

SANTA FE COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL MEETING
March 27, 2019

Anna T. Hamilton, Chair - District 4
Rudy Garcia - District 3
Anna Hansen, Chair - District 2
Ed Moreno - District 5

Henry Roybal, Vice Chair - District 1- excused

SFC CLERK RECORDED 05/03/2019

SANTA FE COUNTY

SPECIAL MEETING

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

March 27, 2019

I. This special meeting of the Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners was called to order at approximately 10:15 p.m. by Chair Anna Hamilton in the Santa Fe County Commission Chambers, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

II. Roll Call

Roll was called by County Clerk Geraldine Salazar and indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present:

Commissioner Anna Hamilton, Chair
Commissioner Rudy Garcia
Commissioner Anna Hansen
Commissioner Ed Moreno

Members Excused:

Commissioner Henry Roybal

III. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Garcia moved to approve the agenda as published. Commissioner Moreno seconded and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

IV: Overview of 20-Year Capital Improvement Planning (CIP) Process

County Manager Katherine Miller stated that the 20-year CIP will serve as the foundation that informs the County's 5-year CIP.

Paul Olafson, Planning Projects Manager, said staff and consultants will present flexible tools that were implemented to develop the 20-year CIP. He introduced Denise Aten and Aaron Sussman from Bohannon Huston, the consultants.

Mr. Sussman said that Bohannon Huston has been working with County staff for over a year in this endeavor. At the core of the project it was important to understand the County's long-term capital needs. There is a need to consider the requirements for future growth, costs associated with maintaining current services, and to contrast the capital needs against anticipated revenue, and then to identify the potential revenue sources, including impact fees. What was built was a methodology that could be applied over

SFC CLERK RECORDED 05/03/2019

time. Baseline assumptions will change over time as needs evolve. Aside from a 20-year CIP, a structure was built to be utilized by staff. The methodology will assist in decision making and developing objective recommendations.

He noted that the County has a robust planning foundation, and cited the Sustainable Growth Management Plan (SGMP) which identifies long-term growth patterns and sustainable development areas, and the Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) which governs land use and identifies levels of service targets. The County's departmental CIPs were included in the "robust" foundation.

Mr. Sussman said Bohannon Huston used all of the County's planning foundations to build a methodology for the 20-year plan. The projects were congregated with the needs of Santa Fe County. Following that, they determined how projects would be evaluated for their merits and needs. Ultimately the process developed the CIP priority list which identifies the projects programmed for the next five years.

The CIP was developed in timeframes: Near-term or years 1-5; Medium-term or years 6-10, and long-term or years 11-20. Those three terms were broken down by financial considerations and further notes/considerations with the near-term projects matching the anticipated revenue.

Analysis for the CIP included reviewing available revenues and spending targets (based on data from 2014-2018) and developed the following assumptions:

- A baseline of \$13.6 million per year – includes all CIPs
- There is a 2 percent annual growth
- Spending targets can be reviewed in the future or adjusted to consider different financial scenarios

Mr. Sussman emphasized that the tool is flexible to accommodate new revenue sources or spending sources.

Most CIP takes place over multiple years. Mr. Sussman noted that the medium- and long-term timeframe spending targets include a 25 percent buffer. The spending target exceeds the projected availability of funds. He said the targets and projected available funds will be revised over time. Twenty-five percent is a typical contingency. He noted that everything is presented in 2018 dollars.

An evaluation process based on the SGMP principles was developed to prioritize projects. The weightings are as follows:

- Provide a safe community – 30 percent
- Promote a sustainable community – 20 percent
- Support a healthy community – 30 percent
- Promote a proficient, transparent and accessible government – 20 percent

Mr. Olafson repeated that the entire tool as well as the weightings are flexible and numbers can be adjusted. The methodology which was developed over the course of the

Bohannan Huston study provides a mechanism that can be replicated over time.

Mr. Sussman identified “basic services” as those that have to be funded first on a year-to-year basis to maintain and provide existing services at current levels.

Starting with a list of basic services from each department, what follow are elected/desired projects. The basic service needs always consume a significant share of the available budget. Within the first five-year period, the basic services consume 61 percent of the budget. The SLDC’s identify service targets were built into the project list of the basic service needs.

Those unfunded projects from year one will move into year two’s eligible project list. The process of identifying new basic services is ongoing as the project list grows.

Mr. Sussman reviewed an interactive spreadsheet tool and demonstrated how different scenarios are examined. The tool accounts for the fact that there are outside funding sources which augment the CIP and updates are recommended every two years with a more comprehensive update occurring every four years. It is also recommended for the CIP development selection process to be built into the departments’ methodology creating project consistency throughout the County. The tool is to be as automated as possible.

Denise Aten, Bohannan Huston, reviewed the impact fee structure and financial analysis. A national level expert reviewed the impact fee analysis. The County’s existing revenue sources include capital outlay gross receipts tax (GRT), approximately 42 percent, property tax, approximately 39 percent and County hold harmless GRT at 19 percent. She explained how average revenue was determined.

The County Fire impact fee was analyzed with that of comparable communities and the amount of money they obtain through impact fee policies. The comparable entities had a combination of impact fees that included water, sewer, drainage, roads, parks, police and fire. Impact fees are applied on a per unit basis and for commercial it is by square footage. Typically the developer pays the fee. Impact fees apply to future residents, regulated by the state and can only be used to address infrastructure needed for new development.

