SANTA FE COUNTY

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

SPECIAL MEETING

June 26, 2026

Justin Greene, Chair - District 1
Adam Johnson, Vice Chair - District 4
Camilla Bustamante - District 3
Hank Hughes - District 5
Lisa Cacari Stone - District 2

SANTA FE COUNTY

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

SPECIAL MEETING

June 26, 2026

1. A. This regular meeting of the Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners was called to order at approximately 2:00 p.m. by Chair Justin Greene in the County Commission Chambers, 102 Grant Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

B. Roll Call

Roll was called by Keleb McGuire of the County Clerk's Office, and indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

Members Present:
Commissioner Justin Greene, Chair
Commissioner Adam Johnson, Vice Chair
Commissioner Camilla Bustamante
Commissioner Hank Hughes
Commissioner Lisa Cacari Stone [participated virtually for the first 15 minutes and then in person]

Members Excused:
None

C. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Johnson moved to approve as published. Commissioner Bustamante seconded and the motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

2. FY 2027 Capital and Maintenance Project Budget

A. Presentation and Discussion of Potential Fiscal Year 2027 Capital and Maintenance Projects Budget and Five-Year Capital and Maintenance Plan

GREG SHAFFER (County Manager): Thank you Chair and Commissioners. And I want to start out by thanking both the Finance team, Public Works team, as well as the Planning team who've worked hard to put together in front of you. a five-year capital and maintenance budget. We think as we'll get into details shortly, that this is a significant step forward relative to the robustness of the County's budget planning process where you can actually look forward and see both maintenance projects as well as two projects that the Board has committed to are slated to be funded looking out over a five-year capital planning horizon based upon what we anticipate to be reasonably available resources within our control.

Please before I move on, I want to make sure; can you hear me okay?

CHAIR GREENE: We can hear you, just fine.

MANAGER SHAFFER: Okay. I'm going to go through a PowerPoint presentation. There's a long list of topics that I hope to cover, but I don't believe that any one of them will take a particularly long period of time. I want to go over our significant sources of capital and maintenance project funding. I want to spend a few slides talking about various types of bonds as well as the pros and cons of self-funding projects through accumulated resources versus revenue bonds for capital projects. I want to spend some time talking specifically about two proposed revenue bonds that have been discussed with the Board previously, but we're now at the point where moving forward with those bonds over the next one to two fiscal years seems necessary. And want to talk about our proposed change in the way that we proactively plan for capital projects how that implicates the ICIP, as well as the relationship between our capital budget and the ICIP. Talk about all the various master plans and preliminary engineering reports and other studies, both those that have been previously funded and those that are proposed. What exists as that would be most likely the next source of committed to projects from the Board of County Commissioners. Talk about new capital projects the majority of which the board has familiarity with one point or in one way or another, and then talk about proposed 2026 general obligation bond questions and projects. And then really conclude with a conversation about uncommitted and unassigned fund balance both within the general fund and otherwise, and then summarize with regard to our capital outlay gross receipts tax and general obligation bond capacity over, again, the next five-year planning horizon.

Starting with a general refresher relative to resources. Significant County resources that can be used for capital and maintenance resources include general obligation bonds, the County's capital outlay gross receipts tax, the first one-eighth hold harmless gross receipts tax, which at this point has really been largely dedicated to road maintenance as well as to debt service.

Revenue bonds general fund could be a source of capital and maintenance resources as directed by the Board with a particular emphasis on uncommitted and unassigned balance of the general fund that's not otherwise used for housing. And then we do have some not recurring but some other resources in significant other funds that can and have used been used as a source of funding for capital and maintenance projects.

Obviously, we annually receive capital outlay appropriations from the state legislature and pursue both federal and state grants as well as congressionally directed spending and community projects that are funded through the Congress. Our focus for planning purposes is really on those County resources because the County controls those resources. Obviously we can, do, and continue and will continue to do pursue other funding sources to augment and complement our own source of capital funding. But our plan focuses on the County's resources because that's what we can control and that's what we can have greater certainty around in terms of planning, again, subject to voter approval of general obligation bonds.

So general obligation versus revenue bonds, a refresher in level setting slide. General obligation bonds require voter approval. They're repaid using a property tax that's levied specifically for debt service. They're backed by the full faith and credit of the County which means that the property tax levy that is imposed in order to repay that debt is unlimited in amount theoretically, though the debt that we issue is sized and the timing is issued so as to maintain stable property tax burden. The important thing to emphasize about general obligation bonds is it provides an additional source of capital funding that does not consume general tax revenue again as approved by the voters that provides money over and above operational property tax as well as gross receipts tax and other revenue.

Voter authorization for general obligation bonds is good for four years which means you have to issue the debt within that four-year period of time. Revenue bonds are a different form of obligation. They do not require voter approval, though they do require statutory authority to issue them. The debt service, i.e., the money we pay to bondholders, that consumes recurring revenue that could otherwise be available for other purposes.

When you look at general obligation bonds there is a choice to be made by the Board of County Commissioners as to whether or not you would like to continue with a two or adopt a four-year bond question cycle. And if you continue with a two-year cycle, what that would mean looking over the course of our planning horizon is that you could ask the voters on three separate occasions in 2026, 2028, and 2030 to authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds. Our estimated capacity, i.e., the amount of bonds that we could ask the voters to approve on a two-year cycle would be $45 million in 2026, $45 million in 2028, and $47.5 million in 2030.

In contrast, if the Board were to adopt a four-year cycle you would be seeking voter approval in 2026 to issue up to $90 million in general obligation bond debt and approximately $90 million, it might be a bit higher than that in 2030. Regardless of whether or not it's a two-year or a four-year cycle, the County would time the issuance as well as the structure of the debt so as to maintain level debt service. And to underscore the level debt service I did not put it in the slide, but if you go back historically and look at the amount of the debt levy that appears on property owners' tax bills, it's been steady over the last, five or plus years and the only digit that has changed is actually to a hundredth of a decimal.

So again, we've maintained a level consistent debt rate, and we would continue to try and strive to do so the property owners are not seeing significant really it's de minimis fluctuations from year to year as debt is retired, new debt is issued in order to replace it. But again, the overall levy maintains consistency.

Staff recommends that we continue with a two-year cycle. That does preserve some capacity for changing priorities. So if you ask the voters, to approve up to 90 million for a specific purpose and then you issue all of that debt you might find yourself midstream with a different set of priorities and wishing that you had general obligation bond capacity to help meet them. So again, a two-year cycle gives some flexibility relative to changing priorities. It also, as we build out our process, helps ensure that project costs are fully developed and we know what we should be asking the voters to approve. And also, as our planning process continues to mature a two-year cycle will help minimize the gap between authorization sale of bonds, and actual project implementation.

Wanted to talk a bit about, self-funding versus, revenue bonds. As I indicated revenue bonds don't require voter approval but you are committing a portion of a revenue stream to repay them. And in particular if you look at, as an example, capital outlay gross receipts tax, if you were going to issue revenue bonds the debt service of which is to be paid through capital outlay gross receipts tax, that means that you're taking a portion of what comes in every year and you're pledging it to future debt. That means that the amount that is available in that year to expend on other purposes is in fact not available because again, you've opted to issue revenue bonds in order to get more resources up front in order to invest in, in capital.

The benefits of self-funding, which is you just save money over time in order to meet a need, is that the investment, you earn investment income while you accumulate funds. You also don't have to pay interest on borrowed funds, and you preserve bond capacity for extraordinary capital events. And it also doesn't constrain, future policymakers through the issuance of debt. And then you have flexibility with regard to recurring revenue.

The disadvantages of self-funding is it may take too long to accumulate adequate funding for significant projects. If you have a project that is going to cost a significant amount of money, such as the planned renovation and expansion of the adult detention facility, for example, you may end up delaying that for a number of years while you accumulate enough resources in order to make that investment. And revenue bonds again, allow you to make the investment sooner because you're borrowing the funds necessary to make the needed investment. You also have, counterbalancing the fact that you have to pay interest on borrowed funds is that, every year you wait to move forward with a project the cost of the project increases. And so there's a balancing act there too, if you are in fact saving money for a significant capital project. Again, I'll use the jail as an example, and you're waiting to save $30 million for that project. By the time you might actually go forward with that project, it might now cost $35 million. So there is a balancing act between the interest you pay on borrowed money versus the fact that projects get more expensive over time.

And then also borrowing for significant assets does introduce a bit of equity in terms of paying for long-term assets because then everybody is paying their share but also receiving the benefit of the asset. So if I'm a County resident, which I am, and I would like the benefit of whatever the project is, say a trail, if we have to wait eight years in order to accumulate the resources to pay for the trail, I'm contributing to the money that you're accumulating in order to build that trail. I don't get the use of it for eight years, whereas the folks who are then contributing after me, they'll have the use for a longer period of time in terms of their own life. So that's that idea of equity in terms of financing projects, is it does mean that folks have the benefit of those projects sooner than they would if they were contributing and waiting for capital to be sufficient to actually go forward with the project.

So there are two proposed revenue bonds that are instrumental to the capital plan as presented. And that would be one, for the adult detention facility expansion and remodel. The primary focus of that would be to increase the medical and behavioral health treatment capacity of the adult detention facility, as well as address some other facility constraints. As you might recall from the operating budget we included in the operating budget $1.75 million in future debt service presumed. That would yield depending upon terms, somewhere between 22.7 and 24.6 in estimated proceeds. And then we would augment that with available fund balance in the corrections operations fund and if available and needed, the indigent hospital fund in order to get the available resources to the point needed to fund that significant expansion and remodel. We would anticipate the bonds being sold in fiscal year 2027 or in fiscal year 2028 once the planning for that expansion and remodel have solidified to the point that we can, one, be timely assured of firm cost estimates as well as assured that we can timely implement and spend the bond proceeds.

