

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

March 5, 2026

1. **Call to Order:** This meeting of the City of Santa Fe & Santa Fe County Buckman Direct Diversion Board meeting was called to order by Councilor Jamie Cassutt, BDD Board Chair at approximately 4:04 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 Jamie Cassutt, Chair
Commissioner Justin Greene
Councilor Patricia Feghali
Commissioner Hank Hughes
Rolf Schmidt-Petersen, Citizen Member
T. Egelhoff, The Club at Las Campanas, [non-voting member - via Zoom]

Member(s) Excused:

None

Others Present:

Bradley Prada Facilities Manager
Nancy Long, BDD Board Consulting Attorney
Kyle Harwood, BDD Board Consulting Attorney
Bernardine Padilla, BDD Public Relations Coordinator
Matt Sandoval, BDD Operations Superintendent
Danny Carter, Regulatory Compliance Officer
Brandi Martinez, BDD Staff
Jim Riesterer, GZA
Paul Drakos, GZA
Kurt Travers, CLA

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

3. **Approval of Agenda**

Commissioner Greene moved to approve the agenda as published. His motion was seconded by Councilor Feghali. The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

4. **Approval of Consent Agenda** – No items.

5. **Approval of Minutes**

a. **Approval of the February 5, 2026 Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting Minutes**

Upon motion by Mr. Schmidt-Petersen and second by Commissioner Greene, the February 5, 2026 meeting minutes were unanimously [5-0] approved.

6. **Matters from the Public** - None were offered.

7. **Presentations and Informational Items**

a. **Monthly Update on BDD Operations**

MATT SANDOVAL (BDD Operations Superintendent): Thank you, Madam Chair Cassutt, members of the Board, I'll be presenting the BDD operations report for the month of February, 2026.

BDD Diversions and deliveries have averaged a million gallons per day as follows: raw water diversions 4.9 MGD; raw water delivery to Las Campanas at Booster Station 2A, 0; drinking water deliveries from Booster Stations 4A and 5A, 4.67 million gallons per day. BDD contributed 70 percent of the drinking water to the City and County for the month of February of 2026. And I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Any questions from the Board? Yes, Mr. Schmidt-Petersen.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Just one quick question. Matt, I'm just – I don't know that I saw it here, I'm sure it's in here, but for the operations the last two months, are you diverting native Rio Grande water or San Juan-Chama water.

MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you, Member Schmidt-Petersen, we were calling for 1.5 million gallons per day of SJC stored water and then the rest is native.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Okay. Alright, thanks. This spring looks exactly like last spring. And on the Rio Grande, my expectation would be very low flows again this summer with the need for San Juan-Chama water, but perhaps not native Rio Grande water or Rio Grande water. So just a heads up.

MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Any other questions? Thank you so much.

b. **Report from BDD Facilities Manager**

BRADLEY PRADA (Facilities Manager): Thank you, Madam Chair. Good afternoon. Board members, this report covers our progress on key facility projects, procurement and staffing as of March, 2026.

We are seeing movement on our major repair and replacement projects. The RFP for the PLC control system upgrades moving forward as expected. We have finished the proposal review and expect to select a vendor within the next month. I'm also happy to report that the cyclical replacement for the granular activated carbon has been successfully completed, which keeps our treatment performance at a highest level.

Moving on to the design-build project. The RFI was posted back in January and the posting period is 20 days, excuse me, 60 days. At the same time, our project team includes

AECOM, Wright Water and staff from the City and County, are deep into a feasibility study. We plan to share that completed study with the Board at the April meeting. At that time, we will present the findings for your review and input. It is important to me that the Board has a chance to review the study's direction before we move into an RFQ phase. Our projected timeline for the rest of this year is clear. We expect to post the RFQ for a 30-day period in or before the end of May. That will lead into a technical review and selection process from June through August. If the schedule holds, we are hopeful to bring a contract back to the Board for the 30 percent design phase this September. We've already drafted the RFQ to ensure there is no dead time once the Board review is complete.