The formula to determine the expected revenue impact fee is based on the expectations around growth. The CIP plan proposes the infusion of potential impact fee revenue forecast over a 10- to 20-year period. Taking an average of the comparable communities and applying the average impact fee (less Fire) there is a potential gain by 2020 the County will have collected \$921,000 annually. Between 2020 and 2030, the fees will be between \$1.2 million up to \$1.7 million annually. It is a tangible amount of money that could be used to apply directly to new growth within Santa Fe County.

Commissioner Hansen noted that the County has not experienced much growth

since 2008. Ms. Aten said that without the growth the needs will be reduced and she added that impact fees can only be used for growth. Mr. Olafson said impact fees would be another tool in the box to address new growth needs.

Ms. Miller pointed out that the County's water and sewer includes a connection fee that is comparable to an impact fee.

The Public Improvement Districts and the TIDDs (tax increment for development district) are location-specific alternative revenue sources. Those would be collected and applied based on locational boundaries. These are typically done by the developers to fund their own public improvement districts. Some of the specific requirements to impose impact fees defined within the State's Development Fees Act have been met within the SGMP.

Ms. Miller said the 20-year CIP provides a strong planning tool. The steps for impact fees are provided to determine whether to move forward with the idea. This all ties into the overall ICIP (infrastructure capital improvement plan) process.

Mr. Sussman pointed out that the study attempts to show the County's needs, the cost associated with those needs, available revenue, the substantial gap between the needs and revenues and to emphasize that the gap does not shrink over time.

Available revenue options include impact fees. The next step would be to determine how impact fees would specifically function within Santa Fe County and to determine the level of needs, the available revenue and how to meet the County's needs going forward.

Ms. Miller said impact fees have been an underlying component of the SGMP and SLDC. Impact fees would provide an additional revenue stream supplementing CIP.

Mr. Sussman said the full set of the long-term wish list projects conservatively totaled \$500,000,000+ and does not fully address basic service project needs because they are not well defined beyond the first 5 to 7 years.

Mr. Olafson said the 20-year CIP is identified in the SGMP and SLDC as a task that should be accomplished. The impact fees are envisioned as future revenue but are not mandatory. The CIP is mandatory. Referring to the annual ICIP which is submitted to the state, Mr. Olafson stated that the County receives input from the residents to develop priorities. Simultaneously, the County has a five-year capital planning process which is an internal document for planning purposes. Staff reviews the ICIP and CIP lists annually. He reviewed the proposed capital planning framework which will take the CIP from the current process and evolve it into the 20-year process. At the five-year level the project is proposed, reviewed, scoped, scheduled, ranked, capacity determined, budget proposed and lastly approved by the BCC. The process is qualitative and quantitative. He noted the cycling of reviews is timed to coincide with ICIP scheduling and the budget

process.

Ms. Miller reminded the Commission of non-profit organizations that, mid-way through the legislative session, request that the County manage a project. She emphasized that staff time is an issue when managing a project. As an example, managing a \$1.5 million project will take an FTE 20 hours a week for a year, thus requiring that something the County planned for has to roll over to the next year. In 2008/09, the County passed a resolution requiring entities desiring the County to serve as fiscal agent go through a process. The state had little money in the interim and no one came forward. Now that there is money, the County wants to create a process for the future. The process would provide the County the opportunity to weigh a decision against other priorities.

There was Commission consensus that having a formal process for accepting the fiscal agent responsibility was a wise move. Ms. Miller recommended developing a process and adopting it through resolution.

The CIP projects are the County's proposals within a 20-year window. The ICIP is a state-required plan for submission to the legislature to consider for funding through the capital outlay process. Can the CIP process serve as the ICIP for submittal to the legislature? Can ICIP be placed in the CIP? Ms. Miller said the goal could be for the five-year plan to include non-profits. She recalled in the past any item brought forward for the ICIP by the public was included on the ICIP list. If an evaluation process is developed and a resolution enacted, the ICIP submitted to the legislature will be planned and reviewed by the Commission as priorities. Items can also be listed for "preliminary engineering studies" for a project.

Commissioner Moreno said the County needs to be in the driver's seat in regards to its lobbyist. Having control of the process and the ability to say no to serving as fiscal agent is important.

Chair Hamilton said this proposed 20-year capital improvement planning process should provide the County a great deal more information and justification behind its projects and perhaps shift the balance on legislators' pet projects.

V. Overview of Santa Fe County Capital Planning Process

Mr. Sussman said the projects are organized by categories and structured with ranking. The tool looks at the year the project was proposed and identifies the basic service projects, the costs of those projects, and the remaining amount and which projects could be funded with that amount, and building that out from year to year. In 2020 there are more projects than funding available. He reviewed the rankings of projects using the evaluation process, as the foundation projects can be ranked for different years.

Mr. Olafson said the tool is meant to be open and transparent with a rationale for how projects are evaluated.

[The Commission recessed from 12:20 to 1:05]

VI. Review of Current Capital Projects

[Exhibit 1: Vertical, Open Space and Trails Project Status; Exhibit 2: Roads and Utilities Capital Projects]

Ms. Miller said staff will review each of the current CIP projects, identifying current status, funds needed to complete the project, project budget, available budget, recommended repurposing project, and estimated total costs. The projects were colored, indicating those with adequate funding, cost issues, those that are not moving forward, and those recently completed. Money is not the only resource lacking in projects, rather staff capacity in projects, purchasing, legal and finance to move a project forward. Staff will request feedback on projects. Projects shown in green have enough funding and staff capacity to complete whatever phase they are in.

