

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

April 3, 2025

1. Call to Order

This meeting of the Santa Fe County & City Buckman Direct Diversion Board meeting was called to order by Justin Greene, BDD Board Chair, at 4:14 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:

Commissioner Justin Greene, Chair
Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth
Councilor Jamie Cassutt
Commissioner Hank Hughes
Peter Ives, Citizen Member Alternate
T. Egelhoff, The Club at Las Campanas [non-voting member]

Member(s) Excused:

Rolf Schmidt-Petersen, Citizen Member

Alternates Present:

Commissioner Adam Johnson, County Alternate

Others Present:

Bradley Prada, Facilities Manager
Nancy Long, BDD Legal Counsel
Kyle Harwood, BDD Legal Counsel
Jesse Roach, City PUD Water Division Director
Bernardine Padilla, BDD Public Relations Coordinator
Matt Sandoval, BDD Operations Superintendent
Walker Boyd, County Attorney
Jay Lazarus, Glorieta Geoscience, Inc.
Peter Hunt, Glorieta Geoscience, Inc.
Kurt Traverse, CLA Consultant
Joni Arends, CCNS

3. Approval of Agenda

Councilor Romero-Wirth moved to approve the agenda as published. Commissioner Hughes

seconded and the motion passed by unanimous [5-0] roll call vote.

4. Approval of Minutes

a. February 6, 2024 Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting

Councilor Romero-Wirth moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Hughes seconded and the motion passed by unanimous [5-0] roll call vote.

5. Matters from the Public

CHAIR GREENE: Joni, if you'd like to come up.

JONI ARENDS: My name is Joni Arends. I am with Concerned Citizens of Nuclear Safety. I've been watching this project since 2002 when the first scoping meeting took place down at the Chavez Center. I am here to address issues with the LANL SWEIS comment prepared by the Buckman Board and have some constructive criticism about how they need to carry more weight. They need to cover more issues. The LANL SWEIS, the Sitewide Environmental Impact Statement, is 1,200 pages long. It's going to cover a period of the next 15 years of operation which is until 2040. It's kind of difficult to think about that amount of time but when we think about the amount of waste that is buried on the Pajarito Plateau in unlined pits, trenches and shafts at different depths and with different contaminants and radionuclides and toxic materials, it's not a long time. So we need to look both ways. Both till 2040 but we also need to look down the line many, many years – centuries actually.

Right now there is 800,000 cubic meters of waste buried on the Pajarito Plateau in the unlined pits, trenches and shafts and it's moving towards the regional drinking water aquifer. The hexavalent chromium and perchlorate in Mortandad Canyon is just an example of the contamination traveling 1,000 feet below the surface to the water supplies. And so here we are at a project that is diverting water in order to facilitate people living in Santa Fe and we need to do better.

LANL has proposed three alternatives in the LANL SWEIS. There's a no-action alternative – and this is all required by the National Environmental Policy Act – a no action alternative, a modernized operations alternative and an expanded operations alternative. And each one builds upon the other. So it's not really a no action alternative. It's an alternative that is packed with projects.

CCNS is asking for an actual or true no action alternative because there is no other alternative other than these three that DOE has proposed. We are also asking for a reduced operations alternative which goes in the opposite direction of what LANL is proposing for the next 15 years.

LANL states that the expanded operations alternative includes the modernized operations alternative and it responds to feature nuclear security challenges and meets increasing requirements. It also proposes to have construction and operation of new facilities that would expand capabilities that LANL be on those that currently exist. Expanded operations are 50 pits plutonium pits per year to be produced there – 30 pits, 50 pits. And then they would a 927,000 square feet of buildings and operations. Then – and that's the big one, the expanded operations. But under expanded operation there's modernized operations and that would be 2.2 million square feet of new space and then under that is the no-action

alternative which would produce the 30 war reserve plutonium pits per year. So we have about 3 million square feet of new space at LANL and that's when it rains or snows that is going to collect and it's going to come down the Rio Grande eventually whether it goes on the surface or it comes down through all the different layers of geology to this area and that's for the next 40 years or 15 years. We need to look broader.

So our main concern is that the proposed BDD comments which is found in the next to last line in the comment letter, it states, that the Board supports the expanded operations alternatives which includes changes in operations, revised wildland fire, reduction treatment and management of feral cattle. So reducing the wildfire risk and the management of feral cattle are only a little tiny piece of the expanded operations alternative. And it doesn't address the number – the three tiers from the no-action alternative to the modernized alternative to the expanded operations which includes all three.

What I provided here [*Exhibit 1*] is from the summary of the SWEIS is the actual language from that section that describes the expanded operation so that you can see what LANL actually said. And then when you go down here on the actual page of S-12 you can see where the feral cattle and things are – on that's actually on the other sheet. It's on the first page, I believe, yeah, it's at the bottom of the page. The sentence in the comments seems to indicate that the expanded operations are supported by the board and I just want to point out that there's only two things here. This paragraph here, it's S.2.4, talks about the culmination of the three alternatives into this expanded operations. And then if you look on S-12, it says that there would be notable increased in annual electricity and water requirement over this 15 years. So we need to have a more holistic view of what LANL is proposing and the possibility of the need for the Buckman Board to protect the water supplies on the east side of the river at the Buckman and make sure that it's functional so that we're not just focusing – in this case, we're not focusing specifically at Pueblo Los Alamos Canyon. We're looking at the whole river and all of the contamination that has come down and is found in the springs along the west side of the Rio Grande the contamination that is already showing up at the springs of the Rio Grande including Spring 9, Spring 10 further down the river.

The CCNS's recommendation is that there's time, the comments are due April 10th. There's time to go back and write fuller comments that demand more protection of the Buckman and the river and the springs and the overall health of the area because, you know, they're talking about big increases – and I really do appreciate in the comments talking about the water rights issues cause that is huge. And just looking at the numbers for the water that they're anticipating using it really challenges under national security whether the Buckman would even be able to operate and take water. So it's bigger than what's been put forward and I think it needs to be strengthened. So thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Joni. Is there anyone else here from the public that would wish to speak to this or just public comments?

NANCY LONG (BDD Counsel): Jay, you are going to be presenting on that.

JAY LAZARUS: I'm speaking as the public right now.

MS. LONG: Oh, okay.

MR. LAZARUS: I know that it is totally unexpected and this is the second time I've done this, Commissioner Greene and everybody else on the Board, thank you.

On behalf of the City of Las Vegas, New Mexico we really want to thank Brad and Jesse for helping the city through their most recent water emergency at 700 6,000 tanker

trucks that filled at Buckman to help the City of Las Vegas. And on behalf of the City of Las Vegas, thank you guys.

CHAIR GREENE: And anybody else in the public that would like to speak.
Thank you.

[Chair Greene read the agenda captions throughout the meeting.]

6. Presentations and Information Items
a. Monthly Update on BDD Operations

MATT SANDOVAL (BDD Operations Superintendent): Thank you, Chair Greene, members of the Board. The memorandum is to update Buckman Direct Diversion Board on BDD operations during the month of March 2025.