Finally onto the staffing front, we are working closely with city staff to fill our open positions. We are now down to only three remaining vacancies and we have strong leads on those. Reaching this level of staffing has been a massive undertaking and I want to thank the team for the persistence in making sure that we are properly resourced to meet our goals.

Thank you, and I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you so much. Any questions or comments from the Board? Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Do you promise April?

MR. PRADA: Thank you. We're pretty close, we're pretty close.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay.

MR. PRADA: I'm very hopeful that we can bring it forward.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I appreciate a critical path, right. You know, we've heard about how this has lingered and we move two steps forward, three steps back, and so let's have a timeline. I like seeing, oh, we have September to look forward to, and all those things so that we can sort of keep some accountability here and, anyway, thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you. Any other questions, comments, suggestions? Thank you so much, Brad

**c. Presentation of Rio Grande Water Quality Calendar Year 2026
Workplan Pursuant to BDDDB Resolution No. 2022-2**

JIM RIESTERER (GZA Consultant): Thank you Madam Chair, members of the Board. I really appreciate that; nobody ever gets my name right on the first try.

CHAIR CASSUTT: I'm usually referred to as cassette, so I understand the pain.

MR. RIESTERER: Well, I appreciate it. So hopefully you all have the water quality work plan as part of your packet. I'm not going to read through the whole thing, but I'd just like to touch on the items that we see as important going forward. The work plan is set up with three tiers. Tier 1 being the more immediate items. Tier 2 things that we expect to work on this year but maybe a lower priority. And then Tier 3 being things that are sort of at the bottom of the list, but we want to have them included in case they become more active.

Number one on our list for Tier 1 issues is the memorandum of understanding with LANL. That was signed in December. For 2026, what we're anticipating is just continuing to work with DOE, to monitor discharges of stormwater, and implement changes to the camera configuration at the E110.7 gage. We did meet with them in January to look at that camera configuration and have been working with them to get that camera selected. Kyle has been following up with their attorney on the progress on that.

And in May we anticipate participating in the annual review, which is to review the Early Notification System, and BDD operations and sampling program, as well as the sediment transport and mitigation project. And we'll work with the BDD staff on the intake sampling and La Pueblo sediment sampling as that comes up throughout the year.

Our next item is the LA Pueblo Canyon waning limb discharge lag time determination. The purpose of this is to try and quantify the time it takes for stormwater discharges from La Pueblo Canyon to reach and get past the BDD intake so that the BDD operation staff has a better idea of what that timeframe is where the diversion needs to be closed off after a storm event that discharges from LA Pueblo Canyon.

Item 3, is broken up into two parts but it's all related to the hexavalent chromium issue that I think everybody's familiar with. But part of that issue is the water rights issue. The Board protested the application that went in for water rights for the treatment system that was about 698 feet. That application is still pending, but some of the interim measures that have been proposed or implemented, suggested they might need to divert up to 1,690 acre-feet of water so that application has not been filed with the State Engineer. But if that's the path they have to go down to file that, we'll keep on top of that and support the Board with protest of that application, if that's what we need to do to get a seat at the table for that discussion.

The second part of the chromium is monitoring the chromium plume migration. There's been a lot going on with the chromium plume, and there was a well that was put in. It's called the SIMR3 well that was drilled in 2025. A screening sample of that well came back with a hit of chromium which suggests that plume was larger than what was expected. And then most recently, in early February, NMED issued administrative orders of compliance that made the lab shut down the mitigation operations as they were currently going on along with some pretty hefty fines. So right now, that's all in flux in terms of how they're going to mitigate the plume, how they're going to characterize the plume and what might need to happen with that? So we'll be here to provide support however needed for monitoring those activities as they go forward.

Item #4 under Tier 1 is PFAS. For PFAS there's just a lot going on in the regulatory world in terms of coming up with what regulatory standards are. So really, we're just going to stay focused on what those changes and rules that are coming into play are, and keep the Board apprised of that and keep operations apprised.

