



## Agenda

**Regular Meeting of the  
Buckman Direct Diversion  
Board  
March 5, 2026 at 4:00 PM  
Council Chambers  
City Hall  
200 Lincoln Avenue**

---

### **Procedures for Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting**

The Agenda and packet for the BDD meeting are posted at <https://santafe.primegov.com/public/.portal>

**Join on Zoom:** <https://santafenm-gov.zoom.us/j/85068470377>

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Consent Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes
  - a. Approval of the February 5, 2026, Buckman Direct Diversion Board Minutes.
6. Matters from the Public
7. Presentations and Informational Items
  - a. Monthly Update on BDD Operations. (Matt Sandoval, BDD Operations Superintendent; [mgsandoval@santafenm.gov](mailto:mgsandoval@santafenm.gov), 505-955-4501).
  - b. Report from the BDD Facilities Manager. (Bradley Prada, BDD Facilities Manager; [bxprada@santafenm.gov](mailto:bxprada@santafenm.gov), 505-955-4507).
  - c. Presentation of Rio Grande Water Quality Calendar Year 2026 Workplan pursuant to BDDDB Resolution No. 2022-2. (Jim Riesterer, BDDDB Consultant/GZA GeoEnvironmental Inc. d/b/a Glorieta Geoscience, [james.riesterer@gza.com](mailto:james.riesterer@gza.com), 505-983-5446, Kyle Harwood, BDDDB Legal Counsel, [kyle@harwoodpierpont.com](mailto:kyle@harwoodpierpont.com), 505-660-6818).
8. Action Items: Consent Agenda

9. Action Items: Discussion Agenda

- a. Request for Approval and Recommendation to Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners and City of Santa Fe Governing Body to Approve the Fiscal Year 2027 Buckman Direct Diversion Operating Budget and Other Fund Contributions. (Bradley Prada, BDD Facilities Manager, bxprada@santafenm.gov, 505-955-4507. Kurt Traverse, CliftonLarsonAllen Contractor, kftraverse@santafenm.gov).
- i. Presentation of the proposed FY2026 BDD Operating Budget and Other Fund Contributions.
- ii. Public Comment

10. Matters from the Board

11. Next Meeting: Thursday, April 2, 2026

12. Adjourn

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6521, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

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

**February 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 Commissioner Justin Greene, BDD Board Chair at approximately 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

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

**BDD Board Members Present:**

Commissioner Justin Greene, Chair  
Councilor Jamie Cassutt  
Councilor Patricia Feghali  
Commissioner Hank Hughes  
Rolf Schmidt-Petersen, Citizen Member  
T. Egelhoff, The Club at Las Campanas, [non-voting member]

**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  
Bill Schneider, City of Santa Fe Water Resources and Conservation Manager  
Levi Newell, City of Santa Fe Water Resource Analyst  
Brandi Martinez, BDD Staff  
Larry “Boots” Pierce, GZA  
John Sikora, AECOM  
Joni Arends, CCNS

3. **Approval of Agenda**

Councilor Cassutt moved to approve the agenda as published. Her motion was seconded by Member Schmidt-Petersen. The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

4. **Approval of Consent Agenda**

Councilor Cassutt moved to approve and Councilor Feghali seconded. The motion passed by

unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

**8. Consent Agenda Items:**

- a. **Request for Approval to Replace the Variable Frequency Drive (VFD) through Eaton Corporation at Booster Station 2A with funding from the MR&R Fund in the Amount of \$405,718.16.**
  1. **Request for Approval of a Budget Adjustment Resolution (BAR) to authorize funds approved by the BDDDB from the MR&R Fund in the amount of \$209,000.00 to bring the total project funding to \$444,000.00.**
- b. **Request for Approval to Service and Repair the Water Treatment Plant Centrifuge through Andritz Separation, in the Amount of \$114,905.00 plus NMGRT with funding from the MR&R Fund.**

**4. Approval of Minutes**

- a. **Approval of the January 8, 2026 Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting Minutes**

Member Schmidt-Petersen offered the following corrections:

Under Matters of the Board, third paragraph: “It was really interesting to see the reaction ~~in~~ on the lower basin side because ~~it was like~~ they were saying they we need hundreds of thousands of acre-feet ~~of dollars, you know, a thousand million~~ ~~acre-feet~~, and what you’re offering is way too small. ~~[away from microphone].~~ So that gap is huge.”

Councilor Cassutt moved to approve the minutes as amended. Member Schmidt-Petersen seconded. The motion passed by 5-0 voice vote.

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

**7. Presentations and Informational Items**

- a. **Update on the City of Santa Fe Water Resources Annual Planning**

CHAIR GREENE: William Schneider, please introduce yourself.

WILLIAM SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Chair Greene and members of the Board. Thank you for the opportunity to sort of present a very preliminary status update on our water resource planning that is conducted jointly between the City, the County, and also includes Las Campanas.

And I should introduce myself as well. So I'm Bill Schneider. I'm with City of Santa Fe Water Division. I manage the Water Resources and Conservation Group. And today I have a presentation. And I just want to do a quick shout out to Levi Newell, who's sitting in the back. He's a new strategic hire with the City and just recently completed his graduate studies in atmospheric science and climate change. And so he's a really integral player in terms of some of the new technologies that we've adopted and some of the new modeling tools that we're building. So we'll touch on that a little bit today and be happy to come back and provide more detail if the Bard feels that brings value.

Today's touch point really, I want to touch on is, it's a very preliminary presentation. It's January, it's early in the water season. But we are starting to get some information. And most importantly, I want to just convey to the Board the amount of work that goes on behind the scenes relative to planning and effort and data analysis and decision making as I mentioned jointly with between the City and the County.

There's a credible amount of uncertainty right now. We're watching that the weather patterns hopefully develop into maybe getting some storms early next week. But things certainly are challenging and sort of setting up, as you're going to see here in a minute, to be very similar to last year. And fortunately and this is a real huge shout out to Brad Prada and, and his team is, despite 2025 being one of the most challenging years on the Rio Grande, the BDD was operating throughout the year, there was no curtailment. And, so that's really something we worked closely as a collective effort to avoid. We certainly value the BDD as a critical, if not most important component of our water supply water system. And having it, being able to utilize it in its design capacity under these extreme conditions certainly is proven to be very useful. And so with that said I'm just going to walk through a couple quick slides and then stand for questions.

So this first slide is a 30-year record of the snow water equivalency recorded up in the San Juan Mountains, which is sort of, we'll call it a surrogate for the amount of water that will be available as runoff into the tributaries of the San Juan, which is where the San Juan-Chama project diverts its water supply which I think most everyone on the Board is familiar with. And the thing to point out, basically in 2026, again, early, we're tracking very similar to 2025. So, the information we have at hand is sort of indicating that we're going to have another year of a lot of close conjunctive management between the City and County on how we utilize our water rights and divert them to the BDD.

With that said, one of the key things that we always emphasize with sort of our water management programs as the importance of, of storage and with emphasis, San Juan-Chama water has a permissible allowance to store that water over a calendar year with no penalty. There's a lot more restrictions on native water rights and the need to have both reservoir that allows for that as well as a storage permit. So the key takeaway here is that currently the City maintains about a little more than 10,000 acre-feet of storage in its three reservoirs that are upstream of the BDD; Heron, Abiquiu, El Vado. In addition, the County, I believe, and I'm going to approximate – I don't see Travis here – but roughly three years of their allotment of SJC. So the, the County has 375 acre-feet a year of contract water. We have not been getting that firm yield. We've been getting reduced supply because of the drought. But I'm going to guesstimate they have about 1,000 acre-feet in storage right now available to be diverted at the BDD at the discretion of the County.

And then moving down to the Santa Fe River Watershed similar again, it's a surrogate for the amount of water that exists up in the watershed right now. Now this is behaving a little bit differently than the San Juans, but similarly tracking very closely to 2026. I guess, Levi, we just today, just this afternoon, we got the latest February NRCS forecasts. Things are trending maybe even in the wrong direction in terms of what's being projected for flows. So what I really want to convey to the Board the importance of all this sort of monitoring, tracking, and data analysis is conjunctive management. We, the City does maintain groundwater wells in reserve. We have the amended water resource agreement between the City and County that allows for the City to provide up to 1,350 acre-feet of water as backup supply. I'll touch on a little bit more on that in a moment. But right now, even with the

reservoir repairs going on in Nichols, we still retain around 2,000 acre-feet of storage up in McClure. So, again, trying to build this sort of reserve given the uncertainty around river conditions for this year. And to that point, the forecasts are not looking favorable. There's an update came out I think just recently, but this is for February, March, April. Again, we're seeing below average with respect to precipitation and warmer conditions. So trending in a direction that we do not prefer.

And we were just having a side conversation regarding the Rio Grande. And so what's really key with respect to the Rio Grande is the Buckman Direct Diversion has permits, the City and County have diversion permits, and there are triggers for curtailment in the case of very low flow conditions. And one of the very creative solutions has been shared resources with respect to water rights, where the City and the County have something we title, The Shared Pool Agreement. And that allows us to navigate and, maximize the resource. So which again, as last year was a testament we were able to maintain the BDD throughout the year.

But the takeaway, again, 2025 was pretty challenging, particularly for certain months, and 2026 is again tracking along that path. So it's a pretty common theme throughout this presentation.

We bring up the drought monitor and again, it's just a form of information. We kind of like to use lines of evidence of what's available to help inform our decision making relative to what sources of supply we use when and how. And so the drought monitors we did, as Rolfe was sharing with me, we did have a fairly favorable monsoon season last summer and helped sort of lift us a bit out of the drought dryness categories. So we're more or less in the abnormally dry zone currently. And that feeds into something that's been brought to the Board before, which is a tool that we developed. Jesse Roach was I think our primary advocate for developing this technique, but it's a way to give us sort of an indicator for our sort of current status of our water resource. It's a score relative to water availability. And it touches on three components and what this ultimately is being designed to, and it's going to get rolled up eventually, it's part of our water conservation plan at the City. I presume the County will be adopting something similar. But ultimately we are going to be revamping our Chapter 25 Ordinances if we can get through a, a code rewrite because we want to embed the WRI. Because really what it is, is a tool to help guide decision making and policy relative to when we would declare a water emergency or various stages of drought and how we can inform drought demand management concepts. So it's something that we're evolving. It's been adopted and it's continuing to be used.

So this is something that I really want to emphasize is that we meet weekly, and when I say we, Brad and the BDD team, Matt, as well as, Santa Fe County and the City team and it's a large group. Tom joins as well. What we're essentially doing is making informed decisions with the information we have available in terms of how to manage. Again, we have reservoir repair, dam repairs happening in Nichols. We're going to be moving up to McClure. Obviously, Buckman has some challenges, and then we have the wellfields that we have to exercise and utilize to essentially establish the best compromise in terms of maximizing the resource. We do this, we build this. And so this is the first step in this process. And so coming before the Board today, we already have 2026 projections on how we plan to use our water supply. It changes daily though. Again, these are just very preliminary forecasts.

And one of the key things again is we were able to successfully operate the BDD in 2025. We're planning with all hopes and intents, is to have some similar operations. And I

guess I'm looking over at Brad, similarly in 2026. So that's our goal and intent. If things deviate, we have plans in sort of relative to mitigate any changes of conditions.

And so this is really probably the most important step here is the first bullet is we're now in this early period planning cycle where we're basically, again, infrastructure has a fairly critical piece. Obviously, the hydrology as well. Then we start working with our federal partners, with all the stakeholders on the river. So now we're expanding sort of our work to include the ISC, Albuquerque Water Authority, MRGCD, obviously the Bureau of Reclamation – I can just go down the list. A lot of data analysis, data sharing, and shared sort of planning goes forth. And so typically April is the time period where a lot of that stuff is going to be rolled up. And we're going to be really firming up our projections. We'll be getting the final NRCS forecast. We're going to get the Bureau Reclamation operating plan. Ultimately, at that point, at the same time we have under Chapter 25 a requirement to bring forth to the City manager and then to the governing body, sort of a declaration on the status of our water resources. We roll that up into something called, "What's Up the Water." Past three years Jesse Roach has presented that. We've brought that to the Buckman Board and we're going to ask for the permission to bring that back in April.