The BDD diversion deliveries averaged 1 million gallons per day as follows: raw water diversions, 5.99 million gallons per day; drinking water deliveries through Booster Station 4A/5A, 5.20 million gallons per day average; raw water delivery to Las Campanas at Booster Station 2A 0.59 million gallons per day. The BDD provided approximately 70.5 percent of the water supply to the City and the County for the month of March of 2025.

Then I've also included in your packet the February operations report for your reference. And I'll stand for questions if you have any questions.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you very much. Since we missed last month, was there any comment from last month that we should have been updated in on part of this operations report?

MR. SANDOVAL: Chair Greene, members of the Board, nothing unusual.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple of questions. In terms of the water deliveries, do we have sense of the breakdown of the San Juan-Chama versus native water in terms of those waters coming through Buckman?

MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you, Board member – as far as breakdown per day? I'm not sure I understand.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Yes, a daily and also a daily calculation.

MR. SANDOVAL: It does change week to week depending on the forecast for the week. And looking at the month of March it was anywhere from 2 to 3 million gallons per day San Juan-Chama. The extent of the rest was native as part of our forecast.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Just curious because I know the City has a certain portion that it can pull as does the County and the County has a mixture of the native and the San Juan. So I am just always curious about that. There was a question from citizen member Schmidt-Peterson which was, can you describe contingencies for providing water demand from BDD or other sources if one or more of the City or County sources of water is unable to provide its planned supply in what's looking like a dry/warm spring. And that dry/warm spring seems to be reflected on the other charts that are here within the packet.

MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you, can I refer to Jesse Roach.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Hold on just a second. So is this an appropriate topic? This is a bigger issue than BDD. I just don't know if it needs to be noticed on the agenda to be talking about the water supply overall not just the BDD operations. I am just asking the question.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: I think it is fair because it does relate to BDD operations if there are contingency plans in place.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Right, but we're talking about the overall water systems and I think the way you phrased it was for the City and the County and we don't have a County representative here from their water division; do we?

BOARD MEMBER IVES: It doesn't look that way.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: This to me feels to me – it's an interesting topic and I'm curious about it but I just don't know –

CHAIR GREENE: Is there a process here that we can forward this on and at least have it reported out? It is an interesting topic and then the goals of transparency to get this sort of thing – if one person is asking, 100 people are asking.

MS. LONG: Mr. Chairman, we could have it as an agenda item at our next meeting if people are available and have it as a separate item so we could have a whole discussion on it and presentation.

CHAIR GREENE: There's a level of I know that this is BDD but there's a level of the two water boards in a way could be reporting on some water things in the future even if it's not related as a sort of mechanism –

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I just want to make sure that the people who might be interested in this would have notice and would be here to hear what the information is. And that's why we put things on the agenda.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: I certainly have no objection to having a session looking at those issues and understanding what contingencies are being put in place given it's looking like a dry season. If we could add that as an agenda item and make sure we have people here who can address those topics that would be great.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I also think, Mr. Chair, just that that is a big an important question and I would like the staff to be able to go through that in a coherent way.

CHAIR GREENE: Jesse, do you think you could be prepared for your team by next month and we'll send the request over to our team at the County. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And I'm sure that these contingency plans are being considered so if we could get a fuller presentation and maybe some materials beforehand looking at those issues, that would be great.

CHAIR GREENE: Any other questions? Anybody else for operations? Seeing none we'll move on to 6.b.

b. Report from BDD Facilities Manager

BRADLEY PRADA (Facilities Manager): Thank you Board members. So we have made significant progress on our MR&R plan. We are moving forward with a procurement process purchasing three different GAC replacements and also two different membrane rack replacements. On the rebuild project, phase II design-build procurement documents have been finalized and distributed to offerors. Responses, including technical solutions, schedules, and cost ranges, are due in early May. BDD and City Procurement have been leveraging the City's established on-call engineering contracts to streamline the process for securing our owners' representative. We are actively negotiating with candidates and expect to finalize the agreement in the coming months.

Good news on the audit, it has been finalized and sent out. Due to conflicting schedules we weren't able to schedule and put this on the agenda but it will be next month.

And as you can see our current job vacancies, we have been filling more than a few. We have also lost a few so we haven't really made much headway in that respect but we are hiring some of these more important roles. And I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR GREENE: Any questions?

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Just one question on the status of efforts to engage an owners' rep in connection with the design work plans going out.

MR. PRADA: I'll defer that to Nancy.

MS. LONG: Mr. Chairman and Member Ives, as Brad mentioned we do have the ability to utilize the City procurement for their on-call engineer contracts. There are several candidates that look very promising. We are moving ahead with one of them in terms of some further negotiations. And we're hopeful we'll have an owners' rep contract for you in the very near future. I would like to say at our next meeting but I don't want to promise that. But we are working on it diligently.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Councilor Cassutt, anything from the real world?

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: No, thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Just to reiterate that owners' rep is probably the most important thing that I see on our agenda right now so expediting that and making sure we get a good one is – it's great to have this on-call person providing those eyes but the earlier that somebody comes on the better the results we'll get on the procurement for the actual engineers. Wonderful.

7. Action Item: Discussion Agenda

a. Request approval to delegate to the BDD Board Chair to execute an Amendment to the "Memorandum of Understanding between the US Department of Energy, Office of Environmental Management, Los Alamos Field Office and the Buckman Direct Diversion Board Regarding Notification of Streamflow and Water Quality Monitoring in Los Alamos and Pueblo Canyons extending the termination date and allowing additional time to negotiate a new MOU.

KYLE HARWOOD (BDD Counsel): Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the Board. Thank you. So the recommendation that we're bringing to you this evening is to delegate to the Board Chair authority to entertain a new extension. At this point, we think it would be prudent to have your involvement, Mr. Chair, with our next conversation with our LANL counterparts to try and resolve this issue for the MOU extension and the MOU replacement agreement. I don't know if you want to hear anymore from Jay or I about where we are but that's the gist of the recommendation today for going forward and we'd like to suggest we work with you to get that call scheduled with Jay and I and our counterparts at LANL.

CHAIR GREENE: I'm game for anything like that but I'd also wanted to see if that's – there's been precedent with this and is this typical.

MR. HARWOOD: We've had various Board member involvement with regulatory agencies. I think notably to a series of meetings that we had with senior NMED

staff. We've also had different contact with all different levels of the Department of Energy by prior Board members so it is not outside that set of prior experiences.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I guess I have a question, Mr. Chair, if that's okay. So this agenda item again, sorry to be -- request approval to delegate to the BDD Board Chair to execute an Amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding; what does that mean exactly? I thought we were extending the -- I know that when I was Chair we extended the time and we were going to have a meeting and there might be some need to sign an agreement to extend the time and so I was granted authority to sign something that we would extend the time. But this seems a little broader in some areas.

MR. HARWOOD: It's intended to be the same authority, Councilor.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay.

CHAIR GREENE: And to sort of clarify; it's just to negotiate the extension or to actually help get over the finish line?