In addition, we are now at a critical point as it relates to the Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System. This is a countywide project of significance both in terms of the commitment of County resources, but also because of the critical importance that the system plays to the long-term water security of the County utility system as well as the entire regional system. The capital plan anticipates that $2.2 million in capital outlay gross receipts tax revenue will be dedicated to debt service for revenue bonds issued for the Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System. There's a pretty wide range in terms of estimated proceeds, and that would depend in part upon the term, but also who we're borrowing from. So if we're able to borrow money from the state at near zero interest rate, then that number obviously moves up. If we're selling revenue bonds on the open market at market rates, then the amount of money that we'll have to spend will be less. And in addition, the availability of potential grant subsidy from the water project fund would influence that. But the point being that there is a significant need for resources in order to make that system viable as well as ensure that the County has resources in order to meet the demonstrated demand within the Pojoaque Basin.

If ultimately authorized by the Board and if sold, the primary purposes for those bonds would be one, to ensure that we can construct the distribution lines in the Pojoaque Basin that are actually supported by in-basin demand, i.e. customers who are willing and committed to sign up to the system. But secondly, the bond proceeds would allow for the interconnection of the Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System and the Santa Fe Basin Regional Water System of the City and County of Santa Fe. The interconnect, to be clear is not a new idea and the idea of using water that is not currently needed in the basin, outside of the basin in the remainder of the County, none of those are new ideas that are being put forth now for the first time. To the contrary, the settlement agreement that resolved the Aamodt water rights adjudication and the act of Congress that approved that settlement all reflected the fact that the County could use water outside the basin on an interim basis, meaning until such time as it was needed within the basin.

In addition, the particular design that is now driving the Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System and calls for the ability of 1,000 acre-feet per year to be delivered to a T at the intersection of Bishops Lodge Road and, it's the Tesuque Road, but it's right by the Tesuque Market. That design parameter was agreed to by all of our Pueblo partners, as well as the Bureau of Reclamation. So I just want to alleviate any concerns that this is a new idea. It is not. It is an idea that has in fact been around since the inception of the proposed Pojoaque Basin, or at least the agreement, that called for the creation of the

Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System and the act of Congress that approved it.

The reason that the interconnect is so important is that, one, it allows for additional demand outside the basin to help shoulder some of the significant operation and maintenance cost of the system. And so that will make the cost of water inside the basin less expensive, all other things being equal. Two, given the amount of transmission line being installed from the Otowi gauge at San Ildefonso Pueblo or just above the Otowi gauge at San Ildefonso Pueblo, all the way down to the Tesuque Market, without a significant customer on the other end of that line you would run the risk of potentially significant water quality issues given the length that the water has to travel and the fact that it's not being turned over in the system.

And those are the two, again, primary reasons. But focusing on the basin itself, the Pojoaque Basin, having the interconnect also provides a backup source of supply to the Pojoaque Basin system that currently does not exist outside of the limited number of tanks that will store some amount of water in the event of a significant system shutdown.

So to summarize the interconnect is necessary both for fiscal operational reasons as well as actual operational reasons as it relates to the operation of the system, but it also provides a viable source of backup water supply to the Pojoaque Basin that doesn't otherwise exist.

So the next series of slides really talk about changing the way we plan for capital projects in terms of being realistic about the resources that we can anticipate and planning how we're going to fund those projects chosen by the Board of County Commissioners to actually become projects that are committed to within the five-year planning horizon. Looking back over previous iterations of capital planning in the County's ICIP, I think it's fairly clear that projects were identified as projects before there was a firm cost estimate backed by a concrete funding plan to implement a project. I think that where the team sitting in front of you sits what we see is that created some unrealistic expectations because folks had a sense that something was going to be done within a timeframe that really wasn't based in financial reality in terms of the resources that were available to complete projects. And that also meant relatedly that approved projects that were on the ICIP exceeded reasonably available resources.

That resulted in the ICIP looking more like a wish list than an actual five-year capital plan, and it also we believe, contributed to what Brian and his team are patiently and steadily working through, which is a backlog of partially funded projects that each year are trying to fight in order to get the next stage of money but again, without a firm plan in place to meet all of those needs.

So what we are proposing in terms of how we move forward is that the default path should be that an idea that the Board thinks might have merit to become a project would be scoped and the cost and feasibility would be evaluated through a preliminary engineering report or a feasibility study. Then once the Board of County Commissioners had a more concrete sense of the cost of the project and the project's operational or other feasibility, the Board of County Commissioners would choose which of those projects should move forward into the design phase, and then ultimately into the construction phase. But as those decisions were being made, we would be adding them to the five-year capital plan backed again with reasonably anticipated revenue so that the Board and the community had greater certainty in terms of the actual timelines that were reasonable for a particular project to be fully implemented.

So as we continue down that thought process about changing the way we plan for capital projects one of the recent presentations to the Board of County Commissioners was actually a facilities assessment conducted by an independent third-party consultant, the acronym of which is ARC, Architectural Resources Consultants, I believe is their name. And they evaluated all of the County facilities that we have and put forward ultimately a facility assessment and plan as to the maintenance needs of all those various facilities. That, as Brian will explain as we get to the maintenance project list, is the primary driver of the maintenance projects that are identified on the five-year maintenance plan.

The planning process that we're proposing for the Board is that maintenance projects get funded first. And in essence, it's a commitment by the County to taking care of our existing stuff before we start planning for and constructing new projects. We want to make sure that our existing facilities are getting the maintenance that they need in a timely way so that we are not accumulating significant amounts of deferred maintenance which, can lead to a variety of problems, both a big bill when the deferred maintenance ends, but also can lead to more costly repairs and problems. If you don't timely replace your roof and you're dealing with roof leaks, to take an obvious example, that can degrade the performance of the entire system. So you'll see in the plan as well as the potential uses of resources that maintenance is proposed to be funded first. And Brian and his team used the facility assessment to identify those maintenance projects putting the Fire Department to the side given that, they have independent and separate funding sources as well as a potential GO bond question to help support their maintenance needs.

We also tried to build into the capital plan some assumed set-aside for additional preliminary engineering reports and/or design allocations for each year. I'd have to pull up the specific sources and uses to give you accurate numbers, but I believe we estimated and assumed it would be a million dollars each year at a minimum. It's not the expectation that you would use all of that each year on new preliminary engineering reports, otherwise you're just going to outstrip your ability to fund things by through a different means. But that they would be there in order to look at the feasibility and cost of a project idea, and that would be available each year so that we're constantly filling the pipeline of potential projects.

In addition, to the extent that money is not utilized for those purposes that would be available to design things that the Board has committed to in terms of a project that you would like to see completed within the five-year time horizon so that we could take a selected project by the Board to the, again, to the design stage in anticipation of significant construction resources becoming available in future years.

The end goal of all of this is that we hope as an organization to become more effective at planning, but also getting money out the door as it becomes available to us to actually implement projects. So in other words as, Brian and his team continues the backlog of projects, what you're seeing is a drawing down of in excess of, and I believe it's still close to $200 million in accumulated resources over the years. We don't want to see that happen again. We want to see money getting out the door as it comes in the door.

And by being more selective in the things that we call projects and having an actual plan to complete them, we think that we will achieve that goal. What that means though, which isn't a reason not to go in that direction, is that it does have implications for the County budget. Because if we're not sitting on $200 million worth of project funds, we're not also earning interest on that. So again, that is just an implication that I want to make sure we're all aware of. It's by design, but the point is you're going to see if we're successful in making this transformation less investment income available in the County budget. And again, that's by design, but I would be remiss if I didn't point that out.

To summarize visually, what we're looking at is that, you're going to start at one. There are going to be a lot of ideas that come from the community, that come from the staff. Not all of those ideas are going to be turned into projects. The first competition, if you will, as you move from one to two, is you're going to look at those ideas and say which of them are we interested enough in? Or, Which of them do we think meet the community needs at a level that we want to explore them further? And that sub-list of potential projects, those ideas would move into round two which is the preliminary engineering report stage. You would then have those ideas that are selected, reviewed, and evaluated for feasibility and cost. And then when you get to step three when you know the feasibility and cost of a project as well as the resources you have available, as well as the other projects that have been developed to that point, that's where the Board of County Commissioners will decide of these ideas that have been vetted through the preliminary engineering report stage, we're going to put them onto our five-year capital improvement plan because of their priority and available resources, again, with priorities being decided by the Board. And then, finally, again, those projects that are in fact ultimately identified as projects and implemented, that becomes the infrastructure and the amenities that our community relies upon and again supports the community for years to come.

Should we move as a County in this direction I think it also has some implications for our ICIP, which Leandro is going to talk about. The primary point is that if the ICIP is going to serve its intended and stated purpose of actually being a five-year planning document, you should not have projects on there that materially exceed the County's anticipated resources over that five-year plan. So if the projects on the ICIP total $200 million and you only reasonably anticipate to bring in $100 million over the course of that five-year plan, like I said, you're not really planning. There's going to be items on the ICIP that really are more of a wish list because again, we don't have a plan in place to actually fund those projects.

In addition we feel that the ICIP should include all active County projects meaning those that we're working towards implementing but are not yet under construction contracts where pricing is fully locked in. And again, only those that the BCC is committed to funding within a planning horizon. The way we would propose to score what we think are quote-unquote fully funded projects at the time on the ICIP is to factor in a 15 percent additional cost, if you will, both to deal with uncertainty with regard to price escalation as well as a contingency that's not separately included in the budgeted or projected project cost. What that allows us to do is to approach legislators to provide what I believe they often want to provide, which is the final gap funding. And again, in my conversations with legislators but also looking at their actual allocation decisions, they don't want to be the first funders of any project, and they don't want to be the primary funders of a project. They want to leverage their own resources to help see local government projects move forward. And so this approach is consistent with that. It allows us to have reasonable ask that a legislator or two could fully fund and gives them certainty that when they give us money we're going to spend it timely within, the expenditure period provided by law because we're only coming to them with projects that we're fully committed to number one, and number two for that last final gap funding.

