

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

August 6, 2026

1. **Call to Order:** This meeting of the City of Santa Fe & Santa Fe County Buckman Direct Diversion Board meeting was called to order by Councilor Jamie Cassutt, BDD Board Chair at approximately 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

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

BDD Board Members Present:

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

Member(s) Excused:

R. Schmidt Petersen, Citizen Member

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
Chris Encinias, Acting Superintendent of Maintenance
Alexis Garcia, BDD Administrative Manager
Kurt Travers, CLA Accounting Services
Derek Botsworth, CLA Accounting Services
William Schneider, City of Santa Fe, Water Resources Manager
Larry “Boots” Pierce, GZA
William Whitney, Interested Citizen

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

3. **Approval of Agenda**

No changes were offered and Commissioner Hughes moved to approve as presented. Commissioner Greene seconded and the motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Councilor Feghali moved to approve the Consent Agenda as published. Commissioner Greene seconded, and the motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

Consent Action Items:

- a. **Consideration and Request for Approval of Amendment No. 9 to the Project Management and Fiscal Services Agreement (“PMFSA”) Between the Buckman Direct Diversion Board and the City of Santa Fe to Increase the Contract Monetary Authority for the Facilities Manager from \$60,000.00 to \$200,000.00 Plus NMGRT, and to Provide the BDD Facilities Manager Authority to Amend Contracts for Minor Modifications and Time Extensions.**
- b. **Consideration and Request for Approval of the Selection Committee’s Recommendation to Award to SOAP Engineering, LLC to Replace Multiple PLC Units and to Provide Modifications to SCADA Systems, Request for Proposal # FY26-RFP-036.**
 - i. **Request for Approval of a Construction Contract with SOAP Engineering, LLC to Replace Multiple PLC Units and to Provide Modifications to SCADA Systems in the Amount of \$341,497.06 which Amount is Inclusive of NMGRT with Funding from the MR&R Fund.**
- c. **Consideration and Request for Formal Adoption of the FY2027 Annual Operating Budget.**
- d. **Consideration and Request for Approval of a Purchase Order with Miller Bonded Inc. for On-Call HVAC Repair Service for an Amount up to \$110,000.00 which is Inclusive of NMGRT for the Remainder of FY2027.**
- e. **Consideration and Request for Approval of a General Services Contract with Condor Security of America for Security Services at Buckman Direct Diversion Facilities in the Amount of \$231,823.33 Plus NMGRT for the Remainder of FY2027.**

5. Approval of Minutes

- a. **Approval of the June 4, 2026 Buckman Direct Diversion Board Meeting Minutes**

Councilor Feghali moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Hughes seconded. The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

6. Matters from the Public – None were presented.

7. Presentations and Informational Items

- a. **Status Update on the San Juan-Chama Return Flow Project**

WILLIAM SCHNEIDER (City Water Resources Manager): Thank you,

Chair. Thank you, Chair and members of the Board. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to come speak before the Board. We periodically, our team, has come to the Board when we've had sort of key major milestones, and we've reached some coming here in the near, very near term future. So I wanted to bring this to your attention and basically I'm going to give you sort of my two key takeaways right now, and then I'm going to walk through sort of a little bit of the importance and, and the history of this project.

Key thing is that the environmental assessment, this is a federally mandated project. This project's congressionally authorized under the Title XVI program. We have what's deemed under NEPA, the environmental assessment, and that will be going out for public comment, so it's very likely that some of our governing officials, both with the city and the county, may be notified with inquiries on the project itself. And I'll get into more detail on that in a moment. The intention really today was to kick off sort of our informative information exchange with not only the Board, but the intention is to go to the PUC on August 17th with a more detailed summary. So today's kind of a kickoff. Then to go to the BCC on August 24th and then circle back if allowed by the Board, we'd like to come back in more detail next month if, if that would be acceptable.

We've always utilized the slide that's up on the screen, I believe, which shows sort of the regional water, I call it the water footprint. Uh, it's not showing right now. – Okay, thank you, Mike. And again, this, we call this sort of the helicopter view of the Española Basin, and it shows this, and I know everyone on this Board has seen this image, but it basically shows the, uh, the regional footprint of our water supply and for the City, as everyone's aware, has four sources of supply, two of which are within the Santa Fe watershed, and they were the only sources of supply up into the mid-70s. At that time, in the 1970s, PNM permitted the Buckman Wellfield. What's key to that is that basically in that permit is acknowledgement of the ability to receive a return flow credit. So this project, which is designed to maximize the City's and County's San Juan-Chama water, has been a concept for over 50 years, and that's pretty remarkable.