MR. HARWOOD: Both.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And I guess, I'm just wondering because the last time we did this it was just to extend -- it was just to sign a piece a paper that says, you can extend the deadline and we got the Board's approval for me to sign that piece of paper. We didn't grant the authority to talk to folks at LANL about the agreement and I don't know whether it would be appropriate to have a City representative as well, either Councilor Cassutt or myself. And I see Councilor Cassutt has her hand up. And I'm just curious whether -- again, I haven't seen this and obviously not because this is a new situation.

MR. HARWOOD: I should clarify my answer a moment ago. This specific authority is similar to the one that you were given which is to negotiate and execute an extension not to do a replacement agreement. But when I was answering the question about the nature of the call and the topics on the call it is sort of mapped out the extension, the work that needs to be done for the new MOU and we think that the involvement of Board leadership is appropriate at this time.

CHAIR GREENE: I'm at the top of the pyramid but I also have a vice chair and, you know, if the vice chair with her knowledge of this wants to participate, let's do it. Is that good?

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I guess I would defer to our legal counsel on this.

MR. HARWOOD: It would be just as easy from our perspective, you know, we're going to schedule something with busy people and it's easy to do it with you and Councilor Cassutt, we've got a number of other people who need to be on the call and we would happy to proceed with that.

CHAIR GREENE: Do you want to do it or do you want to defer to her?

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: I'm not here right now so I would meet with her.

CHAIR GREENE: Yeah, she could also delegate to you if she feels like that's --

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I think this one is a little broader than the one we approved last year so it might be good to have us both on the call.

CHAIR GREENE: And, I mean, there's a level of getting me up to speed probably and to really get into the details of this so that we're a little bit more prepared when these things happen. And how much -- this time they're asking for the extension; correct?

MR. HARWOOD: We're still needing an extension. Yes, they've asked for an extension through December.

CHAIR GREENE: Nancy.

MS. LONG: I was just going to point out that and I think that your question answered it or your statement did. There are really two separate things: it's extending the current MOU and then negotiating a new one. So I think first is just to get the extension in place and I understand that LANL is asking for until the end of the year but I would think you would want something shorter to get the negotiations heated up a little bit more so that we can get to a new MOU.

CHAIR GREENE: I agree. I mean that would probably be my first intention with the extension not to go all the way to December but you know September –

MR. HARWOOD: I don't think we meant to use the word "heated" in the fullness of that.

CHAIR GREENE: Yes, with intention.

MS. LONG: That's what I meant.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you for clarifying. Mr. Ives.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Quick question, who is negotiating this on behalf of BDD currently?

MR. HARWOOD: Jay and I.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Okay. I do not see any reference in this to changing that structure. If there's a request to extend the existing agreement and then also allowing additional time to negotiate a new MOU which is different than saying a whole new negotiating team. I'm trying to really understand what is being sought here.

JAY LAZARUS (Glorieta Geoscience): Chair, Board members and Kyle correct me if I'm wrong, he always does. But what we're looking at here is really just two items that remain on negotiation but they're big items. One is the amount of money that we would be receiving from LANL for our monitoring and the other one is the replacement of the E110.7 gage. Everything else is pretty much agreed on, it's just those two items and they're biggies.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And I understand that but it didn't answer my question which is, are you proposing to change the negotiation team and how negotiations are being handled as part of this? Because this here doesn't say that to me.

MR. HARWOOD: The intent of the caption, Member Ives, is to give the Board Chair the authority the authority to sign the extension which is the same authority given to Councilor Romero-Wirth at the end of her chairship. The tension what we've requested and what the lab has suggested we think that now is appropriate to involve the Board Chair in resolving that so that we can make the space for negotiating the new MOU that will exceed the current one.

So the agenda item is intended to be a mirror. I think it is a direct mirror of the one that was previously presented. But since this has now become intertwined with different degrees of extension and how that fits into the replacement MOU, that's the suggestion from us today.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And in the reference here "allowing additional time to negotiate" which is different than changing your negotiating team to include this delegation, it really suggests that you're saying strike allowing additional time. So it's extending the termination and to negotiate the new MOU.

MR. HARWOOD: The intent of that phrase from the prior agenda item and this one is that we need the extension to allow for the time for the new one.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And I understand that and that's clearly there. But the question of negotiation is –

CHAIR GREENE: So, I think and I don't know actually if we are required to delegate here who the negotiating team is. But if there's a request by you for the some of the Board to be a part of this to sort of get it over the finish line, I think we can take that request and find a City representative and a County representative to be on that without necessarily having an action on that. So really, let's break these things into two and we can then take legal and advisory support to that and take that – so I'm going to break this into two things. First thing, we have request for approval to delegate BDD Chair to execute an amendment which is an extension to this. So do we have a motion to take care of that?

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Move to approve.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Second.

CHAIR GREENE: We have a motion from Councilor Ives and a second from Councilor Romero-Wirth. Roll call please.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I'm sorry, just before you do that. Councilor Cassutt did have her hand up. I just want to make sure that whatever questions she had got answered.

CHAIR GREENE: Go for it please.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Thank you. I did just want to clarify so Commissioner Greene, you're breaking this into two pieces but right now we have on the caption is only describing the Board Chair and so I just want to make sure that not specifying as we vote having a City representative there that that's not going to impact our ability to do this. So my understanding is that there is a negotiation team that will have a City representative but we are saying here is that as Board Chair it's essentially the ability to –

CHAIR GREENE: Sign the extension.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: If that is who signs the agreement, okay.

CHAIR GREENE: It's just the extension. We're not going to sign – the agreement will come before us once it's negotiated. But all we're talking about is signing the extension in this motion.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Okay, thank you. I appreciate that clarification.

CHAIR GREENE: Yes, roll call please.

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

Peter Ives, Citizen Member Alternate	Yes
Commissioner Hank Hughes	Yes
Councilor Jamie Cassutt	Yes
Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth	Yes
Chair Justin Greene	Yes

CHAIR GREENE: I'm going to just let you guys come back to us and say, please, you guys, decide who wants to be a part of this from the City and we'll figure it out on this side as well.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: So the MOU is going to come back to the full board to approve?

CHAIR GREENE: Absolutely. The final MOU absolutely.

MR. HARWOOD: As it always has.

CHAIR GREENE: Yes.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Mr. Chair, if I can. I think what our legal counsel is asking for is Board leadership so I think naturally that would be you as Chair. If we want to have a City representative it is me as Vice Chair.

CHAIR GREENE: Okay.

b. Review and Approval of Buckman Direct Diversion Board Comments on Los Alamos National Laboratory Draft Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, Jay Lazarus with Glorieta Geoscience. As part of the 2025 Water Quality Work Plan item #6 on the work plan specified that we would comment on the SWEIS as appropriate focusing on the items.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: I don't think the mic is on, I don't hear anything.

MR. LAZARUS: Is that better?

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: There it is. Thank you so much.