Ms. Miller discussed “scope creep” and the importance of defining a project and holding to it. When projects are enlarged during design and/or construction staff needs to return to the BCC for additional funding.

Public Works Director Mike Kelley, Utilities Director John Dupuis, Deputy Public Works Director Robert Martinez, Project Engineer Diego Gomez and Projects Division Director Russell Naranjo were present, as well as Deputy Manager Tony Flores to discuss each of the projects.

Commissioner Hansen reminded staff of the Commission’s commitment to solarization of County-owned buildings. Ms. Miller said one of the goals of the strategic plan under sustainability is to conduct an energy audit of County facilities. A contract will be awarded to an energy consultant once the facilities are identified.

Regarding the Agua Fria/La Tierra Fire Station, Chief Sperling said this is an apparatus bay addition to La Tierra. It is anticipated that the City will be building a new station in close proximity to the Agua Fria station. Additional funding will come from the Agua Fria Fire District Funds as well as impact fees. He said the project will probably begin in 2021 and be internally funded. Ms. Miller said the Fire Department has several different funding sources. She mentioned the difficulties in accumulating enough money for each of the 14 districts to accomplish a project.

Ms. Miller said staff is preparing a list of all of the County’s facilities identifying utility bills and which ones have solar. The highest use ones will be considered for solarization first. How to best use the energy audit and existing funds will be considered.

SFC CLERK RECORDED 05/03/2019

Regarding the Jacona land grant situation, Ms. Miller said the County has been seeking to acquire 10 to 20 acres in the land grant to build a transfer station and fire substation. Originally, the County leased the land for quite a bit of money. An estimate to build the facilities came in over budget because it required a great deal of earthwork and it was determined it was too much money to invest in leased property. The grantees were expected to provide a well with water rights which has not materialized. The County broke the lease with a request to purchase the property. Apparently some of the grantees have approached Commissioner Roybal interested in selling.

Chief Sperling said the main Chimayo Fire Station was to have an apparatus bay and storage added to it; however, during the design phase it was discovered the station is within the 75-foot setback from the arroyo. In order to proceed with the project a stabilization of the bank is required which costs \$133,000 as well as design work. This was not anticipated in the original budget. The Turquoise Trail Fire Station in Cerrillos received \$1.2 million from the 2016 bond issue and Fire Department money, but due to construction cost increases, the square footage cost now exceeds the available budget. The project included PNM lines, water line and Century Link which will serve the future community services facility on the same site. The shortfall is currently estimated at \$250,000. The Madrid Fire Station expansion uses entirely Fire Department resources, but because of square footage cost, came in over \$500 making the project short \$150,000. Adding the shortfalls of the three projects equaled \$550,000. The projects are each well into design phase. He suggested that using \$550,000 from the \$1.2 million slated for the Jacona Substation. Once property is secured for Jacona, the earthwork could be completed, and at a future bond issue funding, could be obtained.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned that “architect and engineer creep” also occurs.

The Hondo Fire Station 2 lacks adequate funding and will be postponed until such funding is located. Regarding Eldorado Fire Station 2, Chief Sperling said the facility lacks water service and either a well or a water line is required – both solutions exceedingly expensive. The money for that project will be repurposed to Edgewood station 3.

A discussion regarding ADA requirements at fire stations ensued and Mr. Naranjo said that as community buildings are sometimes utilized as safe havens, handicapped ramps and restroom accessibility is required. Commissioner Garcia recalled that former Fire Chief Holden received ADA variances from CID for fire stations. Mr. Naranjo said he would review the situation with CID.

Referring to South Meadows park/open space, Ms. Miller said that while the City annexed the area they did not want to take over the park, although they did agree to take over maintenance and ownership of some of the River Trail. The County does not have the funds to make major improvements. The space is entirely fenced and designated as open space through bond money.

Mr. Kelley reviewed the completed projects and suggestions for repurposing remaining funds from those projects.

Mr. Kelley reviewed the road and utilities capital projects and noted that the Village of Agua Fria Wastewater infrastructure project is a multiphase project. The amount the master plan identified was subtracted out the current funding and indexed out over a 10-year period with an estimated \$11.5 million in additional funding required. Commissioner Hansen said Senator Nancy Rodriguez reauthorized money and the relocation of water lines for this project.

Three projects in the Sunlit Hills Subdivision (Paseo del Pinon, Camino Tetzoco and Camino Pacifico) all contain private utilities facilities. The facilities would need to be relocated. Mr. Martinez said it is a risk for staff to continue with the projects because Sunlit Hills' water lines are in conflict with the road construction, and the depth of the water lines raises concerns. Staff recommends not moving forward with the projects. There is an ordinance that requires utilities to move lines; however, the Sunlit Hills Water Association does not have the resources to relocate the lines.

Referring to CR 50A, Camino San Jose, Mr. Gomez said that this is a project which has experienced "scope creep." The funding allocation is not sufficient. The project has drainage issues and easements will be necessary. He mentioned that once the road is paved, problems can no longer be addressed by grading. The project is 30 percent designed, and at this point is on hold while the County determines whether additional funding should be identified or the project halted. This road fronts the La Cienega Senior Center.