In addition, we generally believe that, if we're doing preliminary engineering reports or other feasibility type assessments, those aren't yet projects for the most part again, unless there are extenuating circumstances that would change that characterization. And so PERs and other studies, again, shouldn't be on the ICIP because they're not a project yet. There's just an idea that's being explored in order to help fully form a potential project that the Board may commit to funding. Again, there are exceptions to that but should be, the default when you're talking about potential road improvements trails what have you

So as you look at the available resources not all resources that are anticipated are already spoken for in the five-year plan that is in front of you. More specifically, there are significant general obligation bond capacity available in calendar year 2028 and 2030 as well as some capital outlay gross receipts tax that will be coming available, bigger chunks, if I recall correctly, in fiscal year '30 and '31, as well as a smaller amount in fiscal year '30.

I've listed here, not in rank order, but just so that you can quickly summarize the number of PERs and plans that have already been funded and/or are ongoing. And, I won't read that list to you other than to say, there are at least 12 that I could readily think of that have been funded and/or are ongoing is point one. And point two, some if not many or most of those potential projects include or would come with, we anticipate significant cost. And so just reiterating the point that we have already have in works planning efforts as well as PERs that will, provide to the Board of County Commissioners firm cost estimates and feasibility assessments that can inform, the projects that will be added this time next year to those later years when we anticipate resources being available to take them through the design and construction phase.

So add to that some additional preliminary engineering reports that have been proposed by individual County Commissioners or by staff, and some of these relate to preliminary work on the ICIP, but these are additional reports and PERs that have come to the fore and that could be funded through this planning cycle in order to make get to the point of being considered for a future project. That includes a human rights association building or gathering room feasibility study, preliminary engineering report concerning charging stations for mobility devices on our ADA compliant and wheelchair accessible trails, preliminary engineering report for missing trail and bike lane connections in the Community College District, preliminary engineering report for Bishops Lodge complete streets project as well as parking for the Rio en Medio Open Space, secondary trailhead for the Tesuque Trail, I believe, and potential connection missing connection in Caja del Rio. And again, those are ones that have been identified through this round of planning and discussions with the Board in addition to those that are listed on the previous page of as having received funding previously.

So I wanted to spend a few minutes talking about what appears on the list of capital projects for fiscal year 27. These are those that we actually anticipate spending money toward. New is in quotes because I believe most of these have been discussed with the Board in one way, shape, or form, and so again things that you're familiar with. If you recall when the Board made the decision to acquire new quarters for the District Attorney's Office part of the rationale for that purchase in the long run is that the First Judicial District Court was experiencing space constraints within the Judge Steve Herrera Judicial Complex. And an assessment was done relative to how the existing District Attorney's Office could be used for non-judicial officer functions. So you would move out of the courthouse some judicial operations that, again, are not judicial officer functions, meaning they don't involve a judge. But the pretrial detention is one example, and there were several more listed in the report. But you would take those non-judicial officer functions, put them into the existing district attorney's building, and then you would free up space within the Judge Steve Herrera Courthouse to have, after renovation, additional chambers and hearing rooms for judges and other judicial officers. That would involve both renovations to the existing district attorney's office in terms of its HVAC systems and its other physical plant, as well as interior renovations to the DA's office and to the Judge Steve Herrera Judicial Complex. We believe based upon prior bids and some of the preliminary cost estimating that was done during the facility assessment that including design work that's likely a project that would be in the order of magnitude of $8 million. The thought is that we would augment existing budget that we believe will be left over from the DA relocation to get the County's contribution towards that effort to $4 million. And we would expect and demand that the legislature match that investment through the Administrative Office of the Courts pursuant to their cost-matching program that was developed a few years ago. So in other words, this would show that the County is prepared to move forward whenever the judiciary is prepared to move forward. But we expect both as a matter of equity but also as a matter of relative availability of resources, that the state would meet us halfway by providing funding to make that a reality. Again, this is a statutory responsibility that the County has to provide adequate quarters to district courts. And it has taken on some greater sense of urgency and feasibility, both because we anticipate moving the district attorney's office to their new quarters within the next six months, if I believe is that right, Brian? Moving the district attorney to its new quarters within the next six months, but then also the legislature funded a new judgeship for the First Judicial District Court beginning July 1, 2026.

We have the La Sala expansion and post-release reentry services. Right now we're really at the potential building acquisition phase of a building that you all have already toured. We'll obviously do our best to reduce the amount of the purchase price to the greatest extent feasible, but nonetheless, we do anticipate there being a not insignificant cost for facility acquisition. There are other potential resources that could fund renovations but our hope is that if we acquire the subject building or another building for these purposes that we could come up with reasonable cost estimates to add to an amended ICIP later this year. Again, this is part of both increasing the available capacity for those who are detoxifying from various substances which is the recovery center portion of La Sala, and then moving the New Mexico Solutions portion of La Sala to the new building to be combined with post-release reentry services from the County.

We also recommend funding approximately a million dollars to the Housing Authority Division. This would help ensure that one, we have some funding available for cost increases on previous congressionally directed spending awards as well as legislative appropriations so that we can confidently go back to both Congress congressmen and women, as well as our legislators to say we completed that which you gave us money for. It will also fund a more comprehensive facility systems assessment to help build out a long-term maintenance plan for all of our public housing communities like the ones that we have now for other county facilities. And then it would provide funding to address any identified root causes of mold in units such as bathroom exhaust fans, leaks, what have you. So we want to ensure that there are available resources again, for all of those purposes. So it's more of a basket aggregate type concept rather than being earmarked for a specific purpose such as re-stuccoing, X number of units.

As you saw from the jail tour this week we have a courtroom that was originally envisioned as a physical courtroom, but has now transformed itself into a virtual courtroom. And so this would be funding that would allow the adult detention facility to conduct multiple virtual hearings simultaneously which, again, increases our capacity. And as was discussed, I believe during the tour virtual or video appearances are generally safer, more efficient, and consistent with sustainability goals in that you're not driving people to court.

As was, documented in the facility's master plan for the County there is a need to expand the Public Works Department facilities. And so the plan includes $200,000 to design that expansion with construction funding anticipated in fiscal year 2028.

I'm going to stop there for one second because one species of projects related to the utilities division that are included in the list of proposed projects I didn't specifically call out and I'm going to let Brian Snyder speak to. But these relate to SCADA as well as smart meters and so I'd like Brian to be able to explain the scope and importance of those investments both to conservation as well as utility efficient utility operations generally.

BRIAN SNYDER (Public Works Director): Chair and Commissioners, can you hear me? Okay, great.

So if you see on Exhibit A, we have not gone into Exhibit A yet, but on Exhibit A, we have that capital budget, the five-year capital budget broken down into areas, utilities, roads, open space and trails, buildings, miscellaneous and housing. Under the first section of utilities that Greg referenced there are two utility projects that are instrumental in us moving forward as a utility. They are basically becoming a smarter utility. The automated meter reading system that is on the list, AMI as it's referred to here, is a system that will allow our meters -- we already have smart meters that we do drive-bys of to get meter reading, but this system will allow us to get the meter readings to our facility. So they will be sent via telemetry to our facility, so it will reduce the field staff need to go into the field. As we expand our utility into areas such as Chupadero, Cañoncito, the more rural areas, it's important that we are able to read these meters efficiently to provide accurate customer service information.

So that project, coupled with our telemetry system and the expansion of that will allow us to put real-time information into our customers' hands. Right now, we currently are looking a month behind. You use your water for a month, and then you get a bill, and then you can see, Oh, I used too much water, or, I had a leak. This will allow us to be able to be more proactive. Somewhat like the City has an eye on water program, which will allow us to notify customers of leaks in advance, as well as the customer will be able to access and determine, how much water they're using for washing a load of laundry, irrigation, those types of things. So those are the two projects I would like to highlight.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Excuse me, Chair. Brian, behind what tab are you? Are you on the matrix in the same tab?

MR. SNYDER: So Exhibit A, five-year capital projects.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Okay, great. Thanks.

MANAGER SHAFFER: Thank you for that Brian. And going back to complete the presentation relative to our overall strategy. We did have recommendations relative to the potential general obligation bond election this fall which I did want to review with the Board for consideration as it is a backbone component of the five-year capital plan. And those proposed questions are in front of you now both on your screen as well as the projected screen behind you.

In terms of water and wastewater there are three related projects that we would recommend we ask the voters to approve. The first would be the development of a treated effluent bulk water station along New Mexico 14. This would be one of the recommended projects that you will see in the wastewater master plan. And the idea is to take again reclaimed wastewater and make it available in bulk through a dispensing station to be used for those applications that don't require drinkable water, i.e., dust control and construction activities. So it would allow us again to make better utilization of our water resources and in particular provide a substitute for potable water for those applications that don't require drinkable water. And that would be a step towards, again fully utilizing the water resources that make their way to the Quill plant.

You've also recently received a presentation from our Sustainability team relative to green stormwater infrastructure. There were several facilities at which such infrastructure were was proposed at an estimated cost of about $1.5 million. That would both help, again, capture water and help clean it in ways that are more sustainable than current stormwater management systems. And would be a good exercise to install those so that they become, again, part and parcel of projects as we move forward.

In addition as you all know we did a previous Board of County Commissioners authorized the acquisition of the Hyde Park Water System so that is now not separate and apart from the County utility system, but actually a part of the County-owned and operated and maintained system. And so the request is for approximately $3.2 million in general obligation bonds to fully fund that.

With regard to fire stations, we are proposing that we ask the voters to approve general obligation bonds both for a specific fire station Agua Fria Station 1 which is the regional station that would serve both the Agua Fria Traditional Historic Community, unincorporated areas of the County as well as portions of the City of Santa Fe to which this station would be the closest responding station. In addition we have a proposal to fund improvements and renovations at fire stations countywide. I'll pause here and I'll ask Chief Black to come forward and talk briefly about the need for and importance of the

Agua Fria Station 1, as well as the need to continuously invest in the maintenance and improvements of our over 32 fire stations.