Beyond that, again, it's adaptive management and decision making as we roll through the spring. And then of course all the challenges that we could have, low flow conditions Otowi Gauge. Obviously sediment issues, I mean, the list goes on. But we're certainly prepared for any challenges. And a key takeaway is that we feel very confident that we have the resources and the team available to meet the needs and the expectation that the BDD will operate as designed and planned.

I guess kind of in closing remarks, and they'll stand for questions, for the board is I want to touch – we're kind of touching on sort of very short term planning cycles now, right? We're going on weekly to monthly, then an annual time stamp. Something that is happening also that's really important is something called Santa Fe 2100, which is a very rigorous water planning. It's been done in conjunction through a grant and partnership with the Bureau of Reclamation under the Water Smart Program. We're using state of the science in terms of climate hydrology that are coming out of the University of Massachusetts through the Bureau of Reclamation. Recently, the Santa Fe County joined through an MOA to be partnered on this planning cycle. Obviously, the City's a bit ahead; we've been working on this for a while. So now we're collectively working on how to sort of manage this on parallel tracks and where it makes best sense to sort of tie it all together. And so with that said, we actually have a meeting tomorrow to sort of talk about some backup scenarios above and beyond the water resource agreement. We will also be having some community outreach as part of Santa Fe 2100 this year. So stay tuned and, and hopefully be able to bring more out in terms of where we are in the process.

And so with that, I will stand for questions, Chair.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you very much. From the Board, questions,

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Mr. Chair, I have one, kind of thought for Bill. I have maybe more than one question. But, first thing I want to say is, you know, from my 35 years of kind of being involved with water, what Bill Schneider was talking today is a success story. It was essentially what Santa Fe and others were seeking to accomplish back in 2002 when there basically there was no outdoor watering, right? Because the wells wouldn't start. And so to get to this point, to see 26 years into a mega drought and

having three years of available supply, is remarkable. And so I just want to acknowledge that and say thank you to all of the water managers that are here today.

And then just a suggestion, well, actually it's a question. I think for the public, it doesn't seem like the NRCS has their snow melt forecast out and posted. But, you're getting them so you have a volume –

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah, I did not bring them, they literally came into my inbox at 2:00 today.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: If you're aware of where those are, because they're not on their websites anymore, and I was just wondering if it was something that the federal government wasn't providing anymore. But it sounds like they are.

MR. SCHNEIDER: In fact, I'm sorry to interrupt. In response, I will email you that when I, when I'm done here. But also they've ported over to a dashboard now, so there is a new site that they're using and they've created some new visualization tools to sort of convey some of the probabilities of other projections. So it's pretty powerful.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Thank you. Okay. And then just one last suggestion. I think 2002 for the San Juan-Chama project was the lowest inflow year on record. And I'm not quite sure where that sits compared to '25 or '26. I wonder if you have a feeling for that?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I wasn't around, and I haven't looked at it recently, Rolf. But my recollection, I think it was 21 percent of supply. Last year for Santa Fe we got, or the County for that matter, we got 39 percent.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Okay, thank you.

MR. SCHNEIDER: So certainly to your point we're adapting to shortages in terms of what our allocations are,

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: But looking more like something in the 20 percent range if we get precipitation, not six. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Is your committee that's looking at planning for water, are you going to come up with an idea of how many people we can have in Santa Fe County? How many houses are allowed to be built? I know that's a rough question, but it also might be fairly important if there's a limit.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Commissioner Hughes. What we've done is we've hired economic expert, and we've built an updated demand tool. So we've done projections out into the future based on several variables, not just 2 percent population growth going out 40 years. So we tried to attempt to put more rigors behind it. But relative to where the whole intention of the plan itself is to create what's called adaptation strategies or methods by which we could address potential shortages in the future under various climate hydrology based on our estimated projections.

So where those lines cross in the event where we can't meet demand, I guess, would be sort of what you're inquiring is what are those triggers where the, the City and/or County can't grow beyond that population. So I guess inherently that will fall out of the analysis. But really I would flip the equation to say what we're doing is working to be able to meet with additional supply or conservation and reuse a combination thereof to meet future demand needs under various hydrologies.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: So in other words reuse the water if we have to, that sort of thing.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Absolutely. That is something that was sort of adopted through this whole process with the Bureau of Reclamation going back to 2015 when the City and the County partnered on what was called, The Santa Fe Basin Study, and that was the first anywhere, as I'm told, look at water supply demand under various climate hydrologies. Here we are 10 years later, revisiting it with more rigor, better models, better science., and that's really what 2100 is really designed to accomplish is to be making informed decisions. And, again, trying to project when these sort of trip wires may happen to ensure that we're building out our supply needs.

And to the point maybe you're making is, maybe additional water reuse above and beyond the San Juan-Chama return project being one example of an adaptation. Aquifer recharge is certainly something that could be enhanced through various projects. So we have a litany of about 40 adaptations that we're going to be modeling and exploring and looking at sort of the various forms of benefit that they may bring. We try to obviously take cost into consideration, but also green space and other forms of projects that could enhance the livability of Santa Fe.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Good. I'm glad you're looking and all that. And that's it. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thanks. Councilors?

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Thank you. I really appreciate Rolf, your historical knowledge. Because as I'm looking at this I start to get a little panicky because it's, you know, these dry years. And, I know that the City's Water Department does an incredible job of this forecasting and has been really, really strategic and intelligent along with BDD. But I really appreciated that reminder from you about where we were when I was, you know, taking showers with buckets so my mom could water the garden – But I think that that is really important and that, you know, a lot of Santa Fe is really – we are a success story in the face of all the challenges and I really do appreciate all the work that you all do. And you do a very good job of keeping us up to date on what's happening to both the governing body and here so that we are able to make those decisions with that information. So I just wanted to point that out because you definitely gave me a little bit of a level setting again that I needed. So thank you.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Excellent. Thanks. You know, I look at things at a micro-level, right? What I would call a medium-level and then a macro-level. And some of those things are quasi-geopolitical, like upper-basin and lower-basin allotments and state to state compacts and things like that. That's that super-upper level. In that allotment, how do we either negotiate or what's our – are we just subject to the winds of the water gods somewhere in Washington or somewhere in the west?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We do have a resident expert in the rooms, Rolf, and his former career was a ISC Director, and certainly you were the Colorado Commissioner for a while; is that right?

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: I was an assistant commissioner.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Okay. To answer your question, Commissioner, I'm going to defer Rolf to enhance anything. We are meeting regularly with the Colorado Commissioner right now. We have something and we would certainly welcome the County to be a partner on this. So I'm going take a plug, if I may.

CHAIR GREENE: Sure.

MR. SCHNEIDER: We have something called the San Juan Chama Contractors Association, and so all the basic contractors, the City Water Authority, Albuquerque, Middle Rio Graduate Conservancy District, many of the pueblos, also the Jicarilla Apache Nation. We've banded together have basically small dues and we've built an organization's charter. It's led by Kyle Harwood here. We've hired as a sort of representative, and so we have a liaison, which allows for us to work directly with the State of New Mexico, essentially the governor level, and then up through the various states to essentially weigh in because certainly there's a lot of uncertainty with potential post 2026 as you're implying, institutional shortages that could be coming. It's simply beyond a crystal ball. We hear things. I'm optimistic that there's going to be a consensus solution between the seven states but stay tuned.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Please, advocate, tell us what we might be missing, where the County can step into this.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah. A quick clarity: the County is a contract holder. They have 375 acre-feet of, of contract water, and so they're invited to participate. The fees are prorated based on how much water entitlement each group has. And I think Kyle is working with Travis. Yeah, please.

KYLE HARWOOD (BDD Counsel): Thank you, Bill, The County for various reasons has not joined the San Juan-Chama Contractors Association. They're invited and attend a lot of meetings, but I've renewed that suggestion to Brian and Travis recently.

CHAIR GREENE: Is that Brian and Travis, or is that John Utton?

MR. HARWOOD: For this group, it is typically the water, the non-legal water managers that attend, and I serve as the administrator of the group, not really the lawyer. So, yeah, it'd be wonderful to have the County as a full member.

CHAIR GREENE: Excellent. Well, we'll go back home and advocate for that a little bit.

MR. HARWOOD: The dues are \$175 a year for the County because it's 50-cents an acre.

CHAIR GREENE: Okay. We should buy more acre feet. So I guess to Commissioner Hughes's point, and this is something that I'm going to be working through at the County and I hope my comrades over at the City and even beyond that, you know, from Los Alamos to Rio Arriba to Albuquerque and so on, that we start to look at a regional housing study so that we start to look at if we start to repatriate people that live in Rio Rancho to Santa Fe that's moving their water burden to Santa Fe, right? And so there's some knock-on things in that. And while we want people to move back to where they work, right, it's like how do we look at housing really comprehensively? And, so housing study, but also plugged into that, the water resources of that big picture, right? So it's everything from affordable housing, which is income restricted to workforce housing, to not so workforce housing and second homes and the whole spectrum in commuters and everybody. And so not looking at just the County, not looking at just the City and not looking at even just the City and the County, but bringing the pueblos in. Bringing all the – and then adding in, it's not just BDD because the City has a very complex water portfolio. The County has a complex water portfolio. We've got the Pojoaque Regional Water System.

So how do we, those two things seem linked very tightly and finding a way to make sure that we look at these things comprehensively. So you guys are working on a general plan update. We're working on a general plan update. Water is actually, it's not just land use

and housing, it's actually water is one of those major inputs. And I hope you're working as an input into the City's general plan update and that we get the same resources into our general plan update over at the County. I don't know if there was a question in there.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Comment noted and thank you for mentioning the general plan.

CHAIR GREENE: Yes, ma'am.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: And on that note, the other thing, you know, general plan coming and we had this discussion at the governing body the other day about all of our various plans that need to align. The City also has our green building code update coming forward finally. Unfortunately, Councilor Romero-Wirth who carried this thing the entire way was not here to carry it over the finish line. So she left me to do that one. But, that has a lot of conversation around how we're changing some of our regulations around water and wind developments, water and what does this start to look like? So, fun preview for things to come.

CHAIR GREENE: That's great. In the case of the County, we did cistern requirements for all units over 2,500, and that's turned into a burden for a lot of houses. So there's great ideas out there that can suddenly restrict a bunch of housing out there. So yeah. Great. Thank you very much.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

#### **b. Monthly Update on BDD Operations**

MATT SANDOVAL (BDD Operations Superintendent): Thank you, Chair Greene, members of the Board. I'll be presenting the BDD operations report for the month of January, 2026. The BDD diversion and deliveries have averaged a million gallons per day as follows: raw water diversions, 5.08 million gallons per day; drinking water deliveries through Booster Station 4A and 5A, 5.03 million gallons per day; and, raw water delivery to Las Campanas at Booster Station 2A was zero million gallons per day for the month of January, 2026.

BDD contributed 47.4 percent of the drinking water to the City and County for the month of January, 2026. And I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR GREENE: Are your reservoirs, this is more the City, are your reservoirs back up and running or are they still under and maybe there's no water put in the reservoir?

MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you, Chair Greene. Yes, on page 2, I believe I have an update for Canyon Road. So Nichols Reservoir is at 97.39 percent capacity and McClure is at 37.6 and that's going on while they're doing their construction and work of there.

CHAIR GREENE: Okay, great. Yes, ma'am.

COUNCILOR FEGALI: Forgive me if everyone else already knows this, but why is Las Campanas at zero; is that usual?