NPDES Primacy, again, the bill passed the Senate to get primacy for New Mexico on surface water regulations. NMED is in the process of developing the permitting rules, and has petitioned the Water Quality Control Commission for public hearing in the spring of 2026. So we'll be keeping track of that. And the most recent update on that is that the regulations are – the proposed regulations are going to go in front of the Water Quality Control Commission on June 8th and the comment period for that opens on March 13th. So, we'll be working to get comments on those proposed regulations as we go forward.

Moving into the Tier 2 issues: the LANL NPDES permits, so this goes back to the primacy issue in some ways, but EPA has determined that LA and Pueblo canyons are Waters of the US. So as NPDES permits come up for renewal with LANL, we'll be keeping an eye on those and participate in public hearings as needed for those.

The Sitewide Environmental Impact Statement for LANL, which is fondly referred to SWEIS, that has been moving forward. BDD submitted comments on that draft SWEIS in 2025. So we'll just keep an eye on that to see what of those comments have been

implemented as that's going forward. And if there's opportunity to follow up with comment, we'll keep you apprised of that.

On the consent order, so this is the Tier 3 issue. The LANL Consent Order is just a proposed actions that LANL will take. There's a schedule laid out how they'll do these, so we're kind of tracking those. Of interest this year in the 2026 plan, they're developing what they're calling their phase three investigation work plan for Pueblo Canyon and for Upper Los Alamos, Pueblo Canyon. That's part of their work plan that's due in September of 2026. And that is of interest to the Board because as we know LA Canyon comes out just above the diversion. So we'll keep an eye on that, see what that work plan is looking like.

Item 9 on our list is the Clean Water Act, integrated report and list of impaired waters. So that list came out in February of 2025. NMED has been sampling the reach between San I and Cochiti for constituents of concern that were identified in that. Those results are due out in – the sampling is going to be finished in November of 2026 and the, results will be out in spring of 2027. So we'll just kind of keep an eye on what they're doing with that sampling.

We've got the LA County MS4 permit. So that has to do with stormwater discharges from the Los Alamos urban area outside of the laboratory because the lab has its own stormwater permits. LA County's permit has expired but has been administratively continued. So they're just operating under that permit, which means they can't add any new points of diversion and when that permit gets up for renewal, there'll be a public comment period. So we'll just keep an eye on that as that moves forward.

And then the last item on the list is the Triennial Review of state surface water quality standards that actually wrapped up in 2026 for the last three year period. So we really don't anticipate that we'll be doing any work on that this year, but we kept it in the word plan in case anything comes up.

With that, I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Wonderful. Thank you so much appreciate it. Questions comes from the Board members? Member Schmidt-Petersen.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I just want to say I really like the format of the work plan that you have here where we have these distinct areas of focus that you're working on and it kind of gives us a feel for where the priorities and so on. I think that's really good.

I kind of wonder with this, there's so much building going on and so much additional work at LANL the last few years. We know that they're upping their manufacturing of plutonium pits and things like that, and I'm just wondering if any of that changes or potentially changes, the focus of where we should be looking for things. And I don't know if you guys have thought about that or not, or if there's anything to be concerned about.

KYLE HARWOOD (BDDDB Counsel): Thank you, Member Schmidt-Petersen, I think that a lot of that construction is intended to be addressed by the SWEIS, the sitewide environmental impact statement, and there was a lot of pressure put on the lab to start that process and I think it's now slowed down for several reasons. But, obviously all the new facilities need to get permits consistent with federal law and state law where it applies. We have mostly been looking at the older projects and the cleanup work. That's been a frequent focus of this Board's interest in the past with different members. So we do continue to monitor that. But the short answer is that I think a lot of the new projects out at the lab are intended to be covered by the SWEIS. And I think it's probably a good time here in Q1 of 26

for us to inquire whether we can get a little more information on how quickly the next step in that process is going to be happening. So when we get an answer back on that, we'll bring it back to Brad and perhaps include it in a facility manager's update if that's appropriate or something bigger if the Board would like.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: That works fine for me. Thank you.