But another key point, and this is a real major milestone, you know, the City last investment in groundwater in terms of new water supply wells was 2003. Then in 2011, the joint project of the Buckman Direct Diversion, here we are. Now, in the near term future, we have the Pojoaque Regional Water System coming online, and then ultimately this project, which is federally funded, and we have a performance period through December of 2028. So this is going to happen if it were to happen with the authorization of, of the City Council, fast and furious, and our intention is to meet that milestone and have this built. But first, we need these permits.

So basically, I'll go to the next slide. What ultimately will be happening is this public comment period. And interesting enough, NEPA guidelines have now changed for the third time since this project has been underway. They're under revision right now and as you may imagine, the standards are adjusting according to the current administration. However, we're following the guidelines that are required. And what we're going to have is a 30-day comment period for the public. And we'll be addressing those comments and the hope, and I'll touch on the schedule in a minute, is to have this project permitted and ready for construction at the end of December of this year. That's the hope.

So what is this project? I think most everyone on the Board's familiar with it. It's a very simple project. It fell out of a joint City-County water plan, the Santa Fe Basin Study, and that led to a feasibility study that looked at seven alternatives. What we landed on is this

project. It's a very basic project. It basically, it's a pipe and a pump that routes effluent that originates as San Juan-Chama water back to the Buckman Direct Diversion.

What's very unique about this is it's a contract, the water's available, clearly we have variance on that availability year to year according to the hydrology. So really what drives is the need to maximize its value, to reuse that water to the fullest extent possible. And so where we landed – this is the schedule as of today. We met with the Forest Service and the Bureau of Reclamation, but the hope is to basically have this draft EA out on September 28th. 30-day review cycle, public comment, address comments, and then have the EA go out in mid-November with the hope of then establishing getting a permit for construction.

There are still some challenges. There has been requests for government to government consultation with the Pueblos, Cochiti, as well as Tesuque. So, as far as I know, they've been informed throughout this process, so this is not a new project for them either. And hopefully we can address any remaining concerns and proceed with construction.

So with that, I would ask the Board if I could stand for questions and permission to come back in more detail next month. Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Wonderful. Thank you so much. And I think coming back in more detail is always welcome. Detail is always fun. Any questions, comments from the Board? Yes, Vice Chair Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: One of the things, calculations or percentages, my understanding is Santa Fe County has seven percent of this in terms of the water reuse value as well as the financial contribution. Is that correct?

MR. SCHNEIDER: That is correct. And to put a finer point, how, how did we arrive at seven percent? Because I get asked that a lot. The City has a contracted water right of 5,230 acre feet, and the County has 375. So that seven percent is that ratio between those two numbers.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay. So, with the potential of Pojoaque basin water coming into this basin and potentially juicing the number that comes into this basin to be used, is there any value to that in the return flow calculations? Either, maybe it's worth more than seven percent, maybe there's more that we can get out of a return flow credit in that space. Is that something that's being considered?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah. That's a very insightful and perceptive view. And I would – the answer, the short answer is yes. Key point is this project is only designed and permitted and constructed for the use of San Juan-Chama water. So as long as Pojoaque Regional Water System water, which is comprised of Native and SJCP, we absolutely have the authority and the ability to use this system above and beyond that seven percent, but those agreements and how that would actually be implemented have yet to be worked out.

We are meeting on that now with County staff and as well as the attorneys. There's many ideas being discussed to bring value not only to the City and the County, but also to the regional partners on the other side of Tano Road, the four pueblos.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And has the County, other than myself, brought this concept up?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. John Utton has brought it to our attention

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay. And then do we have any idea what the Pueblos' issues are?

MR. SCHNEIDER: No. I will say the government-to-government consultations directly with the federal government and the City has not been apprised of what

the issues are, but the consultations have not happened yet.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Do you need help with that?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I would say, yes, after we hear back from the Bureau of Reclamation, the lead federal agency, as to what those concerns are.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Right. I would recommend at least – they work at different schedules than we do necessarily, and if you would like to, like, if Tesuque is one of the pueblos, Tesuque goes on an annual leadership change. And so if this leadership wants to have time, you should get before them before November, really before October. Otherwise, you won't get anything signed if you need a signature.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner. And specific to Tesuque Pueblo, the meeting with them is on September 4th.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And you're great. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you so much. Commissioner Hughes.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yes, thank you. I was wondering, as part of this project there was, I think, a public meeting with La Cienega and their water use and making sure that this project didn't interfere too much with their water use. How's that going? Are you familiar with that?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, Commissioner, very familiar. So as part of the agreement between the City and the County, and maybe this is very helpful, maybe what I could do is respond at a high level, and I can specifically address these concerns when I come to the BCC on the 25th, but that's a proposal for your consideration. We have an agreement. The City and the County have an agreement, and with that agreement, the County was to lead a public process to lead us through the levels of issue and mitigation measures to address the concerns, and there's many.