FIRE CHIEF JACOB BLACK: Good afternoon, Chair Greene, Commissioners. The proposed 2026 general obligation bond to support fire stations would address the two critical components, as Manager Shaffer just shared. The first component of the bond would fund the construction of a new fire station to replace existing Agua Fria Fire Station 1. This station serves as a critical emergency, a regional emergency response hub along the 599 corridor. Through our close collaboration with the City of Santa Fe crews assigned to this station respond to not only incidents within the County but also to emergency calls within the city limits, ensuring the closest and quickest emergency response regardless of jurisdiction.

The existing station was originally construct-constructed by volunteers in 1991 with a modular addition installed approximately 17 years ago to accommodate the continued growth within the area. While the station has served the community well, it no longer meets the operational needs of a modern fire department. Construction of the new facility would provide the crews with a more efficient and purpose-built fire station capable of meeting today's emergency response demands while positioning the department to meet the future community needs.

Upon completion of the new facility, the existing Agua Fria Station would be repurposed as a dedicated training center for the Fire Department, allowing the County to expand our training opportunities while maximizing the value of our existing infrastructure.

The second component of the GO bond would provide for funding for fire station maintenance and repair as mentioned throughout the counties throughout the county. Our department operates 32 fire stations, many of which were originally constructed by local community members and volunteers before the formation of the County Fire Department in 1997. As these facilities continue to age, they require significant investment to maintain critical infrastructure and ensure that they remain safe and functional for our operations. The proposed funding would address these priority projects, these two priorities identified through by Public Works Facilities Assessment and would help extend the useful life of our fire stations while improving the reliability, safety, and the operational readiness of our 32 fire stations

MANAGER SHAFFER: Thank you, Chief Black. For roads the proposed list of road projects include the San Ysidro river crossing, La Jolla Road, Ojo de la Vaca for the paving drainage project as it may ultimately be defined, Chupadero Road improvements and the final gap funding for General Goodwin Road improvements through the underpass under the railroad tracks.

For open space and trails we're recommending both the funding we anticipate to be necessary for Section C as well as to complete that the construction of that section as well as the design and construction of Section D.

Finally we're recommending that we seek approval for what we're calling Phase 2 of the New Mexico 14 Turquoise Trail Extension which is from the 599 interchange to the Arroyo Hondo Trail. Phase 1 is the section that serves the Turquoise Trail all affordable multi-family development as well as Cresta Ranch, excuse me which ultimately connects with the Arroyo Hondo Trail to get to the 599 station. This will provide the funding necessary for the link between the Arroyo Hondo Trail connection and the Phase 3 of the Turquoise Trail Extension, which will run from 599 to Camino Justicio along the New Mexico 14 Scenic Byway.

And then finally to increase the usability of the Romero Park ball fields the request is that we seek $1.5 million for lights so those ball fields can be utilized for extended hours by all users of the fields. But in particular, we want to ensure that our recreational and athletic amenities are available to the youth of the community beyond sunlight hours.

So I wanted to spend some time talking about the general fund and the uncommitted and unassigned fund balance. This may or may not ultimately be part of a capital discussion but it does feed into the final budget for the fiscal year. Taking into account fiscal year 26 allocations the uncommitted and unassigned fund balance based upon the audited fiscal year 2025 financial statements, again, unless Board of County Commissioners allocations in 2026, we have approximately $15 million of available resources. The primary area of focus relative to those resources has been permanent, supportive housing. The range that was provided and I would submit for the Board's consideration to really try to hypercharge that project and get it done in a timely way is 8.5 up to $10.5 million. First, and forgive me the typo, but there's a 15-year service reserve which was estimated to be in the range of $5 million. Also owner guarantees for such a project of $3 million some initial project implementation and site and design consultation services that sum to about $280,000. And then finally anticipating in advance that we may be required to try and fill gaps as the project advances, I'd recommend adding $2 million to help fund the capital stack if necessary.

Again, my recommendation is if the Board wants to see that project move forward in a timely way that the resources necessary to do that, be allocated upfront so that we can move forward with confidence that the hardest portions of funding those projects, which are the 15-year service reserve and the owner guarantees because those are not capital commitments. Again, those are operational commitments, so not something you're going to be able to fund through the capital outlay process, not something you're going to be able to fund from equity investors. Again, those are the hard commitments and the hardest commitments to meet in order to make a project like that viable as I understand the report and feasibility study from our consultant Project Moxie.

Other potential uses for the uncommitted and unassigned fund balance in the general fund. It's possible to allocate those funds for affordable housing programs in future years. They could be used for open space acquisition or other land conservation capital or other projects, or again some of those funds could be retained for unanticipated initiatives that the Board might identify in, in the future.

So I wanted to talk briefly about some other uncommitted fund balances and significant funds just to be transparent. Fund balances are not only reported to the Board as part of the audited financial statements but they're also reported to the Board as part of the budgeting process. The ones I wanted to highlight first, there are resources both in the first one-eighth hold harmless gross receipts tax fund and the capital outlay gross receipts tax fund. Those total $5.5 million. We recommend at the staff level that those monies not

be allocated out to specific projects. They serve the purpose of having some protection against cost inflation as well as adding a source of project contingencies. The idea being if you commit to a project our best estimate is that it's going to cost $10 million, and the cost estimate comes in at 10.5 or 11 that there be a pot of available resources that we can look to in order to allow that project to continue to move forward.
Again, it would also be a source of potential project contingencies for any given project so that as unexpected items arise they can be addressed in the field.

We anticipate the uncommitted balance in the correction operations fund to be about $5.2 million. That is the most significant resource that will help augment bond proceeds in order to fully fund the adult detention facility expansion and remodel.
And to the extent that, again, it's not needed for that purpose or in the interim that could fund unanticipated maintenance needs and repairs that arise from time to time in the adult detention facility.

The fire operations fund has about 5.1 million in uncommitted fund balance. This is again over and above our true reserves. In addition to facility improvements in the out years that are not funded through the general obligation bond allotment if approved by the Board and the voters there are significant apparatus replacement needs that we have every year, and this helps support the apparatus replacement plan and schedule that Chief Black and his team are developing. To put it in context every ambulance costs about $600,000. Engines cost in excess of a million dollars, as do other significant apparatus. So may seem like a lot of money but the equipment needs of the department are quite significant, and the price tag associated with that apparatus is also quite significant.

We've talked about the Indigent Hospital Fund. This is the fund balance that currently exists. Having that is what allowed the Board of County Commissioners, I believe, to go forward confidently with the Regional Youth Behavioral Health Center given there were some unknowns with it, as well as the La Sala expansion and post release re-entry project. And then finally, it could also, after those other needs are met, potentially provide an additional source of funding for the significant adult detention facility expansion and remodel.

So I'm going to summarize where we think we are vis-a-vis the most significant sources of what I'll call general capital outlay resources.

First is the capital outlay gross receipts tax. We've tried to show anticipated resource availability by fiscal year given the plan that was presented to the Board as well as, again, anticipated debt service and allocations towards future PERs and design work. So you see under the plan as presented capital outlay gross receipts tax is anticipated to be fully allocated in fiscal year 27 through 29 with some capacity being available in 2030 and a significant amount of capacity being available in 2031. The reason that you see the increase in 2031 is not only because receipts are anticipated to continue to go up but about $3.3 million in existing debt service will come offline, meaning the bonds will be fully matured, I believe, beginning in 2031.

In terms of the GO bond capacity again, we've put forth a proposal that would allocate the anticipated $45 million in capacity subject to voter approval in 27. There have been some identified priorities already in 2029 to include continued investment if affirmatively authorized by the Board for the Agua Fria sewer project As well as the

Paseo C de Baca road and drainage improvement project as well as a few others that are listed. But then looking forward to 2031 in the five-year capital plan as presented no GO bond capacity has yet been identified or allocations identified.

So we have a variety of exhibits to include the five-year capital projects plan as well as the five-year maintenance plan. We also have a spreadsheet that looks at the sources and uses of potential County resources. The one thing that is not reflected there is the revenue bonds for the adult detention facility remodel and renovation. We will add that for completeness, but also we didn't know what the final cost would be, so didn't draw out and put together all of those potential sources of funding. We also provided to the Board in your packet individual project pages for those existing and proposed projects as well as their historic budget information.

At this point I'll stop and answer any questions and we'll take the direction from the Board as to what you would like us to highlight or discuss. We weren't planning unless requested to go over each individual project cost or line item. But I did want Brian at a minimum to talk a bit about the five-year maintenance plan which is again, a new request and presentation to the Board how that was built out using the facilities assessment report, and then also any items that were scored as maintenance that were not generated from that report. So I'd like to give Brian that opportunity, and then we'll stand for any questions. Thank you.

MR. SNYDER: Chair and Commissioners. Thank you, Greg. As Greg said, the facility assessment that you had a presentation on probably a couple months ago at BCC now really set the stage for this five-year maintenance plan. This is the first time we've had a five-year maintenance plan. I'm looking forward to us implementing the five-year maintenance plan. It'll be a tool for us, once approved, for us to build out plans for what we're doing in-house versus what we're contracting out. One of our approaches is to do as much in-house as we can. That saves costs. The costs that are listed here are for us going out to a contractor. But there's some areas where we definitely need to supplement our internal resources with contracted support. I just verified while the Fire Chief was speaking earlier, I just verified with Laura what I had thought that all maintenance projects that are on this list are included in the facility assessment that was completed and presented to the Board a couple months ago.

What we did here on this plan was to look at the priorities within the plan the facility assessment, and put them into five years. So the top portion on the first page, and we're on Exhibit B five-year maintenance plan that's showing on the screen now breaking down into in-house first. So we looked at each of the next five years of what we're going to do in-house with our current staff, and then what we're going to use a contractor for below that. And as I said earlier, some of those things that we're anticipating using contractor, if we can pull some of those in-house with existing resources, we definitely will to save funds as well as accomplish the work with in-house.