MR. SANDOVAL: That's pretty typical for this time of year. During the winter they don't water the grass. Tom could probably speak that better.

CHAIR GREENE: And actually there is kind of a little bit of a interesting thing to potentially this graph that shows year over year could almost be broken into a graph

for each of the deliveries, right? So we can compare City deliveries, County deliveries, Las Campanas deliveries, and year over year so we could see, yes, it's typical.

MR. SANDOVAL: Yes, thank you for that Chair. I can add that to the report going forward.

CHAIR GREENE: Great. Thank you. Anything else? Matt, thank you very much.

MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you.

**c. Report from BDD Facilities Manager**

BRAD PRADA (Facilities Manager): Thank you. Chair Greene. First off, I want say thank you to Bill and the Water Resource Team stepping up to the plate here and trying to bring some clarification to some of these questions that we've had repeatedly the last couple Board meetings. So I want to thank them.

Members of the Board for today for the month of February, 2026, I'd like to provide an update on the key facility projects procurement status. First regarding legislation and external affairs. Senator Heinrich's office is introducing legislation to permanently protect the Caja del Rio area. Since the Buckman facility sits within this corridor, we have been contacted from the Senator's team. We have provided them with all the necessary facility information, locations, and will continue to cooperate with him. We are monitoring the progress closely though we do not anticipate any impact on our operations.

Moving on to the repair and replacement for an RFP for the control system upgrade is progressing as expected. We have reviewed the proposals and anticipate selecting a vendor within the next month. Additionally, our cyclical replacement for granular activated carbon is on track to begin on February 23<sup>rd</sup> this month.

Regarding the design-build project, the request for information was posted on January 21<sup>st</sup> and we will now be in the 60-day posting period. Simultaneously, our project team, including AECOM, Wright Water, and staff from BDD, City and County, is moving forward with the feasibility study. We are also drafting the RFQ now so that when the RFI is complete, we can post it immediately after,

Finally, an update on staffing: our recent rapid hire event was highly successful, resulting in three offers extended to operators. We are also in the final processing stages for our chemist and administrative manager. Notably, since this report was finalized a week ago, we have concluded interviews and extended an offer to a qualified journeyman electrician.

Thank you. And with that, I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Yes, sir.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I have a couple of questions, Bradley. Could you, not even remind me, but make me aware of what a PLC control system upgrade is?

MR. PRADA: Chair Greene, Rolf Schmidt-Petersen, that is a programmable logic control unit.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: And used for?

MR. PRADA: This specific one controls our membrane feed.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. And then I had a question about next steps with design-build project. I just want to see if I'm getting this right. So, you have the request for information out, continuing the internal

feasibility study and then once that's completed, looking to go to RFQ. And I'm wondering within that if I, and maybe this is a question more for Nancy, so would the RFQ come to the Board per kind of review and approval to go forward? That's my experience with other boards and commissions for request for proposals and so on.

MR. PRADA: If I could? Thank you, Rolf Schmidt-Petersen. It's going to be a suggestion that we bring to you guys. So you're not going to necessarily be making the selection. It'll be our recommendation.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Yeah, I apologize that I'm not asking the question correctly. At least when I was director of the ISC and I was looking to put forward request for proposals, I would bring those drafts to the commission before I could actually put them out and then get them approved. And I don't know if those are policies here or not. And so I was trying to understand that timeline and then what our feed of information would be.

NANCY LONG (BDD Counsel): Mr. Chairman and Member Schmidt-Petersen, that is not our process here, nor the City's process through procurement.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Okay.

MS. LONG: So Procurement will have a strong hand in it and have to approve everything that goes out. But it's being drafted by AECOM and Brad, and I'm doing a legal review and so not until the committee makes a recommendation, the selection committee makes a recommendation as to that engineer, and that contract would, for award, would come to the Board. But the Board does not typically get involved in RFP drafts.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: In my experience, they never did, but at least with state personnel office and things like that, we had to have a resolution or a decision signed by the chair that the, you know, of obligation and of funding so on towards an engineer. And so for any RFP that went out, there was a something that came to the board. Here's our draft request for proposals. We are seeking approval of that and here's essentially what it's going to be. And then discussion, approval, and then move forward.

MS. LONG: That has not been our process here nor the City's process.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: So what is the process? Where does the Board get involved?

MS. LONG: The Board gets involved when there's a recommendation for award of the contract by the selection committee, not in the actual RFP document itself.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: I'm disturbed by parts of that, at least from what the Chair had brought up before and this aspect from a public perspective which is my role as a member. What exactly are we trying to achieve with this engineer? And where are we involved in that process? Because right now we don't know; right? And my understanding from the last meeting is before we went up to request for qualifications, there would be basically a charrette, essentially an evaluation of alternatives. And we would hear something from that before moving forward.

MS. LONG: The charrette that was discussed, I think was more of an internal meeting of the engineer, of our consulting engineer, our owner's representative, City and County representatives – with the technical and engineering people.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: And I understood that. But I understood also that the intent was to come forward with the results of that summary level and say, Here's the alternatives we looked at. Here's kind of the pathway we're proposing to go forward. This is what we think the best option is. And that seems to be going away. And I'm

really frustrated with that if I'm perceiving it correctly.

CHAIR GREENE: So if I may, you have a unique role in this, on this Board here. One, you're the public, but more importantly, you're kind of an expert playing in a room full of policy makers and so there is a true value to have you here to really look at this, at the formation of the RFP. And so I don't know if that has a viable way that that can come forward and help you, one other set of eyes on the RFP. I would just be dangerous and I bet you the other four of us here.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Could I back up. I'm not really concerned about the legal aspects of the RFP, but it's the what, right? I mean, because we've been going on for over a year with a failed process, right? And I don't want to get into a new failed process. I mean at least for the two years that I've been here. It's not the RFP so much, but it is what is the goal? Where are we heading?

CHAIR GREENE: Absolutely. It's like the scope, it's the direction of how the RFP is going to be made to do this. And you know, I would defer to Nancy as to at what point somebody can be involved from this Board or --

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: My point is, before they even go into that closed process there should be a presentation to the Board saying, given everything we looked at and the fact that we're changing how we are moving forward with looking at engineering design and what we want constructed, what did we look at and based upon the things that were looked at, what's the approach going forward? What are the risk factors with that? What's the likely money pieces to that, that they frame policy is where I'm trying to go. And we don't have any of that info.

MR. PRADA: Member Schmidt-Petersen, thank you for that. I'll kind of reiterate what Justin was saying, excuse me, Chair Greene was saying is, you know, you have a very vast knowledge of how these functions work in other places. That's not necessarily the case here. To add to that, in your respective board member position it's really not in your best interest or our best interest or the Board's for that matter to dive into the super details of all this.

It'll be shared with you when we come up with our recommendation and then you can make your selection on saying yes or no at that point. And to a little bit more for the direction we're going to be going, after the RFQ, we're going to be looking for an engineer for 30-percent design. That's the RFQ.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Let me be clear. I'm not looking to understand anything about details. I'm trying to just understand what the planned engineering design and construction process is, what the alternatives we looked at and what the results of that alternative review were with just simple performance criteria. Everybody at this dais could understand those things. There's no technical expertise that's required. But I don't even hear we're getting that. That really concerns me.

CHAIR GREENE: So I'm going to go to you, Jamie, in a second, but I'm going to say, that at the last meeting we had a, a comment about sort of an expected pathway forward, right? Milestones, when we're going to get it, what it's going to be, and at what point we have some input in this, right? So I agree that, you know, to give you some backup and some guidance in this, we can be that group to do that. To say, here's the timeline and in the next eight to 10 months, we're going to be doing this, this, this, and this. Maybe it's 14 months, whatever it is. And here are the touch points that the Board is going to have on this. And so the feasibility study is something that we've discussed both in here and in private and

as a key aspect to this. And I think that that's maybe one of those touch points that we should all be involved in.

And then in building the scope of making sure that the scope of the RFQ has all of those details that all of us, but, you know, including you, most importantly to be, maybe not most importantly, but equally to make sure that, that that is all comprehensively looked at. One, to get the best bang for the buck, right? Some of it is process and engineering specifics but really I think that maybe that's where you want to be involved.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: I mean, I could help to provide some clarity to it. I'm just a little bit confused from a board standpoint with regards to such a large potential expenditure of dollars, right, and basically understanding what the staff are trying to achieve with their process before we go into a closed process, which we went into before where we couldn't hear anything. Right? So I just want to basically say we understand, you know, 100 percent this is where staff is heading with the proposed engineering design. Here's what they're proposing, that engineer designed for construction. Because from all of the experience of the last year, what I understand from that relative, in particular with Brad's becoming the overall manager for the facility, he knows what's not working and what is working and what they potentially need. It's a very different place than two years ago and that's great. It's actually a very positive thing, but before diving into a closed process with review of engineers, which can take huge amounts of time, it's like, okay, this is where we sit today. Here's what we're, we're proposing, be constructed and be designed. And, let's just have that out there so we all know what it is. And then if we have questions about it, we can ask those questions. That's even before you go into any RFQ process or anything like that. That's all.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. We follow the City's procurement process, and I think that is my question. I know the City's procurement process is not fun for any of us involved. And so with part of this conversation where are the avenues through that procurement process? Because I know we get pretty blocked out until the end. We've experienced this frustration many times. I'm very used to this frustration. But I am curious, you know, as we are looking at it from the point of BDD and, and what this starts to look like, that's my understanding is that we have to follow City procurement. We have a lot of regulations from the state. And so Nancy, maybe, or Brad, either of you, if you could provide a little bit more insight into how all of these things are lining up that would be, I think, helpful for me.

MS. LONG: Yes. Chair Greene and Councilor Cassutt, you are correct that we do follow the City's procurement process, which largely follows the State procurement process. And they set the rules and provide the parameters for what we can do and what we can share. And there's also the overlay of, we don't want, just like you don't want City councilors drafting RFPs that then they're eventually, they're going to award on, it just would probably be a conflict and could create some other problems. So, we're not going to have you do that. We're not going to have you step into that kind of risk or that kind of role, not that some of it wouldn't be valuable, but we do have to kind of follow those guardrails.

That doesn't mean that we can't provide overall information and timeframes of how we expect this to go. We are, Brad said, in the midst of working on the RFQ now, and we've got some proposed timelines for that. So, I'd be happy to visit with Brad about this and see if perhaps our owner's rep could provide an overall timeline and the steps that we can anticipate with this project going forward.

But it is on a good path and I think we've got some very good people working on it. And I'm, I'm feeling all more hopeful about this process going forward that we're going to find someone good for the engineering.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Mr. Chairman and Nancy, I would just ask and maybe put it out as a proposal two things. One is, let's just get a summary level presentation from AECOM or whoever; here is the results of the evaluation, this 15 percent evaluation. That would give us a good handle of what was looked at and we're, you know, basically this entire group of experts are suggesting to head. That's great. And then separate from that, this kind of procurement process and the plan for it, I would just like to have that discussion about, you know, the evaluation to date before that procurement process begins and the door starts slamming shut.

MS. LONG: Okay. We'll have to see what we can do. We've had some discussions internally about the kinds of information and data that we have that we are going to share with potential with respondents, potential contractors. So we have to thread that needle because we don't want to have discussion coming out at a meeting that we have decided for certain strategic reasons not to include in the RFQ, right? Because then those minutes would be available and it could impact the procurement. So we're going to have to think about that because we just had a discussion about that last week.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: You know, I'll just bring that up again too. I understand that from the past, but I'm saying, the things that were in that evaluation probably should be in your RFQ for your contractor. Because we cannot be in the same risk profile with a potential engineer as we were previously. You, staff, are not in the same position that you were previously. The burden of the risk is going to have to be shared. And, so all cards on the table I think is the way to go forward given the history of what kind of what happened with that last procurement. At least, that's just my opinion.

