SANTA FE

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

SPECIAL MEETING

July 14, 2004

Paul Campos, Chairman
Michael D. Anaya
Jack Sullivan [Excused]
Paul D. Duran
Harry B. Montoya

SANTA FE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSION CHAMBERS **COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

SPECIAL MEETING

July 14, 2004 11:30 am-1:30 pm

Notice of Special Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners of Santa Fe County, Santa Fe, NM, will hold a special study session on Wednesday, July 14, 2004 between 11:30 am-1:30 pm in the Commission Chambers at the County Administration Building, 102 Grant Avenue, Santa Fe, NM.

AGENDA

I. Call to Order
II. Roll Call
III. Approval of Agenda
IV. Special Study Session – GRT Funding Issues
V. Adjournment

The County of Santa Fe makes every practical effort to assure that it's meetings and programs are accessible to the physically challenged. Physically challenged individuals should contact Santa Fe County in advance to discuss any special needs (e.g., interpreters for the hearing and sight impaired).

SANTA FE COUNTY

SPECIAL MEETING

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

July 14, 2004

This regular meeting of the Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners was called to order at approximately 12:05 p.m. by Chairman Paul Campos, in the Santa Fe County Commission Chambers, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, roll was called by County Clerk Rebecca Bustamante and indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present:
Commissioner Paul Campos, Chairman
Commissioner Mike Anaya
Commissioner Paul Duran
Commissioner Harry Montoya

Members Absent:
Commissioner Jack Sullivan

III. Approval of the Agenda

Commissioner Duran moved approval of the agenda as published. Commissioner Anaya seconded and the agenda was unanimously approved.

IV. Special Study Session - GRT Funding Issues

GERALD GONZALEZ (County Manager): Mr. Chair, Commissioners, first of all, to open this up, I wan to thank Tony and Susan for putting together the packets that we've got in front of you. [Exhibits 1 & 2] What I think we'll find as we go through the material here is that what we're bringing forward is what we hope will be a rational structure, a rational process for approaching GRT issues. The thought is that by doing that we'll be able to attract additional dollars. We'll be able to leverage the money that we have for the maximum possible and nevertheless we will still be able to accommodate individual district needs while balancing the County needs across all districts.

We know that individual districts have separate needs; they're all different. So we've tried to accommodate those in how we've developed the approach and of course the capital structure that we've put in place in the past. We think that what we're proposing here is an outline to the approach to GRT, a plan that will allow us to make the most effective and productive use of our County dollars from a GRT standpoint. And it's the product of a lot of internal discussion to date among the County staff so it's a beginning point and obviously we're open to Commission input and the thoughts that you have as we go through the process and with that I'll go ahead and turn it over to Tony and Susan.

TONY FLORES (PFMD Director): Thank you, Gerald. Commissioners before you we've provide two packets. The first one is the green packet that we'll discuss first and that gives you a general overview of the current imposed gross receipts taxes, their uses, what that equates to as far as dollars. It also provides a section that we'll go through that talks about the new enabling legislation and how that can transpire and what our thoughts are on that. And then specifically from there we will take out to the orange section, the light yellow section, is the capital outlay GRT which will be the second part that we discuss and that will give some options to the Commissioners about how we see the capital outlay allocations from each Commission district and how we come up with a process that we can bring back to you, a plan in August that will assist us in developing the funding strategy as we enter into this legislative session in a couple of months.

So with that, what I'd like to do is Susan is going – we're going to do a tag team approach. We'll go through the green packet with you and it gives you a general overview of where we are today and then we'll specifically address the capital outlay in the yellow one.

If you flip to the green packet, we've provided an overview. Currently within the incorporate and unincorporated areas of the county we have imposed seven gross receipts taxes, are implemented totally 1-1/8 cents. We're giving you a break-out of how those GRTs are currently allocated and their purposes. This manual is intended for you to take with you and be able to refer to it at times when we have questions on what the indigent GRT takes care of or the infrastructure, etc.

With that, the total revenues of all of those imposed or enacted GRTs, the County realizes a revenue of $23.3 million. And as you can see on the page that has the money bags, each of those funds, those eighths or quarters are broken out to different GRTs and equate to a different total amount. In total, like I indicated earlier, the total for those enacted ones for FY2005 is expected to generate $23.3 million.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Sir.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Tony, these aren't numbered but the second page, incorporated and unincorporated GRT revenues, the 1/8 general, which one is that one? Is that the one we just approved?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, I'll defer to Susan.

SUSAN LUCERO (Finance Director): Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, that 1/8 has already been in place. It's one of the original ones that actually the County enacted back in I think 1990.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Oh, okay.

MS. LUCERO: So what we're doing is historically giving you a picture of what's already in place.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Okay, great.

MR. FLORES: And then from there, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, we'll go into the new legislation enabling acts and what those could be used for.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: This is in place already?

MR. FLORES: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Sir.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Are any of these time-limited?

MR. FLORES: Yes, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya. Fire has a sunset clause in it about time limits. It has to be brought back every five years, I believe.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So that's the 1.4 on page 3?

MR. FLORES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: That's the only one.

MR. FLORES: Yes.

MS. LUCERO: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, the recent legislation also changed the sunset, actually terminated the sunset but that one will have to be grandfathered in so they will have to go again to the voters again I think in 2008 for voter approval. And if at that time it's approved positively then they would not have to go back again.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Mr. Chair.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Sir.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Tony, on page 2, the bottom of the page, the quarter capital outlay, $8.2 million and then you have it broken down, 75 percent water, 15 percent open space, 10 percent infrastructure. Are those percentages just on the half? On the amount of that quarter percent that is attributable to the County?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, no, that's the overall. And we'll actually get to a section where I'll go through exactly how that's broken out. That allocation, 100 percent is - and I'll show you the graph in a minute, 100 percent of that money is split 50-50.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: And that would go into the 75.

MR. FLORES: Exactly. And I'll show you how that breaks out in a minute. Mr. Chair, we'll jump right to that. If we flip to the capital outlay gross receipts tax, which would be the first tab over the overviews -

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Let me ask you a different way.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, if we flip to the capital outlay gross receipts tax, the quarter percent, you can see that that ordinance was adopted in March of 2002, effective January 3rd. And the purpose of that capital outlay tax is to provide revenue for capital projects in three areas, water, wastewater, open space and parks and roads and other permitted uses. The formula of distribution was set by ordinance where water and wastewater projects get 75 percent, open space and parks get 15 and roads and other get 10. And then in addition the distribution is split 50-50 between the County and regional capital outlay projects which I've indicated to the RPA. The ordinance specifies specific projects such as Buckman Diversion, development of water quality, City railyard park, river restoration, water and wastewater projects in La Cienega, Edgewood, Eldorado areas, water and wastewater projects in northern Santa Fe County, including the communities of Pojoaque, Tesuque, Santa Cruz, and various other projects.

MR. GONZALEZ: I was just going to say that as a side note, the 75-15-10 split operates independently of the 50 percent split. So two different ways of cutting the pie.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: What do you mean?

MR. GONZALEZ: It means that the 50 percent simply says that 50 percent has to be used for regional projects and 50 percent for County projects.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Is that 4.1, Gerald? Would that be 4.1?

MR. GONZALEZ: Right. But what it means is that you could use the entire 4.1 for water and wastewater and then that would leave the whole 15 percent, 10 percent and an additional 25 percent would be available for strictly County projects if the 50 percent regional went strictly to water. It also means that you could split the 15 percent in half, 7.5 regional, 7.5 County. The roads, 5 percent regional and 5 percent County and water and wastewater, 37.5 percent regional and 37.5 percent County. What I'm saying is you have the option of deciding how the 50-50 distribution goes in addition to the fact that the 75-15-10 percent split is already specified.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: I understand.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Sir.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: When you regional/County, isn't that the same?

MR. GONZALEZ: The way the language reads as I recall is that 50 percent of the money must be used for projects that benefit city residents. Now, it doesn't say it has to be used in the city but it has to be used for the benefit of city residents, meaning City of Santa Fe.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: You say city but we've got three cities.

MR. GONZALEZ: Right. But the specific reference, as I recall was to the City of Santa Fe.

MR. FLORES: That's correct, Mr. Chair. It talks about that. Capital outlay gross receipts tax shall be used for joint regional projects that benefit residents of the incorporated boundaries of the City of Santa Fe.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: That's regional projects.