But I'll stand for any questions on that. Again our team is excited to have this five-year plan and have the facility assessment and putting it to action. So I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Brian. Greg, you wanted the mic back?

MANAGER SHAFFER: Thank you very much Commissioners for giving us the time and space to make this presentation. The summary that I would simply provide is we're trying to do, again, more robust planning both on the maintenance side in terms of looking out over a period of five years as to what we need to take care of our existing facilities. But also providing to you and to the community again, a five-year look forward in terms of what we think our available resources are so that we can plan more confidently relative to the timely implementation of projects. I want to put a fine point on how that planning will also help Brian and his team. As the number of existing projects, again reduces naturally over time the fact that the Board has targeted a particular project to be included, for example, in a general obligation bond sale in 2030, then that allows them to know, hey, if the resources are available to do the design, we want to have the design done so that the bonds can be sold and, we can move forward with construction. All of that planning then also allows them to work proactively with our Procurement Department so that the procurement can be underway even before the bonds are sold.

So we believe that this will help us deliver more timely on the projects that are chosen by the Board as projects and, more confidently work with our legislators for funding and other funding sources on, grant opportunities and the like, simply because we both have the commitment from the Board as well as a bona fide plan to meet the County's share of resources.

In terms of again, stand for any questions, in terms of our next steps in this process. The capital budget does not have to be approved until the end of July for submission as part of our final budget. So there's no deadline associated with approval of the capital budget.

We presented them in tandem with the ICIP today for the reasons that were already discussed. The ICIP should not be divorced from the capital plan and the capital budget. They should really mirror each other because if, again, if there's something on the ICIP that's not on the capital plan then again, we're not really planning. The ICIP again is getting divorced from the actual planning efforts of the County in terms of timely implementing capital projects within available resources. And so we believe that they should really, again, mirror each other, which is why we're presenting them in tandem to the Board of County Commissioners at this time. But technically, again, the capital budget does not have to be approved until July.

The infrastructure capital improvement plan, however, does need to be approved in time to be submitted to the Department of Finance & Administration by July 1. There is an opportunity under the, guidance that's put out from DFA to amend the ICIP through November 1st for projects that appear on the initial ICIP.

So we'll stop here. If there are questions that you have of me or the rest of the team about the capital planning process and the proposed capital budget either in this year or in future fiscal years we'd be pleased to answer those questions. Alternatively, we can continue on now to the ICIP recognizing again that the board doesn't have to make any decisions today either on the capital budget or on the ICIP. But if the Board does not take action on the ICIP today, then we would be looking to have it approved and considered at next Tuesday's meeting. Thank you very much, Chair and Commissioners.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Greg. Thank you, everybody. I know a lot of work goes into this and it's gotten better over the years, but that's just my opinion. Let's hear it from the rest of us. Commissioner Bustamante.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Chair. I do agree that this process looks organized and I appreciate it. I do have a few questions with regard to some of those projects. And basically, before I get into that, what is the method for any kind of -- let's say there's something that needs to be immediately addressed that wouldn't be an insurance covered type of thing or it's a strike while the iron's hot type of opportunity. We do know of projects that come up within a year and, let's say, we could get this building that would allow us to this, how do we prepare for those types of initiatives with this new process?

MANAGER SHAFFER: Thank you, Chair Greene and Commissioner Bustamante. I think that you can do that through a variety of methods. One you cannot fully utilize the unassigned and uncommitted fund balance in the general fund. And so even if the Board decided to, move forward aggressively and with passion on permanent supportive housing, that would leave approximately, I want to say, $5 million of unassigned and uncommitted general fund balance. You could just leave it there, and you could say, We're going to leave that there because we know that there are going to be some opportunities that may present itself. It could be an open space acquisition. It could be a facility acquisition. It could be a, again, a project that's unanticipated. That would be one strategy.

The fact that not all of the resources in the capital outlay gross receipts tax fund or in the first one-eighth increment of the hold harmless fund are being allocated, that would be another source of potential opportunistic investment, though again we recommend that be available to complete projects.

The final avenue that would be available for those opportunities is the Board I think very astutely along those lines set aside significant amounts of money several years ago for grant matching opportunities. I believe it started out at about $10 million and is slowly being spent down as opportunities present themselves. And so that is a third way in which you could again reserve, if you will I don't want to use reserve because that's a technical word but hold back on available resources so that you can be opportunistic as things present themselves without dipping into your true rainy day funds.

So again, this is money that you're saying we're not going to spend or allocate because we know that those opportunities might present themselves. So those would be the three already existing and most significant ways that I could think of to meet the need that you've articulated.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. Another question. The way I look at, and I hope that, my colleagues here on the dais will filter as well this way, but I tend to look at those items that are more critical with regard to first, ultimate impact on human health. Second, ultimate impact on the human health and the environment or property damage in that order. And there are two items that seem to have dissolved. One of those is the traffic study. We spent $50,000 of taxpayer dollars on a traffic study for La Cienega. But I do know that there were requests that came out of that traffic study with regard to, as it came out of the report, the potential for traffic calming initiatives. But there isn't anything put into the budget to really be able to get some traffic calming measures as a result of the conversations with the community. That one as well as – and I put that with the health and safety category.

The other one is the Madrid walkway. That one, I think anybody who goes at the most popular times of the summer through Madrid, people are walking right on the road, and we don't have anything. We've talked about it. The people of Madrid believe the County's working on it. It shows that we actually have it on our list, but it's not put in as a priority to help get people out of the line of traffic because people walk right in front of cars. I invite anybody to go to Albuquerque through there when there's something fun and neat to do, and you'll have to slow down for the pedestrians.

The other is the, Paseo C de Baca, as we've discussed. I see General Goodwin as, I don't see it as a priority, but the Paseo C de Baca, as I understood it from Ryan Ward before he left, is a previous PER had been done. And I think for those of you who've been here longer than I, you may know whether that is true or not. But if there was a previous PER or there had been, that had been on the list for a while. And this past year, unfortunately as a result of the big weather projects, it was an act of God. That's what the insurance company says. It's an act of God, it's not your fault. I'm just going to say fully that we all know, and it was said so by our engineers, that had our culverts been clean, we would have probably had less damage or been able to control a little bit more of that water before it went in and caused damage to two residence. I feel very nervous, not nervous, I don't necessarily want to say the next thing I'm going to say, but I'm going to say it in the interest of keeping us as a government accountable. The people who were in those buildings were told, Go file insurance, and it came back it was an act of God. And frankly, this is an older woman in her late 70s who could have taken it and gotten an attorney and brought that up that the damage to her home, which was over $44,000, as I understand it, at least over 40, was something that she could have had a conversation with an attorney and find out how she could possibly have it paid for. Short of the community getting together and collecting funds, she had some support, but I'm really not appreciative on behalf of my community and the constituents that it's take us to court, let's see how it goes. Because We were told, and I say we being the people who went right after the flooding, that had those culverts been cleared, we would not have seen as much damage. So to see this put on the fiscal year '30 is a concern. And I would like to see, now that we're doing, whether it's the first PER or the second PER, what I understood from our previous engineer was that there had been one, but now the costs are very different, and the conditions may have changed. So we had to do another PER, and that's what I was told. That being said, if we're doing another PER, I would ask sincerely in the interest of the neighbors who are concerned about property damage that we move whatever comes from that PER up the list. And not knowing the circumstances with General Goodwin, I don't know that they have the same. I have not been called to any of their flooding events. I know that at times it's impassable. But when it's impassable and I'm going along the categories of impacts to human health, impacts to the environment, and impacts to property between General Goodwin and impacts to property Paseo C de Baca goes higher on that list.

So I would very much like to see us not wait until 2030. And I think I was sharing with you, I know I was, and I want to share it again today. When it's a perspective of the community, and it's important for people to understand when the community sees action being taken. We're about to cut a ribbon on a new bridge that has long been needed in the

La Cienega area, and it's wonderful. And yay, it's going to look like I made sure it was put in, which I had absolutely nothing to do with. Meanwhile, Paseo C de Baca, that has also been on a list, isn't getting addressed. But we had a Commissioner who was living there, and it looks political, and I'm just saying the optics aren't good. And I say that in the interest of full disclosure of how these things arise to community comments. Look, and they still haven't done anything about Paseo C de Baca. I had nothing to do with that. I feel compelled to say that out loud every time, and I'm grateful for the bridge, so don't get me wrong. And I'm happy to hold a big scissor, but I'd like the Manager to do it. Bottom line is, when we look at what's happening with Paseo C de Baca, I would like very much for us to take those issues of damage, whether it was our call or not, whether or not a judge would see it that way or not, that we do whatever we can to avoid further damage to the personal property of the residents along that line because it was told to them, as well as myself, that the culverts had been plugged and it would've mediated some of that flooding. So I'll leave it on that. And those are the two, the three big items that I have. So thank you.

MANAGER SHAFFER: Thank you, Chair Greene and Commissioner Bustamante. I did follow up on the information that you had shared with me. We are not aware of any preliminary engineering report ever having been done for Paseo C de Baca. So far as Brian is able to discern there may have been a very preliminary cost or estimate of cost provided by a former county employee many years ago. But I believe from so far as Brian's been able to discern, the recommendation was always that there be a preliminary engineering report completed to actually assess the issues as well as potential solutions and costs. So we're not aware of that.

In terms of again, priorities, ultimately the Board sets those. And so if there's something that you feel should be prioritized differently, that's for the Board to decide. I would say that as a practical matter for the preliminary engineering report to be completed and the design work to be completed on what I anticipate will be a significant, again, significant public works project for Paseo C de Baca I think that the design would not be completed before 2028 in, as a practical reality. So I think that the design work being completed actually does line up with the potential bond sale in 2028. In other words, even if the Paseo C de Baca was included in the bond sale in this fall, I don't know that we'd be able to spend the money in significant chunks any sooner. But Brian, if you want to comment just in terms of the actual time necessary to do a design on a project of that score I'd be pleased to have you correct me if I got it the timeline wrong.