CHAIR GREENE: So what I think I would ask is that so taking a step back to last week or last month, I think we discussed the idea that the feasibility study would be coming to us this meeting or March, May, March. So that would be great to get an assessment of that. Of course, trying to thread that needle, I get it. I think we all get it. But to understand the full scope. You know, you all looked at 50 different options, narrowed it down to 10, narrowed it down to five because of this, and you're going to let it out for that. That was one of the more important things for us to sort of assess here. Then the timeline for all of those other pieces and, you know, just to give us some sort of – something to say that we can see the future coming. And instead of just a surprise, here's where what we've got.

MR. PRADA: Thank you Chair Greene. We shared that pathway last month, so if you look back into the minutes from last month, it was in my presentation. On that note, I would be happy to come up with a presentation or the team, I should say, would be happy to come up and present something when we're ready at that milestone.

CHAIR GREENE: Okay. And so it's the March meeting so just to keep us on track for that.

Anything else on this subject? Okay. I do want to thank you for taking the time to start looking at the Caja del Rio. We have a letter in our agenda for next Tuesday. And I think there was a conversation being had as to whether BDD wanted to tie those letters together. But let's make sure that BDD is at the table for this and not on the video as they said.

I'm also going to DC at the end of this month and speaking to USDA and Interior in regards to things not related to, well one thing's related to Caja de Rio but to other things. And if there's anything that is of value for me to be briefed on, to take to our delegation or to any of the administration partners, I'm happy to go make some time there.

MR. PRADA: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, if we move any more in that direction or get any more feedback from Senator Heinrich's, we'll be in touch with you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Anything else? Excellent.

## 9. Action Items: Discussion Agenda

### a. **Election of Chair and Vice-chair of the Buckman Direct Diversion Board**

CHAIR GREENE: I'm just going to start off by saying, this has been a blast everybody. Thank you very much. This has been great to work with you all. Great councilors and commissioners and support team. Being chair has really been an honor. I love this. I've learned a lot. I hope I've contributed a bunch too and help navigate some things here.

I don't know if there's a different way of, of doing this here for BDD, but I will take nominations for chair., I'm going to nominate Councilor Cassutt to be chair for this next year.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN I'd like to second.

CHAIR GREENE: Great. So we have a motion and a second. But I just to allow everybody else and so just so you know, we alternate between city and county. And so it's the city's year. Are there any other nominations out there? Okay.

### **The motion passed by [4-0] voice vote with Councilor Cassutt abstaining.**

CHAIR GREENE: Do I pass the gavel now or do we wait till the next meeting?

MS. LONG: We usually wait till the next meeting. Mr. Chair.

CHAIR GREENE: So moving on to Vice-chair. You know, I'm going to make a little statement right now based on some conversations that I've had over the past few months of people asking me to be vice-chair in this alternating situation here, both from some of our experts in the room because there's a lot of big decisions as we know this year.

I know there is someone to my right that also would like to be vice-chair. So I will, let us both sit for this and allow debate to happen here. If somebody would like to nominate myself or Commissioner Hughes, I stand open to the conversation.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: I have a question,

CHAIR GREENE: Please.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Thank you. So what we've have frequently done at the City is we usually do two rotations every two years. So a rotation as chair retreat and vice-chair before we swapped to the next councilor. Last year was a bit of an anomaly, Carol took it because she's Carol and she's amazing.

Chair Greene, have you done a vice-chair and chair or just chair?

CHAIR GREENE: No, prior to my chairmanship I was alternate and I did attend, I think every meeting just to get up to speed. So I would be ready to be potentially chair because the two Annas, Anna Hamilton and Anna Hansen were chair and vice-chair for successive years.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Got it. And do you guys tend to do that pattern or is that just an us thing?

CHAIR GREENE: We do it at the Commission level. We hadn't done it at the BDD level. It had been the Annas for a long time.

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

CHAIR GREENE: Is that wrong?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Well, we don't even necessarily do vice-chair and chair. You were elected chair, but you weren't vice-chair of the Commission,

CHAIR GREENE: This year, that is correct.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah. So we tend to do whatever. Being vice-chair doesn't mean you're automatically the chair.

CHAIR GREENE: Yeah, I'll make my case. I'll continue to make my case and I'll invite, Commissioner Hughes to make his case. But in this past two years, I've spent a lot of time learning about what's going on in BDD. One, as an alternate and spending the time, even though I was an alternate and sitting down in the gallery down here, but then as chair this past year had a lot of offline meetings to navigate this contract. We've got a pretty important contract to rebuild the facility. I've, you know, spent two and a half hours with my constituents up in the north talking about the Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System and the interconnect. And so I've over the past few years have become an expert on water policy and construction of these projects like this. And so everything from the, using the things that BDD does, or the Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System is using and bringing them over here, such as a Ranney well and the interconnect. These are all big picture things. And so I stand to see where people want this to.

CHAIR GREENE: I don't see how not being vice-chair means you don't have a chance to continue learning and having influence on this. I have a degree in environmental engineering, so I feel like I'm very familiar with water issues. I studied water many years. I've worked five years in groundwater pollution and so I think I will be easily up to speed in anything. I think that we should bring a lot of issues to the whole Board to decide on not just the chair and the vice-chair. And since you are chair of the County Commission, I think that's a lot of work and I think that I would like to share your workload by being vice-chair of this committee. It's not that big a deal, but I would like to do it.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: I apologize. We just do this a little differently in the City. We normally have a discuss it amongst ourselves.

CHAIR GREENE: We did not discuss this amongst ourselves.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: Yeah, I figured that out.

MEMBER SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Mr. Chair and Councilor, I think there's a number of different kind of pathways to go on this, but in thinking about it, just in the way that the Board has operated in the total two years I've been on, you know the aspect of the continuity with the chair and vice-chair is really important. And, and in reality, there's a lot that does happen with staff, with the chair and vice-chair. And so in thinking about that, and no, nothing in this regards to your experience and so on, but that two years of carried over history relative to, let's say, the rebuild, what happened with the contracting where Carol was a big part of it, and then Justin and then you were a big part of it too, and then carried on to the chair. I think that's still very important.

So I'll just do that because I'm the public member. I'll just propose that Board member Greene be vice-chair again for the upcoming year.

COUNCILOR CASSUTT: I appreciate that perspective. Again, and I'll go ahead and second.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Are there any other nominations for vice-chair?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: I don't know. It's not that big a deal. I'm not going to nominate myself.

CHAIR GREENE: Well, I mean but thank you folks., Well, we have a nomination from Member Schmidt- Petersen and a second from Councilor Cassutt.

**The motion passed by [4-0] vote with Commissioner Hughes abstaining.**

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you very much everybody. I appreciate that and will work hard as the vice-chair in this next year. And I look forward to the honor and the work.

**10. Matters from the Board**

CHAIR GREENE: No matters. I do want to ask our friends over at the City to start working together on this housing plan and potentially a water plan and looking comprehensively as how it fits. And so I would hope that, especially at the water level, this can work together for us.

**11. Next Meeting: Thursday, March 5, 2026**

**12. Adjourn**

Upon motion by Councilor Cassutt and second by Member Schmidt-Petersen, Chair Greene declared this meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Justin Greene, Board Chair

Respectfully submitted:  
Wordswork

**ATTEST TO**

\_\_\_\_\_  
KATHARINE E. CLARK  
Santa Fe County Clerk



**Date:** March 5, 2026  
**To:** Buckman Direct Diversion Board  
**From:** Matthew Sandoval, BDD Operations Superintendent  
**Subject:** Update on BDD Operations for the Month of February 2026

**ITEM:**


1. This memorandum is to update the Buckman Direct Diversion Board (BDDDB) on BDD operations during the month of February 2026. The BDD diversions and deliveries have averaged, in Million Gallons Per Day (MGD), as follows:

	<b>February</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>2025</b>
Raw water diversions		4.90 MGD	3.65 MGD
Raw water delivery to Las Campanas at BS2A		0 MGD	0.12 MGD
Drinking water deliveries through Booster Station 4A/5A		4.67 MGD	3.41 MGD

2. Water supply to the City and County from all sources.

	<b>February</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>2025</b>
BDD		70.0 %	49.6 %
Canyon Rd WTP		23.8 %	23.3 %
City Wells		0 %	22.3 %
Buckman Wells		6.2 %	4.8 %

3. The BDD year-to-date diversions are depicted below:





## Regional Water Overview


Daily metered regional water demand for the month averaged approximately: 6.4 MGD

Rio Grande flows averaged approximately: 660 CFS (cubic feet per second)

City/County/Las Campanas Storage- as updated by partners. As of February 24, 2026 City of SF Abiquiu SJC storage is at about 3851.36 AF.

### City Storage (af)

● Abiquiu Lake Santa Fe ... ● El Vado Reservoir... ● Heron Lake Sa...



## Regional Water Supply

CRWTP reservoir storage: Nichols: 86.58% McClure: 40.30% Watershed Inflow: 2.03 MGD

- Santa Fe SNOTEL
  - Cumulative snow Water/Equiv. Inches 6.8
  - Cumulative Snow in Depth in Inches 22



## **Current Rio Grande Watershed Snowpack Storage Data:**

The current (2/17/26) Upper Rio Grande Basin Index is 49% of the historic median value for Snow Water Equivalent (SWE) and 92% of the historic median value for precipitation. This suggests that, while total precipitation in this basin has been near average for the water year starting October 1, the below normal snowpack may result in reduced spring runoff and river flows if it is not supplemented by snow accumulation in the coming months.

Source: <https://wcc.sc.egov.usda.gov/reports>

## **Current El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) Status Summary**

At the time this report is being prepared (2/16/26) NOAA is reporting that a weak La Niña is still underway. In January–early February 2026, sea surface temperatures remained below average across much of the east-central and eastern equatorial Pacific, with the most recent weekly Niño-3.4 index around  $-0.9$  °C, and other Niño region indices near or slightly below normal for a weak La Niña event. This means parts of the Pacific Ocean near the equator are a bit cooler than normal, which affects global weather patterns, though the signal is weakening as subsurface heat increases. Atmospheric patterns continue to reflect La Niña, but signs of a transition to neutral are emerging. Ocean temperatures are currently below average, and the atmosphere is still behaving in ways typical of La Niña. However, both oceanic and atmospheric indicators suggest a gradual relaxation. In New Mexico, La Niña conditions typically result in warmer and drier weather, with actual impacts depending on location and the strength of La Niña conditions.

This La Niña is weak and is not expected to last much longer. Forecasters think there is about a 60–75% chance that conditions will return to normal (ENSO-neutral) sometime between February and April 2026, with ENSO-neutral conditions likely to persist through at least late spring and possibly as late as August 2026.

Source: [cpc.ncep.noaa.gov](http://cpc.ncep.noaa.gov)

## **Seasonal Precipitation and Temperature Outlooks:**


The current NOAA one-month forecast indicates near normal precipitation with above average temperatures for the region. The current NOAA three-month precipitation outlook is leaning below normal while the three-month temperature forecast is above normal for the region. Maps of one-month and three-month temperature and precipitation forecasts are provided below.

Source: [https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/predictions/long\\_range/seasonal.php?lead=1](https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/predictions/long_range/seasonal.php?lead=1)

## **Summary/Interpretation**

Below average snowpack in the Upper Rio Grande basin, in conjunction with projections of below normal precipitation and above average temperatures for the next three months indicates that there could be below normal spring runoff/native Rio Grande flows and, potentially, a San Juan Chama Project allocation that is less than 100%.








# Seasonal Precipitation Outlook




Valid: Feb-Mar-Apr 2026  
Issued: January 15, 2026



# Seasonal Temperature Outlook



Valid: Feb-Mar-Apr 2026  
Issued: January 15, 2026





Data is current as of 2/27/2026.