MR. LAZARUS: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, thank you. Jay Lazarus with Glorieta Geoscience. We're talking about the Board's proposed comments on the SWEIS. Our comments follow item 6 on the 2025 Water Quality Work Plan which was to provide comments on the SWEIS on item that were of specific interest to the Board and specifically affected the Board and they're specially addressing the hexavalent chromium plume, PFAS contamination and water rights. And I don't want to go through and read the whole document but we have limited our comments to those items that are specific to the Board's interest and I'll be happy to stand for any questions or discussion.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you very much. Commissioner Hughes.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yes, I don't understand why we are supporting the expanded operations alternatives when a lot of times the no action alternative or zero action alternative is just as desirable.

MR. LAZARUS: Because this was the – Chair, Commissioner Hughes, because this was the one alternative that addressed the wildfire risk and feral cattle. Wildfire risk is really important to us.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Can we support the wildfire risk without supporting the rest of the expanded alternative?

MR. LAZARUS: If the Board so chooses, yes, we can.

CHAIR GREENE: Yeah, and I kind of like to support that but other questions before I give mine?

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, a question, do we want LANL to more explicitly address legacy contamination that could migrate down to LA Canyon should more big fires occur or at least try and get them to upgrade the early warning system for close down LA Canyon into the Rio Grande?

MR. LAZARUS: Member Ives, members of the Board, I'm trying to remember both of your questions. You are a lawyer and you do compound questions. But the second one specifically, yeah, wildfire risk is for real and we are supporting their efforts to reduce the wildfire risk. I have firsthand experience, Peter and I, with the City of Las

Vegas with what a wildfire did to the Gallinas server watershed so that's why we addressed the wildfire risk in here.

Could you please repeat the first part of that question?

BOARD MEMBER IVES: I said, should we want them to more explicitly address legacy contamination that could migrate down LA Canyon should more big fires occur?

MR. LAZARUS: We could include that. That's not specifically in – I followed the language in the 2025 Water Quality Work Plan looking at the specific concerns that the Board has. If the Board wants us to expand the comments to looking at how legacy contamination may come down LA and Pueblo Canyons and the tributaries, we can add that also.

The SWEIS, with all due respect to all the people that put all this energy into it, it's a big arm wave in a lot of ways. There aren't a lot of specifics to sink our teeth into and we're a little disappointed that there weren't specifics in there for us to sink our teeth into especially as it related to the Board's specific concerns. So we took our specific concerns and tried to fit it into this broad, broad document – I'll put it that way.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And then do you think it would be worthwhile to ask them about upgrading the early warning systems in some way that would be able to detect and provide information more quickly?

MR. LAZARUS: If you want to – it's not a matter of providing the information more quickly. It's a matter of upgrading the gauge – it would be providing some of that information more quickly depending on how they would do the reconfigured E110.7. We're asking them and – if I'm understanding you – you're right, Member Ives, what you're asking for is incorporating our MOU ask into the SWEIS comments. So if the Board desires that, we can revise this and put that in there.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: It would seem to certainly elevate the result a little bit if we were consistent in several different interactions with them.

MR. LAZARUS: Bear with me as I write a couple of different notes. But, yes, we can do that.

CHAIR GREENE: I believe in consistency.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: And I would suggest at the same time taking out the support for – the Board supports the expanded operation, just taking that out of the last sentence, the second to the last sentence.

MR. LAZARUS: I just made that note, Commissioner Hughes.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay.

CHAIR GREENE: Councilor? On the side bench over here, Commissioner Johnson? Councilor Cassutt?

MR. LAZARUS: If I may, Mr. Chair, comments are due one week from today and we wanted to make sure that – and this is one of those rare occasions where we're actually on time. But this is also structured for all of the Board members to sign the documents. So in terms of the mechanics of making those changes, getting Board approval and getting all of the members to approve it, I'll do whatever the Board wishes but we need to understand how the mechanics are going to work a little bit on this.

CHAIR GREENE: Nancy.

MS. LONG: I was just going to note, Mr. Chairman, that the Board should approve it now with the changes that have been recommended so that that action, if that's what your inclination is to approve it, that should go ahead and get done tonight. And then the letter can be circulated for signature. We'll find a way to do that.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Mr. Chair.

CHAIR GREENE: Yes.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Is there a way on the last sentence, so it says, the Board supports expanded operational alternative which includes changes in operations, revised wildland fire risk reduction treatment and management of feral cattle. But we are concerned about wildland fire risk reduction treatment and the management of feral cattle, so is there a way to say that without –

CHAIR GREENE: Endorsing the –

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: -- yes, endorsing the operations alternative?

MR. LAZARUS: Councilor Romero-Wirth, we could just take out the language that says "expanded operations alternative" and wordsmith it appropriately. But take out those few words and if I'm not putting words in Commissioner Hughes's mouth, I think that is what he was looking for.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Right, except he worded it as take out the last sentence which I think the whole memo is around, well, not the whole memo, but, makes these important points which are our concerns and –

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: No, I meant what he said.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: To say the Board supports changes in operations to reduce the revised wildland fire risk etc.

CHAIR GREENE: And I would advise some highlighting of that and sort of calling out that this should be part of a no alternative – right? No growth or modernization, whatever it is, these things should be happening regardless of whichever way they go.

MR. LAZARUS: Would it, Mr. Chairman, would it be okay with the Board to have language saying, regardless of which alternative the lab proceeds with –

CHAIR GREENE: These are our priorities and a, b, c.

MR. LAZARUS: Exactly, but only for this wildfire section.

CHAIR GREENE: And the feral cattle. The things that would protect our water at the BDD that regardless of their choice of how they expand or don't expand or modernize.

MR. LAZARUS: We can do that.

CHAIR GREENE: Wonderful. And so, you know, in this the wildfire passage, I think is fabulous/fine, but if I were drafting this I would put an inclusion paragraph after this that then restates everything, you know, stated, restated, tell me a third time just in case I missed it, and put the sort of summary of all of these recommendations including, you know, that last sentence is almost the conclusion but it's buried under wildfire. So another paragraph comes in and says, in conclusion the Board of the BDD says these are the important things and despite your/our arm waving these are the most important things.

MR. LAZARUS: Chairman Greene, would it fulfill your request if we instead of conclusions maybe say recommendations?

CHAIR GREENE: Sure. Just summarize everything into a short paragraph that says the most important things a third time.

MR. LAZARUS: We can do that.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Councilor Cassutt; anything?

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: I'm okay, thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Anybody else have anything?

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Move to approve as we've outlined.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: What's the other change besides the one we've talked about that I suggested?

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: A summary of the points that are being made.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Right and then was there another change too?

MR. LAZARUS: -- contaminant, wildfire, remobilizing legacy contaminants in LA and Pueblo Canyons if I got that right.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Upgrading the warning system.

CHAIR GREENE: And quantifying – I don't know what's in there but it would be good to know.

MR. LAZARUS: In terms of a contaminant inventory that is something that the lab is doing, albeit at lab speed.

CHAIR GREENE: I would encourage an expedited – I would then add an expedited –

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Which is warp speed [laughter]

CHAIR GREENE: We have a motion and do we have a second out that?

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: So moved.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Second.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Second.