MR. FLORES: That's correct. Residents of the incorporated limits. That's the current ordinance.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: It's for 50 percent -

MR. FLORES: It says as long as it imposes at least half of all revenue generated from the County capital outlay gross receipts tax shall be used for joint regional projects that benefit residents within the incorporated boundaries of the City of Santa Fe. And that's directly out of the ordinance that was adopted in 2002. So that's how the regional portion of that has been defined as it exists today.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Okay, I'm pretty clear on how we can spend the 50 percent of this, on water, wastewater, open space, parks, roads and other permitted uses, and we do that independent of any regional effort.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, if you flip to the page that talks about quarter percent, where it talks about the breakdowns.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Right.

MR. FLORES: We've taken now and actually broken out how that percentage equates.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: But bear with me for a second. I want to get it clear in my mind and it might help all of us. So I understand that 50 percent of that goes – is under County control entirely.

MR. FLORES: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: No input from the City. It doesn't have to be regional. Whatever we want to.

MR. FLORES: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Now the other 50 percent is for regional issues, right?

MR. FLORES: Correct. That is used in this document here, that's how the RPA sets up those regional projects, the City/County effort for designation or authorization of regional projects.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So how does the County or the City earmark that $4.1 million? Do we have to go to the City and say, Here's a project that we would like you to consider?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, the process has been currently that those projects are worked together with the City and County staff and then brought forward to the Regional Planning Authority on a regional project by project basis.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Is that how the City spent the $1.5 million?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, that's how the City has been able to get us to come to the table with them to identify and allocate funds for regional projects, through the Regional Planning Authority.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: They did that in collaboration with County staff.

MR. FLORES: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: And so the rest of it, and that's how you're going to proceed on how to spend that $4.1 on regional issues?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, currently, the way the ordinance is written, that's the avenue that we're required to follow. And that is up for discussion today as possibly direction that can be received from the Board to staff on how we want to possibly retool the way the language and the distribution or even the requirements of the process is handled.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Here's what I'm trying to get to. I want to make sure that the City just can't start sending us bills for improvements to either their system or they just unilaterally decide that this is a regional expenditure. Send us a check for $2 million.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, part of the ordinance has a requirement that the way the regional projects will be developed or proceeded with is that there has to be agreements between the City and the County that are negotiated that cover a myriad of requirements including operation, maintenance, ownership of the facility or projects. Those all have to be done prior to us even getting into the discussions and negotiations of how that money will be distributed or utilized. That's currently in the ordinance.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Can I say something?

MR. FLORES: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: The RPA, after discussing with County and City staff makes a recommendation to the BCC. The BCC makes the final decision. There is requirement in the ordinance that we have an agreement, that we talk about how we're going to do things and what's going to be done, etc. Only the BCC can make the final decision. The RPA simply recommends. Their recommendation is not binding.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I don't recall having discussions or an agreement with the City that the $1.5 million Gerald says that we gave them - did we agree at some point in time that we were going to spend this money upgrading those wells for a regional effort?

MR. GONZALEZ: The $1.5 million? That agreement was a two-step process. First the RPA's portion of the process in which the recommendation was that that $1.5 be used for that purpose. Then the next step was there had to be negotiated an agreement between the City and the County that the BCC would agree to. And that's what that resolution was that we adopted, was the agreement between the City and the County based on BCC approval that we would accept that recommendation from the RPA to spend that money in that way. So it's always been a two-step process. RPA takes the input from both staffs, makes its recommendation, but then there's still the need for negotiating an agreement between the City and the County on operation and maintenance, and the BCC then has to approve that agreement. So that approval came in the form of the resolution that we adopted, the joint resolution.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: The reason I was asking all that is that when the $4.1 million that we have for County water and wastewater projects, open space and parks, roads and other permitted uses has not yet been earmarked for any - we haven't decided where we're going to spend that yet, correct?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, we have and we haven't. The regional, the ordinance requires that the Road Advisory Committee and COLTPAC, two of the smaller issues provide recommendations as part of their planning processes of what road and open space and parks projects are undertaken with this money. And that's in the ordinance today. Part of the process also includes the development that we've included since 2002 is that the development of those projects as part of our infrastructure capital improvement plan and earmarking of certain funds, whether they be federal, state, local, GRT, whatever the case may be, to complete any project. So it is required by the ordinance that the COLTPAC review County projects which they have done and recommended, and also the Road Advisory Committee is required to also review the road project listing that then comes up to the Board and eventually makes its way to this plan.

With the exception of the water and wastewater projects, we have brought projects before the Board that are funded through the GRT, as recently as three months ago with the Pojoaque wastewater feasibility study which was a project that was identified within the GRT. So there have been projects that have been prioritized through the recommending bodies by ordinance. There are projects that are still remaining to be brought forward to be able to find funding and that's what we're going to talk about as a process of how the Board wants to see it at this part, what you want us to bring forward to you.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: My last question and then I'll let it rest. When we approved the budget several weeks or a month or so ago, there was not a distribution of the quarter percent in the budget that we approved.

MS. LUCERO: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, what there was was not a detailed line item specific distribution but just an allocation in the 75-15-10 proportion between regional and County. So for example, right now, within the budget for capital outlay there is – let me take roads for an example. There is $200,000 budgeted for roads under the County side, and another $200,000 budgeted to roads under the regional side.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: And is that $200,000 coming out of our $4.2?

MS. LUCERO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Okay. So then you have earmarked some of the funds.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, in FY05 we've identified funds but not specific projects. That we have not done yet for this fiscal year that we're in right now.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Let me ask a question. How much time have we allotted to this meeting? And the second question is do any Commissioners have any time constraints where they have to be somewhere?

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: I'm leaving tomorrow at 3:00. Going to Phoenix tomorrow at 3:00.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: We can stay here until 3:00.

MR. FLORES: If I may, Mr. Chair, we can go through each of the green packets and we can just tell you what the existing GRT is and I think then we can spend most of the time on the discussion exactly on what we do with the capital outlay GRT.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Okay.

MR. FLORES: What we've done on each tab and we won't spend a lot of time on this so we can concentrate on the capital is that we've provided a simple outline of what the existing GRTs are from the fire protection excise tax. What the uses are, what they can't be used for and what their estimated revenue generated for FY05. That goes all the way to each of these, the GRT that's currently enacted and is imposed on County residents, city or non-city.

If we can jump very quickly –

COMMISSIONER DURAN: You left out all the pages before fire protection.

MR. FLORES: We're going to come back to those, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran in the packet. If we can briefly flip to the tab that says 2004 Enabled GRT. I'm going to turn this over to Susan and that talks about the eighth that we've talked about at the Board level about the implementation or enactment.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Now, don't go too fast. We don't know this stuff.

RUDY GARCIA: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, this basically describes all the GRT taxes that have actually been acted on [inaudible] Actually, right now, what Susan is going to talk about is the gross receipts tax that was passed this year by legislature [inaudible]

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Mr. Chair, is this the one we recently decided to adopt as an ordinance?

MR. GARCIA: Yes.

MS. LUCERO: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, the newest tax that has legislatively been approved is in two pieces. The correction facility and then the general purpose gross receipts tax. And you hear us talk about how many sixteenths and so on. So the general purpose is one sixteenth, which equates to approximately $2 million annually to the County and the correctional facility is one eighth which equates to $4 million annually. And the reason these are to that magnitude of dollars is because it's a tax borne on both the incorporated and unincorporated areas, both city and county businesses do charge that tax.

So on the second page of this section again we show the different slices of the penny. A one eight cent correctional GRT equates to $1.2 million if enacted this fiscal year by the end of July in order for collections to begin January 2005. And if it's not negatively petitioned by the voters then it would continue and it would grow to an annual amount of $4.2 the following fiscal year. The one sixteenth general GRT, which the Board has not enacted or decided to go forward with is just here for illustration purposes. It equates to about half, $600,000 for next fiscal year if it was adopted and $2.1 on an annual basis after that.

The third page, we go into a description of this tax as far as what it may be used for. This tax has been available for only specific counties in years past. So here, what Tony's done is highlighted the areas that have changed. This tax will be used for construction, operations, maintenance – these are the two areas, operation and maintenance which were not lawful purposes that were allowed in the past; now they are. Continuing, it's also allowed for purchasing, furnishing, equipping, rehabilitating, expanding or improving a judicial-correctional or County correctional facility or grounds of a judicial-correctional or County correctional facility, or to the payment of bonds. In addition, the proceeds may also be used for expenses related to transporting and extraditing prisoners.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Question. What does judicial-correctional mean?