## Buckman Direct Diversion Monthly Native and SJC Diversions (ac-ft)

	Total Diverted	Total Native Diverted	County Native Rio Grande Diversions				TCLC Native Rio Grande Diversion			San Juan-Chama Diversions			
			Total County Native Diverted	County Native SP-4842	County Native SP-4842-A	County Native RG-20516 et al. into SP-C	County Native RG-20516 et al. into SP-A & B	Total TCLC Native Diverted	TCLC Native SP-4842-A	TCLC Native RG-20516 et al. into SP-4842-A	Total SJC Diverted	City SJC SP-2847-E Diverted	County SJC SP-2847-E Diverted
2026 Jan	496,024	380,983	380,983	380,983	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	115,041	115,041	0.000	0.000
Feb	361,474	251,035	251,035	251,035	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	110,440	110,440	0.000	0.000
<b>Total</b>	<b>857,498</b>	<b>632,017</b>	<b>632,017</b>	<b>632,017</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>225,481</b>	<b>225,481</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Max Allowable</b>		<b>2,440,368</b>	<b>2,224,234</b>	<b>1,358,530</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>372,384</b>	<b>493,320</b>	<b>69,804</b>	<b>146,330</b>	<b>7,454,125</b>	<b>6,406,750</b>	<b>459,375</b>	<b>588,000</b>
<b>Remaining</b>		<b>1,808,351</b>	<b>1,592,217</b>	<b>726,513</b>		<b>372,384</b>	<b>493,320</b>	<b>69,804</b>	<b>146,330</b>	<b>7,228,644</b>	<b>6,181,269</b>	<b>459,375</b>	<b>588,000</b>

Buckman Direct Diversion Monthly Native and SJC Diversions (ac-ft)

	Total Diverted	Total Native Diverted	County Native Rio Grande Diversions				TCLC Native Rio Grande Diversion			San Juan-Chama Diversions			
			Total County Native Diverted	County Native SP-4842	County Native SP-4842-A	County Native RG-20516 et al. -C into SP-4842	County Native RG-20516 et al. -A & -B into SP-4842-A	Total TCLC Native Diverted	TCLC Native SP-4842-A	TCLC Native RG-20516 et al. -A & -B into SP-4842-A	Total SJC Diverted	City SJC SP-2847-E Diverted	County SJC SP-2847-E Diverted
2025 Jan	326.141	123.689	123.689	123.689	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	202.453	202.453	0.000	0.000
Feb	313.427	28.205	28.205	28.205	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	285.223	285.223	0.000	0.000
Mar	563.860	257.038	257.038	257.038	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	306.823	306.823	0.000	0.000
Apr	677.035	471.649	471.649	471.649	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	205.388	205.388	0.000	0.000
May	918.542	292.560	292.560	292.560	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	625.983	625.983	0.000	0.000
Jun	754.206	62.214	62.214	62.214	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	691.993	691.993	0.000	0.000
Jul	748.447	35.193	35.193	35.193	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	713.256	713.256	0.000	0.000
Aug	446.168	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	446.169	446.169	0.000	0.000
Sep	418.331	65.790	65.790	65.790	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	352.542	352.542	0.000	0.000
Oct	304.622	148.107	148.107	148.107	0.000	125.915	0.000	0.000	0.000	156.516	156.516	0.000	0.000
Nov	301.012	282.448	282.448	282.448	0.000	246.469	35.979	0.000	0.000	18.565	0.000	0.000	18.565
Dec	425.163	425.164	425.164	425.164	0.000	0.000	425.164	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,196.954</b>	<b>2,192.057</b>	<b>2,192.057</b>	<b>2,192.057</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>372.384</b>	<b>461.143</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>4,004.911</b>	<b>3,986.345</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>18.565</b>
<b>Max Allowable</b>		<b>2,440.368</b>	<b>2,224.234</b>	<b>1,358.530</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>372.384</b>	<b>493.320</b>	<b>146.330</b>	<b>69.804</b>	<b>7,362.500</b>	<b>6,407.000</b>	<b>367.500</b>	<b>588.000</b>
<b>Remaining</b>		<b>248.311</b>	<b>32.177</b>				<b>32.177</b>	<b>146.330</b>	<b>69.804</b>	<b>3,357.589</b>	<b>2,420.655</b>	<b>367.500</b>	<b>569.435</b>

Projected Diversions (ac-ft)

--	--

SJC in Storage as of Thursday, January 1, 2026 (ac-ft)

City SJC in Storage		TCLC SJC in Storage
County SJC in Storage	10,558	1,003
		1,109







**Date:** March 5, 2026

**To:** BDD Board

**From:** Bradley Prada, BDD Facilities Manager

**Re:** BDD Facilities Manager Monthly Update to the BDD Board

This report outlines progress on key facility projects, procurement, and staffing as of March 2026. Significant updates include the advancement of Major Repair and Replacement (MR&R) projects and continued progress on the Design/Rebuild project.

- **Major Repair and Replacement (MR&R) Fund.**

The Request for Proposal (RFP) for the PLC (Control System) upgrade is progressing as expected. We've reviewed the proposal and anticipate a vendor selection within the coming month.

The cyclical replacement for the Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) has been successfully completed, ensuring optimal treatment performance.

- **Design/Build project**

The Request for Information (RFI) was posted on January 21, 2026, with a 60-day posting period. Concurrently, the project team including AECOM, WWE, and staff from the City, County, and BDD is continuing work on the feasibility study. We intend to share the completed study with the Board at the April meeting. We have already drafted a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and shared it with Procurement for feedback; this ensures we are positioned to post the RFQ immediately following the RFI closing.

- **Current Job Vacancy Updates**

BDD personnel are collaborating closely with City staff to fill open positions. I would like to recognize the hard work of our team as we are now down to only three remaining vacancies, and we have strong leads on most of those. Reaching this level of staffing has been a significant undertaking, and I want to thank the team for their persistence in ensuring we are properly resourced to meet our operational goals.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Status</u>
Journeyman Electrician	Selected, starts on March 30 <sup>th</sup>
Chemist	Selected, starts on March 16 <sup>th</sup>
Administrator Manager	Hired, starts March 16 <sup>th</sup>
Accounting Manager	Posted, closes March 15 <sup>th</sup>
PUD Operator Ladder	Posting Lead Operator





---

## *Memorandum*

**Date:** March 5, 2026  
**To:** Buckman Direct Diversion Board  
**From:** Brad Prada (BDD Facility Manager)  
Paul Drakos, Jim Riesterer, Boot Pierce, GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. d/b/a  
Glorieta Geoscience (GGI)  
Nancy R. Long, Kyle Harwood (BDD General Counsel)  
**Subject:** Rio Grande Water Quality Calendar Year 2026 Workplan pursuant to BDDB  
Resolution No. 2022-2

This memorandum is provided pursuant to Buckman Direct Diversion Board ("BDDB") Resolution No. 2022-2, to set forth the anticipated water quality issues for the BDDB in Calendar Year 2026.

These issues are ranked according to their priority to the BDDB. Tier 1 is top priority where immediate attention may be required and impending actions. Tier 2 has future actions anticipated and ongoing monitoring. Tier 3 issues require no action at present but may require attention and actions in the future.

A copy of Resolution No. 2022-2 is attached to this memo for reference.

### **TIER 1 ISSUES:**

#### **1. Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") with the U.S. Department of Energy ("DOE")**

The BDDB and DOE (collectively, the "Parties") entered a fifth MOU in December 2025 that memorializes their respective commitments through December 1, 2028, concerning stormwater and sediment migration from the Los Alamos National Laboratory ("LANL") to the Rio Grande above the Buckman Direct Diversion. Aside from extending the term of the MOU, the major change from the fourth MOU is that DOE will no longer provide funding for sampling.

Issues addressed in the 2025 MOU included:

- Ongoing operation and maintenance of the Early Notification System ("ENS"), including resolution of data transmission issues as well as an agreement to modify the E110.7 gage, located near the confluence of the Los Alamos/Pueblo (LA/Pueblo) Canyon and the Rio Grande, such that the camera (with night functionality) shall be pointed upstream so that LA/Pueblo Canyon flows can be determined even when the Rio Grande may be in flood stage. The approval of Pueblo de San Ildefonso will be required for this new camera alignment

- Clarifications to the map exhibit.
- Changes to the description of reporting by LANL EM-LA to NMED of LA/Pueblo Canyon environmental monitoring and the reporting to the Intellus database.
- Minor edits recommended by the parties
- Ongoing sampling, data collection, and data sharing with DOE and the New Mexico Environment Department ("NMED").

**Recommendations for 2026:**

- Continue to work with DOE in accordance with the terms of the MOU to monitor discharges of stormwater from the LANL property to the Rio Grande.
- Coordinate with the Pueblo and EM-LA to implement changes to the camera configuration at E110.7 to direct the camera view upstream in LA/Pueblo Canyon, including night viewing, to allow confirmation of storm flows.
- Work with the Pueblo and EM-LA to investigate options for more robust data transmission from the camera at E110.7. BDD General Counsel, BDD Facilities Manager, and GGI will continue to work with DOE as operation, maintenance, and data transmission issues arise.
- BDD General Counsel, BDD Facilities Manager, and GGI will participate in the Annual Review (anticipated to occur in May).
- GGI will support the facilities manager for BDD intake sampling and LA-Pueblo sediment surveillance sampling. The BDD Intake Sampling Program will continue.

Leads: BDD General Counsel, BDD Facility Manager, GGI

**2. LA/Pueblo Canyon Waning Limb Discharge Lag Time Determination**

When a storm event results in surface water flow from LA/Pueblo Canyon to the Rio Grande, the BDD halts diversions from the river to ensure that no contaminants from LA/Pueblo Canyon are taken into the Buckman facility. Current BDD operations policy requires that the diversion be shut down for a minimum of 12 hours following the end of an LA/Pueblo Canyon discharge event, as recorded at the E 110.7 gage.

**Recommendation for 2026:** GGI, the BDD Facilities Manager, and Staff will work to develop and implement a program to quantify the transport time for contaminants discharging from LA/Pueblo Canyon to reach the BDD intake. Implementation of the plan will be contingent on stormwater discharges taking place from LA/Pueblo Canyon during CY 2026.

**3. Hexavalent Chromium ("Cr-VI") Water Rights Protest and Plume Mitigation Monitoring**

**3a. Hexavalent Chromium Water Rights Protest**

DOE and Los Alamos County filed an application ("the Application") with the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer ("OSE") to transfer water rights from existing points of diversion to extraction, injection, and monitoring wells used in the remediation Interim Measure ("IM") for the Cr-VI groundwater plume. In 2020, the BDDB protested the application asserting that, among other deficiencies, DOE failed to provide information

about impacts to the Rio Grande. Although two settlement conferences occurred in 2022, the protest is still pending. Also, in 2022, NMED took several regulatory actions that could affect the factual basis of the Application, including directives to cease injection of treated water at the current locations under the IM, and to consider land application or an alternative injection site outside of the plume for treated water under strict conditions. The outcome of these directives could affect the factual basis of the Application, potentially leading to its modification or even withdrawal.

In December 2023, Environmental Management-Los Alamos (EM-LA) issued its responses to comments on the Draft Chromium Interim Measure and Final Remedy Environmental Assessment ("IM-EA"). Options 1 and 2 of the IM-EA require a diversion of 1688 ac-ft/yr which greatly exceeds the original application to the OSE for 679 ac-ft/yr and will require filing a new permit. The BDDDB has prepared and submitted comments on the draft IM-EA, describing its preferred remediation alternatives, including requiring DOE to specifically test and list results for Cr-VI, and advocating for land application of treated water to create a cone of depression to achieve hydraulic and hydrologic control of the Cr-VI plume. In addition, the BDDDB has requested as a condition of any groundwater pumping that all impacts to the Rio Grande from that pumping be offset.

**Recommendations for 2026:** Monitor the regulatory actions and, if appropriate, engage with the EM-LA and NMED in their resolution. The BDDDB will continue the OSE protest of the 679 ac-ft/yr application and protest the new application (not currently submitted) to ensure EM-LA offsets depletion effects on the Rio Grande, in coordination with Santa Fe County (who is also a co-protestant).