Ms. Miller said the CIP process discussed earlier will ensure that projects are not altered at the last minute without preparing and without thinking how it will be achieved. When the project is listed on a bond it is important that the County do what it said it will do.

Regarding the projects that have been completed and have remaining funds, Mr. Kelley noted some funds have been recommended for General Goodwin Road and the Nancy Rodriguez driveway improvement. Mr. Martinez pointed out that the completed projects on the list are not inclusive of all completed projects.

VII. Next Steps

Ms. Miller asked the Commissioners to review the projects and determine if there are any that they would like further public input on, or perhaps repurposing funds for.

The CIP process will be further refined by staff and brought back to the Commission for its action. From that point, staff will begin preparing the next CIP cycle to include a bond question for 2020.

In response to Commissioner Garcia's request, Mr. Flores provided an overview of the design-build process and how it benefits the County. The process does not remove any control from the County. Design-build is similar to running a project in the private sector with the owner having control from beginning to end. Design-build is only as good as its implementation team.

Purchasing Director Bill Taylor pointed out that the big difference between the traditional design, bid, build method is that the liability is with the owner; the design-build moves the liability to the design-build team. The design-build team has to perform and deliver the project based on the budget and performance requirements set forth.

VIII. Adjournment

Chair Hamilton declared this meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Approved by:

Anna Hamilton
Board of County Commissioners
Anna Hamilton, Chair

ATTEST TO:

Geraldine Salazar
GERALDINE SALAZAR
SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK



SFC CLERK RECORDED 05/03/2019

SFC CLERK RECORDED 05/03/2019

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Farrell
Karen Farrell, Wordswork
453 Cerrillos Road
Santa Fe, NM 87501

COUNTY OF SANTA FE)
STATE OF NEW MEXICO) ss

BCC MINUTES
PAGES: 17

I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for
Record On The 3RD Day Of May, 2019 at 09:00:31 AM
And Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 1885357
Of The Records Of Santa Fe County



Witness My Hand And Seal Of Office
Geraldine Salazar
Deputy County Clerk, Santa Fe, NM

Estrella Martinez

Vertical, Open Space and Trails
Project Status

Project Name	Current Status	Comm District	Needed Funds for Current Phase	Project Budget	Available Budget (Unencumbered)	Recommend Repurposing Project	Remaining Funds Available for Repurposing	Total Estimated Project Cost for Future Phases	Notes
1 Bennie J. Chavez Park	Design Development Phase	1	NO	\$259,000.00	\$214,688.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Implementing design.
2 Abedon Lopez Remodel	Design	1	NO	\$200,000.00	\$164,434.34	NO	NA	\$0.00	Currently being reviewed by SFC Land Use for TAC requirements. Scheduled to be approved mid to late March 2019.
3 La Puebla Station #1	Design	1	NO	\$1,620,954.00	\$1,498,901.41	NO	NA	\$0.00	
4 Romero Park Phase II	Schematic Phase	2	NO	\$3,725,351.00	\$2,122,195.00	NO	NA	\$10,272,000.00	Received direction from CM on revised design SOW on 1/29/19. Revising design. In 2014, the master plan for the facility indicates that a total cost of \$11,950,000 was required for the total project. Since that time, \$3,725,000 has been budgeted to the project and Phase 1 has been completed. This leaves \$8,225,000 for future needs. Indexing \$8,225,000 for ten years at 2.5% indicates that \$10,272,000 is required for the completion of the elements identified in the master plan.
5 Santa Fe River Greenway "B" Acquisitions	Acquisition	2	NO	\$1,264,202.85	\$0.00	NO	NA		ROW acquisition is ongoing.
6 Santa Fe River Greenway-Frenchy's Field to Slier Bridge- Pre Flood	Project Close Out	2	NO	\$4,129,316.54	\$0.00	NO	NA		Project Closeout.
7 Santa Fe River Greenway-Frenchy's Field to Slier Bridge- Post Flood	Project Close Out	2	NO	\$635,091.95	\$0.00	NO	NA		Project Closeout.
8 Santa Fe River Greenway Acquisition of BLM Parcels in Section "C"	Acquisition	2	NO	\$31,651.83	\$0.00	NO	NA		All requested information submitted to BLM. Working on Arch Study and NEPA.
9 Agua Fria/La Tierra Fire Station		2	NO	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
10 Thornton Ranch Open Space Master Plan Implementation	Environmental Clearances	3	NO	\$9,194,564.00	\$2,455,713.82	NO	NA	\$4,870,000.00	Targeting National Trails Day 2021 for grand opening. Master plan has identified approximately \$6,500,000 for masterplan buildout. Currently \$2,600,576 is budgeted. This leaves \$3,900,000 for project buildout. Indexing \$3,900,000 for ten years at 2.5% yields \$4,876,000 for total buildout of the master plan. \$593,988 previously spent on master plan.
11 Edgewood Fire Station #1		3	NO	\$85,000.00	\$31,475.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
12 Edgewood Senior Center ADA Improvements	Construction	3	NO	\$165,206.02	\$84.68	NO	NA	\$0.00	A pre-construction meeting was held on March 7, 2019. Construction is scheduled to begin on March 27, 2019.
13 Turquoise Trail Station	Design	3		\$75,000.00	\$0.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
14 Turquoise Trail Fire Station #2-ADA Improvements	Construction	3	NO	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Documents requesting a P. O. from Purchasing were submitted to SFC Fire Dept. on March 7, 2019.
15 East Mountain Healthcare Facility	Project Close Out	3	NO	\$5,273,415.00	\$0.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	

