman Direct Diversion Operating Budget and Other Fund Contributions.**
  - i. **Presentation of the proposed FY2025 BDD Operating Budget and Other Fund Contributions**
  - ii. **Public Comment**

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We have two pieces of this. Our Facilities Manager Rick Carpenter is here and we're going to do a presentation on this budget and the other funds contributions and there is also opportunity for public comment on this item and I just wanted to point out that there are two phases to this discussion. Mr. Carpenter, do you want to take it from there.

MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Board. In your packet you will find the 12-page summary of the requested budget with a cover memo on top. I will just step through this. The BDD is pleased to present the proposed Buckman Direct Diversion Annual Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2025, and proposed contributions

to the Major Repair & Replacement Fund. The proposed budget accounts for all projected necessary costs to meet the Board's service level objectives and to continue to provide high quality water to our partners.

BDD staff actively collaborated with its partners on the development of this budget. There's a highlighted summary behind the cover memo and I'll run through that. The BDD requested operating budget for fiscal year 25 is \$8,512,347. The partner reimbursements are \$8,282,847. There is \$120,000 for PNM solar rebate and \$96,000 for federal funds.

If I could step through some of the highlights in the budget packet. I'd call your attention to page 2, which is a summary broken down into the major categories: federal funds, solar City's share, County's share, Las Campanas Club and Las Campanas Co-op. So the federal funds, again, \$96,000. PNM solar, \$120,000. The City's share of the operating fund would be \$5,678,747. The County's share would be \$2,283,503. Las Campanas Club, \$265,621 and the Co-op would be \$68,476.

I would call to your attention the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2025 very closely mirror and is very similar to the previous year's budget and in fact, the year before that. So there is a slight increase of \$221,794 and the emergency fund is fully funded at \$2 million and Major Repair & Replacement Fund request is \$1,535,019.

I would call your attention to page 5 of your packet which does compare this year's budget request with the last fiscal year that was approved by the Board. Last fiscal year was \$8,290,553. This proposed operating budget is \$8,512,347. That's a slight increase of \$221,794 over the previous year's budget.

I'll have you turn to page 9 of your budget. This again is just a description of the Emergency Reserve Fund balance. We are required to carry this by the governing documents of the board require it. We have funded the targeted balance of \$2 million. To my knowledge this has never been touched but the governing documents want it there in case there is a true emergency. It has accrued a little bit of interest, it looks like \$87,997. So that's in good shape.

On the next page you will see a discussion of the Major Repair & Replacement. The BDD Board has authorized \$2,961,007 for the major repair and replacement. Some of that has been spent and some of has not. Again, the request is for \$1,935,019. And a little bit of explanation on the next page, page 11, Table J. The red total across column, that's projects that have been completed and below that you'll see another number of projects that are in black type. Those are projects that are about to start and have been approved as part of the Major Repair & Replacement Plan. That's where the \$2,961,006 comes from.

Table K below itemizes the Fiscal Year 25 requested contribution for Major Repair & Replacement. Again, \$1,935,019, mostly related to valve replacements and some other big ticket items – membrane replacements, granulated activated carbon, PLC replacements and that's how we get to that figure.

And the last page combines the Operating Budget with the Major Repair & Replacement budget. So the City's operating fund would be \$5,738,702. The County would be \$2,210,048. The Club, \$265,261 and the Co-op, \$68,476. When you add to that the Major Repair & Replacement Fund which is \$1,375,667 for the City. \$483,190 for the County. \$33,251 for the Club and \$42,911 for the Co-op. That totals up to \$7,114,369 total for the City; \$2,693,238 for the County; \$298,872 for the Club and \$111,387 for the Co-op.

With that, Madam Chair and members of the Board, I would be happy to stand for questions.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Questions. Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. How come the Cop pays more than Las Campanas on the Major Repair & Replacement? I'm just curious.

MR. EGELHOFF: I know that answer. It is based off of capacity. The Cop has more capacity in the BDD project than the Club.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you. I appreciate that, Tom, thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Any other questions on the budget?  
Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question that might not be so much of a BDD question but might have to do with the City and County. How much does the City and County recoup of their contribution? Is it all recoupable? Are the utility rates for all customers on both of our respective systems able to recoup that or is this just a fixed amount and we recoup at our own peril or opportunity?

MR. CARPENTER: Commissioner Greene, I'm not sure I'm understanding your question but we bill our partners every month based on actuals so we have a projected amount and an actual amount, for example, how much electricity one partner uses versus the other that month and we go over those actuals.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And then it's each utility department's responsibility to separate and to try and recoup as much money as possible out of that \$5 million or \$2 million more or less.

MR. CARPENTER: It is very carefully tracked.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: It's the business of the City and the County to charge – they pay for water essentially like bulk water. They pay for what they use. So the County is a customer and the City is a customer and then it is their business to make their charge rates accordingly. And at the County we do it and at the City I have no idea but I imagine it's done responsibly.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: That was the basis of my question. I just wanted to know how much and how accurate each of our individual utility departments were able to match that --- the cost of water to how much BDD charges each of us. Thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Other questions? Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I know Commissioner Greene you might not have been there when we approved rate hikes for water but we're pretty accurate about recouping what we are spending, okay. You would want to look at those when we do the budget in a couple of months, in May, you can see the results there. I just wanted to take the time to answer that.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Great. Any other comments or questions, concerns?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I do have one, Madam Chair, sorry. Where is the \$55,000 located?