MR. HARWOOD: And I also just say your compliments about the memo really go to former Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth, who had the leadership to pass the resolution that drives this memo and its structures. So, we're happy to take the thanks, but it's really due to her.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Thank you, Carol.

CHAIR CASSUTT: I'm always happy to give Carol credit all the time. Ues, Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Thank you. So just to follow on your point, I know that this increased pit production is – I went to a LANL presentation today. It is not official, and so they're not making any plans about it. So everything that [inaudible] until they get the actual directive to do it, everything, whether it's a SWEIS or whatever is going be based on things that are concrete. So when we hear that it is for real then we ask questions.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I asked that same question.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you. Commissioner Hughes.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Could you talk a little bit more about 3b, hexavalent chromium whether there's any plan to actually capture the plume and keep it from reaching the Rio Grande?

MR. RIESTERER: Thank you. What I would say on that is that, these administrative orders of compliance that were issued to the lab by NMED, one was from the the Groundwater Quality Bureau, one was from the HAZ Waste Bureau, and they lay out specific things that have to be done in terms of better characterizing the extent of the plume, and where they need to drill wells and recommendations for how they need to get rid of the waste. But I think it's essentially a directive to answer your question.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: And is LANL cooperating?

MR. RIESTERER: That I can't answer. We have reached out to LANL to request additional information about that SIMR3 well. And I wouldn't say they weren't cooperative, but we have not been given any additional information on that well

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you, Commissioner. Anything else? Thank you so much and thank you Carol, because this was very, very clear and straightforward. I really do appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. RIESTERER: Thank you.

8. Consent Agenda Items - None

9. Action Items - Discussion Agenda

- a. Request for Approval and Recommendation to Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners City of Santa Fe Governing Body to Approve the Fiscal Year 2027 Buckman Direct Diversion Operating Budget and Other**

Fund Contributions

- i. Presentation of the proposed FY2027 BDD Operating Budget and Other Fund Contributions**
- ii. Public Comment**

KURT TRAVERSE (BDD Accounting Support/Contractor): Thank you Madam Chair and Board members. I have been your accounting continuity support for BDD since June of 2024 for those periods when BDD's internal accounting is in transition like we are right now. I also presented last year's budget. And I'll tell you when those transitions occur, budget season.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you. And for any members of the public real fast, I just want to make a quick correction. Our agenda says that we're getting the presentation of the proposed FY 2026, but this is actually the FY2027. So, the primary caption is correct, but we just want people to know, talking about next year, not this year. Thank you.

MR. TRAVERSE: BDD staff are pleased to present the proposed Buckman Direct Diversion annual operating budget for Fiscal Year 2027, along with proof codes to contributions to the major repair and replacement fund. This proposed budget accounts for all projected necessary costs to meet the Board service level objectives and to continue to provide higher quality water to our partners.

In your packets is the 13 page summary of the Fiscal Year 27 budget proposal. Again, prepared using the same methodology, support files, discussions with our program directors, and with our partners as we did in prior years. So the budget memo highlights, if we look at the budget, we are requesting a budget approval of \$9,366,000 for Fiscal Year 2027 operations and as partner contributions and solar rebate revenues associated with that. Fiscal Year 2027 budget requested increased by \$580,000. The major repair and replacement fund is a \$1,695,000 requested contribution. That is a decrease from prior year requests. Two years ago was 1.9. Last year was about 1.8.

I'd like to call out a few areas in that budget summary. So on page 3, we have a pie chart, which sort of breaks down expenditures, again, it's visually. You can see the largest part of that is personnel. That's about 45 percent of total expected costs. As Brad mentioned, staffing levels are actually increasing and getting to where they should be. That's where those staffing metals will occur. Your other big areas are electricity costs, chemicals and all other operating costs, which would include things like our contracts and in areas like that.

The next area I'd like to call out is looking at the BDD programs on page 8. Again, that brings a pie chart, what do we spend our money on? We're spending it mostly on operations. Almost again, 50 percent of it. Operations includes that electricity, the chemicals, things like that. So this is not just personnel costs, this is what it takes to run it. The other major component, as you would expect, is maintenance. We have administrative costs and within administrative includes our fiscal agent fee that we pay to the City for operating.