Leads: BDD General Counsel, BDD Facility Manager, and GGI

### **3b. Hexavalent Chromium Plume Migration Monitoring**

In December 2023, the DOE-EM-LA, together with the NMED, prepared a letter requesting that an independent technical review be conducted of actions taken by EM-LA to characterize, model, and contain the hexavalent chromium plume at LANL and the efficacy of chromium plume control interim measures taken to prevent plume migration offsite.

The Independent Technical Review report was released in December 2024 and the report's conclusions are in agreement with GGI's previous assessment that the chromium plume boundaries have not been adequately defined. This has now been confirmed by preliminary sample results from the San Ildefonso Mortandad Regional Well 3 (SIMR3) well that showed Cr-VI concentration exceeding groundwater standards.

**Recommendations for 2026:** Monitor and evaluate pumping during IM activities – obtain pumping records to evaluate both cumulative and annual total groundwater diversions and cumulative and annual net groundwater diversions. GGI will continue to monitor progress on

SIMR3 well completion, development, and testing to further assess implications for the plume migration and delineation of the plume boundaries

Leads: GGI, BDD Facility Manager

#### **4. PFAS**

In January 2024, the LANL NPDES permittees submitted the second Annual Data Report for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances ("PFAS") as required by the settlement agreement with the DOE. As in 2022, three of the 15 locations proposed to be sampled were in the Los Alamos Canyon watershed, none of which were sampleable due to lack of triggering events (i.e., sufficient flow). One location - outside of the LA/Pueblo Canyon watershed - was sampled in 2023, with various PFAS detected. In the two years of monitoring under this program, no samples have been collected in sites in the LA/Pueblo Canyon watershed. The BDDDB has also approached NMED to adopt surface water standards for PFAS. LANL has committed to continue PFAS sampling of groundwater. In 2025 GGI collected samples from the Rio Grande above and below the confluence with Los Alamos/Pueblo Canyon. No PFAS compounds were detected that exceeded NMED standards.

It is important to note that the Granular Activated Carbon (GAC), which is part of the BDD treatment train, is very effective in removing PFAS from water. If PFAS is present in source water, the GAC will effectively treat it.

***Recommendations for 2026:*** Closely monitor PFAS standards and actions at the federal and state level. Coordinate with BDD Facility Manager to assess costs and develop strategies for sampling at the BDD intake. Continue outreach to NMED to stay apprised of amendments to state groundwater and surface water standards that may involve PFAS.

Leads: GGI, BDD Facility Manager

#### **5. New Mexico NPDES Primacy**

New Mexico is one of three states that does not have authority from the federal government to implement the NPDES permitting program under the Clean Water Act. Consequently, NPDES permits in New Mexico are issued by the Environmental Protection Agency, Dallas office.

Two bills passed in the 2025 Legislative Session that contained outlines for new NM Water Quality Control Commission rules for development of a State-run NPDES permitting program. In these bills, NMED requested funding for new staff to support a permitting program. NMED is in the process of developing permitting rules and has petitioned the Water Quality Control Commission (WQCC) for a public hearing on proposed rules in spring of 2026.

***Recommendations for 2026:*** Continue to interface with NMED as appropriate to track development of the permitting program both as it may affect permitting at LANL and BDD's

current NPDES permit for sediment return to the Rio Grande. Participate in public hearings as needed.

Leads: GGI, BDD General Counsel

## **TIER 2 ISSUES:**

### **6. LANL National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits**

The BDDDB provided comments to NMED in 2020 on the State certification of LANL's surface water permits for its industrial outfalls (NPDES Permit No. NM002835) and stormwater discharges (NPDES Permit No. NM0030759). The Board's comments centered on technical aspects of the permits, and how they relate to the cleanup activities for legacy pollution at LANL. The LANL operators petitioned for review of the State certification of the two permits and conditions imposed in the certification process, and hearings were granted although not scheduled. In a Settlement Agreement of the petition the parties agreed to address per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances ("PFAS") monitoring as described above in Issue #3.

In the wake of *Sackett v. USEPA*, the EPA appears to continue its enforcement of NPDES permits issued for areas where outfall or stormwater discharges into intermittent streams where there is a confluence with a body of water defined as a "Waters of the United States" ("WOTUS") (e.g., the Rio Grande). As part of its analysis of Jemez Mountain streams, the EPA determined that Los Alamos Canyon is a WOTUS and should be regulated under NPDES permitting.

***Recommendations for 2026:*** Monitor these and other LANL permits, particularly when LANL is required to seek renewals or seeks to modify the existing permits. Monitoring results collected from Los Alamos and Pueblo Canyons and their tributaries under the Agreement will be reviewed. Monitor NMED's progress to obtain NPDES primacy and how NMED will regulate surface water discharges from LANL. Participate in public hearings as needed.

Leads: BDD Facility Manager, GGI

### **7. DOE's Sitewide Environmental Impact Statement for LANL**

In January of 2025, the U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration and Los Alamos National Laboratory published a Draft Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement for Continued Operation of Los Alamos National Laboratory ("SWEIS").

The BDDDB's primary concern is contaminants originating from Los Alamos and Pueblo Canyons and their tributaries and groundwater discharge to the Rio Grande upstream of the BDD intake. The SWEIS, however, does not specifically address Los Alamos and Pueblo Canyons but presents a wide range of issues that LANL will address. The SWEIS broadly addresses the Hexavalent Chromium plume, PFAS contamination and water rights. The BDDDB submitted

comments on the draft SWEIS in April, 2025. Comments included eight specific recommendations.

**Recommendations for 2026:** Follow up with NMED and DOE on the BDDB recommendations and whether they have been incorporated/implemented in revisions to the draft SWEIS.

Leads: GGI, BDD Facility Manager

### **TIER 3 ISSUES:**

#### **8. NMED/LANL Consent Order**

In August 2024, to avoid lengthy and costly litigation, NMED and LANL entered into a Settlement Agreement on the Consent Order. The general purposes of this Consent Order are to: provide a framework for current and future actions to implement regulatory requirements; establish an effective structure for accomplishing work on a priority basis through cleanup campaigns with achievable milestones and targets; drive toward cost effective work resulting in tangible, measurable environmental clean-up; minimize the duplication of investigative and analytical work and documentation and ensure the quality of data management; set a structure for the establishment of additional cleanup campaigns and milestones as new information becomes available and campaigns are completed; facilitate cooperation; exchange of information; provide for effective public participation; and define and clarify the Settlement Agreement's relationship to other regulatory requirements. On January 14, 2026, LANL presented proposed consent order activities in 2026, which include development of a workplan to investigate (Phase III investigation) reaches of Pueblo Canyon and Upper LA/Pueblo Canyon.

**Recommendation for 2026:** GGI will work with NMED to track progress on the Settlement Agreement and pursue BDD interests. GGI will engage with LANL and report back to the BDD Facilities Manager regarding development of the Pueblo Canyon Phase III Investigation Workplan and Upper LA/Pueblo Canyon Phase III Investigation Workplan.

Leads: GGI, BDD General Counsel, BDD Facility Manager

#### **9. Clean Water Act §303(d)/305(b) Integrated Report and List of Impaired Waters ("Integrated Report")**

NMED prepares an Integrated Report every two years in compliance with Sections 303(d) and 305(b) of the Clean Water Act. The Integrated Report serves as a source of information on water quality and pollution control programs as well as how NMED assesses surface water quality data against water quality standards. The BDDB has provided comments to NMED on the last three (2020, 2022, and 2023) Integrated Reports. The BDDB's comments on the 2024-2026 Integrated Report centered on NMED's delays in implementing Total Maximum Daily Loads ("TMDLs") to address impairment of the Rio Grande and streams on the Pajarito Plateau,

as well as assessing the entirety of Los Alamos Canyon and its tributaries in 2024 for its suitability as a Public Water Supply ("PWS").

NMED stated in the March 12, 2024, Water Quality Control Commission ("WQCC") meeting that it did not intend to assess LA/Pueblo Canyon and its tributaries as a PWS. The WQCC voted unanimously to send the current 303(d) list and 305(b) report to the EPA.

NMED submitted the final Draft Integrated Report to the EPA on April 1, 2024. NMED TMDL sample collection was proposed for the Rio Grande (Cochiti Reservoir to San Ildefonso boundary).

The NMED Surface Water Quality Bureau submitted a 2025-2026 Middle Rio Grande and Santa Fe Watershed Field Sampling Plan on February 28, 2025. The sample collection was initiated in 2025 and is expected by NMED to be finalized in November 2026, with final data validation to follow and publication of a survey report to follow in the Spring of 2027.

On December 8, 2025, a public notice was issued by NMED on the 2026-2028 CWA §§303(d)/305(b) Integrated List of Assessed Surface Waters. No BDD comments were provided.

Recommendations for 2026: Continue to monitor and review NMED TMDL assessment efforts and documents for the Rio Grande reach (Cochiti Reservoir to San Ildefonso boundary) and assess data as it becomes available. Coordinate with the BDD Facility Manager and prepare to develop public comments on the assessment.

Leads: GGI, BDD General Counsel, BDD Facility Manager

#### **10. Los Alamos County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System ("MS4") Permit**

Prior to 2022, the EPA was in the process of drafting a NPDES MS4 permit for Los Alamos County, the New Mexico Department of Transportation, and DOE to regulate stormwater discharges in Los Alamos County outside of LANL, which is covered by its own stormwater discharge permit. A significant portion of these discharge locations are in the Los Alamos Canyon watershed. In December 2024, the EPA issued a determination that discharges from small MS4s located in the Los Alamos Urban Area, as defined by the latest decennial Census, and from MS4s located on LANL property within Los Alamos and Santa Fe Counties, New Mexico require NPDES permit coverage because the discharges are contributing to violations of New Mexico Water Quality Standards in Waters of the United States.

At this time, the current permit is active, but administratively continued and no additional discharges may be added until the next draft of the new permit is issued by the EPA.

**Recommendations for 2026:** Monitor the development of this permit as it pertains to numerous uncontrolled discharges that are not currently covered by the LANL stormwater NPDES permit.

Coordinate with the BDD Facility Manager on any draft EPA permit revisions and prepare comments on the draft permits, once released, for the BDD's consideration.

Leads: BDD Facility Manager, BDD General Counsel, GGI.

### **11. Triennial Review of State Surface Water Quality Standards**

In January 2024, the Board provided comments to NMED on the draft 2024-2026 State of New Mexico Clean Water Act (CWA) §303(d)/305(b) Integrated List of Assessed Surface Waters. In the past the BDD has requested that NMED provide special provisions and assessments for stream segments from the Pajarito Plateau and the Rio Grande at the BDD intake in State Standards.

***Recommendations for 2026:*** The next Triennial Review process will begin in 2028, when the public will be invited to review and comment on NMED's surface water quality standards. It is not anticipated that work on the 2028 review will begin during 2026, but if any unforeseen issues related to the Triennial Review arise in 2026, GGI will coordinate with the BDD facility manager to address them as appropriate.

Leads: GGI, BDD General Counsel, BDD Facilities Manager



**Date:** March 5, 2026  
**To:** Buckman Direct Diversion Board  
**From:** Brad Prada, BDD Facilities Manager  
**Via:** Kurt Traverse, BDD Accounting Support  
**Subject:** Proposed Fiscal Year 2027 Annual Operating Budget Request

### **ITEM AND ISSUE:**

Request for approval and recommendation of the BDD Annual Operating Budget & Other Fund Contributions for Fiscal Year 2027.

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

BDD staff is pleased to present the proposed Buckman Direct Diversion (BDD) Annual Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2027 and proposed contributions to the Major Repair and Replacement (MRR) Fund. The proposed budget accounts for all projected necessary costs to meet the Board's service level objectives and to continue to provide high quality water to our partners, the City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, the Club at Las Campanas and the Las Campanas Water and Sewer Cooperative.