CHAIR GREENE: So we have a motion from Councilor Romero-Wirth and I heard Councilor Cassutt before Commissioner Hughes. So with those corrections we will get it edited and redrafted in the next few days. Roll call please.

MR. LAZARUS: Before you do that, I'm sorry. Mechanically, how do I do this? Who do I push it to? Do I get it to Nancy and it will be distributed.

MS. LONG: We'll figure it out.

CHAIR GREENE: We'll figure it out. Nancy and I will figure it out.

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

Peter Ives, Citizen Member Alternate	Yes
Commissioner Hank Hughes	Yes
Councilor Jamie Cassutt	Yes
Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth	Yes
Chair Justin Greene	Yes

c. Request for Approval of Buckman Direct Diversion Board Policy Addressing the Tapping of BDD Transmission Lines.

CHAIR GREENE: Jesse, please.

JESSE ROACH (City Interim Public Utilities Department Director): Chair Greene, members of the Board, the BDD includes two transmission lines that we refer to as 4A and 5A which deliver finished water to the City and County potable distribution systems. There is no formal policy in place for considering and approving new connections to these lines. The policy proposed here requires BDD approval of new connections to these lines, specifies that those connections can only occur at locations where tees and valves were installed during transmission line construction, and lays out required specifications for said connections.

The policy itself is quite short, so I think I'll go ahead and read that and then I'll stand for questions. There's additional background information in the policy but the policy itself says, No connections will be allowed to the BDD 4A transmission line. All future connections to the BDD 5A transmission line will be solely through the use of the existing blind tees. Any connection proposing to tap the BDD 4A transmission line or BDD 5A transmission line without using an existing blind tee is prohibited. Connection to the 5A transmission line at a blind tee will require BDD Board approval of the connection, adherence to BDD connection specifications and installation of a master meter to BDD specifications. Once the connection and master meter have been inspected and accepted by the BDD Facilities Manager, the master meter will be dedicated to, and become part of, the BDD Project. BDD connection specifications and master meter specifications are included as a drawing with notes for either 6 inch or 8 inch master meters as an attachment to this policy.

I've also provided a map that gives a visual to the table in the policy that explains where the blind tees are and I apologize to Councilor Cassutt, this is a last second map development and there are hard copies in the room and we will attach a copy of this to the policy for purposes of clarification. With that, I would stand for questions.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I would move to approve the policy.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Second.

CHAIR GREENE: We have a motion from Councilor Romero-Wirth and a second Councilor Cassutt. Any discussion? Yes, sir.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just that the only map I have is a sort of engineered drawing of –

MR. ROACH: I apologize. There weren't quite enough to go around but there should be one there that you can share with Commissioner Hughes. And I guess while you're looking at it and familiarizing yourself with it, I will say that this is explained a little more fully in the policy but this policy essentially says that the 4A line can be tapped. So the 4A line goes from the Buckman Direct Diversion to the 10 million gallon tank in the La Tierra open space. It is our policy that that line should not be directly tapped. The distribution lines that come back from the tank are how people get that water. Now, of course, anything could be done by this Board but it would require a different motion. By policy we would say not and that you have to figure out a way to ask for a special exception.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: I don't know how the original 10 tees were identified or what potential development there was around the city at that point in time. I guess I have a lot of questions about how all of that developed where we're at this point around the city that I would need to understand better before saying let's prohibit other taps. We know we have the housing shortages and crises and there's land that can be developed likely along these corridors. So, I'm not ready to vote in favor simply because I think there's

more information we need to know before saying, no, you can't do this. And I realize that could be changed but once you put something in place it's a lot harder to change it.

MR. PRADA: Mr. Chair, may I say something?

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And I have something to say as well.

CHAIR GREENE: Yes, go ahead.

MR. PRADA: The way the 4A line functions we just can't tie into it the way that it functions. The 5A line is run by pressure so that means we can tie into it. So to reiterate what Jesse was saying, is that it would take massive engineering maybe even a booster station, something like that, to tie in to the 4A line. It's just the way it functions.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Mr. Chair.

CHAIR GREENE: Hold on. So is your question based on the 4A line or just on what you're seeing with the 5A line?

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Really both because, again, I didn't have the map. I sort of saw this but had no idea where these tees were or in fact where these lines were running. I'd just like to understand all of that better against the background of city development generally.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Can I put a frame around this. I think that it is important to remember that BDD is a wholesaler; right. And in terms of your question which I think is focused on the development needs of both the City and the County, there are other ways to tap into those water systems without tapping in to how we deliver wholesale water to the partners. So I think this is – and maybe Director Roach, with that lead in, can help us better understand why it's really important that we have this policy.

MR. ROACH: Chair Greene, Member Ives, Councilor Romero-Wirth, thank you. I would say that in best practices you have transmission lines – like with electricity, frankly – you have transmission lines that move bulk water around to storage tanks and then you have distribution lines that customers can tap into. I think that also as a wholesaler, in a perfect world there would only be transmission lines going from BDD to the distribution network. In the case of 4A we decided, somebody decided and I don't have the context that you're asking about on how they decided where to put the blind tees on 5A, but in terms of 4A the decision was made to take this water to the tank and there's also one other potentially – there's a booster station along the way where water potentially could be split out to the County. But the decision was made that that's sufficient and we won't tap for distribution.

I would say that if someone has a development that really has a good reason that they want to tap into a line somewhere on 4A or somewhere on 5A where there is a tee already, then they can come to the Board and make their case. But they can't go through a simple process of, yeah, we would like a connection at this tee. So I would highly discourage any policy that allows an ad hoc connection to either of these transmission lines for reasons that are laid out in the policy itself.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: My question is very simple, can you explain this map a little bit. Where is line 4A?

CHAIR GREENE: 4A is not on that map. 4A goes up and off the map to the upper right. This is as much as I've learned.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: So this is all 5A?

CHAIR GREENE: All 5A and this goes – so that goes south to the County lines –

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah, I see that. What's #1 is that a water tank?

MR. ROACH: Chair Greene, Commissioner Hughes, I apologize for the lack of clarity. We can improve on this map. This is hot off the presses. To give you a little more context, the Buckman Direct Diversion Water Treatment Plant would be just off the map on the upper left. And, in fact, at that point #1 is, and Brad can correct me although he doesn't have the map, is where 4A and 5A split. And 4A goes north and connects to the 10 million gallon tank. 5A continues south along the Caja del Rio Road until it hits 599 which is on the border of the – the hash line there is the City limits. So this is all showing the 4A line with the numbers calling out where blind tees were established on that line and this policy recommends that that's where connections can occur and it would be a relatively simple process for somebody who would propose a connection at one of those locations.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Jesse. Councilor.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And I guess just to underscore our facilities manager's point, I think the reason why you would want somebody coming to the Board is that this does have real implications for how the system works and we would want to understand the pros and cons of any connection made and we don't want that administratively approved. We want this Board, if there were somebody who wanted to do that to come here and have staff help us understand why it is or isn't a good idea. I think really what we're doing is protecting the system so that it can best deliver to the partners who then deliver to their communities whether it is Las Campanas, the County or the City.