If we move to page 11, that's the major repair and replacement fund proposals. There are two parts of that. We sort of look at what is our balance here. What we ended fiscal year 25 with a certain balance. If you'll remember, earlier this year, we did bring a large number of projects forward into this fiscal year we had to carry forward. I want to say it was about \$2 million and that was some discussion. We've actually spent a good amount of that money this year. We've already spent 1.7 million. As Brad mentioned, we've got the GAC project that's

going to be completed. We've got another few projects that were in bid for the PLC Project, things that were getting encumbered this year. We're actually going to almost use all that \$4 million that's coming from prior years. We're actually going to maybe not spend it, but it will be encumbered. So, we didn't spend a lot last year. That's definitely changed in Brad's team and all the staff who done a good job about getting these projects over the line.

For the Fiscal Year 2027 for post contributions, again, it's about 1.7 million. It's a little bit less than last year. And I would like to call out the third paragraph and I'll read that one as a little bit more of a new introduction this year. The BDD facility manager and staff, we prepare that 15 month MR&R plan with preliminary estimates working with our vendor partners. So this is something, I've been with Brad and staff in January, February we talk about what projects are coming up. It's a 15 month plan. It's a very long term. Anything that goes out in these plans are an estimate. And what we've run into is that working with the City, we have an estimate of \$65,000, but, 12 months later comes in at 69, causes problems, because it wasn't called out that at that amount. What this is saying is, as the project schedules firm up and more exact quotes are provided, the BDD facility manager will rebalance the expected cost per project within their delegated authority. Any project quote that increases the above the previously authorized 15 month MR&R plan by a value exceeding the BDD facility manager's authority will be brought back to the Board for authorization of any quote. So it's in those instances where it's a few thousand dollars over, Brad won't have to bring that back to you because it's within his authority to look at projects like that. So that's, the new wordiness within this budget beyond previous budgets.

And with that, I will stop and stand and take questions from the Board.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you, so much. Questions from the Board?
Commissioner Greene, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: So a question about electricity. Does our solar project, is that financing for solar or have we not achieved a –

MR. TRAVERS: So we actually have four meter locations. And so this is the PNM bills that are from operating that. Now we do get refunds. We do get reduced costs from the solar project. Some of that, if you look back five years electricity costs were a little bit higher. So these have been effective projects. But we do still have to for electricity. PNM issued a rolling rate increase in July of 2025 and that's why we do see there's an increase in projected electricity cost. The electricity budget had been flat for several years, and so we're trying proactively account for these rate increases that will be occurring.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: This may not be a question for you and may be for Brad and the facilities folks, but do we have a goal of trying to get net zero and we're just not there yet?

MR. PRADA: Thank you, Vice Chair Greene. Yes, we're working towards that. Obviously, there is agreements that we have with PNM that are specific to each station that we have. And so obviously we get the best benefit from solar arrays that we're preemptively put back in the day. As we progress through that, we've noticed that we get less and less benefit cost wise with the solar arrays that we put in later.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Is that because they only compensate us a certain amount per megawatt because it is not tied to each. So let me ask a question because I know that we at Santa Fe County missed our opportunity to become interested in the PNM acquisition. I bet you we did too.

MR. PRADA: I believe so.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: So that goes to Nancy. Do we have any, is there any interest in asking as a large user, specifically as a user, is there any way that we can get ourselves into that negotiation to say, please treat us better? You know, we have certain goals.

NANCY LONG (BDDDB Counsel): Madam Chair and Commissioner Greene, we operate on a unique tariff with PNM, which is called 11B. And I think Rio Rancho is on it, and Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority is on it. Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority is in the settlement discussions. I happen to be getting a lot of those emails because I am in as local counsel for someone else. I've seen that they're in, I don't know what their proposals are. But I can certainly reach out to their lawyer and find out what they are doing and whether it makes sense to get involved.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay, because maybe they can advocate on our behalf because if everybody under 11B, if we're all treated equally, then that's great. We can support them in that. This is also a question for the City of Santa Fe and for Santa Fe County, is that, I know that we missed our shot at that. We're having internal discussions as to if it's too late or what.