**Vertical, Open Space and Trails
Project Status**

	Project Name	Current Status	Comm District	Needed Funds for Current Phase	Project Budget	Available Budget (Unencumbered)	Recommend Repurposing Project	Remaining Funds Available for Repurposing	Total Estimated Project Cost for Future Phases	Notes
16	Design and Construct El Camino Real Buckman Road Segment Retracement Trail	Project Close Out	2,3	NO	\$632,514.41	\$0.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Pending final invoice from FHWA to close out project. \$632,514.41 was the County match that leveraged the federal funding for the trail.
17	Gallisteo Fire re-stucco	Design	3	NO	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Hold until Spring
18	Eldorado Main Station (FS #1)	Bidding & Negotiations Phase	4	NO	\$745,716.00	\$667,416.30	NO	NA	\$0.00	
19	Arroyo Hondo Trail Segment 2	Design	5	NO	\$76,390.00	\$0.00	NO	NA		
20	Santa Fe Rail Trail Segment 5	Bidding & Negotiations Phase	5	NO	\$526,040.69	\$89,818.98	NO	NA		
21	El Dorado Trail Maint.	Bidding & Negotiations Phase	5	NO	\$160,000.00	\$160,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Avenida Vista Grande. Bid via the on call construction price agreement.
22	Leo Gurule Park	Design	5	NO	\$80,000.00	\$63,707.37	NO	NA	\$0.00	A public meeting will be held to determine future plans for the park in absence of the basketball court and tennis court
23	Public Safety Security Upgrades	Construction	5	NO	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Security Cameras. Work began on 3/20/19
24	Public Safety Complex Upgrades (RECC)	Design Build	1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$4,577,120.00	\$4,243,037.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Meeting held to determine procurement method. It has been agreed that a design build approach will be used for this project.
25	Santa Fe Rail Trail Trailheads	Final Design Phase	4,5	NO	\$140,000.00	\$121,336.71	NO	NA		Plan to start construction after Santa Fe Rail Trail Segment 5 construction is completed so that the Avenida Eldorado trailhead location can be used as the staging area for construction of Segment 5.
26	Behavioral Health Triage Center	Design Build	1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$2,200,000.00	\$2,200,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
27	Public Works Expansion PH II - property control bldg.	Construction	1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$2,390,167.58	\$256,071.87	NO	NA	\$0.00	Construction began the week on March 18, 2019.
28	Admin Building Upgrade	Design Build	1,2,3,4,5	NO			NO	NA	\$0.00	
29	Grant Street Complex (CAO)	Design Build	1,2,3,4,5	NO			NO	NA	\$0.00	
30	Adult Detention Center Roof	Construction	1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$5,250,012.22	\$1,250,012.22	NO	NA	\$0.00	A contract extension has been issued for National Roof extending the contract till May 31, 2019.
31	Solarize Other Santa Fe Facilities		1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$250,000.00	\$130,141.80	NO	NA	\$500,000.00	Spent \$4,613 for Edgewood, \$44,530 for NRCC, \$8,057 Nambe SWCC. The remaining is encumbered for El Dorado Center.
32	Pojoaque Valley Recreation Complex Phase III	Bidding & Negotiations Phase	1	NO	\$1,545,055.49	\$240,255.60	NO	NA	\$0.00	In for development permit review and issuance. Change of ownership form submitted to OSE.