MR. CARPENTER: Madam Chair, Commissioner Hansen, the \$55,000 is not enumerated in this summary but it was put into the salaries line item of the budget.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: That brings up a question for me. Is it a strict \$55,000 in the salary? Is there some portion of that that is benefits and overtime?

MR. CARPENTER: Madam Chair, yes, that includes the full rate of what the projected salary would be of that person. So it's all in there.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay, thank you. So that \$55,000 is going to be split across a couple of those line items based on what you're telling me.

MR. CARPENTER: It is captured as a single line item in the salary portion of the overall budget.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: So there isn't a portion that is in the benefit?

MR. CARPENTER: The \$55,000 includes the benefits

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: I'm looking at page 5.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: It was in the previous part.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Commissioner Greene, do you want to use a microphone. I'm not sure what you're saying.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Apologies. So they broke out the full package in the previous discussion point.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Oh, right here. Okay, perfect. Thanks. This is an action item and you need approval from us tonight; is that correct?

MR. CARPENTER: That's correct.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Maybe also for our new folks could somebody speak to what happens next. We approve it and it goes to the County Commission and it goes to the governing body of the City; can you kind of walk us through this.

MS. LONG: Yes, Madam Chair. Tonight we're seeking a recommendation, approval for a recommendation of this budget that would then go to the respective bodies. To the County Commission and the governing body so they'll have the information for their budget. And then it would come back, if approved, and presumably it would be by each of the bodies. Sometimes there are some questions or tweaks. It will come back to this Board for final approval after that. So this is a recommendation for approval but you will see it again and that's usually in June.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: If there are no more questions –

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: You need a public hearing.

## **ii. Public Comment**

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: That's right. If we're done having this discussion then we can go to public comment. Is there anybody who would like to comment on the budget for the FY25 fiscal year for the Buckman Direct Diversion? I don't see anyone in the chamber and we are not hybrid in any way. It doesn't look like we have any public comment. Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I wonder about that not being able to be hybrid. Is there something in the budget that could help us pay for virtual participation or do we need to think about that? Since we're in the City Chambers is that something that is in your budget that is going to be happening?

MR. CARPENTER: I did not foresee putting that in the budget so it is not in there. But if it does happen and there are costs incurred by the Board it will be paid for out of Other Operational Expenses. Hopefully, it won't be a very big number.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: No, I don't think it should be a big number but I do think for public transparency and access we should have that available to the public.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, I think that is something we should revisit. It has been an issue for a while now. And I think that's the best we can do right now because it's not really on the agenda but there is no public here to make comment so I'm going to close that portion.

We can now go to entertain a motion for approval of the budget for the Fiscal Year 2025.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Madam Chair, I think it needs to be as Nancy stated a request for approval and recommendation.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay, are you going to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: A request for approval and recommendation to Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners and the City of Santa Fe City Council to approve Fiscal Year 2025 Buckman Direct Diversion Operating Budget and Other Fund Contributors.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Is there a second?

MR. HELMS: Second.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We have a motion and a second to approve the FY25 budget of the Buckman Direct Diversion Operating and Other Fund contributions. Is there anymore discussion? And if not do we need a roll call on this one?

MS. LONG: That would be in your discretion, Madam Chair. But I think maybe for budget you would want to do that.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, that's what I was thinking. Could we get a roll call.

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] roll call vote as follows:

Councilor Jamie Cassutt	Yes
Commissioner Anna Hansen	Yes
Mr. J.C. Helms	Yes
Commissioner Anna Hamilton	Yes
Chair Carol Romero-Wirth	Yes

**8. b. Request for approval for Chair Romero-Wirth, Vice-Chair Anna Hamilton, Facilities Manager Rick Carpenter and Board Attorney Nancy Long to serve on the committee to interview Citizen Member and Alternate Citizen Member applicants and provide recommendations to the Board for the positions**

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We have Nancy Long and Rick Carpenter here if there are questions. I'll open it up to questions or comments on that item. And if there are none, could I have a motion?

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Move to approve.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Second.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: All right. We have a motion and a second to approve this item. All those in favor?

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

**9. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC**

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: Once again we have a second opportunity for the public and we do not have any members – oh, are you putting on your public hat?

DR. ROACH: Yes, Madam Chair. One matter from the public is John Dupuis, the Public Utilities Department Director, went to grab a cake for Rick and since you were all expecting to be here for two hours I hope you’ll stick around.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: And I just saw him walk across the window there. Awesome.

**10. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Maybe we should sing Happy Birthday to Rick.

CHAIR ROMERO-WIRTH: We can sing after the meeting when the cake arrives. Other matters from the Board?

**11. NEXT MEETING:** Thursday, April 4, 2024 at 4:00 p.m.

**12. ADJOURN**

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, Chair Romero-Wirth declared this meeting adjourned at approximately 4:57 p.m.

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carol Romero-Wirth, Board Chair

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Farrell, Wordswork

**ATTEST TO**

\_\_\_\_\_  
GERALYN F. CARDENAS  
INTERIM CITY CLERK