MS. LONG: Our interests have been aligned with Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority in the past. But I will look into that. And some of 11B of course has to do with time of day usage. And we haven't always had that same interest with them, but otherwise we have had our interest in alignment. So I will check on that.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you so much. Member Schmidt-Petersen.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Thank you. Just one question. I think maybe more for Bradley or for Nancy. Can you remind me of the overall process here for final approval of this proposal? Because there's steps with the City, both with staff on the City and then I think with the Council and even with the County Commission and where are we in that process at this point in time?

MR. PRADA: Thank you. We will first get you guys to approve and then each entity, County and the City, will present it in the kind of roll up of their budget. I don't think that it breaks it down for BDD specifically. So the Water Department for the City of Santa Fe will present their overall budget to City Council and then that will get approved. But I don't think it's necessarily in detail what we submit.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Okay. Thank you. I guess that that gets to the part of the question I was thinking about the, the operating costs and the salary piece of that. What you're proposing here would be then consistent with what the water division is submitting with, you know, to Santa Fe County. And so that's been already embedded so that there's no, you know, possible conflict.

MR. PRADA: Yes, we already have had a conversation with the City, specifically because they're our fiscal administrator for let's say a COLA or things like that so that we don't have conflicting budgets that we both present.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Appreciate it. It'll be really interesting to see where we get with all the new staff that are there this component of the budget probably be more completely expended, so thanks.

MR. PRADA: Absolutely.

MR. TRAVERSE: And I have been in contact with Travis and so he has this proposed budget and we've already been talking about after the Board approves it, that he

would be ready to present it. I think we had our timing off a little bit the last couple, last couple of years. So we'll be proactive this year.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Commissioner Hughes.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: How much of an increase are you asking the County for?

MR. TRAVERSE: So this is an interesting question. I think I didn't bring last year's report that breaks it down by partner request. I don't know what the percentage is for the County, and I can come back to you with that number.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: What's the overall percentage?

MR. TRAVERSE: 6.6 percent on the operating side and then the major repair and replacement funding is percentage wise, it drops I think maybe 5 percent. But the operating fund is much higher so it's weight a little higher.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. I would like you to come back with that information. The City will probably need to know as well.

MR. TRAVERSE: Okay.

MR. PRADA: Member Hughes, just for your context. The County is billed off of their projected allocation. So they tell us how much they're going to produce and so some of these increases are based off of the County increasing their use as well.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah, that makes sense.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you. Any other questions? I have one regarding the discussion around the MR&R plan and how high is your authority of what you can approve when there is a difference?

MR. PRADA: Zero. If we have a line item in the MR&R plan and we come in and budget for 65,000, and it comes back and it's 66,000; we have to bring it back for your authority to sign off on that. And so that's the problem with the way it was written to begin with. Obviously, we're vetting some of these things as we move through the program. This is pretty new. It's only three or four years old, and so this year we ran into quite a few of those instances where we would have a budgeted line item in MR&R and then we moved down and got the actual invoice for that or the current quote I should say. And that quote was in exceedance of that line item. And so I cannot sign without bringing them back and having your approval.

MS. LONG: Madam Chair, if I can just add to that. The facilities managers authorized authority is \$60,000. It's been \$60,000 for a long, long time, and it was kind of in lockstep with the city manager. Now the city managers at what, 200,000? So we're going to bring a proposal to you in combination with the city, hopefully, because 60 doesn't do much anymore. We need to get Brad up to 200,000.