The City definitely recognizes the importance of traditional ag and the challenges on water supply. Particularly Cienega is code red with respect to this millennial drought. And so that is partly what drove the concept behind this project to focus on San Juan-Chama water only, in the sense that that water is not native to this basin. And by us stretching that further, it allows the City and the County to partner on working to improve hydrologic conditions throughout the Santa Fe watershed for the betterment of all.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. And more details then when you come before the BCC.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, happy to do that. And what I'll do is I'll actually bring the agreement, and we can talk line by line on where we stand with items on that.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Very good.

MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will mention that was a County-led effort.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Councilor?

MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Bill, where is it in terms of design at this point in time?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Thank you, Board Member Ives. A very glaring oversight, my apologies. The design is at 90 percent completion. In fact, as part of our agreement with the County, it's with the county now for review. So Brian Snyder and Travis and their team are reviewing the design concept. We have a, a workshop next week, City, County, our design engineer, Carollo, as well as Bureau of Reclamation. Our expectation basically is the turnaround and completion, 100 percent design ready to have a shovel-ready project will be within six weeks.

MEMBER IVES: Wonderful. I know when this pipeline first hit my consciousness back on Council, it was probably 2012, early 2013. And as I recall, the estimates for construction at that point in time were about 12 million. I know that has increased significantly over the years. Any sense currently what is projected, if you can tell us?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, I absolutely can. And the initial design cost for the project, we had a preliminary engineering design report that was done a little after that time period, 2017 was the final completion. The cost of the project came in at \$24 million. The current price, and really there's one driver, there's simply one component of this project which is driving the cost to the newest estimate, which is between \$50 and \$60 million, is there is 17 miles of iron ductile pipe that is going to basically comprise the system. The cost of steel has gone up 2.5X since this project was conceived.

MEMBER IVES: Thank you. And if you were able to start construction in 90 days, what's the estimated completion date?

MR. SCHNEIDER: That has not been shared with me yet. There's a couple questions with respect to navigating around, and this occurred during the BDD construction of the fiber optic line and the need for oversight, construction management. So we're working through that. But I'm told that we could have this completed construction-wise cradle-to-grave within two years, and likely sooner. That's what we're shooting for.

MEMBER IVES: And then one other question. Over the course of some time there was contemplated possibly a reinjection site on the pipeline back towards the Buckman wells. Is that still part of the planning? And how does that fare?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah. Thank you for the question. And, so that concept, and for the benefit of the audience and for the Board, is a managed aquifer recharge project which would utilize to the great benefit of, of the region existing infrastructure. And so what it would effectively entail is pulling water, say San Juan-Chama water, let's just be specific, from the Buckman Direct Diversion using various infrastructure, some of which, say in the case just conceptually right now, with the Club Las Campanas that has the ability to bring water all the way up to their area, which is right by the Buckman Wellfield, is a partnership maybe through the BDD that would allow for a joint managed aquifer recharge project.

Now, where the pipeline, specific to your question, could tie this together is if we're returning and reusing San Juan-Chama water and creating essentially a sufficient amount in Abiquiu as a result of that, we could make the decision and determination that we could put backup supply in the ground for reserve for cases when the BDD goes offline. Clearly, that's beneficial probably to every partner.

So that's a high-level concept, but maybe I didn't answer your question. That's being evaluated as part of the joint City-County Santa Fe 2100 water planning effort. And right now, that falls under the category of adaptation strategies. So that is one of the probably 30 adaptations that are being explored.

MEMBER IVES: And I know, obviously, recirculation of the San Juan-Chama, presumably as many times as possible within that system. Any sense of how that water will be made available?

MR. SCHNEIDER: could you be more specific?

MEMBER IVES: So if that water is circulating and it's been through the system and being pulled out again for reuse, does it just come through Buckman and into the City and County water systems at rates that presumably are applicable at the time?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you, because I didn't understand that question. It's a great one, and maybe I could ask that I can bring the graphics that we have to support the description of how the project would be operated. But in the most basic sense, right now, if the City or the County currently, without the pipeline, calls for one hundred units of water and brings it into the City, the water then is basically 33 roughly percent of that water is lost as a consumptive use. Sixty-six percent of that water returns through our sewer shed back to the Paseo Real Water Reclamation Facility for reuse. So sticking with that math of call for a 100 and right now we use it to extinction from a water rights standpoint and water availability standpoint, if the pipeline comes online, the way it will work is instead of calling for one hundred, because we're returning sixty-six of those units back to the Rio Grande below the intakes of the BDD, we're only calling for 33 units of water in its place.

So how that then effectively instead using it what was originally the concept back 10 years ago to the extinction, instead now our permit allows for us to operate differently. Return the water, get an immediate credit, and pull that water immediately back through the BDD. So it's a pretty unique new change to how the system would operate, and it gives the City and the County much more flexibility because now we'll effectively keep that water up in Abiquiu.