MR. ROACH: That's well stated and I would like to make a couple more points of clarification while we're into this. There already are connections at point #4 which is Wildlife Way – sorry, at point 3 which is Wildlife Way. Point 4 which is the archaeology building, point 7 which is the County Public Works Complex. So these connections have already been made at these locations at these tees. We haven't had a formal process in place and I haven't been around for the administration of any of those connections but they are occurring. These are also large-scale investments for the [inaudible] and the master meter that go in here to the tune of half a million dollars. And my understanding, and again, this is just my understanding and I could be wrong, I believe that although there is a blind tee at #5, the Animal Shelter, it was cheaper for the County to connect to their distribution lines off of line 4 that then went under the road and serve the Animal Shelter because it is a huge endeavor to tap into these transmission lines and we shouldn't lightly. We will always, our staff recommendation will always be not to tap into these lines if there's any other alternative. No there may be situations in the future that were unanticipated by the planners of this line that mean that we do need to consider that but we will not take that proposal lightly.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: So, are you getting request then to tap into these lines?

MR. ROACH: Yes, the next agenda item will be a request that I have to tap into this line.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And is it at one of these points?

MR. ROACH: It is.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: So the only entity asking to tap into the lines is City of Santa Fe?

MR. ROACH: Well, most of these connections really will serve the County. The one I'm going to ask about is at point #2 and it will be to serve the City's golf complex but most of these other connections off of the 5A line would serve potential County development.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And 4A and the water tank you referenced, what are served by line 4A? There don't appear to be any taps on 4A; is that true?

MR. ROACH: And to answer the question, we will – we'll see if we can fit the 4A line and the 10 million gallon tank on this map, the next iteration of this map. The City and the County serve customers from the 10 million gallon tank most notably all of Las Campanas is served off of the 10 million gallon tank. So 4A and 5A serves both City and County via that distribution point.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And, again, I just have more questions about how exactly the system is structured and a more complete map. So I am frustrated to the point where I would take note.

CHAIR GREENE: So I think that for the purposes of growth and for the purposes of a system, the system says don't tap in; right. And this is a recommendation based on experts and engineers and then there are probably plenty of taps for us to work within. So the 10 million gallon tank can deal, for instance, the northwest quadrant or Las Campanas or Tano Road or any growth that is happening gravity fed from there or even with pumps in the north side of Santa Fe. And this line 5A ends up dealing with the west side and south side of Santa Fe and allows for Eldorado and the Community College District to get water through that extension in that system; is that correct? So that's to explain a little bit. To the point where growth is going to happen but growth shouldn't happen by just these taps without coming to us which is really the main point of this.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Right, and I guess I would just add, we're protecting the overall integrity of our facility here and its ability to deliver water to the partners who then will deliver water for growth to its customers.

CHAIR GREENE: And any major growth or recommendations. Any growth would go probably through the City's Planning Commission or the County's Planning Commission and then if they needed to have a recommendation for a new tap into this, it's a heavy lift, but it should go before City or County boards and say, look we've got letters from the Planning Commission or from the Commission or the Council, can we ask the BDD to do that. And then at that point, to allow hurdles and review before we actually get an administrator that decides on one page to do this –

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Yes, and I would add to that, it's not just about the City and County boards or the developers who are coming to ask for this but it's also hearing from our staff and our engineers that it'll do no harm and that it will – again, I think we're just protecting the integrity of the infrastructure that we have and our ability to serve the partners that are part of the Buckman Diversion.

MS. LONG: Mr. Chair, before you call for a vote I just wanted to point out that we will be changing the effective date at the top of the policy. This was obviously prepared for our last meeting that was cancelled due to the wind. So we'll change the effective date to today's date if there's a favorable vote.

CHAIR GREENE: Can we get that included in the motion just to make it –

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Do you want that as a motion?

MR. ROACH: And does it matter because no request came?

MS. LONG: It needs to reflect the date that the Board adopts the policy and that's today.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I'll just amend my motion to approve this new policy and ask that it be dated as of today.

CHAIR GREENE: Councilor Cassutt?

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Yes, I agree as the second.

CHAIR GREENE: Wonderful, great. Roll call please

The motion passed by [4-0] roll call vote as follows:

Peter Ives, Citizen Member Alternate	Abstain
Commissioner Hank Hughes	Yes
Councilor Jamie Cassutt	Yes
Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth	Yes
Chair Justin Greene	Yes

d Request approval to add a connection for the Marty Sanchez Golf Course to tie into the 5A transmission line.

MR. ROACH: Chair and members of the Board, I am sorry that this memo did not make it into the packet. I'm going to read the memo, a short memo, into the record for consideration by the Board. The item is BDD 5A transmission line connection for the Marty Sanchez Golf Complex. Background: the Marty Sanchez Golf Complex would like to use utility water instead of an on-site well for domestic purposes and have access to high-pressure potable water for turf irrigation needs in the event of an emergency disruption to effluent or raw water resources. The 5A transmission line runs adjacent to the complex. The request is for approval of a City of Santa Fe connection to the BDD 5A transmission line at the blind tee on 5A near County Road 69 as shown on the BDD Water Treatment Plant Raw Water and Finished Water Pipeline record drawings, sheet #45. Connection and master meter installation will be made to BDD connection specifications pursuant to the BDD Board policy for tapping BDD transmission lines.

CHAIR GREENE: Are there any questions about this? I've got a question, is Marty Sanchez using effluent now? Has that been restored or was that cut off?

MR. ROACH: Chair Greene, they did update their ponds and for a time they did not have access directly to effluent so they were trucking potable water in during the winter for the greens only. But they're on schedule to begin their true irrigation this season with effluent and the wastewater treatment plant is in compliance for delivery of that effluent.

CHAIR GREENE: So this is an emergency plan purely as a back up?

MR. ROACH: Correct and I will say that the water division takes this very seriously that we do not want potable water to be the easy button at this golf course but there is a huge amount of infrastructure there that we want to have the ability to maintain in the event of an emergency. And I will say that plan A is the effluent. Plan B is raw water that due to our very helpful partners at Las Campanas have helped us find a way that in the event that effluent is not available there is a way that we can get raw water from 2A through Las Campanas' system into that system. So that's plan B and then plan C is emergency only potable water.

CHAIR GREENE: The system for raw water is in place or needs a little bit of

MR. ROACH: It exists. It's not perfect. It could be improved and a formal agreement fairly compensating Las Campanas for the use of their equipment is not yet in place.

CHAIR GREENE: And Marty Sanchez is pretty close to BDD so couldn't we run raw water from BDD to Marty Sanchez with our own system without having to –

MR. ROACH: That is potentially possible but I think it would be far more expensive than working out an arrangement with Las Campanas that fairly compensates them for the use of their infrastructure and a tie-in that was made to allow us to essentially take water on the way to the Las Campanas and move it in to the pipeline system that is utilized by Marty Sanchez and the Soccer Valley and as a matter of fact, it could go all the way to Swan Park.