**Vertical, Open Space and Trails
Project Status**

Project Name	Current Status	Comm District	Needed Funds for Current Phase	Project Budget	Available Budget (Unencumbered)	Recommend Repurposing Project	Remaining Funds Available for Repurposing	Total Estimated Project Cost for Future Phases	Notes
33 Rio En Medio Senior Center		1	NO	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	YES	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	Road Maintenance addressed the drainage so project is no longer required.
34 Chimayo Fire Station- Main	Design	1	\$133,000.00	\$607,423.29	\$529,177.44	NO	NA	\$0.00	
35 Tesuque Fire Station- Existing Retaining Wall Repair	Design	1	\$45,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	\$133,000 needed for a bank stabilization in the Arroyo adjacent to the project issued NTP to Surveyor for Topographic Map. On 2.25.2019, Topo should be delivered late March 2019.
36 Agua Fria Gateway		2	\$47,490.00	\$100,000.00	\$12,510.27	NO	NA	\$0.00	\$47,490 needed for second monument sign.
37 Soccer Complex at MRC		2	NO	\$500,000.00	\$500,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
38 La Cienega Community Center Parking Lot	Design	3	NO	\$65,807.00	\$65,807.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Attempting to obtain drainage easement from adjacent property owner.
39 Turquoise Trail Fire Station in Cerrillos	Design	3	\$132,058.00	\$1,375,318.38	\$1,274,645.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
40 Madrid Fire Station Expansion	Design	3	\$150,000.00	\$461,367.60	\$422,803.06	NO	NA	\$0.00	Pending on a decision from SFC Fire Dept. on when to forward with an IFB. Decision is based on securing additional funding needed.
41 Hwy 14 Senior/Community Center	Design	3	NO	\$2,100,000.00	\$1,854,621.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	On hold pending receipt on Legislative Funds.
42 Edgewood Fire Station #3 ADA Improvements	Construction	3	\$35,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	As per the SFC Fire Dept. project has been put on hold until further notice based on the lack of sufficient funding.
43 Arroyo Hondo Trail Segment 4	Bidding & Negotiations Phase	5	\$225,000.00	\$1,447,539.80	\$77,339.28	NO	NA	\$0.00	Bids are due on 4/4/19. Potential Shortfall depending on bids.
44 Eldorado Trail Project between Avenida Buena Ventura and Chusco Road	Design	5	NO	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
45 District Attorney Complex ADA & office upgrades	Design	1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$1,842,152.00	\$1,690,000.85	NO	NA	\$0.00	DA has requested funding from the Legislature for relocation expenses. Pending outcome of legislative request.
46 Northern SFC (Chavez) Station	Acquisition		NO	\$2,991,232.00	\$2,831,979.20	NO	NA	\$0.00	Proposition held pending alternative location for facility
47 District Attorney Complex ADA	On Hold		NO	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,200,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	As per the SFC Fire Dept. project is off hold until further notice because of the lack of funding.
48 District Attorney Complex ADA	Acquisition		NO	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,200,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	As per the SFC Fire Dept. project is off hold until further notice because of the lack of funding.
49 District Attorney Complex ADA	Acquisition		NO	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,200,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	As per the SFC Fire Dept. project is off hold until further notice because of the lack of funding.
50 District Attorney Complex ADA	Acquisition		NO	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,200,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	As per the SFC Fire Dept. project is off hold until further notice because of the lack of funding.
51 District Attorney Complex ADA	Acquisition		NO	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,200,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	As per the SFC Fire Dept. project is off hold until further notice because of the lack of funding.
52 Ramirez Chavez Comm. Center	Complete	1	NO	\$80,000.00	\$13,988.50	NO	\$13,988.50	\$0.00	Project is complete and closed out.
53 Stanley Cyclone Center	Complete	3	NO	\$1,243,539.36	\$5,600.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Project is complete and closed out.
54 Lakewood Fire Station #2	Complete	8	NO	\$65,000.00	\$29,151.00	NO	\$29,151.00	\$0.00	Project is complete and closed out.

**Vertical, Open Space and Trails
Project Status**

	Project Name	Current Status	Comm District	Needed Funds for Current Phase	Project Budget	Available Budget (Unencumbered)	Recommend Repurposing Project	Remaining Funds Available for Repurposing	Total Estimated Project Cost for Future Phases	Notes
55	Santa Fe County Fairgrounds	Complete	5	NO	\$1,600,000.00	\$99,020.00	NO	\$99,020.00	\$0.00	Remaining budget to be put toward solar installation at the Fairgrounds.
56	Glorieta/E. Dorado SR Center	Complete	5	NO	\$1,776,495.00	\$22,282.00	NO	\$22,282.00	\$0.00	Project is complete and closed out.
57	Los Potreros Open Space	Complete	3	NO	\$388,033.00	\$8,857.60	NO	NA	\$0.00	Not an active project. Growth Mgmt. is using the remaining funds for resource management.
58	Youth Development Facility	Complete	1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$381,649.17	\$6,973.03	NO	NA	\$0.00	Project is complete and closed out.
59	Nancy Rodriguez Center	Complete	2	NO	\$300,000.00	\$4,948.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Requesting to use the remaining funds toward improving the driveway entrance on Caja Del Oro.