And so the thinking is in the winter months when demands are lower, we potentially jointly could then implement using the existing BDD as one example, during those winter months is when we could take call for water, bring it up to this managed aquifer recharge area within the Buckman Wellfield, allow that water to infiltrate and reserve it in the ground for future need during a time of emergency.

MEMBER IVES: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And I'll come back with really shiny graphics that can explain that much better.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Sorry, really quickly. Related to that. So, the Buckman Wellfields are City wellfields, and we are not, we Santa Fe County, are not a party to that. But if in that sort of recharge thing that we would – is there a seven percent or is there an opportunity for us to bank water there on behalf of Santa Fe County so that potentially we could start to bank water?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you for the question. I would say that opportunity exists, and those conversations are happening. Clearly, that falls outside the current framework of the agreement for the return flow project. However, the project then does create the opportunities, as you alluded to, very creative thinking, on ways to utilize and collaborate.

You're absolutely correct that the City is the sole owner of the Buckman Wellfield, which would be part of the system. So and again, I'm just on the stand, just high level responding that ways that could be accomplished is the County could financially contribute to the infrastructure in the Buckman Wellfield, or it could be completed through the wheeling agreement. There's several ways that that could happen. Clearly, any agreement would have to go to the governing body and to the BCC. But I assure you, Commissioner, that these conversations are happening fast and furious right now because of what's happening in the Pojoaque Regional Water System. Again, with schedules and timelines with federal monies, we have to work fast, smart, and hard because the money needs to be put to best use and

spent at least in the case of San Juan-Chama return project, there's a sunset date on when we can use those funds. And, and so we don't want to lose the ability to, to leverage them.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And then I guess related, there is a sunset date on Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System, and we've got a bill before Congress right now to extend that date. I don't know if there's any initiative there to try to extend that date for the San Juan-Chama date.

MR. SCHNEIDER: There is. I'm in the process of actually petitioning for some additional funding that goes to the federal government on August 18th and with that hope is we'll get additional funding with an extension on the period of performance.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Get some more money for Pojoaque Basin while you're at it. If you can make sure that we bring up the concept of collaborating on the wellfields as well as potentially using Pojoaque Basin water. You mentioned that, John Utton is already talking about that, but I'll whisper to him as well about the wellfields, because I know that in this conversation here we share or we keep a sort of a balance sheet and a ledger about using water from different things. But if we can contribute to it to offset our debt in that pool, then it might help everybody in this conversation.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I agree, the shared pool agreement has been a massive success on both sides.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: I wanted to scroll back to funding real fast. As you mentioned, it's at least-- the cost has at least doubled since this was passed 2019, at least doubled or more.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Right.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Can you remind me our funding sources? This is -- is it the low-interest loan? Is this the grant from the federal government? And then you just mentioned that you're going back for more. I'm assuming that has to do with the increase in the cost, and if we don't -- if we're not granted that money, then what? Or are we not even considering that scenario because it's too scary.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah. No, that's -- thank you for that very insightful question. So currently, the City has a grant through Department of Interior, for 25 percent of the total project cost, and of which now we've received \$11.25 million. That already -- that money has already been fully appropriated. And basically, we have the ability to spend it.

We're now seeking additional funding based on that, to Board Member Ives' questions, we have this new cost estimate from the engineering design. So now we're basically trying to seek up to the 25 percent. So that's one funding source.

In addition, we have \$2.3 million of Water Trust Board fund through the State of New Mexico for the engineering design. We're in conversations with two other federal agencies with the hopes to potentially seek further funding. It would have to come through the state because there's rules with respect to using federal funding as a match, you can appreciate that.

But right now we have a guarantee, basically, of \$13 million guaranteed, and then we're seeking additional.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Okay. So \$13 million, do we foresee challenges in potentially acquiring these funds based on what's happening at the administration at the federal level?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I can only offer my professional judgment. I think

because the fact that this is reuse and it's Colorado River water, I think we're insulated from some of the challenges happening right now in the administration at the federal level. And every conversation I'm having is this is the type of project that every municipality needs to pursue to build greater resiliency. So we're kind of out ahead on many respects. And so my hope is we'll be able to see that through with additional funding, but we do not have any guarantees at this point.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Okay. And have we contemplated the plan B, C, D, E, F for when – in case –

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think the extreme is plan B, which is that we've already budgeted in our CIP to have basically the City and the County at seven percent contribute to build this project. And there's many opportunities on how to recoup costs within our current business, but I'm not sure if that really falls within the BDD purview right now, but I'm happy to touch on that if you like.