MS. LUCERO: What this means is it may be allowed for judicial complex or anything regarding attorneys and housing –

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Does it mean a courthouse?

MS. LUCERO: Perhaps.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Really? And how much is that?

MS. LUCERO: Not enough, but we have some ideas on how we can manipulate that or use it, is a better word. And again once enacted the estimated revenue for this fiscal year would be $1.2 million and for the next fiscal year, $4.2 million.

This next chart is an illustration so that you can firmly understand the County's position, which we are aware you do of how much money is attributable and how much the operation currently costs to run the correctional facility for both juvenile in the green, electronic monitoring in the yellow, adults in the blue and debt service in the red, depicted by these bars and colors as I just indicated. You can see the adult population from fiscal year 2002 to fiscal year 2005 has increased approximately 20 percent, which is an average of five percent a year. You can also see the funding to accommodate that level of population has gone from $3.8 million in 2002 to $8.4 million in 2005. So proportionately to our population the costs of care and also bringing on the juvenile facility under the County's operation solely has increased that cost more than twice. More than 100 percent. More than 200 percent.

So we know where we're headed. And we know that by enacting this GRT we know we must consider that as this GRT expands this correctional facility and the requirements will have to expand. So any expansion on GRT needs to be also considered for a correctional facility because the needs there are far greater than solely the one eight increment here, as you can see.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Sir.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Just real quickly. The increase in the cost of our maintaining our jail, does that have any direct relationship to the number of days that the inmates are staying in there? Just like, several years ago it was just over a year that they were staying there and in that report from Greg Parrish, there are people that have been there for over two years. So I guess I'm just trying to say can we at some point in time, maybe not today, but talk to the judges to keep that –

MR. GONZALEZ: One of the study sessions that I proposed, if you'll recall yesterday was on the jail and that's a time when we will have the opportunity to thrash through all of that. Hopefully, we'll be able to get some of the judges here for that discussion.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to throw that in.

MR. GONZALEZ: That's totally appropriate.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I've been meaning to talk to you about that.

MS. LUCERO: The next page is simply a summary. The proceeds of this tax are available – Oh, I'm sorry. To switch to the general purpose GRT, the one sixteenth.

MR. FLORES: Which we have not been given direction for.

MS. LUCERO: This is just for educational purposes. The proceeds of this tax are available for general purposes for County operations. And if enacted the estimated revenue for the upcoming fiscal year would be $600,000. It would be two million on an annual basis. So scratch the $2.7 and I would put $.6 million for FY05.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: And then for 2006 – could this money be bonded?

MS. LUCERO: Any GRT can be bonded, can be leveraged for debt. Yes.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Okay.

MS. LUCERO: As long as it's not dedicated to something else, which none of these are. One thing I need to clarify though is right now as we speak, the way the bond was issued for the jail is it's first pledged for revenue from care of prisoners, secondly pledged with GRT. So right now the general GRT that we've had in place since 1990 has been dedicated as a second collateral if you will to paying off the debt at the jail. So if the new correctional facility GRT goes through and everything is fine, we need to approach our bond writers and our trustee regarding the allocation and dedication of this new GRT so it will allow you the freedom to use the original GRT for other purposes. And that will take a little bit of work but it's a step we need to go through.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So this one sixteenth where it says available for general purposes. There are still some limitations to that?

MS. LUCERO: Commissioner Duran, they're not limitations to the use of this specific increment. It's just what we have existing that need to be, as Tony put it, retooled, reconfigured.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Right. So it complies with –

MS. LUCERO: With our current trust indenture with the bond.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Okay.]

MS. LUCERO: Bond underwriter. This next page is then a picture in terms of cents. If all the newer enactments were actually enabled by ordinance and followed through without negative petition, the County would have instituted and in place on and five sixteenths cents. So on every dollar, one and five sixteenth cent would go for County purposes, operations, etc. And you can see the different increments as indicated there. What is darker on the penny, as well as the newly enacted slice to the right indicates that those are GRT increments that are charged countywide, meaning city and county business. These increments, because they're allowed cross both areas, bring in the largest flow, almost a difference of six to one. The other areas, less colored and less orange, the penny and the slice to the right, the environmental piece are only allowed in county or unincorporated areas. So the funding there is smaller.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, the next page and the pages after that talk about thoughts or ideas or development of processes that we would undertake if one or both of these additional enabling legislation gross receipts taxes are enacted. The purpose of these are to start the discussion, the dialogue or the thinking, big picture, of what we would look at on that retooling or reconfiguring what we would be doing. By merely saying that we would be taking four million dollars out of the general fund by using the correctional GRT, as myself as the department director would have the idea, well, that's a lot of money that we could be using to expand things. And I think we would look to the Board to provide us some ideas on how we could retool or reconfigure those dollars that we're alleviating, one. Two, we could retool and look at the existing GRT that we have in place and see if there's a way that we can maximize the use of those, specifically in the solid waste areas under the environmental, for instance, because that is a program we're having difficulties with maintaining at a level that is functional.

So what we could do is if the Board gives us direction, we've provided some ideas or objectives here, we could begin to develop a plan on how we could present some options to the Board on the retooling or reconfiguring of the general fund dollars that would be replaced by the correctional GRT and also a way that we could look at the usage of our existing GRT to maximize the use of those funds by enabling these GRTs, one or both.

These areas would include possibly personnel, looking at planning for FTEs, probably program areas, additional programs and services, looking at retention plans. I know the sheriff's department is considering some ideas and some options about making sure that we fund our public safety operations. Infrastructure, if we look at retooling some of these GRTs we may be able to use them for purposes that are allowed that we're not currently utilizing them for. We can look at possibly the economic development, not only at the business park but also countywide with the cultural resources and the historical trails. We could look at the expansion of some of the services that we currently provide through the state, through County health. Risk management, we talked about during the budgeting cycle about possibly preparing ourselves to do a self-insurance contingency reserve. Heavy equipment replacement for Public Works is a big issue there. They are probably the most critically in need for equipment for the County. Possibly areas of biomass for fuel reduction, and I think the most important part of this from my perspective is of course the debt management, looking at the reconfiguration of our existing correction facility bond, that's what Susan talked about earlier. Possibly reserving the revenue flow for debt service on future bonding, and possibly also looking at, and this is something if I put my finance hat back on, a replenishment and maintain a certain level of our cash reserves.

As you all know, because the costs of the jail keep rising we need to be tapping into our reserves to be able to supplement the required money for the jail. So we looked at possibly doing some type of replenishment to maintain those cash reserves at consistent levels that we would feel comfortable with. Do you have anything to add to that part?

MS. LUCERO: One thing I'd just briefly like to add is in approaching this in terms of objectives, I think the idea is probably in terms of your greatest assets, your personnel, your buildings, your equipment, and what are the areas there that you contemplate need identifying. These are areas that we've come up with through the budget process, through conversations outside of the County with different entities that have and continue to do business with the County, rely on the County for services, for payment of those services, and it's also along the line of future planning in terms of risk management, which is not only just liability issues. We have in terms of our current coverage New Mexico Association of Counties but also just area-wide issues such as biomass fuel reduction, the equipment that we need for Public Works purposes, for open space areas, etc.

And then on the debt management side, this is a huge area because you're right kind of at the point now at which you can leverage a little bit more, you will be wooed by numerous investors who will want to of course issue a bond on behalf of the County and leverage this potential GRT. So these are ideas, these are areas that we think need addressing and with that we'd wait for your summarization and direction on specific objectives that we have in addition to those or in line with this that we could pursue.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Sir.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: So are you saying that on, let's say the eighth percent for corrections, if we wanted to bond that money, that would mean we couldn't spend any of that right now? And not only the corrections but the other GRT. Let's say we wanted to bond that and get more projects done and we've got money to take care of the bond, which Gerald suggested was one of the suggestions, we wouldn't be able to use any of that money right now?

MS. LUCERO: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Anaya, what we're saying is that we would need to develop our plan to know what to go forward with and what we could or couldn't issue bonds for right now.