So we will be bringing that to you. But I think what Brad was explaining is within the fund itself, he does not have authority. So we've gone to procurement and said, look, he's got monetary authority according to the PMFSA of \$60,000. But then they said, well, the board hasn't authorized him to use that authority within the MR&R plan. So that's what we're trying to fix now. We don't know if this will fix it or not, but this is our best effort as part of the budget. But we will be bringing something that is really following kind of what the City is doing on authority that we've seen presented as coming back to you in March on the project manager's authority to also change scope and be able to operate within that monetary authority, hopefully increased by then.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Okay. That was my question because I know at the city

we've had conversation around how inefficient that is and we meet more frequently. So I imagine that this does slow down projects a lot. And I don't really see a need for it. When we've told you to go and do the thing that we would like you to do, you know, go do the thing that we would like you to do. Obviously if there's a budgeting issue, we have to run into that, but, glad to hear that that conversation will be coming.

MS. LONG: Madam Chair, right now when we say within the proposal today that the facility manager would have authority up to his monetary authority amount, that's 60,000. So then Brad could work within the MR&R Fund if there was a change of 5,000 up to 60 on a project. And if the funds are there, then he would have the authority to do that. Hopefully that will work.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Great. Good, glad to hear. Now kind of again, looking at how this reflects what happens at the City, I know that as long as it's not a budget adjustment request it, at a budget adjustment request, the city manager still has authority up to 60,000. There has been conversation as to whether or not we should be shifting that. Where does that lie within BDD right now? I know, I mean obviously if in line items and there's things that have been budgeted, but in terms of if there's a full budget adjustment request that is needed, how does that process occur or do not get to because of whatever reason.

MR. PRADA: Madam Chair, we've never really run into that were we have to make that kind of adjustment. So we'll see how it phases out.

CHAIR CASSUTT: So hopefully that won't happen. But maybe keeping that in the back pocket, just in case. Something to think about. All right, thank you.

MR. TRAVERSE: And that's an interesting question because we do use TBAs, the technical one, which is just moving money that you've already approved between budget categories. But the BAR process, as Brad mentioned, haven't had to use it. But now that we're going to be basically fully staffed, we'll see what happens. Those TBAs potential may not be there.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Yeah, I don't want us to be caught so off guard that again, it causes a major slowdown and that we're not being as efficient as possible. I would like to make sure that the appropriate authorities are there, that we feel comfortable with. So that'll be a discussion for us to have.

Any other questions, comments at this time before we actually go to public comment?

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: I just had one follow up to your questions there. I mean, I like that process so you don't get held up for these things that are over, a little bit over cost and so on. One way that maybe potentially to deal with that too is just, annually or somewhere in there just say, here's what I had to do. Just report it out.

MR. PRADA: Thank you, Member Schmidt-Petersen. It's very intuitive of this Board, the problem is that we don't get it approved through procurement if we didn't have that authority.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Oh no, excuse me. That wasn't what I was trying to say. I mean, you have that authority, you go forward and do it, and then just periodically come back and say, you know, here's what we had to adjust.

MR. PRADA: I agree. Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: I believe we get quarterly reports of budget adjustments and it's a lovely long list of a bunch of numbers and line items that are slightly out of context.

Again, I realize I missed the public comment portion, although I, I don't believe there's anybody here from the public, but is there any public comment on this item? I don't

see any public comment on this item? [None were offered.]

Alright, any other questions, comments from the Board? And if not, do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER GREENE: I would move to approve the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2027 BDD operating budget and other fund contributions.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: I'll second that.

CHAIR CASSUTT: We have a motion and a second. May I please have a roll call.

MS. LONG: And, Madam Chair, before you get to the roll call, can I just clarify that the motion does include the facilities manager's requested authority within the Major Repair & Replacement Fund.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: That's a friendly amendment. I will make that a part of my motion. Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Does a second agree as well?

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: I do.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Roll call, please.

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

Rolf Schmidt-Petersen	Yes
Councilor Patricia Feghali	Yes
Commissioner Hank Hughes	Yes
Commissioner Justin Greene	Yes
Chair Jamie Cassutt	Yes

10. Matters from the Board - None were presented

11. Next Meeting: Thursday, April 2, 2026

12. Adjourn

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, Chair Cassutt declared this meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Approved by:

Jamie Cassutt, Board Chair

ATTEST TO

Geralyn Cardenas
Interim City Clerk