CHAIR CASSUTT: No, that's okay. I love that we're thinking about those things. So, I appreciate it, and I assume that we hopefully will find out within the next few months.

Obviously, we're hoping to break ground.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah, that's right. I would say in an ideal, perfect world, nine months from now.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Okay. All right. Wonderful. Thank you. Yes, please continue.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: So actually, you brought up a question that now makes me wonder, is this going to be something that BDD will contemplate as a business model, or is this purely in the City's realm or where does the, you know, where does this live? We're only seven percent partners but potentially more. Is it a part of BDD's operation?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I can only speak to the existing agreement. I guess agreements can always be modified if in accordance to need and purpose. But, the current agreement is that this will be a city-led project. We will own it, operate it, and as a partner, the County would contribute seven percent and get seven percent of the benefit.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And for negotiating Potential for more, or is there, you know, what's the – has there been opposition to us saying, Hey, we're going to double it because we're going to bring in water from the Pojoaque Basin?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, coming back to that very scenario, that was not contemplated at the time of the agreement. So I think the opportunity is there, Commissioner. I think the devil's in the details. We're having those conversations. Kyle had shared with me some great insights earlier before the meeting, was there's the Water Resources Agreement from 2016, the amended version, where the City and the County – and it specifies that all effluent leaving the Paseo Real is owned by the City of Santa Fe. So with this new source of supply, which was not contemplated either under the WRA, nor this project, nor the City and County agreement to the project, I'm not a lawyer, but everything that I'm hearing falls within, I think, the existing allowance. So if the County, as a partner, were to bring San Juan-Chama water in through the City system through an intertie of some form or fashion, I see no reason why there couldn't be an agreement above and beyond what we have. But I'm only speculating, and that's a governing body decision.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: The existing agreement shows that it's all City

water. There's talk of just seven percent, but everything can be renegotiated or a new superseding agreement can come in.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Any other questions? Nope? Thanks so much, Bill. Appreciate it. Thank you and we'll see you next month.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

b. Monthly Update on BDD Operations

MATT SANDOVAL (BDD Operations Superintendent): Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. I'll be presenting the BDD operations report for the months of June and July 2026. The BDD diversions and deliveries have averaged a million gallons per day as follows. For the month of July 2026, raw water diversions were 5.80 million gallons per day. Raw water delivery to Las Campanas at Booster Station 2A was 1.13 million gallons per day. And the drinking water deliveries through booster stations 4A and 5A was 5.66 million gallons per day.

For the month of June, raw water deliveries were 8.86 million gallons per day. Raw water delivery to Las Campanas at Booster Station 2A, 1.24 million gallons per day. And the drinking water deliveries through booster station 4A and 5A, 8.63 million gallons per day.

BDD contributed 40.1 percent of the drinking water to the City and County for the month of July, and 64.1 percent of the drinking water to the City and County for the month of June 2026. And I will stand for questions.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you, Matt. Any questions? Mr. Ives.

MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a quick one. I was looking at the June, July at the bottom of the page in the packet. And it does note that BDD went from 64 percent down to 40 percent, June to July. Canyon Road stayed the same, so, it looks like the Buckman wells, and in part the City wells made up that difference. I'm just curious about the thinking behind that.

BRADLEY PRADA (Facilities Manager): Madam Chair, if I could. It plays a role in what the water resources team comes up and what's needed by the City. At times some of those wells are becoming artesian, and so they have to take advantage of that and start pumping water. So that may be a contributing factor at that time. And there could be other ones as well. But that's the idea that they're – that we're producing the water that the City's asking from us. So whether it goes down or up is dependent on what is needed from BDD.

MEMBER IVES: I know that when we use the wells, we often have the sort of recharge obligations associated with the well permits. I was always curious. I know we have to use the wells to make sure they remain operable as well. And I guess I wasn't aware that the Buckman wells in particular were artesian in nature, especially given the low flows on the river.

MR. PRADA: Since BDD has been online, they've actually recharged. And Bill can speak to that better than I can. But, it's a good thing.

MEMBER IVES: Yes. No, certainly no argument on that occurrence.

MR. PRADA: Yeah, Bill, if you want to say something.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Yes, please.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah, it's actually kind of a fascinating, and a lot of credit to Brad and his team. And the board has seen sort of the BDD accounting tool, which is the dashboard, which gives us real-time transparent water resource management of all the water rights that come through the BDD.

Specific to the question of Board Member Ives, in addition to the points that Brad had mentioned, and we are trying to – we've been doing some testing to ensure that in the event we have to go into groundwater-only scenario, similar to what Albuquerque is going through, that we have the ability to do that. So we want more sustained pumping during high-peak demand so that we can basically test our infrastructure. We're also in the process of completing the repairs and replacement work at Nichols Reservoir, and also brought in new water treatment technology. And so we're also in the process of testing various flow rates. So we've been putting a bit more priority on other sources in addition to the BDD. So it's a combination of factors.