MR. SNYDER: Chair Greene and Commissioner Bustamante. Thank you, Greg. No, your timeline is I believe it's correct. We're currently procuring an engineer to initiate a PER. So we'll initiate that more or less, it, once it's initiated, take probably about six to eight months. And then the outcomes of that on how we move forward will have to be assessed, presented to the Board on how we want to move forward for design. And then once we got approval to move forward and the funding in place, then we would do the procurement of design. A design of this magnitude from a survey acquisition, right-of- way assessment along that corridor is going to be pretty, pretty large. There's going to be a lot of easements to get to the river, road widening easements. And so that's, the level of effort that's going to have to get into it with not just the design, but then from a survey and public meetings and interactions along that entire corridor, as well as the acequias on the downstream slope of that immediately adjacent to the road. So that creates another challenge, too. All can be designed around, but those kinds of nuances and challenges add time. I do agree with Greg that most likely the design will not be completed by the end of 28, but we would have a good engineer's estimate by then because we'd be well along and we could use that on the 29 bond sale.

MANAGER SHAFFER: And to be clear the bond sales were scored for resource availability by fiscal year. The sale would actually happen in 2028. Just to be clear. So if approved the bonds we would anticipate selling after the general election. So I just want to clarify the, clarify the dates.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Greg. Thank you, Chair, Greg, and Brian. I do have a question then. Does that mean that possibly it could be moved into the 2029 for action?
Instead of 2030? The sooner the better. And I think I would like to also have our presence out there in showing that we're doing what we can to keep those culverts open.

MR. SNYDER: Chair Greene and Commissioner Bustamante regarding the culverts, I'll answer that first or acknowledge that first. We heard from the Commission last year after the large storms loud and clear. We do do culvert maintenance throughout all our maintenance districts. We have the equipment, the staff to do that along with road grading, along with pothole repair, along with everything else that goes – all of those things that go along with road maintenance and right-of-way maintenance. What we did do and I think the Commission took action on, if I'm not mistaken, four or five months ago, was to purchase a standalone jetter to clean culverts to supplement the additional the work that's already being done.

In addition to that, I recently stood up a standalone crew that is developing culvert maintenance program throughout the County, in addition to the culvert maintenance that's already going on in each of these districts. We've filled those positions, and that crew started two weeks ago and is working starting to develop that plan and work through the system. So that we heard the need, we saw the need to supplement resources and we did that. I think from a capital standpoint, I'll let Greg and Yvonne touch on that a little bit. But to what you were saying, I think that's the timing of when General Goodwill is going to be coming out in '28 is my understanding. So I think back is back to what resources are available capital funding-wise and shifting things around, that, that could be a possibility.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Brian.

MANAGER SHAFFER: So if I could just answer your question, Commissioner Bustamante. In the capital plan as presented Paseo C de Baca is actually proposed for inclusion in the calendar year 28 bond sale fiscal year 29. So on the sources and uses, that's where it's been slotted in at, again, an estimated cost, which is really, again, just an estimate until the PER is done of $9.3 million. So again that would be the timeline, and we've tried to build in funding associated with that timeline of PER and design completion hopefully by the end of calendar year 28.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: So I can disregard the 2030 highlighted?

MANAGER SHAFFER: Again, that is correct. And again if there's something in the documentation that says, 30 it's actually in the sources and uses slated for fiscal year 29, which would be the 2028 general election.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. And only to emphasize I understand the complexity, and I think it's since recently we learned about culverts that were put in on private property.

We have documentation of the easements that the County put the culverts on private property, and the easements were allowed to the private landowner, and those culverts are failing, and the landowner is seeing water collect up around her back door, and we run the risk of having another residence, and that would be the third, and I get calls when it rains. I do want to just emphasize the criticalness of this particular situation and knowing that likely we forgot because we change employees, but residents still sit there, and she knows that this culvert was put in once upon a time, and no one who put that in at that time works here any longer. So we had to do some homework to see what that culvert was about, and that's where we're running into if we don't do something, there will be another residence that will have or may be affected by the water. I thank you for that time and I yield. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Commissioner Bustamante. I would just recommend that you keep your persistence and stay on it and maybe get some legislative money that can go faster than our bond sales.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Yes, sir. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Commissioner Hughes, go for it.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah, I just have a clarifying question. So the GO bond questions, even though it designates like 6.5 million for water and wastewater, and then it designates three projects, we don't necessarily have to spend the money on those three projects, right? They could change around. Same with roads. Even though $14 million for roads, we don't have to do necessarily those exact roads.

MANAGER SHAFFER: Chair Greene, Commissioner Hughes, that is correct. Voters approve questions, not individual projects. And so long as the use of the proceeds are consistent with the voter authorizations that type of reallocation is permissible. It's not a legal risk, it's just more of a constituency risk if those reallocations are made. But nothing prohibits you from doing that from a legal perspective. But we try to put forth in front of voters what we again, what we anticipate relative to relative to projects and uses of funds. But you are accurate that they can be used for any road project.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. And then are you asking us to approve the as part of the capital budget, the general obligation bond questions?

MANAGER SHAFFER: Thank you for that question. We would actually as we finalize things in July we would be bringing forward a general obligation bond question resolution. So no approval necessary today. If you'd like us to look at other projects or differently, then we would like to know that. But the formal approval would, again, come in the form of a resolution actually calling for the general obligation bond questions to be put on the ballot in the November general election. And at that time because we would be going to the voters, we'd want to know what that project list is. But for purposes of building out this plan, we wanted to at least put forward what our recommendations were. And again, ultimately these priorities are the Board's priorities. And so if there are different priorities then again we'll adjust accordingly. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah. Then are you expecting us, or not expecting, but allowing us to approve the rest of the capital budget today, or how do you see this working out?

MANAGER SHAFFER: I would anticipate receiving feedback and then the formal approval would be when we approve the final budget. So just like we did with the operating budget, if this looks good, then we will move forward to prepare the final budget for approval by the Board in July. If there are tweaks that you would like to see made, then we would hear that now. But the formal approval of the capital budget would again, come formally as part of the final budget approved in July.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. The one tweak I would like to make, and no one will be surprised by this, I would suggest that we do put the $10.5 million toward permanent supportive housing out of the uncommitted, unassigned fund balance. But other than that, I don't have any changes to this. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Manager Shaffer, thank you to everyone in this room for all the hard work. I will be as brief as possible. I do have something to proposed – a proposed addition to the capital projects plan and to the ICIP, so I won't repeat myself when we get to that stage.

I just, District 4 has a conundrum, specifically the traditional – pass that down, please. [fact sheet distributed to the Commissioners] Traditional historic community of Cañada de los Alamos. They've been struggling for two decades with well failures. They from 2020 to 2025 had to tank water. The USDA drilled a new well for the mutual domestic in 2025 that pumps one gallon per minute. And recommendation for a mutual domestic of that size, 10 gallons, so one-tenth of what they are receiving.

I've written out a proposal just for reference because it can be, we're tired. So I would like to propose District 4 request that the Santa Fe County to Cañada de los Alamos Mutual Domestic Water Connection Project be added to the capital budgets project plan.

So as I just mentioned, the wells have been failing and this community has been struggling for quite some time. I absolutely agree with the philosophy that the management has proposed but I do see that we need to have flexibility in both the budget and the ICIP approvals because we need to be strategic in how we approach project development. The logic of the proposed changes is quite sound. But in this case, the Mutual Domestic Association has been working for six, seven years on a project. They completed a preliminary engineering report in 2021, which was updated. So they have done scoping. As of this year, they finished a scoped feasibility study with Molzem Corbin Engineering Firm. They have done design for the project without giving you the full packet. I have a map of the proposed water line system that connects to the Rancho Viejo tank by the railroad tracks, moves down Nine Mile Road, has stub-outs for the communities in District 4our of Seton Village, of Sunlit Hills, stub-outs on south Old Santa Fe Trail, and then the pipeline's proposed route goes to the tank at Cañada de los Alamos, which serves the mutual domestic.

The price tag is high. So I am not requesting that this project be, jumping in line to be-- But the well's proposed failure-- or estimated failure is in the next five to 10 years or five to 10 years from now. So we have to act. And in this district, in the foothills in the southeastern Santa Fe County or eastern really, we are seeing low water quality. We're seeing toxic contamination. Water wells in Cañada de los Alamos have had uranium found in them, have found rust bacteria, et cetera. What I'm proposing is that we add this ideally to the fiscal year 2028, but 2029 would set us up for planning and recognizing and appreciating the efforts that the community has done.

They have obtained $1.4 million already to do the design, and they've done it. They need easements and agreements from the County for NMDOT, for railroad crossing, things like that, and they've done a ton of legwork. We have supported them in the process through regular meetings. I want to recognize the work of Public Works, Travis, Brian, past members of your teams who have worked with this community.

And in collaboration/in coordination, let's say, with the County, the PER was expanded to anticipate future connections to the mutual to the water line that the county would own. The mutual domestic has 60 users. They have requests for more, but they pump one gallon per minute, so they, they really can't add to it. So it's a rock and a hard place situation for them, and a failing water situation.

So I respectfully request that we add this to the capital plan, understanding that this will take time. The community has already demonstrated the ability to raise funds. I don't anticipate the County to pony up $16 million for this project, but I do want us to have skin in the game because that's how they will be able – how the County and the mutual domestic will be able to leverage funds from the Water Trust Board, from the offices of Wirth and Szczepanski, from the Army Corps of Engineers, from, various other sources, RCAC, et cetera.

I feel compelled to make this proposal because representing these folks who have done this kind of legwork in advance and then to see our philosophy, which again, I agree with, they, they have done much of the legwork. They have not completed the design because they need some permits, they need some easements with various property owners and controlling agencies.