CHAIR GREENE: And is this going to be able to be used on Soccer Valley as well, this Marty Sanchez tie in?

MR. ROACH: No. Well, sort of creating distribution lines or a different connection, this specific connection at the moment is not envisioned to serve the Soccer Valley.

CHAIR GREENE: And is this agreement between Marty Sanchez and BDD, in this case, exclusive and so Marty Sanchez couldn't resell water?

MR. ROACH: Marty Sanchez is a customer of the City Water Division. So just like any customer they can't take the water and resell it.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: So if I can, Mr. Chair, I think the agreement is between BDD and the City for the tie-in, not Marty Sanchez. Marty Sanchez is the City and the City has a contract for Marty Sanchez's operations.

CHAIR GREENE: Okay, I get it. Okay.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Move to approve.

CHAIR GREENE: More questions?

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. How much water does Marty Sanchez use every year?

MR. ROACH: For irrigation purposes?

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Any and all purposes. I assume irrigation is the primary.

MR. ROACH: I don't have those numbers off the top of my head by right now their domestic use is met by a single on premise well and so I'm guessing it's on the order of less than 10 acre-feet. Whereas, their golf course irrigation operations with effluent are orders of magnitude larger than that and we, as I mentioned, this is in some sense we think of this as a fire service almost. It's there for emergency but we do not want to use as the easy option.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Understood. I would simply like to know what their annual usage is if that can be provided.

MR. ROACH: I won't put you on the spot, Tom. Tom probably knows but I won't –

CHAIR GREENE: He's grabbing the microphone; do you want to say something?

TOM EGELHOFF: I would guess probably 475 acre-feet a year, something in that area. I would add that in emergency situation they are using the fire hydrants already. So that's happened already. They're using Buckman Well water already in an emergency.

MR. ROACH: So, Chair Greene and member Egelhoff, I appreciate you mentioning that and I think for the context of the Board, especially the new members, it is worth mentioning that at the moment – when we were talking about the tee to the 5A transmission line at Wildland Way, that serves County customers along that road and we have created, we have a potable fire hydrant there and then across the fence we have a non-potable fire hydrant that connects to the effluent line. So as Tom mentioned in times of emergency the way we have gotten potable water to the golf course is by connecting those fire hydrants with a back-flow preventer between them. And what that did, it does deliver the potable water but it goes to a pond and it's not pressurized. So that's the reason for desiring that if we're going to have to use potable water anyways, if it's pressurized they can directly run the sprinklers with it they don't have to store it in a pond.

CHAIR GREENE: Do you have a motion?

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Move to approve.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Second.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you Councilor. Councilor Romero-Wirth with the motion and Councilor Cassutt with the second. Roll call please.

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

Peter Ives, Citizen Member Alternate	Yes
Commissioner Hank Hughes	Yes
Councilor Jamie Cassutt	Yes
Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth	Yes
Chair Justin Greene	Yes

e. 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 2026 Buckman Direct Diversion Operating Budget and Other Fund Contributions

MR. PRADA: Chairman Greene, this is Kurt Traverse, he's been helping in the interim.

CHAIR GREENE: Can you introduce yourself beyond what Brad said and give us a little bit about – are you a consultant? Are you part of the City on loan? Are you – tell us where you're coming from.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And make sure you speak into that mic. You're tall you can put it up on the edge there but in order for Councilor Cassutt to hear you, you've got to really be talking into it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

KURT TRAVERSE: Thank you, Chair Greene and members of the Board. My name is Kurt Traverse. I am with CliftonLarsenAllen who is the accounting support group. We are brought in to provide assistance support continuity in those instances where BDD's accounting function may have an interruption which is what we're currently in right now and why I am here today.

In your packets you will find a 12-page summary of a proposed budget with a cover on top. We'll talk through the various major sections of it but I did want to mention that this was prepared using the same methodology, the same files as BDD has done in the past years so there's been nothing new brought into this preparation.

BDD is pleased to present the proposed Buckman Direct Diversion Annual Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2026 along with proposed contributions to the Major Repair & Replacement Fund. This 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 your partners. The BDD staff actively worked with its partners on developing this budget particularly on water estimates which makes the basis of our cost-sharing structure.

We'll start by looking at budget highlights from the memo. In that we have \$8,786,157 for Fiscal Year 2026 Operations. Of that, \$8,570,157 is for Partner Reimbursements; \$120,000 is from PNM Solar Rebate Revenue; and, at the moment we have \$96,000 for Federal Funds reimbursements from the grants and of course we'll see how that goes as we move through. Fiscal Year 2026 Budget Request increased by \$273,810 from the Fiscal Year 2025 Adopted Budget. The Emergency Reserve Fund is fully funded to our target balance of \$2,000,000 and the Major Repair & Replacement Fund has \$1,786,676 as requested contributions.

We'll go through the budget packet itself. I call attention to page 2 which is the total proposed fiscal year operating budget broken out by partners and by third party reimbursements and it gives you a sense of partner and third party reimbursement percentages that contribute to this operating budget. On page 3, we start to breakdown expenditures by categories. As you can see, personnel costs are a little bit less than half of the total operating budget. If we move to page 5, this compares the operating budget compared to fiscal year 25's adopted budget and the results of fiscal year 2024. This in particular is a nice piece of work in looking at it as an accountant. So this is what we like to do. As you can see that 273,810 increase from prior year adapted budget, the major component of that is chemicals. One of the reasons that that went up high this year is that we have not touched the budget which was set at a little over 400,000 for a couple of years but costs have increased in last fiscal year 23 and all the way through fiscal year 24. Now we're trying to reset that. So where you see in fiscal year 24 the actuals were 620,000, the budget was 420,000. This year I'm looking at an extrapolated and it looks like they'll be about \$600,000 again. So that's why we increased that.

If we go to page 6, this is the summarized cost sharing in partner volumetric estimates. These are the basis of how we do our cost sharing allocation. Not much change on this one but down on the bottom of the page you'll find the Fiscal Year 2026 estimates.

If we go to page 9, this is where we have the Emergency Reserve Fund. There's no changes. Only again, we increased about 80,000 from interest on that fund. If we go to page 10 and 11, this is where we have the Major Repair & Replacement Fund details. This shows our projected fund balance, where we ended June 30, 2024, the contributions approved for the 2025 plan, the funds authorized for expenditure which would include not only in 2025 but any carry over from funds that weren't expended in prior years and then also the 2026 proposed contribution of 1,786,519. With the approval of this contribution and no additional authorizations, the fund balance will be 4,660,588 for Fiscal Year 2026.

Page 11 is that detail behind the MMRF projects. And then I'd like to finish up on page 12 which just summarizes the funding allocation by partners and this is the final request

Operating Fund and Major Repair and Replacement Fund, 0,572,676. And I would be happy to assist the Facilities Manager and stand for any questions.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you for that presentation, welcome to the team. You know we're hiring.

MR. TRAVERSE: I have heard that.

CHAIR GREENE: Go for it.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Since we have a lot of new members, I don't know who can best speak to this, maybe Nancy, about how this process works. I could do but maybe it's better if you do just in terms of we're seeing this and then what happens? We're going to see it again and just on how this process works.