The BDD actively collaborated with its partners on the development of this budget, and with their support, we present this budget request.

#### Budget Highlights & Considerations:

- Requesting budget approval of \$9,366,160 for FY 2027 Operations (Page 2 of Budget Proposal)
  - \$9,216,160 – Partner Reimbursements
  - \$150,000– PNM Solar Rebate Revenue
- FY 2027 Budget Request increased by \$580,003 from the FY 2026 Adopted Budget (Page 5)
- Emergency Reserve Fund is fully funded to our target balance of \$2,000,000 (Page 10)
- Major Repair & Replacement Fund - \$1,695,500 requested contributions. (Page 11)



**ACTION REQUESTED:**

Staff recommend approval by the BDD Board and recommendation of the BDD Annual Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2027 and the requested contributions to our Major Repair and Replacement Fund to City of Santa Fe's City Council and Santa Fe County Board of Commissioners.

We look forward to presenting the proposed budget and addressing your comments and questions.

Thank you

Approved by BDDDB March 5, 2026

---

Jamie Cassutt, BDDDB Chair



# Buckman Direct Diversion

## FISCAL YEAR 2027


Proposed Annual Operating  
Budget & Partner Contributions



**Prepared by:**  
**Bradley Prada, BDD Facilities Manager**



**BUCKMAN DIRECT DIVERSION REGIONAL WATER PLANT ORGANIZATIONAL CHART**





## Buckman Direct Diversion (BDD) Proposed Annual Operating Budget for FY27

### Budget Message

The *Project Management and Fiscal Services Agreement* (PMFSA) requires the Project Manager to submit an Annual Operating Budget. With this submittal, the Project Manager requests the Buckman Direct Diversion Board (BDDDB) approve and recommend the Fiscal Year 2027 Operating Budget of \$9,366,160.

### Budget Revenue/Reimbursement Summary

#### TOTAL PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2027 OPERATING BUDGET

#### TABLE A

	<u>Fixed</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
<b>Revenues/Reimbursements by Source:</b>				
Federal Funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0%
PNM Solar Rebates	-	150,000	150,000	2%
City of Santa Fe	4,867,799	1,543,108	6,410,907	68%
Santa Fe County	1,896,652	591,365	2,488,017	27%
Las Campanas (Club)	193,970	46,240	240,210	3%
Las Campanas (Coop)	77,026	-	77,026	1%
<b>Total Revenues by Source</b>	<b>\$ 7,035,447</b>	<b>\$ 2,330,713</b>	<b>\$ 9,366,160</b>	<b>100%</b>
% of overall budget	75%	25%	100%	

This budget request consists of fixed and variable costs and includes revenue/reimbursements from several sources. The principle operating revenue of BDD’s operating budget is reimbursements from the partners for the cost of operations.

BDD had previously been granted federal funds from the Department of Energy for the BDD Storm Water Sampling Program. This funding source is discontinued as of 2025; the collection of samples from the Rio Grande at the BDD in order to make determinations on the water quality of the river during LANL events is now folded within other BDD regulatory and sampling operations for partner reimbursements.

The monthly PNM solar rebates received for the water treatment plant solar array are also accounted for as a source of revenue. The resulting reimbursement requests for American Capital Energy (primary owner of this solar array) to the City of Santa Fe and Santa Fe County will be reduced by the revenue received.

The partner reimbursement revenue is estimated based on projected expenditure types and allocated based on the cost sharing allocations established in the governing documents. Partners are billed in accordance with the BDD Working Capital and Billing Policy.




## Budget Expenditure Summary

The Buckman Direct Diversion budget consists of seven major categories as presented below. These categories are used to track expenditures for reporting and monitoring our available budget balance. In accordance with our BDD Working Capital and Billing policy, any budget adjustment requests between major categories require board approval. Expenditures are generally recorded when a liability is incurred and are reported in BDD’s main enterprise fund.

**PARTNER SHARE OF TOTAL PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2027 OPERATING BUDGET** **TABLE B**

<b>Expenditure by Category:</b>	<b><u>City of Santa Fe</u></b>	<b><u>Santa Fe County</u></b>	<b><u>Las Campanas (Club)</u></b>	<b><u>Las Campanas (Coop)</u></b>	<b><u>Federal Funds</u></b>	<b><u>Total</u></b>
Personnel	\$ 3,054,110	\$ 1,165,723	\$ 112,719	\$ 60,639	\$ -	\$ 4,393,191
Electricity	1,109,232	422,591	49,409	4,089	-	1,585,321
Chemicals	499,973	175,028	-	-	-	675,000
Solids	76,691	26,789	-	-	-	103,480
Materials & Supplies	507,306	205,015	23,229	10,326	-	745,875
Other Operating Costs	1,010,983	419,699	40,699	1,972	-	1,473,353
Fiscal Agent Fee	263,716	112,069	14,155	-	-	389,940
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,522,011</b>	<b>2,526,912</b>	<b>\$ 240,210</b>	<b>\$ 77,026</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 9,366,160</b>
PNM Solar Rebates	(111,105)	(38,895)				
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,410,906</b>	<b>\$ 2,488,017</b>				





## Budget Summary & Highlights


In Fiscal Year 2027, the BDD will be in its sixteenth year of operations. The BDD uses yearly volumetric flow predictions provided by each partner for our variable and project wide allocation of expenditures.

The BDD has collaborated with its partners on the development of this budget and with their support; we present the Fiscal Year 2027 budget request with the following change:

- The proposed annual operating budget for fiscal year 2027 is \$9,366,160, which represents a 6.6% increase from the adopted FY2025 operating budget.

Closing the gap between actual expenditures and budget was considered in the development of the annual operating budget request. This will continue to be a factor, to ensure funds are properly expended for the purposes as requested.

- Fiscal Year 2021 Actual Expenditures \$8,686,832 (with 6 vacant positions offset by higher than budget electricity costs) which was \$76,883 lower than the adopted budget.
- Fiscal Year 2022 Actual Expenditures \$7,695,417 (with 7 vacant positions) which was \$1,147,292 lower than the adopted budget.
- Fiscal Year 2023 Actual Expenditures \$7,063,226 (with 9 vacant positions) which was \$1,172,554 lower than the adopted budget.
- Fiscal Year 2024 Actual Expenditures \$7,311,456 (with 10 vacant positions) which was \$979,097 lower than the adopted budget.
- Fiscal Year 2025 Actual Expenditures \$7,154,077 (with 15 vacant positions) which was \$1,358,271 lower than the adopted budget.
- Fiscal Year 2026 PROJECTED Expenditures \$8,069,164 (with 5 vacant positions) which would be \$716,993 lower than the adopted budget.





## Budget Comparisons

Table C presents actual expenses by major category for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025, along with the change in the proposed fiscal year 2027 operating budget request in comparison to the current 2026 adopted budget. There is an overall increase in the budget proposal of \$580,003 which is an increase of 6.6% from the current budget. This increase is due to: the standardization of BDD operating staff to the City’s Utility Operator job class; normalizing the chemical inventory budget to cost increases over the last operating years; and a non-discretionary correction to the solar project debt service (within the Electricity category) which had not been updated in several prior year budget proposals. We are projecting flat costs in materials and supplies and other operating costs. To partially offset, BDD staff are also recommending a decrease in its Major Repair and Replacement funding request based on the Major Repair and Replacement Annual Plan for FY2027 (Table L).

The BDD staff will continue to work with its partners in determining the costs and funding needed to ensure BDD properly operates and maintains the facilities to meet the demands of the region.

**BUCKMAN DIRECT DIVERSION OPERATING BUDGET**

**TABLE C**

	FY 2025 Adopted Budget	FY 2025 Unaudited Actual 6/30/25	FY 2025 Variance \$ (Under) / Over Budget	%	FY 2026 Adopted Budget	FY 2027 Proposed Budget	\$ Change FY 2026 vs FY 2027	%
<b>Revenues/Reimbursements by Fund:</b>								
Partner Reimbursements	\$ 8,296,347	\$ 6,901,374	(1,394,973)	83%	\$ 8,570,157	\$ 9,216,160	\$ 646,003	8%
PNM Solar Rebates	120,000	164,344	44,344	137%	120,000	150,000	30,000	25%
Federal Funds	96,000	88,359.05	(7,641)	92%	96,000	-	(96,000)	-100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,512,347</b>	<b>\$ 7,154,077</b>	<b>\$ (1,358,271)</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>\$ 8,786,157</b>	<b>\$ 9,366,160</b>	<b>\$ 580,003</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>Expenditures by Category:</b>								
Salaries	\$ 2,594,917	\$ 1,628,949	\$ 965,968	63%	\$ 2,570,448	\$ 2,877,919	\$ 307,471	12%
Overtime	230,000	207,728	22,272	90%	230,000	230,000	-	0%
Benefits	1,254,511	822,293	432,218	66%	1,222,810	1,285,272	62,462	5%
Electricity	1,461,631	1,407,359	54,272	96%	1,461,631	1,585,321	123,690	8%
Chemicals	423,500	736,852	(313,352)	174%	625,000	675,000	50,000	8%
Solids	83,219	15,228	67,991	18%	83,480	103,480	20,000	24%
Materials & Supplies*	720,925	666,317	54,608	92%	732,925	745,875	12,950	2%
Other Operating Costs*	1,396,457	1,322,164	74,293	95%	1,493,703	1,473,353	(20,350)	-1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,165,160</b>	<b>6,806,889</b>	<b>1,358,271</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>8,419,997</b>	<b>8,976,220</b>	<b>556,223</b>	<b>7%</b>
Fiscal Agent Fee	347,188	347,188	-	100%	366,160	389,940	23,780	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,512,347</b>	<b>\$ 7,154,076</b>	<b>\$ 1,358,271</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>\$ 8,786,157</b>	<b>\$ 9,366,160</b>	<b>\$ 580,003</b>	<b>7%</b>



## Budget Fixed & Variable Costs Analysis

The BDD’s annual operating budget consists of fixed, variable and project-wide costs. These costs are allocated by percentages contained in the Facility Operations and Procedures Agreement (FOPA). This budget request was prepared with the following cost sharing principles.

### Cost Sharing

TABLE D

<u>Fixed</u>	<u>City of Santa Fe</u>	<u>Santa Fe County</u>	<u>Las Campanas (Club)</u>	<u>Las Campanas (Coop)</u>	<u>Total</u>
Shared Facilities (CCL)	62.09%	25.61%	5.37%	6.93%	100.00%
Separate Facilities (CC)	75.33%	24.67%	-	-	100.00%
<b><u>Project Wide</u></b>					
Projected Volumetric Flow (PW)	67.63%	28.74%	3.63%	-	100.00%
<b><u>Variable</u></b>					
Projected Volumetric Flow (CCL)	67.63%	28.74%	3.63%	-	100.00%
Projected Volumetric Flow (CC)	74.07%	25.93%	-	-	100.00%

Annual volumetric flow predictions provided by the partners are also used as the basis for project wide costs and variable costs that are primarily related to chemicals, electricity, and solids management.