MR. GONZALEZ: As an example, Commissioner Anaya, you would not have to bond out the total revenue stream. We could take a portion of the revenue stream and bond out that and then use the remainder as it comes in for ongoing projects.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: So that we need to get our lists of roads and get our lists of equipment. We need to get our projects that we want, our wastewater projects, our open space and we need to put them out there and we need to add them all up and go out for the bonds. Is that pretty much –

MR. GONZALEZ: That would be one way of doing it and probably the preferable way in terms of getting a big chunk of money up front in order to do the larger projects. For the smaller ones you might want to simply tap the revenue stream as it comes in. So for example with the acequia projects up north, we have some equipment needs that we could probably bond for. We know that we probably need some loaders and those kinds of things. Those we could bond for, but in terms of ongoing usage of that money we could also use it for day to day operations to the extent permitted by the statutory language.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Anaya, I would add to that by saying that with the enabling aids that the Board just directed staff to proceed with I think we would look at all of the options, not just specifically capital outlay and that we would look at possibly retooling the way that the quarter percent capital outlay gross receipts tax which we'll talk about in a second, is used. And there's some options in there that are provided that would accomplish basically the same thing but out of a different source. I think if we're going to remove general fund dollars or replace it, the infusion of general fund dollars for the correctional facility GRT, we need to look at all of the options for the general fund expenditures. And most of you know that general fund does not pay for capital outlay projects. We use other GRTs or state appropriations, federal appropriations or grants to pay for those. There's a very small amount of money that actually is used out of the general fund for capital outlay projects.

If the Board directs us toward some of those objectives it may be that we reserve a percentage or a portion of that $4 million in this plan to be able to do that, but that we also look at the quarter percent GRT as existing right now and look at the options in there where we could accomplish the same thing without having to deter or minimize what we could maximize of the $4 million that we're replacing.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: I guess what you're asking from us and me is I'm not an expert in all this stuff. So I guess what I would say is this is the project I want done. And then you them from all the districts and you see if you can accommodate all those projects with the money that we have. Is that bottom line?

MR. FLORES: In my opinion as the capital outlay director, that's a portion of it, yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: I'm not going to be able to be here figuring out percentages. I don't want to do that. I'm not going to do it. I'm just going to tell you, okay, I want this road done. I want this equipment here and I want Edgewood to have their water system or wastewater system, and you go and figure out how we're going to do it.

MR. FLORES: Commissioner Anaya, yes. As long as that direction is provided then we can come up with the sources or the options that we can bring back to you on how we can accomplish that project.

MR. GONZALEZ: And that's been a portion of the ICIP plan that we've been in the process of developing, so that we get input not only from the communities but also from you as Commissioners, so that we put your projects on the list as well.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I'll try and simplify this thing. I know that there are some contingencies that you're going to have to apply, but how much of the general fund is going to operate the jail right now?

MS. LUCERO: Commissioner Duran, Mr. Chair, right now, it's $8.4 million.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: $8.4 million. Okay, so out of our general fund, we have $8.4 million going. So basically, what we could do is take this $4.2 we're getting for corrections, throw it into the general fund and have $4.2 million available to us for other projects that the Commission wants to pursue. And I know you have to go through a lot of justification and make sure that it's right. But to simplify the process, that's what we're trying to do.

MS. LUCERO: Yes and no, because what we also, and what I'm looking for from the Board is from a financial perspective is where your priorities are. For example, do you foresee the County at some point in time either remodifying what's currently in place as far as operating the jail, meaning running it ourselves, continuing a private –

COMMISSIONER DURAN: That's a different – that's a totally different conversation. But if we wanted to throw all that $4.2 million into the general fund so that we could pull $4.2 million out and use it anyway we felt was appropriate, we could do that.

MR. FLORES: Yes, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, in a nutshell, yes. Provided that we figure out what those areas are and when you say projects, I would expand that to mean programs or other things. So that we don't get caught up in the projects, per se, that we could use it for other general uses of County government.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So basically what this does is it frees up our general funds to provide the community other services and programs that the Commission deems appropriate and there's a need. It frees up the money.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, it frees up the money. What we're asking for is a process so that we identify your priorities on how that money should be utilized. I use it in a simple way. We free up four million out of the general fund today and our population and our costs keep going up we're going to have to have a contingency plan. So there's myriad things. I wouldn't say that we'd be automatically be putting out new programs or projects. We'd be developing a process.

MR. GONZALEZ: The caveat obviously is if the jail costs rise faster than the increase in general fund receipts then over time we'll have an attrition of what's available in order to do what you just said, but it would be there.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: It seems to me, the way I heard it discussed recently was that with the costs going up at the jail so fast there really isn't going to be much additional money.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, if we take a look at our current population and we even do our best efforts and the Sheriff and the jail team is committed to that, the national average is a seven percent increase in our own population, a year. If we minimize that and we project a three to five percent of our own inmates. And remember, we have to pay for our own inmates. We will be at a point where whatever we pull out of the general fund there will be 50 or 60 percent going back into it to still take care of our own inmates. We will never get to a point where we're able to operate the jail, I hate to use the words, but a break-even point so that the revenues collected pays for itself.

In my opinion, Susan can jump in as Finance Director, but the general fund will always be required to infuse money into the jail. There will never be the point in time that I can foresee that it's a stand-alone deal. So we need to be careful on how we take that formula and reauthorize it over a period of time.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So based on what Commissioner Campos has told me, the $4.2 is pretty much a zero net effect to our ability to provide other services, in the long run.

MS. LUCERO: Commissioner Duran, over time, yes.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: How much time?

MS. LUCERO: Well, based on projections I've done for the jail, at the current growth rate we're at, and I know there are things, we've talked about things that would help in alleviate some of the population growth but not to a point where it's going to make a huge difference. Within seven years we will have matched our own facilities with our own prisoners, at this rate that we're going.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Then we shouldn't be seeing this $4.2 million as a windfall.

MS. LUCERO: Absolutely not.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: It's a safeguard for the future.

MS. LUCERO: Right. And an opportunity to reconfigure your existing delivery of services, not only there but everywhere, solid waste, etc.

MR. FLORES: That's why I talk about retooling the existing – the first part of this manual is retooling what we currently have to maximize the use. The environmental gross receipts tax, maybe we can retool that so that we dedicate a larger portion of it to solid waste by using some of the infill for the potential revenues we would gain. So that's why I'm talking about retooling. I think we need to take a look at the big picture and not just earmark $4 million for new programs or projects or services.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So basically, this just allows us to enhance or fund or take care of our existing problems.

MR. FLORES: That's why on the capital outlay I think we can use a different mechanism to be able to still accomplish the Board's goal on that issue, separate from this eighth percent.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: The Sheriff had indicated in a discussion that we had that with this new tax, he's like to use that for new police officers but in the long run we're just going to have barely enough money. We're never going to have enough money to pay for the jail. We're always going to have to supplement from the general fund. That's what the Sheriff wanted to do. His thought was, okay, we're going to pitch this to the public in the next general election. Let's say we're going to add some new deputies. It just doesn't work out.

MR. FLORES: And that's why we're asking for that plan.

MS. LUCERO: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, keep in mind that one of the reasons this tax was enacted was because there are several counties who are going bankrupt because of their jail. And luckily you have made some conservative decisions. There have been a lot of things put in place over the last several years financially that have given the County an A-1 or Aa rating with your bond raters. That is huge. That means that you can go out as if you're going out for your own personal loan and get a low interest loan to do very large projects, is what you're contemplating without assessing your day to day operations. That means a lot. So that's something we want to continue.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Mr. Chair, how much of that $8.4, is any of that going to pay off the debt of the jail?

MS. LUCERO: Yes, $2 million goes to pay the annual debt service.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So we're looking at $6.4 in terms of the actual cost of the jail.

MS. LUCERO: Yes. Which includes at this point $450,000 for juvenile, because juvenile is not yet stand-alone. It will take them another year to be stand-alone, I think. That's my prediction. They're still in a start-up mode. They're still trying to gain new contracts, new children and so on and they've made some progress I think at this point. They've increased their population by ten percent, ten to fifteen percent. But we're still not at full capacity bed-wise to accommodate the amount of salaries that we're paying. It's going to take us another 12 months to get there.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So if we do this with the eighth percent, you're saying we're going to retool the debt? Is there anything that can be done with our bond?

MS. LUCERO: There's a couple things, but I don't want to paint a rosy picture because it's not rosy. There are two things that need to be done. Number one, if this tax is enacted we need to ask the trustees to switch the pledging of this general GRT with this correctional. That's step one. And all it does it just changes the dedication. It doesn't change the funding or the flow. Nothing like that. It's a legal thing more than anything.