MEMBER IVES: Gotcha. Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Commissioner Hughes and then Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah, I was just wondering, maybe this is a question for you, Bill, but, if we had to go to a total groundwater situation, how long could we supply water just from our wells?

MR. SCHNEIDER: The short answer is for as long as we need to. And we recognize, that we have the necessity to also provide water to Santa Fe County as our partner as a backup water for the water resource agreement. As Brad alluded to, we've seen remarkable recovery in the wellfield since 2011 when the BDDs come online. If you haven't seen some of that data of that recovery to the point where three of the wells are artesian and flowing, it's pretty remarkable. It's a huge success story. I'm happy to show that. It does clearly tie to the BDD. I see the nexus if you do as well, so I'm happy to bring that next month.

But basically to answer your question, we've run multitudes of scenarios with our various models, and we're able to meet the demand as long as needed on groundwater only. So we have a very resilient system.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Well, it couldn't be forever, though, because otherwise we wouldn't need the Buckman Direct Diversion Structure.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Clearly. Yeah, I'm sorry if I said for as long as necessary. I didn't say forever; did I?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Well, okay. But if necessary is forever.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Let's hope not to your point. We peaked at over 9,000 acre-feet of groundwater only in 1995 before the City acquired the water system, and that's effectively our demand now. It's been done. Not only, this isn't speculation. Since that time, we've brought three of our biggest producing wells online with Buckman 10 through 13, which, which what I was referring to the most recent wells constructed in 2003. So we have added resiliency in our groundwater system.

And then we're in the process of a repair replacement program, and that's going to be really important, you know, what is it, \$40 million dollars investment at Canyon Road. Clearly, we have a lot of work going on at the BDD. We're operating in the most extreme conditions in recent memory. There's a lot of resiliency in our system. That's just the reality.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Thanks for that answer.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Thank you. So somewhat related, if these wells are becoming artesian already without us recharging them, where they're just naturally recharging at this point, correct? The idea of us recharging them actively might be of not so much value.

MR. SCHNEIDER: That's a very insightful comment. Let me be more specific. And I'm going to touch on another opportunity coming down the line, which could be part of this broader conversation for the BDD in the future. So specific to your question, the wells that are becoming artesian are ones that are right at the river. So Well 1 and 8, Well 1, and Well 8, and periodically Well 6, if we allow it. And so where the recharge program, this is a very insightful question, and for those in the room, is if the aquifer's artesian, where are you going to place additional water, right? As you move further up Old Buckman Road to close to Las Campanas, there are areas that are not artesian, that there is capacity in the aquifer system to store additional water. So thank you for that question.

Another key thing that I said coalescence of efforts that bring value, and I tie this to the BDD, is we're also working, City and County, with the state of New Mexico on some very – the governor has provided the state through OSE, significant funding to do additional aquifer characterization. And this kind of hints at something former Councilor Ives used to hit on all the time is, is there another source of water supply at depth, brackish water? So they're working through getting permits, consulting with the pueblos. There will be some helicopter activity happening with state-of-the-art geophysics to look for architecture and potential for a new source of groundwater supply. But it will also inform us to the question that was asked by Councilor Ives of, what does the aquifer look like? Are there pockets of higher permeability of unsaturated aquifer that could be used for a managed aquifer system? And then the question then lends is, are we looking at managed aquifer with infiltration basins? Are we doing direct inject water wells? There's various engineering scenarios. It comes down to cost, permitting, O&M, and then ultimately, in case of infiltration basins, there's opportunities for parks. Like there's other things that could be done for the win-win.

But again, this is all going to fall out of Santa Fe 2100. I only mention it because this very unique opportunity to do further characterization of the aquifer that's going to happen this year.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Going further north, we're talking about doing the interconnect and taking water out of Pojoaque Basin; could we be sending water north to Pojoaque Basin?

Granted, it's treated because the return flow pipeline doesn't do the treated effluent up there. But could that water be used to bank water in the Pojoaque Basin?

MR. SCHNEIDER: If the governing body allowed for that, that's a scenario that I think could be accomplished. And it's my understanding the County is with Bureau of Reclamation, is exploring a two-way interconnect –

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: -- that would allow for water to go the other direction. The question really comes down to the economics, the legalities, and, agreements. So at this stage, all I can offer is it's a concept being explored, but from a water resource and engineering standpoint only.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And could this also be used to recharge our fine friends in Eldorado's wellfield?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I would defer to the County Commission. Yeah, sorry.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Every little bank account counts.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, yes.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you. Councilor.

MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just two quick follow-up questions. So my understanding of artesian wells, and I believe there's some up in the San Luis Valley, is that they often flow above ground and become rivulet streams running down to larger waterways. If it is coming out of one of the Buckman wells, would that water qualify for return flow credits under our permits?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm getting the most creative concepts today. There's a water right law and I'll maybe defer to Mr. Harwood if I need to. But basically, it's about conservation of water. We intentionally never allow for water to flow naturally out of a well onto the ground at the risk of that being viewed as wasteful. So we purposely, and this kind of ties to what Brad was hitting on, run our wells and operate them to depressurize that aquifer to ensure that that artesian condition never reaches the ground surface. So we don't allow for that to happen.

As far as whether we did let it happen, could we get credit for it? That's a very interesting question. And I would say possibly yes, only because I'm thinking on the Pecos River, there's the case where the ISC has a system that they use for compact compliance in the Seven Rivers Basin, where they pump wells occasionally into the river to ensure that we can get water to the Carlsbad Irrigation District and meet our compliance obligations to Texas.

MEMBER IVES: And then just one last question. And I know when that funding was announced, they parked, I think at ten billion down at New Mexico Tech for those basin delineations. We sit on the Española Basin, and there was some deep water desal plant that could be placed close to the river into a basin; boy, wouldn't that be nice? And beyond that, the Anderson School and their innovation group worked with Creative Santa Fe who at some time last year and did a presentation here in Santa Fe where they were looking at the amount of this deep basin water that might be available in the state. And I wish I had taken better notes, but my recollection is 4 billion gallons plus. And of course, part of the challenge is it's not necessarily a regenerative source, but it certainly suggested that there might be some long-term benefits from tapping into those reserves and using them, especially in times of need.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, thank you. I'll just reinforce that point. With the emergence of new technologies on treatment, and this could tie to the BDD of additional treatment train technology or advanced filtration, various membranes, even reverse osmosis, which is going to go online in Pojoaque, you can see a scenario where you have a plant state of the art of the BDD that you've kept modernized that would have the ability, technically speaking, to treat not only brackish water, but even someday potentially effluent, right? And just so coincidentally, this project that we were here to speak about today runs right past the Buckman Direct Diversion.

So many versions of future opportunities. I guess the question really that why we're doing the water plan in 2100 is looking at future supply under various climate change scenarios and then future demand and where those lines cross ensure that we're continuing to build greater resiliency in our system.

I absolutely agree that ultimately brackish water will be part of that equation. The question is when, because our wells in the Buckman right now, the deepest wells are 2,000

feet deep. The aquifer is estimated to be as potentially as deep as six to seven, maybe more a thousand feet. But as the deeper you go, the finer the porosity gets because of all the weight on top the sediments get squeezed, and then you run into water quality issues.

But again, clearly the state is investing millions of dollars. We want to map it out, and clearly there's a need for that. In the case of Santa Fe, my hope is not for the near term, that's just one opinion.

MEMBER IVES: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Any other questions? Very good. Thank you, Matt.

MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you.

c. Report from BDD Facilities Manager

MR. PRADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good afternoon, Board members. I'll be presenting the monthly update for August 2026, covering emergency authorization for procurement, major repair and replacement project progress, and design-build selection and current staffing levels.

First, I'm providing formal notification regarding an emergency authorization to procure an HVAC unit that failed. Our administration building's HVAC chiller failed and required immediate replacement at a total cost of \$77,000 and some change. Due to that critical nature of repair, obviously, it's very hot out there, so we had to get that up and running. I declared an emergency authorization to make the purchase. This action was taken pursuant to the PMFSA Amendment 7, Article 3, Section 7, which grants the project manager authority to approve expenditures over \$60,000 in emergency situations when advance or approval is not practical. So we went ahead and, and made that. This is my formal notification.

Moving on to the repair and replacement projects for the new fiscal year, we have officially kicked off our vendor outreach for project quotes, which include numerous projects that will be hopefully getting done before the next fiscal year ends. The PLC replacement project is in the final pre-order stage, with completion expected before the end of the year. For the raw water system pumps, multiple units have been ordered, and deliveries are actively arriving.

Regarding the design-build project, our team, comprising Wright Water Engineering, AECOM, and PUD staff have finished reviewing proposals and interviewing RFP respondents. We anticipate selecting an offer and finalizing a contract to present for your approval in the coming months.

Finally, an update on personnel as we continue working closely with the City HR staff. Our operations superintendent and administrative assistant have now accepted the position, but we are awaiting a start date. The accounting manager is currently posted, closing August 12th. The PUD operator ladder, which consists of multiple operations positions, is posted and closing on August 30th. Automation and security administrator interviews concluded without a selection. We are in the process of re-posting that position. And the journeyman electrician, we're currently pending the reclassification of that position. And I thank you for your time. I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you so much. Any questions? Commissioner Greene.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Thank you. This may have been one for Matt,

but it's definitely a BDD and river flow questions. I think we're in the 200 cfs range. What is our cutoff?