## Volumetric Flow History and FY 2027 Predictions

TABLE E

<u>Volumetric Flow (acft)</u>	<u>City of Santa Fe</u>	<u>Santa Fe County</u>	<u>LC (Raw Water) via County</u>	<u>Las Campanas (Raw Water)</u>	<u>Total Diverted</u>
FY 2021	5,141.85	1,398.75	334.23	159.73	7,034.56
FY 2022	4,465.50	1,270.61	321.83	-	6,057.94
FY 2023	3,007.65	981.17	326.99	73.37	4,389.18
FY 2024	3,577.01	1,136.61	257.02	357.90	5,328.54
FY 2025	4,720.77	1,413.49	316.95	206.24	6,657.45
FY 2026 Projection	4,113.66	1,390.26	300.11	211.60	6,015.63
<b><i>FY 2027 Proposed</i></b>	<b><i>4,000.00</i></b>	<b><i>1,400.00</i></b>	<b><i>300.00</i></b>	<b><i>215.00</i></b>	<b><i>5,915.00</i></b>
<i>FY 2027 %</i>	67.62%	23.67%	5.07%	3.63%	100%

% Percentage is used in calculation of partner share (CCL) of variable costs & project wide




### Volumetric Flow History

BDD has completed a budget analysis for fiscal year 2027, which includes volumetric predictions of 1,954,397 1000-gallons per year. This is an 11.8% decrease in water delivery through BDD facilities from the fiscal year 2026 adopted water call and roughly equal to the projected water call for this fiscal year. Staff will continue to work with the partners to adaptively manage BDD water deliveries to meet changes in partner demands.


**Total gallons delivered in 1,000's**  
(Includes raw water)

**CHART 3**



**Total gallons delivered vs. volumetric predictions**  
(Includes raw water)

**CHART 4**





## Programs


The BDD is divided into seven (7) key programs with explicit business functions, each developed to support specific goals and objectives. These business activities encompass all functions necessary to operate the water treatment plant, maintain full regulatory compliance, execute Fiscal Agent responsibilities, and optimize infrastructure investments through comprehensive asset management.

### Strategic Goals – Supported by program resources

- ✚ **Operations** – To ensure the highest standard of water quality, using the most efficient and up to date water production methods.
- ✚ **Regulatory** – To maintain and improve LANL/DOE monitoring program.
- ✚ **Maintenance** – To equip the staff with the tools and equipment to efficiently and effectively maintain and repair the assets of the BDD.
- ✚ **Safety & Training** – To promote and assure workplace safety and health in preventing workplace injuries.
- ✚ **Administrative Services** – To operate and maintain the BDD within budget and in accordance with the governing documents.
- ✚ **Information Systems** – To maintain and support all automation and security systems.
- ✚ **Public Relations** – To coordinate, create and support key events for the BDD outreach program.

### BDD Operating Budget – by Program

TABLE F





### Program Budget Comparison

The expenditure budgets for these seven key programs are presented below. Total program funding includes all employee wages and benefits for full-time equivalent (FTE) employees and associated overhead expenses. These key programs incorporate all business expenses necessary to execute core business functions and allow the reader to understand how limited resources are allocated within the budget.

### BDD Operating Budget – by Program

TABLE G

	FY 2025 Adopted Budget	FY 2025 Unaudited Actuals	Variance \$ (Under) or Over Budget	FY 2026 Adopted Budget	FY 2027 Proposed Budget	\$ Change FY 2026 vs FY 2027
<b>Expenditures by Program:</b>						
1. Operations (15 FTE FY27 Proposal)	\$ 4,182,378	\$ 3,727,802	\$ (454,576)	\$ 4,073,465	\$ 4,491,314	\$ 417,849
2. Regulatory Compliance (2 FTE)	441,098	355,771	(85,327)	526,106	549,061	22,955
3. Maintenance (10 FTE)	1,596,827	1,045,085	(551,742)	1,565,632	1,599,572	33,940
4. Safety and Training (1 FTE)	175,215	226,889	51,674	454,662	463,143	8,481
5. Administrative Services (4 FTE)	1,288,171	1,103,526	(184,645)	1,302,159	1,301,938	(221)
6. Information Systems (2 FTE)	378,765	230,420	(148,345)	400,189	438,718	38,529
7. Public Relations (1 FTE)	102,705	117,395	14,690	97,784	132,474	34,690
<b>Total Expenditures (35 FTE)</b>	<b>8,165,159</b>	<b>6,806,888</b>	<b>(1,358,271)</b>	<b>8,419,997</b>	<b>8,976,220</b>	<b>556,223</b>
<b>Fiscal Agent Fee</b>	<b>347,188</b>	<b>347,188</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>366,160</b>	<b>389,940</b>	<b>23,780</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,512,347</b>	<b>\$ 7,154,076</b>	<b>\$ (1,358,271)</b>	<b>\$ 8,786,157</b>	<b>\$ 9,366,160</b>	<b>\$ 580,003</b>



### Emergency Reserve Fund (ERF)

The Project Management and Fiscal Services Agreement, Article 3. (E.) requires the BDD Board create an Emergency Reserve Fund and establish procedures for its management. The Emergency Reserve Fund provides immediate reserves for unforeseen or catastrophic infrastructure failures that render facilities unable to deliver water at the needed capacity. The Project Manager, in consultation with the partners, must submit to the BDD Board an analysis of the funds required for an emergency reserve and suggest procedures for creation of and management of the Emergency Reserve Fund.

The BDD Board approved the Emergency Reserve Fund policy and funding contributions as part of the Fiscal Year 2012 budget request. This policy established target balances, replenishment requirements and funding allocations.

### Emergency Reserve Fund Balance

TABLE H

Emergency Fund	City of Santa Fe	Santa Fe County	Las Campanas Club	Las Campanas Coop	Balance
Fund Balance at June 30, 2025	1,472,542	525,410	142,859	113,366	2,254,177

As of June 30, 2025, the Emergency Reserve Fund remained fully funded to its targeted balance of \$2,000,000. As per the BDD Working Capital and Billing Policy, these funds are interest bearing and are allocated to the partners based on the percentage of cash held in their respective accounts at the end of each fiscal year.



### Major Repair and Replacement Fund (MRRF)

The BDD Board also approved the Major Repair and Replacement (MRR) Fund as part of the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget. Per the MRR Fund policy, these funds are to receive annual contributions held in reserve to support major repair and replacement costs of facility equipment and systems, in accordance with each approved plan.

The BDD Board has authorized expenditures of \$4,042,360 for repair and replacement of system equipment in accordance with the policy, Table K. These authorizations, upon expenditure, will reduce the available balance in this fund. The BDD is requesting contributions of \$1,695,500 for the coming fiscal year, based on the expenditure plan listed on the next page, Table L; this is a reduction of \$91,176 from the prior year’s request.

The BDD Facility Manager and staff prepare the 15 Month MRR Plan with preliminary estimates working with our vendor partners; 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 above its previously authorized 15 Month MRR Plan by a value exceeding the BDD Facility Manager’s authority will be brought back to the BDD Board for authorization at the new quote.

### Major Repair and Replacement Fund Balance

TABLE I

Major Repair & Replacement	City of Santa Fe	Santa Fe County	Las Campanas Club	Las Campanas Coop	Balance
Balance as of June 30, 2025	2,763,642	966,087	72,739	78,848	3,881,316
2026 Contributions per approved plan	1,270,094	446,108	30,700	39,618	1,786,519
2026 Funds authorized for expenditure	(2,873,714)	(1,009,377)	(69,529)	(89,740)	(4,042,360)
<b>Projected Fund Balance</b>	<b>1,160,022</b>	<b>402,817</b>	<b>33,910</b>	<b>28,725</b>	<b>1,625,475</b>

### Major Repair and Replacement Fund Fiscal Year 2027 Contributions

TABLE J

	City of Santa Fe	Santa Fe County	Las Campanas Club	Las Campanas Coop	Balance
2027 Proposed Contributions	1,205,385	423,380	29,135	37,600	1,695,500

With the approval of this contribution and no additional authorizations, the fund balance will be \$3,320,975 for fiscal year 2027.



Major Repair and Replacement Fund Plan

TABLE K

FY26 Funds Authorized				
<u>15 Month MR&amp;R Plan</u>	<u>Projected Cost</u>	<u>FY26 Expected Cost</u>	<u>Justification</u>	<u>Status</u>
Replace Media in GAC Contactor	430,500	472,500	Media is exhausted	Completed FY2026 -Calgon Carbon Corp
BS1A Valve Projects	131,000	131,000	Failed valves - replacement	Project Pending
Replacement of VFD Centrifuges	172,416	172,416	Failed, parts discontinued	Completed FY2026 - Andritz Separation
Camera Upgrade	260,000	182,022	Required update	Completed FY2026 - APIC Solutions
Building UPS' Replacement	85,000	85,000	Required update	Project Pending
PLC Replacement	750,000	750,000	Current model obsolete	Project Pending
Surge Tank Bladder Replacement	60,000	60,000	Failed need replacement	Project Pending
VFD repair @ 2A	56,462	56,462	Troubleshoot & repair	Encumbered - Eaton Corp
Verticle Turbine Pump @ 2A	36,177	36,177	Troubleshoot & repair	Encumbered - Motion Ind
Utility Systems Rebuild or Replace	272,361	272,361	Multiple pump & motor items	Project Pending
		<b>2,217,938</b>	<b>FY2025 and prior Appropriations</b>	
Membrane Module Replacement	989,519	861,212	End of expected life span	Completed FY2026 - Aria Filtra
VFD Replacement @ 2A	235,000	426,222	Failed need replacement	Project Pending - Eaton Corp
1A Pump/Motor	100,000	90,602	Cyclical Rebuild or Replace	Project Pending - Motion Ind
2A Pump?Motor	100,000	79,622	Cyclical Rebuild or Replace	Project Pending - Motion Ind
Centrifuge Repair	100,000	100,000	Failed need rebuild	Project Pending
Building UPS' Replacement	36,000	36,000	Required update	Project Pending
Ozone Monitors	65,000	65,000	Failed needing replacement	Project Pending
WTP Epoxy Flooring	96,000	96,000	Failed needing replacement	Project Pending
Vehicle Replacement	65,000	69,764	Cyclical replacement	Completed FY2026 - PowerFord
<b>Total Prior Year Funds Authorized</b>		<b>4,042,360</b>		

TABLE L

FY27 Requested Contribution				
<u>15 Month MR&amp;R Plan</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>Justification</u>
1 Membrane Module Replacement	4,279	208	890,000.00	End of expected life span
2 1A Pump Replacement	90,000	1	90,000.00	Cyclical Rebuild or Replace
3 2A Pump Replacement	90,000	1	90,000.00	Cyclical Rebuild or Replace
4 PLC Replacement	150,000	1	150,000.00	Current model obsolete
5 VFD Replacement	250,000	1	250,000.00	Cyclical Rebuild or Replace
6 Vehicle Replacement	70,000	1	70,000.00	Cyclical replacement
7 Surge Tank Bladder	37,500	1	37,500.00	Failed need replacement
8 HVAC Replacement RW	40,000	1	40,000.00	Failed need replacement
9 Amiad Strainer	45,000	1	45,000.00	Failed need replacement
10 Ozone Monitors	11,000	3	33,000.00	Failed need replacement
			<b>\$1,695,500</b>	<b>FY27 Requested Contribution</b>



### Budget Summary

With this submittal, the Project Manager requests the Buckman Direct Diversion Board approve and recommend the funding for our Fiscal Year 2027 Operating Budget of \$9,366,160 with the annual contribution of \$1,695,500 for the Major Repair and Replacement Fund, for a total request of \$11,061,660. We appreciate the input and support from our partners and our Buckman Direct Diversion Board Members.

### Fiscal Year 2027 Funding Allocation

TABLE M

Funds	City of Santa Fe	Santa Fe County	Las Campanas (Club)	Las Campanas (Coop)	Total
Operating Fund	\$ 6,410,907	\$ 2,474,517	\$ 240,210	\$ 77,026	\$ 9,202,660
			PNM Solar Rebate Revenue		150,000
			Federal Funds		-
			County Conservation Fee		13,500
					<b>\$ 9,366,160</b>
Major Repair & Replacement Fund	1,205,385	423,380	29,135	37,600	1,695,500
<b>Total Fiscal Year 2027 Request</b>	<b>\$ 7,616,292</b>	<b>\$ 2,897,897</b>	<b>\$ 269,345</b>	<b>\$ 114,626</b>	<b>\$ 11,061,660</b>