The second thing is to plan or anticipate that perhaps when some of these original coupons on this bond mature, which are in 2013, and probably none of us will be here right now, but you never know. At that point in time, let's just say that perhaps interest rates are at eight percent, and these bond holders have a bond at six percent. There may be something that the County can do at that point in which you basically issue another bond. You can't pay this other one off. It will sit there until 2027. But what you can do is issue another bond that then leverage the difference between paying this guy six percent and issuing somebody else eight and you have a two percent swing in which it helps you to attract this one coupon holder to let go of that six percent bond because he would want more money and he would be willing to pay a premium to get some kind of, that two percent, you kind of play this shell game between the two parties.

But I don't see that happening for a while until things change in the market and so on. This wouldn't be the time for us to do it now. But it's something that we should kind of plan for and set aside some type of contingency that would give us that opportunity at some point in the future.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Okay, and then regarding the fire tax, how is that spent currently? Is that split amongst the districts?

MS. LUCERO: What the Fire Department does is according to the five-year plan which they revise every five years and I think they just went through their most recent revision, they prioritize areas throughout the county requiring maybe upgrades to their current facilities, upgrades to equipment as well, and they identify that and then they basically facilitate it through that funding mechanism and they determine each year what goes into what area.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: What about the impact fees?

MS. LUCERO: Impact fees can only be used and dedicated towards areas of development showing to new development. So for example, La Cienega which has grown by leaps and bounds over the last five years, the impact fees that they have earned throughout the last few years has been used for building a new fire station, acquiring new equipment and so on, so the impact fees basically augment that quarter percent. The quarter percent, it's only \$1.6 or \$1.7 million, \$1.4, the impact fees augment the quarter percent to get the same types of things done but it's restricted in that you can only use it in areas that are having new growth and it's connected to new development, new growth.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Is that by state statute or is it in the ordinance?

MS. LUCERO: State statute.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, PFMD's responsible for the building of the new fire station. We are trying to get them to incorporate the five-year plan into one document so that the Board gets a plan over a five-year period rather than getting a piecemeal plan for capital outlay. We're responsible for construction management and building of the new facility, but it's part of the overall capital outlay planning. Our goal is to combine.

Although there is a separate component of it, it should be in one document so that it's easy reference for all of us to be able to say this is the anticipated growth and far as facilities and equipment over the next five years and what areas those impact. Because then again, like Susan indicated on the impact fees, we would leverage the two to better accomplish what they need for that one district.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I think that needs to be done because right now I think District 1, in terms of the needs and the reality is the impact fees are never going to go up.

MR. FLORES: You're correct.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So in terms of development in District 1, unless we negotiate something with the Pueblos long term and we get a percentage maybe of their gambling receipts, then maybe we get that as a blessing. But right now there's nothing that we're able to say, okay, La Puebla is going to replace their –

MR. FLORES: Cundiyo is a good example. Cundiyo, for instance we funded Cundiyo's addition and the renovation of the Cundiyo fire district separate from the portion that we grouped together many years ago to be able to upgrade their fire station. And that's a perfect example. They will never be able to generate enough revenue on the impact fee side to ever have anything. They would be at status quo. So that is one of the driving forces that Gerald has insisted upon is that we combine their five-year capital improvement plan for facilities and equipment into the overall County plan, because it is part of the County's overall vision and direction.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: They need a new rescue vehicle, for the record, in Pojoaque. I was just up there this past week and that's something that [inaudible] Mr. Chair, I need to go in a little while and I had a question on this other handout.

MR. FLORES: If you're ready we can jump there.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: I had a question. I think I was going to talk about the jail, that we really need to have a heart-to-heart meeting with the judges because I think when we put a person in jail, it takes them a long time for them to get them out or have a hearing and I think that if we talk to them and maybe they can move things a little faster, that will help us out. From the memo that I got from Greg Parrish, I think we all got it, that is a really big issue. Some times those guys get lost in there and they're there for a year, year and a half or whatever. And I think if we can crack down on that particular thing that would save this County a lot of money.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Commissioner Duran.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I don't want to spend too much time on this but you sent an e-mail out to us recently, maybe it was today or last night, that you are ready to sit down with the Pueblos to talk about –

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: The Aamodt.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Yes, to talk about how we might, how the City and the County might participate in the funding of [inaudible] and somewhere – and I thought to myself, where are we going to get money to do anything like that? So it seems to me the only place that we would be able to even discuss that or find money for that would be through this GRT money that we have.

MR. GONZALEZ: The source that has been primarily discussed for that money would be actually the GRT that was imposed in 2002, the 75-15-10 GRT funding.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So that's the money you're maybe talking about earmarking for the settlement.

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. The 75 percent would be used in part to fund the County's portion of constructing the settlement facilities and the transmission lines and such.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: And that falls in line with that because it's for water and wastewater.

MR. GONZALEZ: Right. And that's why it's important that we've got so many demands right now for that 75 percent that that's probably the greatest piece of what Tony's been doing in terms of gathering information on capital outlay is what are all those needs? Because with the Aamodt settlement proposal, which will take a significant amount from the County's side. I think it's somewhere around $30, $35, $38 million, overall, over time. Not immediately. Then we've got the diversion project demand for funding. And then the other piece that's on the horizon, somewhere down the road and probably sooner rather than later, we're going to have to deal with is wastewater treatment facilities.

Right now, the contract with the state pen will expire in about four years and with the clock ticking, we need to think about if they don't roll over that contract, what are we going to do in terms of wastewater treatment? The time frame for planning, constructing and building a new wastewater treatment facility on the south side would be roughly two years, two and a half years. So we need to start thinking again of how much that's going to cost and the most recent estimates I heard were kind of in the $8 to $10 million range. But again, that would be another draw on that 75 percent that we're talking about.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Thank you, Tony.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Do we want to shift to the other?

MR. FLORES: Yes. Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Mr. Chair, I had some questions regarding the listing of projects under the water-wastewater obligated through '04.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: What page is that on?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I don't know. About half-way through.

MR. FLORES: I apologize for no numbers.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: You'd mentioned that the Pojoaque wastewater study is part of this?

MR. FLORES: Yes, Mr. Chair. After discussing the list with Doug yesterday afternoon, when we brought up that proposal specifically – I'm trying to think, I think it was in March. It was specifically in the ordinance that that was to be included as part of the GRT obligation, specifically under wastewater as an identified site. The listing that we received from the Utility Department did not include that. I have included it in my numbers. So that's why it's not on there. I was trying to get this bound and to you all so you would be able to get some dialogue and some questions going and I apologize for that.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Okay. So then two pages later, roads and other projects, the basecourse program. Is that in addition to what we have, the basecourse program, or are we using now this bond to replace the general fund for the basecourse program?

MS. LUCERO: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, this, for fiscal year '04, was the first year that we used $125,000 from capital outlay for basecourse, only from this source, because during fiscal year '04, our growth was limited on the revenue side to about $1.3 million and $1.1 of that growth went to the jail. In fiscal year '03, as well as fiscal year '05, this current year, basecourse is funded as it has been in the past through the road maintenance fund, which is funded from general fund.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So this is in addition to – how much do we have now in our basecourse program?

ROBERT MARTINEZ (Deputy Public Works Director): Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, for the last three years, I believe it's been $125,000. Prior to then it was I believe $200,000 or $250,000. So to answer your question, this $125,000 that you see here is not in addition. It is replacing what general fund was kicking in for basecourse.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: For '04?

MR. MARTINEZ: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Because I was looking at '05, which we approved, is this in addition too? Was $125,000 plus the other $125,000, a quarter of a million, for the basecourse program?

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, no. It is still $125,000.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: And it's still going to be coming out of this fund.

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, I guess it's up to the Commission where they want to fund the basecourse program out of.

MS. LUCERO: The basecourse this past fiscal year '05 was funded through the road maintenance fund with a transfer from general fund. As it has been in fiscal year '03 and prior. I'm not sure about the dollar amounts. I don't remember it being quite that high. If it was that high it went back to probably '98.

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, the way the basecourse program was originated was when the County took over Agua Fria Road from the State Highway Department, the agreement was that the State Highway Department would give the County – it was either $200,000 or $250,000 per year for four years. So after the money that was coming in from the Highway Department for that exchange expired, the Commission wanted to continue the basecourse program. So the money that was being used for the basecourse program was coming out of the general fund at the Commission's direction.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: When did that expire?