I've given you a little just kind of fact sheet. I know that we don't have to approve the capital budget today, but I respectfully request that we add this to the capital budget. I'll stop for now. I'm happy to answer questions about this. I recognize that the project has its value goes far into the future. The immediate realized value is not the largest population, but as water continues to wells continue to fail in eastern Santa Fe, having a pipe water connection available to tap into and in the designated growth area of sort of southeastern Rancho Viejo area, I believe that this project needs to be on our capital projects list. So I humbly ask for your support. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Commissioner. I do want to discuss a commonality that I think I'm going to hear here based on some of my comments and the urgency of this, is that we have a bunch of projects in the water space, right? Extensions, whether it's Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System, Chupadero, Cuatro Villas, Hyde Park Road.

There's a lot of them, and they're really expensive. And so I'm wondering if there is a separate presentation very specifically to look at how we can really bring all of these projects into a five-year plan maybe whether it's through all sources. We think we could go to the Water Trust Board for this and not have to put it on a bond. That'd be great. We think we could go for this source and not have to put it. But when we do have to go for a bond, that is a great opportunity for us to do that. But these are so many projects in between that that it's a subject unto itself. And to have different communities have to pick winners and losers, and especially with a big one like this, I think it needs to be comprehensively looked at holistically, water commitments, projects and urgency, right?

That's an urgent project. Hyde Park Road is a commitment. Chupadero, we have money already that we just got from the Water Trust Board. They've been waiting for 14 years, and they did the same amount of work. And the, Cañada de los Alamos has a great opportunity to follow that model. I think water just generally, all of these, it has a high, super high value, and I think that there's a space for maybe a conversation before we commit ourselves to a capital plan. Maybe not before we get to a ICIP list. But anyway, that's my thanks. And Commissioner Bustamante.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Chair. Sorry I'll be brief. I know. I do want to say that the individuals from Cañada did do a presentation to the WPAC, and the WPAC's very concerned. I do want to, and it's not in the interest of not putting it on here, we have - I can't tell you right off the top how many residents in La Cienega who have PFAS who just want clean water as soon as we can get it. And the only reason I didn't mention it as part of those priorities is because I understand after discussing this with Brian that we are going to, I'm sorry, Greg, that we're going to have a study that's coming out, and we'll know the breadth of it. And we have to know where we're going to get the water if we're going to provide it to that community.

But I see this as an emergent problem, and I do want to concur with what you're saying. So thank you for the opportunity, Chair. Yeah.

CHAIR GREENE: Just agreeing with you, there are projects on my list. There's projects in La Cienega. There's going to be projects all over. I think that's something that if it's possible to look at that before we go to the capital list it would be great. And then we can – no, no, not right now. Nobody's ready for that right now. But to consolidate these as a singular subject, right? Not roads, not buildings, not programs but specifically water projects and look at urgency, look at how ready shovel-ready they are, look at different sources of funding for each of them.

MANAGER SHAFFER: I'm happy to facilitate that. We have tried to group the projects. The only observation I want to make is we'll always look to leverage our own resources as we did with the investment that the Board authorized in our sustainable development area by going to the Water Project Fund. The key point there is that, supporting mutual domestics through matching funds or loan repayments, as we did with Chupadero, actually increases the pie. If it's a County project we get less match and also the pie shrinks. Whereas in the case of Chupadero the County was able to pursue its own its own project. Again, Board-defined priorities. Chupadero was able to pursue their own project. And between the two we netted $15 million. And the mutual domestics, frankly have leverage that we don't, number one. And number two, candidly, the scope of the problem is such that this really does require legislative funding.

As Commissioner Johnson mentioned, and I don't think he disagrees with this statement, $17 million for, 24 customers currently is a heavy lift. And really the state needs to be and continue to be, in my view, the primary funder of those types of significant public works projects relative to those systems.

And so I think the County can and does have a way to help facilitate those projects. But I do think that the state has to continue to be the leader because of the sheer size and cost of the projects.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Thank you, Greg. And I do want to I do want to show that best practice that we in partnership with Chupadero made it where it wasn't our burden, but it was our partnership that Chupadero got a pretty much a grant, as opposed to us applying and so there's ways, different techniques to get to where we want to get to, but we have to support them in all these different ways. And Chupadero, we had a commitment through a resolution that we were going to do this over a decade ago. We didn't, but nonetheless, we supported them in their grant to the Water Trust Board, and so now we've got almost 100 percent where they have a forgivable loan that we will then be able to adopt.

And I think that there's ways in a comprehensive project-by-project look at each of these and show that. But to support Commissioner Johnson's request, if this is a legislative ask, should this be added to our ICIP list right now so that we can potentially go source at least some of this money in this next cycle?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: And I would say the answer is yes, Chair, if you are yielding to me. Thank you. Manager Schaefer I see your point about the mutual domestics and the leverage that they have with certain funds. However, this project has expanded in, conversation with County utilities to be a pipeline project. It's not a mutual domestic that stretches to Rancho Viejo. It's a pipe that has stub-outs in various communities. So I think that, a phased approach where we coordinate with that mutual domestic, the singular one that is quite small to apply for funds. But we also need to have our own skin in the game because these are potential future water customers in Santa Fe County. If we anticipate in the next 10 years wells failing in my district, we need to have infrastructure in place now. And, spot solutions like filling water tanks in various mutual domestics is only going to go so far. We need to have permanent solutions moving forward.

So I agree that there is for instance an individual ICIP request from the mutual domestic or a water trust application might do better for that small entity, but the project is much larger than that. And they developed it in conversation with the County to expand it to benefit more than just their singular mutual domestic. So that is why I am requesting that it go on our capital plan. We would in order to do this anyway, it would be a connection that the County would ultimately obtain. It seems unreasonable for us to shoulder this community with, they will continue to work on this problem, but they can't solve the $17 million question on their own. So that's why I'm requesting that we add this to the County projects in order to provide them support and coordination. And I could see us phasing this out where – I'm not, again, I'm not asking this for, to go even in the next two years of the capital projects plan. I'm keep forgetting the name. So anyway, I understand that we have different opinions about this, but I think that this is the right thing to do for the constituents of this community, and it will have a benefit to part of District 5, small part, but and to, to District 4 in particular. So that's why I ask for your support in this matter. Thank you.

MANAGER SHAFFER: To be clear, I don't know that we have a difference of opinion. I think we all agree that the state should pay the maximum amount possible always. And so what we're talking about- is how we position ourselves to have the state pay the maximum amount possible always. And I think that's, like I said, really we're talking about strategy as opposed to ultimate goal, just to be clear.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Have they applied to the Water Trust Board yet?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Yes, their initial design funds came from the Water Trust Board. They submitted a capital project request to the County this year. I'm happy to chat out of quorum, but without having a quorum, with people who are interested in this since we've now brought it up and provide documentation to my colleagues. This is not a public hearing part of this meeting, but there may be people from the Mutual Domestic on the online for the ICIP portion. Because we're not deciding this today, I think we should end this portion out of respect for our time. But I, again, I won't say the same thing at the ICIP, but I will nudge you to consider this again for addition because we do need to approve that today. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Cacari Stone, please.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Thank you, Chair. First, County Manager and the management team, Yvonne, Mr. Cordova, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Herrera, I meant to say thank you for all your work. I think this is a really great streamlined process. It's even better than last year, so thank you. Thank you for the visual of our process. I appreciate that. I have more questions on the ICIP, but I think you're up next at center stage, right? Okay, great.

Brian, can you just tell me a little bit about the color coding and the relationship between Exhibit A and Exhibit B? I just want to be sure what you want to highlight in the points here between these two. And then how they relate, County Manager, if you can remind me how they relate to the presentation earlier. I'm just trying to integrate it all so I'm clear.

MANAGER SHAFFER: Absolutely. Thank you, Commissioner Cacari Stone for the question. Exhibit A is the actual proposed five-year capital projects plan which contains our current estimate of project cost, available resources, funding gaps and then when additional resources might be are anticipated to be needed over the next five years.

The color coding on Exhibit A was really just meant to highlight what resources are being proposed to meet those needs, whether it's capital outlay, gross receipts tax general obligation bonds or other County funds. So that's the color coding on Exhibit A as I recall the exhibit being put together.

I think on Exhibit B, that's the five-year maintenance plan. I see now that there's green highlighting in the first year total. I don't believe that was intended to carry any significance vis-a-vis source of funds or otherwise.

Exhibit C really is meant to try and put forward in a different format where sources and uses of potential county resources are going. That includes, again, both capital outlay, gross receipts tax funds, general obligation bond questions, and then to the extent other County funds are being proposed to be used those are reflected there as well. That's primarily, I think, for the next phase of planning efforts for the jail expansion. But we also had some resources that accumulated in a few previous bond issue funds that we proposed to allocate to, projects to use up those resources.

So those are the three primary exhibits. And then D we attempted to include individual project descriptions as well as budgets in a PDF with individual bookmarks. So those are the exhibits. And if we did seek to put the proposed ICIP and which again, at this point should mirror the capital plan into a geospatial map format we were unable to do that before today's meeting but we'll be happy to provide that to all Commissioners after the meeting. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Thank you. I appreciate that. And there wasn't a color code key source. So I was just curious, so when I review this, what the red, the green, the blue are all –

MANAGER SHAFFER: That was left off in error. I regret that, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Okay.

MANAGER SHAFFER: Yvonne will provide a new version of it that has that color key.

I regret that was left off. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Yeah. So it goes back to the budget source. Okay. Excellent. I'm just going to – don't have a lot of questions. I have more questions on the ICIP. In terms of the proposed budget, I just want to say on slide number 13 of the master plan preliminary engineering reports, I totally support what's on the list, but want to emphasize I support the human rights PER also the PER for the mobility charging stations. I think making our open spaces and trails accessible is really critical right now, and I really support the Caja del Rio bike lane extension PER.