MS. LONG: Yes, Mr. Chair and Councilor, the details of how the budget gets presented and approved by each respected body is contained in the Project Management Fiscal Services Agreement. But what you do here is you're approving the budget but you're also recommending the budget to the respective bodies of the City and the County, governing bodies of the City and the County, for their consideration and approval so it can be placed within their budgets that then go out for approval beyond them. Once we get word back here that the budget has been approved, if it has, most years it does come back just as we have recommended. I think there was one year there was some change that was made but then it is presented back to you for final approval of the budget after it's been considered by both bodies and adopted by them. That way it gets put in the budgets of the County and the City.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And just to add to that, I think one of the other things that I don't believe is in here, the employees of the facility are City employees and because the City's budget has not yet been finalized and/or been released any raise for City employees would need to be added to this budget if there is one. Historically over the past handful of years that I've been involved there has been one. So I believe, I don't know how you – did you just keep that flat in this budget or what is reflected here?

MR. TRAVERSE: So that is relatively flat. We did use the City's provided through the HR Department about the list of employees and the current wages. So this does not have any increase in it.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: That's what I would expect. But just so the Board knows that is something that once the City's budget is finalized would need to be reflected and will be reflected when it comes back for final approval.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you for clarifying that and that was my understanding. I would say that not this time it's too late for that but next time it would be great to have some sort of, I wouldn't call it risk analysis but just an understanding what flat wages would be. This is presented as flat wages and here's what CPI was and so CPI says maybe last year the City gave wages based on CPI so we can expect this because flat probably doesn't happen, right. And then if the City decides to be unbelievably generous and goes above CPI then that could be sort of gauged with CPI+. But great, thank you. And Councilor Cassutt.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Thanks, on that note that Councilor Romero-Wirth mentioned salaries, we are scheduled to implement the next phase of class and comp, so that is something that we had previously decided on and stated it was going to happen. When you spoke to HR, were they looking at current salaries or had they already incorporated the plan for class and comp to the next phase of class and comp to go into effect.

MR. TRAVERSE: My understanding is it is current salaries as of February. So the date is really from February.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Okay. Thank you, I appreciate that.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Actually, I wanted to go back to page #1, down at the bottom of that second column to the right, you state 36 FTEs and 19 vacancies; is that 19 vacancies of the 36?

MR. TRAVERSE: That is 19 vacancies of the 36 positions for FTEs.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And then on page 3, you pointed out personnel. Does that personnel number include full funding for all 36 FTEs or how is that done?

MR. TRAVERSE: Yes, those vacancies are all fully funded, salary determination by the position number and, again, there's a range of positions including all benefits. So even though – and actually this number may have changed. Again, we're working off the City's February data file and I know that we've lost people since then and I know that we've also brought in some new people too.

MR. PRADA: No, Commissioner, no it's not exactly that number. If you wanted something we could provide it. It's close to it if it's not.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Part of the reason I ask is because earlier in the evening we covered your report which noted that there were 10 positions that the City was trying to fill and they were in various stages and this is the first suggestion that I've seen that there are actually 19 and it sounds like there might have been a few additional losses. So I'm just trying to figure out the greater thing on the staffing.

MR. PRADA: Member Ives, one number to pay attention to that line on my report that has a ladder on there so there are numerous positions in that ladder for operations and equipment – so that's why there's a discrepancy.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: Okay, so how many positions totally are reflected there?

MR. PRADA: I'd have to go back and get the for-sure number but numerous.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: And I suppose a different way to ask that is simply, are all of these vacancies in process of being advertised for fill?

MR. PRADA: Absolutely.

BOARD MEMBER IVES: That's all I'm looking for. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Councilor.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I just want to go back to the chemicals. So we have had to cover the increase in chemicals but we didn't – so I'm a little confused about how you explained that. We haven't made – the increase hasn't been reflected in the budget as it's passed but the cost has gone up and we've had to cover that over the years. Am I – and maybe we approved that covering the increase as one-off votes. Am I remembering that?

MR. TRAVERSE: I would have to look further into that. There is a budget process in the accounting software or covered by range, so it's not a one-to-one where we have one accounting line with a budget and you cannot go over that. It's a range of budget and within that there have been and obviously we have vacancy savings over the years. We've had that every year and that's detailed on one of the pages showing the prior year results. So that's how we've gotten through that for Fiscal Year 24 also for 25, is that costs are down in other areas and that allows us to withstand the increase in chemicals.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay, that's helpful because I do think that is one area that we obviously don't control very critical to our operations and it has been something that has occurred every year since I've been on this Board.

CHAIR GREENE: Do we do a BAR on those things when that happens?

MR. TRAVERSE: That is not a BAR, no. So a BAR would be a standing request from your budget itself. Again, these are allocations within the overall budget. We are not asking for additional budget it is just moved to cover those.

CHAIR GREENE: When you move from vacancies which is staffing to chemicals there should be some –

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I think it's called TBARs –

MR. TRAVERSE: Oh, it is a TBAR, yes.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: -- and it doesn't require the Board's approval. They can do that. But when you're moving, if you're doing a budget adjustment request, that's a different thing and that would have to come in front of us.

CHAIR GREENE: Okay, thanks for the clarity. Any other questions out there?

1. **Presentation of the proposed FY2025 BDD Operating Budget and Other Fund Contributions.**
2. **Public Comment**

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Move to approve.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you very much.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: I'll second.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Councilor Romero-Wirth with the motion and Councilor Cassutt with the second.

MS. LONG: Mr. Chair, before you take a vote on that motion, if you could just ask if there's any public comment on the budget. It's contained in our PMFSA, so we added that in there.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you for reminding me. Is there anyone in the public that would like to speak or comment on the budget? Thank you, Nancy. I see none in the room and nobody on line.

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

Peter Ives, Citizen Member Alternate	Yes
Commissioner Hank Hughes	Yes
Councilor Jamie Cassutt	Yes
Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth	Yes
Chair Justin Greene	Yes

8. **Matters from the Board**

CHAIR GREENE: Councilor Cassutt.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: I just want to thank everybody for the rigmarole in getting me this link. I really appreciate it and glad I was able to stay for the full meeting. Thank you all and I know it wasn't easy and I very much appreciate everybody who contributed to that.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Councilor. I'd like to say two things. Thank you for allowing me to be the chair and this is my first meeting as chair and it is an honor to be here. But most importantly for all of us in the room, we just passed our 20th anniversary so happy birthday to BDD. So as a note, we should have cake but we had it at the last meeting and you all didn't show up so I ate it [laughter] but congratulations to BDD.

9. **Next Meeting**: Thursday, May 1, 2025 at 4:00 p.m.

10. **Adjourn**

Chair Greene adjourned this meeting at approximately 5:50 p.m.

Approved by:

Justin Greene, Board Chair

Respectfully submitted:

Wordswork

ATTEST TO

KATHARINE E. CLARK
Santa Fe County Clerk

D R A F T

- subject to approval -