MR. MARTINEZ: I believe that was probably around the year 1999 or 2000, somewhere around there.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So it doesn't look like there's going to be any more than that $125,000 then?

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, we requested $125,000 because it was our direction to stay flat.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: That $125,000 is still coming out of the general fund? But then we still have an additional $125,000 for other purposes for '05 then?

MS. LUCERO: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, the $125,000 that you see here for basecourse was funded through the capital outlay for only this one year in this way. Whereas in the past it's been funded through general fund, this year it's funded through general fund and I guess the Road Advisory Committee determined which roads are to get road improvement or basecourse.

MR. MARTINEZ: The Road Advisory Committee takes input from area residents and we put together a list of roads and take a tour on an annual basis to determine which roads will be improved through this particular funding.

MR. GONZALEZ: But I think your question, Commissioner Montoya, is if we took it out of capital outlay this fiscal year and we're not doing it for next fiscal year, does that mean that we have now $125,000 available in capital outlay for '05?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: That's what I didn't get.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay.

MS. LUCERO: I can explain that part. This year Public Works brought as part of the budget request, five different roads that are being funded through the State Highway CO-OP program. And if it's part of the CO-OP program that means it requires a 25 percent match, which is $114,000 for the actually seven different roads. So of the $200,000, $204,000 that's just at this point generally allocated within capital outlay for roads, they would need $114,000 for these and they'd have some remainder for specific projects, basecourse, whatever.

MR. FLORES: And actually, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, if I may. The split of roads and other were done in February of this year primarily to allow us to start the capital outlay strategy for this past session. We had talked about at the Board meeting in February when we actually adopted the resolution a way to be able to complete projects that are currently on the ICIP, either road projects or other projects, and get them off the books. And that was the purpose in coming to the Board in February to look at those projects that are listed under roads and other that includes some of the facilities as well as County Road 55A, the railroad crossing, those types of things. Those are purely at that point to be able to get those projects off the books.

And part of the whole plan –

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Before you go on, the answer to my question then is no.

MR. GONZALEZ: The way I understood is that of what would have been the $125,000, $114,000 is spoken for as matching funds.

MR. FLORES: However, that's what we're here for today, is to get direction from the Board on how you want us to bring projects forward to you in '05 based upon two things. One, the ICIP plan, and two, the recommendations from organizations such as the Road Advisory Committee on how we fund the projects.

MR. GONZALEZ: And the hope is that the $114,000 will shift to the road projects that you find important to your district and also Commissioner Anaya's district since those are the highest road use districts that we have.

MR. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Montoya, I just want to comment on the ordinance. I think the ordinance states that input from the Road Advisory Committee – I don't think that they actually have to take action on what projects get funded through the GRT. I think ultimately it's up to the Board to make that decision.

MR. GONZALEZ: But, yes, we can get you the list.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, the list that the Road Advisory Committee did is included in what the Board acted on as its priority list in June. Those projects in there have not changed from the meetings that we had with the community, the meetings that we had with Road Advisory, COLTPAC, or even the Commission members individually to develop a plan. So that –

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: That's part of the $114,000 then.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, I just saw that today, so I haven't compared that to the existing ICIP plan and I'll need to do that.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So they may not be –

MS. LUCERO: This hasn't been specifically by line item budgeted because the Public Works Department needs to also indicate what the grants portion is from the Highway Department and we don't have that information yet. So I'm assuming they'll probably bring that in August to the Board meeting.

MR. FLORES: The simple answer is yes. I'd like to compare that to what the Board has looked at as far as the ICIP plan to see if they match or if there are differences and why.

MR. GONZALEZ: And if there are roads that you want to have looked at that don't appear, then that can be done. We can work that into the process.

MR. FLORES: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Then, Mr. Chair, under the one, capital outlay project with no existing County funding?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, that's a very broad list and there are many more other projects but these are primarily the focus of PFMD. Based on the fact that we've had some requests, these are projects that we have had requests from the legislature from different municipalities and organizations as well as different mutual domestics.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So we haven't given anything to Chimayo? That's my question.

MR. FLORES: That's correct, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya. They have not received any funding. They have about $5 million but not from us.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: And then the next case, the funding options.

MR. FLORES: If I may, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, what we were trying to do is provide the Board some ideas on how they would like us to utilize the GRT, understanding that there are some projects that we currently have in the ICIP that I feel brought two years ago to you to develop a plan to make sure we don't have projects lingering out there that were underfunded. So we've provided some options that would maximize the Commission districts requests and the projects within each district, and also looking at other areas, we could look at it possibly the revenue bonds, we could use some of the GRT to bond for roads, a road bond for instance or apply that to debt service or facilities, etc.

So these are merely a first attempt; nothing's set in stone about providing options to the Board on how they would like the GRT split up.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: And my question is on option 3, particularly the second bullet, percent of each County project category to be utilized as revenue/debt service for capital outlay revenue bonds. My question is when will that happen? How long will that take?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, we are currently, as of yesterday, we met with the polling and research consulting firm preparing the polls for survey to see the response from voters throughout the county on whether they would support any type of bond. That report should be completed by the end of July. At the same time we were planning on doing a special study session on two issues: one on bonding and whether there would be a direction from the Board to proceed, as well as the results of the space assessment because in some instances, in one area in particular they go hand in hand. So we will have answers for you by the end of July at the first special study session that Gerald and I have talked about conducting, possibly the first week in August.

So we will have those answers for you in the next three and a half weeks.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So I guess my question is can we wait that long?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, I believe we can. I know there are some pressing issues from District 3 and District 1 that I think we need to make a decision on to see how we can further those projects along. So specifically, the north and the south.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Did you hear that? We always get shorted on that.

MR. FLORES: I apologize, Mr. Chair. We are in the process right now of developing this year's funding strategy, what we're going to go to the federal delegation and the state delegation for projects. This is the first step of this plan. Today is kind of step 1-A, which is now developing a process with the Board on how we further these along. And that's part of the first graphic that I had in that thing is that that quarter percent is a component of the entire project. We will never, I don't believe we'll ever be able to fund any project with one single source of funds, with the exception of possibly a water project. Facilities and roads, we will probably never be able to fund from one source. We need to leverage dollars with each other. So that strategy that is being developed after today will be continued to be developed through August and be brought back to the Board September, October where we can immediately start the meetings with the delegation in November, December prior to the session. We're trying to get ahead of the curve this year.

So can it wait? I think it can wait for the next three weeks but I think August is going to be a time that we need to decide on the process that the Board would like us to move forward on. Today I would like to – these are the options that we have. I think we would like to get some response and get direction the Board would see individually, collectively, and then we can then further tool that and bring back concrete numbers to you on how that would equate. Then we can tie that to on real projects.

MR. GONZALEZ: What we're seeing increasingly on the legislative side is that they're reluctant to throw small appropriations at projects and have them sit there for four or five years while they accumulate enough money in order to continue to do that. Because of that, if we don't start closing our project, which we've started doing under Tony's leadership this last year, then we're going to find ourselves shorter and shorter on the legislative appropriations side. So that's why we've been trying to prioritize the open projects, complete them, get them off the books and then move forward with the list that we're developing of what we think is important to each of your districts.

MR. FLORES: As I just pointed out in the legislative update, we're happy to report we've got a few projects off that list. And that's why this year's strategy is I think even more important than what we brought forward last year because it provides the Board the opportunity with the plan to develop new projects.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Long term.

MR. FLORES: Long term. It's because we basically received funding to remove, I think, six roads off the list and seven facility projects. So we don't have very many open projects after this year for the session. So part of that strategy now, we met our expectations more than I had ever anticipated and I don't think any of you had anticipated either so now we have to retool the plan to meet those long-term goals.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Is the legislature driving what we do, or are we driving them?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, we took the approach in 2002 before the legislature came out with the reform that we're driving this.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: That's our hope but is that the reality? Is that the result?

MR. FLORES: After this past session, that is the result.

MR. GONZALEZ: In fact, Santa Fe was looked at as the model in terms of how to deal with these appropriations, not only from the legislative side but also from the governor's side. The governor is also looking – that was that whole thing about not funding projects less than $50,000. Same thing. The thinking is the same on both sides, even though they may not be in synch on the project itself.