Road and Utilities Capital Projects

Project Name	Current Status	Comm District	Needed Funds for Current Phase	Current Project Budget	Available Budget (Unencumbered)	Recommend Repurposing Project	Remaining Funds Available for Repurposing	Total Estimated Project Cost for Future Phases	Notes
1 Bridge Rte 101 on CR72A	Construction	1	NO	\$436,897.00	\$828.56	NO	NA	\$0.00	BCC Approved the Construction Contract Award on 2/12/19.
2 Chupadero MDCWA	Design	1	NO	\$514,582.00	\$589.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	The Mutual Domestic has bid the well for construction. The preconstruction meeting will be held on 3/29/19.
3 Greater Chimsayo MDCWA	Acquisition	1	NO	\$1,165,000.00	\$128,266.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	\$128,266 is unencumbered on the project. The Mutual Domestic is pursuing water rights purchase with the remaining funds.
4 CR 84 & Arroyo Jacobs Low Water Crossing	Design	1	NO	\$249,016.75	\$249,016.75	NO	NA	\$0.00	The FEMA grant agreement has been extended. County staff has completed the design and scope of work and is currently working on acquiring 401, 404 and Pojoracque Pueblo Permits. Plan on utilizing the on-call road construction price agreement to construct this project. Construction estimated to be completed June 30, 2019.
5 PER Lopez Lane Sidewalks	Procurement	2	NO	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	NO	NA	TBD by PER	Received funding 1/29/19. Working on creating scope of work. The PER will provide an estimate for the total estimated project cost.
6 Vista Aurora Sewer System	Construction	2	NO	\$894,000.00	\$319,534.57	NO	NA	\$0.00	Gandy Dancer was selected as the Lowest Qualified Bid for the construction of this project. Notice to Proceed was issued on March 8, 2019. Recommend repurposing any funds that are remaining after project completion.
7 Village of Agua Fria Wastewater Infrastructure (Includes Antonio Lane)	Design	2	NO	\$1,050,000.00	\$678,683.23	NO	NA	\$11,520,000.00	This is a multiphase project with an estimated cost of \$10,000,000. The Notice to Proceed was issued on March 1, 2019 on the current phase. The Agua Fria Utility Infrastructure Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) identified \$10 Million in total infrastructure cost. \$1,050,000 has been budgeted. This includes the design on Antonio Lane Sewer. Morris Surveying & Engineering has submitted 60% design for Antonio Lane including the remaining \$9,000,000 for ten years at 2.5% estimates that \$11,520,000 is needed in additional funding.
8 Phase 2A Road Annexation		2	NO	\$725,000.00	\$725,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	West Alameda Drainage Improvements.
9 Torcido Loop	Construction	3	NO	\$1,272,000.00	\$88,721.51	NO	NA	\$0.00	Construction Contract was approved by the BCC on 2/26/19.019. \$212,882.00 BAPed from Torcido Loop to Racetrack.
10 Race Track	Construction	3	NO	\$780,016.00	\$1,417.76	NO	NA	\$0.00	Construction Contract was approved by the BCC on 2/26/19. \$212,882.00 BAPed from Torcido Loop to Racetrack. \$1,417.76 need to be rebudgeted it was in a prior year PO.
11 Los Pinos Road AWC at Arroyo de los Chamsicos	Project Close Out	3	NO	\$1,576,949.00	\$85,308.90	NO	NA	\$0.00	Substantial Completion was reached on 2/28/19. Project is entering the punchout/closeout phase.
12 West Sector Utility Improvements	Construction	3	NO	\$160,000.00	\$126,926.38	NO	NA	\$0.00	Connection of the PW Facility to the BDD Water Main. Funds are also for the reimbursement of the upsizing cost for the Senior Campus Lift Station and Force Main.
13 CR67F La Barbara Drainage and Road Paving	Construction	4	NO	\$1,642,000.00	\$263,129.72	NO	NA	\$0.00	Construction began on October 15, 2018. Contractor has completed raising the road to the subgrade elevation shown on the plans. Contractor is currently working on installing the drainage structures. The project has a mandatory completion date of June 30, 2019. A change order is in process to construct the last phase of the project. The change order will consume the available budget of \$263,129.72. Anticipate the Change Order going to the BCC for approval on 3/26/19.
14 Hyde Park Estates	Acquisition	4	NO	\$77,303.00	\$71,403.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
15 Balise Road Paving and Drainage Improvements	Construction	4	NO	\$480,000.00	\$1.79	NO	NA	\$0.00	County Staff has completed the design and the scope of work. Submitted PPP and IPR to procurement. Plan on utilizing the on-call road construction price agreement to construct this project. Construction estimated to be completed summer of 2019. A public meeting has been scheduled for 2/20/19 in El Dorado.

SEC. CLERK RECORDED 05/03/2019

Road and Utilities Capital Projects

Project Name	Current Status	Comm District	Needed Funds for Current Phase	Current Project Budget	Available Budget (Unencumbered)	Recommend Repurposing Project	Remaining Funds Available for Repurposing	Total Estimated Project Cost for Future Phases	Notes
16 Rancho Viejo Water Service Improvements	Design	5	NO	\$900,000.00	\$837,637.06	NO	NA	\$0.00	HDR Engineering has been awarded the Engineering Design Services Agreement. Notice to Proceed was issued on February 21, 2019.
17 Canonicito Regional Water Phase II	Design	4	NO	\$2,593,159.00	\$2,389,871.81	NO	NA	\$0.00	This project will be combined as a Sole Source Procurement with the Canonicito Eldorado Waterline Project. \$1,632,000 of \$2,593,159 is Water Trust Board Grant. Negotiations with the Engineering Firm are on going.
18 Water Reclamation Facility	Design/Build	1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$9,245,177.00	\$942,539.50	NO	NA	\$0.00	The design/build contract was approved by the BCC on 1/29/19 with Integrated Water Services. Notice to Proceed issued on February 27, 2019.
19 NE/SE Connector	Design	4, 5	NO	\$11,522,491.00	\$9,812,821.70	NO	NA	\$0.00	Engineering Design Contract was approved at BCC Meeting on January 8, 2019. Staff has issued a notice to proceed to Consultant. Design Kick off meeting scheduled for February 7, 2019. \$514,193 spent to-date on Phase A, B & C alignment study.
20 SCADA Core Development	Scope Development	1,2,3,4,5	NO	\$300,000.00	\$300,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	
21 T16S & Canonicito Eldorado Water Line & Canonicito Connection	Bidding/Negotiations	4, 5	NO	\$9,681,436.00	\$8,011,487.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Project is in the cost negotiation phase of the procurement for engineering design services. The Current Amount Spent includes \$613,590 for design of T16S Transmission Line and \$514,172 for the design of the Lamy Junction Line.
22 CR 88B	Bidding/Negotiations	1	\$20,000.00	\$120,000.00	\$120,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Only received one bid via the on call road agreement. The one bid was over budget.
23 PBRWS	Design	1	\$4,703,528.00	\$5,496,472.00	\$5,075,003.00	NO	NA	\$24,000,000.00	Through the County cost share agreement, the County's indexed amount for the PBRWS is \$10,200,000. \$24,000,000 for future water line extensions.
24 CR 55A General Goodwin Rd Design Upgrade	Design	3	\$200,000.00	\$3,500,000.00	\$3,255,857.28	NO	NA	\$0.00	County staff has received the revised 100% plans and is in the process of reviewing the plans. Coordinating with MMDOT for a maintenance easement along NM 14. The drainage easement along the railroad right of way has been accepted by MMDOT and the County. The maintenance agreement and drainage easements are required by MMDOT for improvements within the MMDOT right of way. Additional funding may be required for acquisition of a drainage easement.
25 Los Pinos Road AWC at Arroyo Hondo	Design	3	\$2,000,000.00	\$186,727.27	\$0.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Engineering Consultant has completed the preliminary drainage report. Coordinating Temporary Work Permits and ROW easements with Pojoaque Pueblo. Additional funding required for construction. \$2,000,000 is needed. Staff would request that this be considered in the next GOB cycle.
26 Paseo Del Pinon	Design	4	NO	\$410,000.00	\$410,000.00	NO	\$116,000.00	\$0.00	County Staff has completed the design and the scope of work. Camino Pacifico, Paseo Del Pinon, Camino Tezocco and Toltec will go out to bid as one project. In the process of submitting IPR and PPR to procurement for an IFB for Construction. Construction estimated to be completed fall of 2019. Staff requesting to reduce the budget amount by \$116,000 and apply \$84,844 to Camino Pacifico and \$31,156 to Toltec Road. A private water system existing on this road may conflict with the new construction. Water system may need to be relocated prior to construction.
27 Camino Tezocco	Design	4	NO	\$252,000.00	\$252,000.00	NO	\$18,844.00	\$0.00	County Staff has completed the design and the scope of work. Camino Pacifico, Paseo Del Pinon, Camino Tezocco and Toltec will go out to bid as one project. In the process of submitting IPR and PPR to procurement for an IFB for Construction. Construction estimated to be completed fall of 2019. Staff is requesting to reduce the budget amount by \$18,844 and apply this amount to Toltec Road. A private water system existing on this road may conflict with the new construction. Water system may need to be relocated prior to construction.