MR. PRADA: Mechanically, we can pump down to 50 cfs. We're not inclined to go that route at this time. So when the time comes enough, we will explore that option.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And so then that goes to the wells and things like that. We just shut down and wait for a good rain up river.

MR. PRADA: Thank you, Vice Chair. Yes, obviously we have multiple sources. And the City, because of the way the City and county has worked together over the years, we have a very robust –

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And what are we at? Like, is this something that, what is, like the daily reports at BDD; is there a way to get, I mean, is that something that we want the community to know every day and to sort of have a daily report when people are wondering if there's water in the river?

MR. PRADA: I think it's available for anybody to look at. We base that number off of Otowi flow gauge. And so anybody has the option to get on that and check it out.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: And that's where – so if it gets to 50 at Otowi we shut down, or 75 or whatever you as a manager want.

MR. PRADA: Mechanically, that's where we would shut off. From a PR standpoint- it could be a lot more but I'm not speculating.

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Councilor Ives.

MEMBER IVES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just one quick question. When I was talking with Rolf, who could be here today, he was curious especially to know how well the BDD diversion is operating at these extended very low river flows. And he noted that these river flows, I'm presuming those are the figures you were just discussing, are the lowest he's ever observed and suggested that with the water operations for the six Middle Rio Grande pueblos. It's likely to undergo -- in response to his question, if I could.

MR. PRADA: I'm not understanding the question; can you clarify?

MEMBER IVES: He's saying, how does the BDD performing given the extended very low river flows that we're experiencing.

MR. PRADA: Well, we are seeing some differences in how the river is – so if the river has a certain depth, let's say 400 cfs, it can create a buffer to when we have these small tributaries of turbidity when we have them infiltrate the river. And so if we don't have that, we see a lot more turbidity events. But obviously mechanically, we're still producing water, whatever the City's asking for.

KYLE HARWOOD (BDD Counsel): I think Brad answered the operations part, but I was going to offer to come back later to address some of the other references that Rolf's question had to pueblo water operations.

MEMBER IVES: Okay. And that wasn't so much a question as an observation. Thank you.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Any other questions? Thanks so much, Brad.

8. Action Items: Consent Agenda [See page 2]

9. Action Items: Discussion Agenda

a. Consideration and Recommendation of the Appointment of the Citizen Member and Alternate Citizen Member to the Buckman Direct Diversion Buckman Direct Diversion Board

NANCY LONG (BDD Counsel): Yes, Madam Chair, members of the Board. We're here on a recommendation of the committee that was formed, the subcommittee that was formed, to make a recommendation to you for the citizen member and alternate citizen member. Both, member terms have expired, however, they hold over until the reappointments are made or appointments are made. And the committee unanimously is recommending that you reappoint Commissioner Rolf Schmidt-Petersen as your citizen member and citizen member Peter Ives as your alternate citizen member. They both applied. They both have agreed to continue to serve, and the committee's feeling was that their experience and their capabilities to assist the Board as they have been in some of the ongoing projects that they know so much about, as well as any new ones that land in their laps, would benefit the Board greatly.

So the committee is recommending that the board reappoint the current citizen member and alternate citizen member for another, it'd be two-year terms from today for both members.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Thank you so much. Any questions, comments? Commissioner Greene?

COMMISSIONER GREENE: Make a motion to accept the recommendations of the citizen members of member Schmidt-Petersen to reappointment and member Ives for reappointment as the alternate.

COUNCILOR FEGHALI: Second.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Motion and a second. Any comments? Councilor Ives, thank you. You keep telling me that you're going to get off board. So, I'm very grateful that you're staying on this one, assuming you're accepting right now.

MEMBER IVES: I would be delighted. As they say, water is always in season here in Santa Fe, and it has been delightful to be able to participate in our water considerations over the course of years, and certainly I would be honored to continue in that position.

CHAIR CASSUTT: Well, thank you. We really, really do appreciate it. Any other questions or comments at this time? Commissioner Hughes.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Don't we need to vote on this?

CHAIR CASSUTT: Yes, we do. Just seeing if there's anything else to talk about before we do that, and apparently not, so roll call.

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

Peter Ives	Abstain
Councilor Patricia Feghali	Yes
Commissioner Hank Hughes	Yes
Commissioner Justin Greene	Yes
Chair Jamie Cassutt	Yes

10. Matters from the Board - None were presented

11. Next Meeting: Thursday, September 3, 2026

12. Adjourn

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, Chair Cassutt declared this meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Approved by:

Jamie Cassutt, Board Chair

ATTEST TO

Geraldyn Cardenas, City Clerk