MR. FLORES: I would say though that there are some instances, even from the legislative side, they seem to drive their own projects that we may not have considered and I don't believe that we will ever be able to get away from that. We just need to be able to plan for that.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Bernalillo has said for some of these projects we're not going to do them because it doesn't make sense for the community.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, I think we're at that point. If we were to receive from my perspective as the Project and Facilities Manager, if I was to get funding for a project that I knew would last for a while and we weren't able to leverage other dollars, I would apprise the Board of that and give my recommendation that we probably do not want to sit on that. Let us give that part back and let's look at different sources. Because it makes no sense. We have one project that remains from June 30th that unfortunately staff set up for three years because we could not move forward on it. And we've changed the direction from your direction that we don't want to do that anymore. It takes time and it takes effort.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: The point too is this. [inaudible]

MR. GONZALEZ: And Commissioner Sullivan gets two votes today.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Sir.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Oh, you're not done.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: One more. Of the options, to me the ideal is number three. And I would support that if I can be assured that there's some time line that we're going to see in terms of coming to some sort of a conclusion as to consensus with the Board and staff as to how we're going to move forward with our capital projects. To me, one and two are kind of like immediate, short-term and I just want to see something done. To me that's the quickest thing. It's probably not the simplest and easiest but it's the quickest in terms of at least mediating some sort of sense of I know where we're headed in terms of direction. But I think ideally, we can go with three and if I can get some time line we can see that so let's say, at the end of September, if we know what direction we're headed in, I'm comfortable with that.

MR. FLORES: I would even think, Commissioner Montoya, that I would like to see it at the end of August.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I would too but I'm saying the end of September.

MR. FLORES: That would be our target date. Regardless of the option, I think we would need August, the month of August to prepare those types of processes and how that time frame works. That would be my target would be the end of August, regardless of the option.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Okay. And then the last comment that I have in terms of the overall picture on the gross receipts tax end of it is that, will be going into the Los Alamos funding in that meeting.

MR. GONZALEZ: I'm still – there's two competing things I've got going on but I'm going to try and make that one, yes.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Because I know hopefully at least I'll be going to that. And that's critical, because that's going to impact, gross receipts tax is going to be impacted by what the lab is going to be doing starting October 1st . What they're going to be doing is instead of having all the contractors like the security, the [inaudible] instead of those being outsourced they're all going to become employees of the lab, and there's a huge transition that's going to happen October 1st. I think 250 of those employees are going to become LANL employees as opposed to being outsourced. That will be part of the gross receipts tax, KSL, or Johnson Controls are paying.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: To Santa Fe County?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Well, part of it is coming here. Part of it. And that's what they're going to explain on Friday is what impact it's going to have on Santa Fe, Los Alamos and Rio Arriba County.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: How about the workforce? Is the workforce staying the same?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: The workers will stay the same.

MR. GONZALEZ: But they'll be in-house instead.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: They'll be in-house instead of outhouse.

MR. GONZALEZ: That's a valley term.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: That's going to be important in terms of us being able to get a picture of where, long-term, this whole gross receipts tax is going. Then that figures even more on the bonding, what we know about the bond proceeds. And then the last thing I would prefer us to do is maybe we should start meeting at some point with the local school district. I think Pojoaque is going to be going out for bond also, next month, if I'm not mistaken, which could impact what we do, at least in terms of the voters in my area. So that at least we're not going to be throwing another bond right after them.

MR. FLORES: Or competing with them.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Exactly. And I think it's real important. We failed three bond issues before we finally passed one to fund that new high school in Pojoaque and it finally passed because we were able to get people to understand how much their tax was going to be increased.

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Montoya, we're actually anticipating that same process of the education, pending what the Board directs us to do on any future bonds, GO's or revenues, is do the education up front. So once – we've already started developing the idea but once we receive that direction and we provide you with the information I think that would be immediately that we start that.

MR. GONZALEZ: And that's part of that research and polling information, although I know we had done that a couple of years ago. We think that the constellation, in terms of what's at the top of voters' minds may have shifted some because of the imposition of the GRT two years ago and some of the other bonding and tax issues that have come up since then. So we want to make sure that we have a fresh feel for what the voters are thinking out there, and it will be a representative sampling across all the precincts in the county.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: That's all I've got. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Let me just say I talked to John Grubesic this morning and at the next meeting, 4:30, we have it on the agenda to make a nomination and he wants to be sworn in. Can we get that on the calendar?

MR. GONZALEZ: Sure can.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: That's at our 10:00 meeting.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Yes. It will be at 4:30.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I thought you were going to give it to me.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: You didn't want it.

MR. GONZALEZ: The swearing window closed.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: It's gone.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I could have been a senator, but no, I get to be a Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Sir.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: So on this water/wastewater projects obligated through fiscal year 2004, that is the money that we are spending for these projects right now?

MR. FLORES: Yes, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Anaya. Through last week, basically. Through the end of FY04. So FY05 monies now are what we're talking about to develop the process.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: So we need to put Edgewood on that?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Anaya, I do have them on the plan. Once we come back with the options, that would be one of those projects that we put on there with the dollar amount on there and they how we can accommodate that project through different sources.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Okay. And then the quarter percent capital outlay funding options, this is for 2004 to 2005, the option number three that Commissioner Montoya was talking about, explain that to me. Just go down the page and explain it.

MR. FLORES: Well, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Anaya, basically, we would use the ICIP as the base, which is the capital plan that we just presented to DFA. We would look at existing projects that are there right now and what the balances are to get them off the list. That's one option.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: That's the first bullet you're talking about.

MR. FLORES: Describe them all or just option 3?

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Go through them all.

MR. FLORES: That's what I'm doing. So we would look, one, at existing projects, determine what that dollar equates to and what the percentage of the total available is and assign it a value. Let's say we have existing projects out there and they need 25 percent of the GRT fund across the categories to be completed, we would give you 25 percent of $4.1 million and these categories would be obligated to existing projects.

The second part them we be then we would look at – or the third part. Let me jump to the third part, is that we would look to each of the Commission districts, take a percentage of each of the category balances and assign them to your individual projects by districts. That's what I got out earlier. These potentially would be new projects that we don't currently have money for and we don't need money for. They would be start up projects, per se. So we take a percentage.

Then the third option or what's in here as the second one is that we would look at the bonding option, road bonds, for instance or revenue bonds for facilities, and we would bring forward to you a pledge of a percentage of that fund, of that category. For instance, if we went out for a revenue bond for the courthouse and we estimated that those bond payments would run us, I'm just going to put a number here and it's probably way low but $200,000. That we needed to service that debt on the revenue bond. We would ask for a percentage of that category to be dedicated to that debt service. So that wouldn't impact any other sources or revenues.

So we'd split it up three ways: Commission projects, current projects, if there's any, and an appropriation to service debt on any potential bonds.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: What else do you want to know? What other information do you need from us?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Anaya, what I need right now is what option the Board is comfortable with us bringing back in further detail in August.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Of one, two, three?

MR. FLORES: Or any others.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: I don't understand them still. I definitely don't get it.

MR. FLORES: Okay, what we could do, Mr. Chair, is we could bring back –

MR. GONZALEZ: Why don't we go through option one, two, and three, Tony, and just explain them one at a time.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: What you're asking us to do is to take the step, you want us to select which one of these options you should pursue.

MR. FLORES: To bring back in further detail, yes.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So I understand what number three is.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: I don't. I don't get it.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I think you will after a while.

MR. FLORES: Option one basically says that in each of those categories, water, wastewater, parks, open space, and roads and others, there's approximately $4.1 million in funds. They're broken up. If we took that and we split that up by category, each of you would get a percentage of that, an equal percentage, split five ways. Let's say for instance, roads and others. Right now, in FY05 there's a $414,000 revenue stream. If we split that up amongst each Commission district, that would get us $82,828 apiece. What that doesn't get us though is to complete a project, potentially, or it would be one project only and what we may need in District 3 is $300,000 and you're only getting $82,000 of it. So that's option one, is to take the money and to split it amongst you five ways.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Let me ask you, if you did that though, you still would have the option – if we did it that way, we'd still have the option to say, Okay, this is how we want to do it because I know what my district needs. Commissioner Anaya knows what his district needs. So we could pool that money and still bond collectively, right? So I could turn that $800,000 for my district into –

MR. FLORES: $80,000.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: $80,000?

MR. FLORES: For roads. I'm just using roads as an option. You're only getting $80,000 worth of road appropriation.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Oh, that's nothing. So I could use that $80,000 still to bond or –

MR. FLORES: And that's kind of what option three does. It gives you that option to be able to collectively –

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So collectively we could agree to this and that $80,000 could be more because we could bond.