Road and Utilities Capital Projects

Project Name	Current Status	Comm District	Needed Funds for Current Phase	Current Project Budget	Available Budget (Unencumbered)	Recommend Repurposing Project	Remaining Funds Available for Repurposing	Total Estimated Project Cost for Future Phases	Notes
28 Camino Pacifico	Design	4	\$340,844.00	\$168,156.00	\$168,156.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	County Staff has completed the design and the scope of work. Camino Pacifico, Paseo Del Pinon, Camino Tezcoco and Toltec will go out to bid as one project. In the process of submitting IPR and PPR to procurement for an IFB for Construction. Construction estimated to be completed fall of 2019. \$340,844 (\$84,844 from Paseo Del Pinon & \$256,000 from Camino Sudeste) is needed. A private water system existing on this road may conflict with the new construction. Water system may need to be relocated prior to construction.
29 Toltec Road	Design	4	\$161,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	County Staff has completed the design and the scope of work. Camino Pacifico, Paseo Del Pinon, Camino Tezcoco and Toltec will go out to bid as one project. In the process of submitting IPR and PPR to procurement for an IFB for Construction. Construction estimated to be completed fall of 2019. \$120,000 was to be intended to be budgeted to this project but only \$12,000 was budgeted. It was discussed that the shortfall was inadvertently place in the NE/SE Connector project. A total of \$173,000 is needed.
30 County Road 89	Acquisition	1	NO	\$1,069,995.00	\$1,014,869.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	On hold pending the completion of the survey in Pojoaque Pueblo.
31 County Road 89C	Acquisition	1	NO	\$1,052,137.00	\$930,751.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	On hold pending the completion of the survey in Pojoaque Pueblo.
32 Pineda Hills	Completed	3	NO	\$0.00	\$31,577.40	NO	\$31,577.40	\$0.00	Remaining funds to be allocated to driveway improvements at the Nancy Robinson Center
33 White Lanes Road	Completed	4	NO	\$0.00	\$0.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Project is completed and closed out.
34 Araya Road	Completed	3	NO	\$0.00	\$97,824.00	NO	\$97,824.00	\$0.00	Remaining funds to be allocated to Central Community Road
35 Drake Road	Completed	3	NO	\$0.00	\$2,405.00	NO	\$2,405.00	\$0.00	Remaining funds to be allocated to Central Community Road
36 CR 15 and Pecos Road	Completed	3	NO	\$0.00	\$3,233.00	NO	\$3,233.00	\$0.00	Remaining funds to be allocated to Central Community Road
37 Kingson Pass	Completed	1	NO	\$0.00	\$1,031.00	NO	\$1,031.00	\$0.00	Remaining funds to be allocated to Central Community Road
38 Highway 28 San Antonio	Completed	1	NO	\$0.00	\$915.00	NO	NA	\$0.00	Remaining funds to be allocated to Central Community Road
39 CR 507 East of La Cienega	Completed	3	NO	\$0.00	\$157,544.16	NO	\$157,544.16	\$0.00	Project is complete and closed out
40 Glenview Estates Road	Completed	4	NO	\$0.00	\$19,841.00	NO	\$19,841.00	\$0.00	Project is complete and closed out