MR. FLORES: Twenty million or ten million or something. That's what option three gives you.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So that's what option one is.

MR. FLORES: No, option one right now just says, You get $80,000, you get $80,000, you get $80,000 and you tell me what you want to do with the $80,000, which is only going to buy you $80,000. Option three allows you to –

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Let's do two first.

MR. FLORES: Okay. Two, we dedicate a percentage of the existing monies, so 75 percent, the 15 percent, the ten percent, to existing capital outlay projects and there's a few of them that exist today that need money to finish, or that would be start-up, new projects that the delegation or somebody gives us, so we take a percentage. For instance. If we took the $414,000 in the roads and other, that's what's available in FY05, and we split that 50-50. That gives us $207,000 split up five ways amongst each of you to get $40,000 apiece and the other money would be dedicated to existing projects that need to be completed in the roads and others. That's what option two gives you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: The second part?

MR. FLORES: The first part gives you $207,000 if we split it 50-50, let's just do the simple math. So $414,000 split two ways is $207,000. $207,000 would go to existing projects in the plan that need to be finished. $207,000 would then be split up five ways for roads and others, so you get about $40,000 apiece.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Option one is the same as option 2.2.

MR. FLORES: With the exception that you look at existing projects to get them off the list.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Now, the projects that are on the list for development through Commission input?

MR. FLORES: Commission input, community input, recommendations from Road Advisory and other lay bodies that the Board has assigned.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So still, if we did that, the second part of it that would be distributed among the Commission could still be pooled together and bonded.

MR. GONZALEZ: And that takes you into option three anyway.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Oh, okay. So that's what option three is.

MR. GONZALEZ: That's what option three is.

MR. FLORES: That's what option three does.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Okay, explain that to us again. By percentage, bullet points.

MR. FLORES: Okay, let's take option three in a simplistic way. We have $400,000 in roads and others. If we split that three ways, that's approximately 33 percent each.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: For each category.

MR. FLORES: For each of those percentages. That's $120,000, $130,000 each. So the first percentage equates to $130,000. Second percentage equates to $130,000 and the third percentage equates to $130,000. We split it three ways.

MR. GONZALEZ: So you could do $130,000 to clear up existing projects – youth shelter, whatever. You could use $130,000 for individual district projects, divided five ways.

MR. FLORES: Correct.

MR. GONZALEZ: And then you could take the remaining $130,000 and bond it and get a much larger sum to do larger projects across all districts.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: Three sounds better.

MR. FLORES: It gives us more latitude to be able to maximize it.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: What's wrong – and maybe it's in here somewhere but I don't see it. I don't recognize it. What's wrong with getting the entire amount and bonding for that entire amount? And then into a percentage of the ICIP and then splitting it up. Because our bonding capacity is so much greater if we use the entire amount than if you carve off a piece to fund some of the ICIP projects.

MR. GONZALEZ: That's option four, bond everything?

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Well, bond everything and then go into completing some of these projects on the ICIP.

MR. FLORES: We looked at that and one of the issues is time. We would be on hold until we were able to get that bond sold on projects because we would already have this source dedicated to the bond. So any projects that we have out there that we are not fully funded on or new projects, we wouldn't be able to move forward on until we were successfully sold on a bond.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: But you're not leveraging your revenue. You're not maximize the leverage available to you with this revenue.

MR. FLORES: Absolutely, that it is an option.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Because you're spending it on projects and you're underfunding – you're spending it on projects that are underfunded.

MR. FLORES: That are underfunded. Correct. To get them completed. That's something we've been trying to work through is that the projects on the list that remained out there were numerous. We had 23 projects that were sitting out there that didn't have enough money. I think that's an excellent idea to leverage 100 percent of our abilities. However, the timing of being able to move some projects quicker than others until those bonds are sold, that's the only drawback.

MR. GONZALEZ: With option three, although we used as an example a third, a third and a third, it could be – those percentages could be shifted. So maybe you do 20 percent to wipe out existing projects, 10 percent or 20 percent for district by district projects, and then bond the remaining 60 percent.

MR. FLORES: I was just trying to make it a clean cut of three ways to show you an example. But we could do it any fashion of percentages.

COMMISSIONER ANAYA: I think whatever way you think best.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: I think my way is the correct way.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: My way or the highway?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, are you speaking for yourself or for Commissioner Sullivan?

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: I think option three because there's a lot of flexibility. We can deal with a lot of things.

MR. FLORES: Let us do this. Let's pool option three. We'll give you some scenarios of different percentages of a split and what that means and how much that would give us in bonding capacity to be able to service debt, and what projects. And we can bring that up in August and that way it gives you a clearer picture. Then we can retool that thinking on option three.

MR. GONZALEZ: So, for example, we can give you an option that looks at bonding 90 percent of the money, one that looks at bonding 75 percent, one that looks at bonding 50 percent and then using the remainder the way it's here.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Could you also give us the problems involved in bonding 100 percent of it?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: So that we know why we can't do that?

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: A couple other issues. The one sixteenth, we had this discussion in the past that the one sixteenth, we were probably not going to go forward because we wanted to do the one eighth and make sure that is enacted, and if we thought about going with two, then there would be a political resistance. Is that an issue we want to discuss today?

MR. FLORES: I think we can. We've tried to provide the information only on the other enabling legislation.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Because that's an issue that's out there. Gerald, do you want to tell us what you think about that?

MR. GONZALEZ: In terms of imposing the additional one sixteenth?

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: The viability of it. We had thought that it was viable then I think we decided to go with the one eighth, correct?

MR. GONZALEZ: Well, first of all, the one sixteenth, obviously, gives us more flexibility in the budget and it gives us more breathing room in terms of how we operate at the County level. The real question is can that be sold to the electorate. And I think that's part of what the research and polling information was. Intuitively, it's obviously easier to impose one tax than two.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: And we didn't want to destroy our ability to get that.

MR. GONZALEZ: Right. We still have the option down the road of doing it. It's always a timing issue, I think, in terms of the perception of the voters, of what they're getting hit with. I think intuitively the sense is that right now is the appropriate time to do the one eighth that we're doing. The one sixteenth, if we do both simultaneously, may raise more questions and more opposition than simply doing the one eighth. So I guess, intuitively, my recommendation would be to look at the one sixteenth down the road, perhaps even next summer.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: One thing I want to bring up with the County is fuel-efficient buildings. We've talked about this and every time we've raised the issue, we're told by staff, [inaudible] So I think we need to build that in long term. Because fuels are only going to get more expensive. If we build a fuel-efficient building in ten years and we amortize it, we've paid it off and we're making money after that.

MR. GONZALEZ: Tony and I discussed this issue and we've talked about exactly what you're saying. What you build in in terms of efficiency, you have to live with for the life of the building. So we did do an audit –

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, we've actually completed an energy audit of the five downtown facilities and that's something we could look at doing because there are some up front costs that would be incurred to be able to make us more efficient, less usage of our electrical costs especially. We are still working through that to determine how the consultant used his analysis of how much savings and the pay-back time on that audit.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Is that Sardella?

MR. FLORES: No, it was a firm from Rebuild New Mexico. It was out of Energy and Minerals Department. It was the one previous to Sardella.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Are you working with the biomass efforts that we're conducting?

MR. FLORES: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Duran, they've contacted us about getting our information regarding our utility costs, sizes of buildings, number of people, that type of thing. So in that respect, yes.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: To me, it's such an important thing that we think about now because if we don't, we're always going to bail out and in the end we're going to just screw ourselves.

MR. FLORES: I agree with you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: Fuel is going up all the time. It's just getting more and more expensive. And if we don't take care of it up front, we have to have a commitment to fuel efficiency.

MR. FLORES: I think energy efficiency across the board, not just fuel.

CHAIRMAN CAMPOS: I'm saying energy efficiency across the board.

COMMISSIONER DURAN: Are we done?

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you. These are the kind of study sessions we want to continue doing so we keep –

COMMISSIONER DURAN: And during the lunch hour is a perfect time. It's perfect for us.

MR. GONZALEZ: And thanks to Tony and Susan for putting together the handouts.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Campos declared this meeting adjourned at approximately 1:50 p.m.

Approved by:

Board of County Commissioners
Paul Campos, Chairman

Respectfully submitted:
Karen Farrell
Karen Farrell, Commission Reporter

ATTEST TO:

REBECCA BUSTAMANTE
SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK

COUNTY CLERK