On slide number 14, new capital projects proposed, I think the list you have here is excellent. I support that. As we go to vote at some point, the proposed yield bond question, I know we're going to discuss that, but everyone's chomping at the bit for the Agua Fria Station. I think it's going to serve a growing area out there and actually has pretty quick access to 599 and Highway 14 as well. Slide 16 support the San Ysidro crossing. Of course, that's been talked about for years, predated me with Commissioner Hansen championing that. I continue to champion that at 5.2 million. The greenway trail Section C and D, our staff in Public Works and Growth Management have all been tremendous in really making sure we're engaging with the community. We had 21 people yesterday with the Watershed Association advocates, so I think folks are really looking forward to this being finished, and we want to fully fund it.

I support Romero Ballpark, 1.5 million. On slide 16, I echo what Commissioner Hughes says. Let's go for it. The County's in the space of long-term supportive housing. We've been looking to the City for doing more emergency housing and overnight shelter, so let's go for the 10.5 million. We've done a lot of planning already. It's been a lot of great thought and work. And the feasibility study from Project Moxie, I think we also have quite a bit of public support for that. I would support the remaining of, if there's any left, of the unassigned funds. Yes, there will be 'cause we have 10.5, that we really have a budget for housing.

I anticipate per the joint resolution with the city and me working with Mayor Garcia to have a joint meeting, I anticipate that's going to come out as a number one priority, is a housing, affordable housing, and housing that meets the needs of our communities.

And I think one more last thing. Yes, thank you for putting the Indigent Fund dedicated monies on slide 18. The Regional Youth Behavioral Health Center, again, hugely needed, is going to be a game changer. Thank you to our staff and our team for putting this forward. La Sala expansion, re-entry, we heard a couple days ago, re-entry, re-entry, re-entry. We really need that. And the adult detention facility remodels so that we really align with behavioral health needs, and we treat, and we don't just imprison people, so thanks. Those are my final comments.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Commissioner Cacari Stone.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Oh, sorry, Chair Greene. Sorry, I did want to support Commissioner Johnson. I think you put a thoughtful proposal here together, and I appreciate you advocating behalf on your district. And I also appreciate that you're putting something well thought out and has a lot of support and some preliminary study and design work.
So I support a stepwise approach to this, knowing we can't fund the whole $62 million, but just know I stand with you and with District 4. Thanks.

CHAIR GREENE: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Cacari Stone. I don't want to necessarily get into specific projects here. I think we can talk offline for that because for everybody's time here. But I do want to talk about two aspects that I would call generalized aspects here. Every one of these projects has potential sources alternative to all of these sources, and those should start to be made more apparent in a spreadsheet. So for instance, if it's a water project, there's the Water Trust Board that we talked about. If it is a senior center, it's got all sorts of senior money. If it's from fire, it has fire money. And so that we can start to see the capital stack that's going to start to come to these things, and that we can then fill the gaps more, with more of an idea of where things are here. And that would be my suggestion and sort of a way for us to make more or better decisions from this perspective.

I also recommend that we continue to start working the legislature, right? I would love to see on every one of these projects that is on here how have we made contact with the senators and representatives who represent those projects, right? If Cañada de los Alamos has the, support of Senator Wirth and Representative Szczepanski, then those should be put in there, and we should be working this summer, not waiting till January to get that put into the capital budget, not into ICIP. This is a big enough project that no senator is going to support it in ICIP, but it's going to have to go to legislative finance and say, This is one of those projects.

Every project should have a champion in the legislature if we're putting it on the ICIP list, period. We should say, We've talked to them. They tell us they love this. They're going to commit to this. Given that they're going to get an order of magnitude, two million, three million, four million, whatever that number is. And if it isn't going to cover it, then how are we going to cover it in other ways? And I think that's a big, long-term, strategic, knowledgeable – they live here, our representatives, and we have a home field advantage at the legislature.

I do have a bunch of projects that are on my list, but I'm not going to belabor the point here. We can talk about that on Monday and again on Tuesday. And I'll talk to you all on Monday. I'll talk to us up here on Tuesday. So yeah, we got a lot to talk about on Tuesday, but, hey, somebody just might want to table their project. Anyway thank you very much for all of this. Let's move on to ICIP, please.

3. Public Hearing on FY 2028-2032 ICIP

A. Presentation and Public Hearing on the Santa Fe County Fiscal years 2028-2032 Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plan (ICIP) and Senior Services Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plan

LEANDRO CORDOVA (Deputy County Manager): Good afternoon, Chairman, Commissioners. Want to start by thanking all of the folks that helped with this ICIP. It's obviously a team effort. Our capital improvement committee, internally. I want to thank Alexandra Ladd, Growth Management Department, and their planning team. Anne Ryan, our Community Services Department, and her seniors and ASD team. Brian Snyder in Public Works Projects team. Jonathan Butler in Community Development and Sustainability. So start with that.

So the reason we're here today, staff is asking to conduct a second public hearing for the Santa Fe County Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plan for the fiscal years 28 through 31, pardon my typo. The Board will be asked to adopt the final ICIP by resolution. Resolution is attached to Exhibit A and upon completion of the list, which is Exhibit B, we'll add the list to the resolution. So I just want to make that point clear.

Some background. The ICIP serves as an essential planning tool for the County. You've heard this often, but it's important to recognize that the ICIP is not a wish list, a funding application, or a funding source or a capital outlay request. The process includes identifying and securing funding sources such as support with state and federal grants, as well as the funding from the County's capital budget. Given that available funding is limited and meeting community needs is critical, prioritizing capital projects is crucial. Our capital planning process is designated in Resolution 2019-103, which is Exhibit D, to facilitate clear, comprehensive, and transparent capital planning for prioritization and implementation of capital projects. It also lays out and defines the way a nonprofit can request to be a fiscal agent. Projects are reviewed for County feasibility and scoped, then evaluated, prioritizing the five-year ICIP, which is adopted by resolution. Your last ICIP was Resolution 2026-018. That's Exhibit C. That was submitted to New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration, and then we budgeted accordingly.

Unlike prior years, this year, we are combining our efforts with our senior services team and the aging and long-term services department. They have aligned their submission of the seniors ICIP to the same date of July 1st as our normal capital ICIP. We were able to combine our efforts in public outreach as well as the senior team doing additional public outreach through different methods such as surveys and just getting out to their seniors. The previous senior ICIP that was adopted by the BCC was on March 25th and that's Exhibit F. That one was not updated, so that was a 2025 resolution.

As I mentioned, public engagement is a key component ensuring community needs and priorities are addressed. As senior services sought senior-specific input in the late fall through a variety of methods, as I mentioned, and all applicable County staff participated in countywide community outreach on February 24, 2026. I want to thank our planning team, which really helped guide and lead that.

County staff is presenting the 2032 ICIP today and we do need. We are asking for a public hearing so that we have an additional opportunity for the public to have an outreach and opportunity to speak towards our plan.

And I want to point out Exhibit E is the PowerPoint that was presented to the public. So I'm not going all through that PowerPoint today, but that was essentially what was presented to the public and available to you for reference.

DFA has this year provided infrastructure capital improvement guidelines, which is Exhibit G, as a guidance document that states lots of things that we did follow, and I want to at least mention that we were pretty close to that guidance for the most part before we started, and then we did adapt to that guidance to complete our entries into the ICIP. Some of that does demonstrate the deadlines. So I want to quickly touch on the submission. As you heard, it is July 1st by resolution. There is an opportunity to request an extension. However, the extensions will be received and approved on a case-by-case basis, and it then eliminates our opportunity to do what they have as an amendment process. So if we do not get our ICIP on, in on time by July 1st we do not have the opportunity to amend our ICIP later, which is at a date of November 1st. That amendment process does allow us to basically rearrange our projects but not add any new projects. So as we approve this for our July 1st deadline those are the projects that will be put on the ICIP, and our November 1st deadline allows us to reprioritize for our top five, top 10, or whatever we decide that we want to prioritize going into that.

I'll also mention right now Exhibit B, the list of recommended projects, has no particular order or rating or ranking. I just want to put that out there.

Additional guidance that was given included project specificity. For example they did suggest that we no longer include general placeholder projects. They suggest do not generalize. For example, no street improvements category. That should be identified as a specific street name and the type of improvements that we're pursuing. So that was taken into account, and that's one of the bases of some of the projects removals, which I'll go through that list shortly.

Another important guidance that I think Manager Shaffer went through pretty well and demonstrated is they really want us to identify the funding needs and possible funding sources to establish a preliminary implementation plan for each project. So that's big. I think that's a big reason why it was so valuable to take a look at our capital budget and the five-year planning that we have taking a look at our sources and uses and what's available to us and do our best to plan based on those sources, understanding that any additional revenues that we can receive from either the state, federal, or any grant opportunities would then free up some of the county money for other projects. So that was the goal. As you heard, we're setting it up that way.

There's been a little bit of, well, there's always talk about capital outlay reform. In last year's legislative session, they passed a bill that attempts to start working towards capital outlay reform. However in my opinion, what it does is create an incentive on the back end for us to be better prepared on the front end.

So what they're doing is saying, No more reauthorizations and basically be prepared to spend your money when you ask for it, or it will be clawed back. And so I think that's another reason why we really focused on the projects that we know we can hit the ground running with, and that if we receive funding, as I mentioned before, it's additional, and it's not as much of a need to complete the project. We are ready to complete the project with or without the funding. Their funding allows us to subsidize some of our County funds and move forward. So I think it's very important that we keep that in our focus that if we are going to ask for it, we need to be prepared to spend it as soon as possible.

The ICIP, after being approved by the Board, is then submitted and reviewed by legislators, governor's office or the Department of Finance and Administration, the public, and other stakeholders and decision-makers. It involves collaboration with various stakeholders, including intergovernmental leaders the County Commissioners, community organizers, and residents.

So at this time I wanted to move on, and if we could look, take a look at, Exhibit B, quickly to go through this. I'm not going to go through every project on here. You guys have this. I do apologize for getting it a little late to you, but we've been working to really fine-tune it. What I want to specifically highlight, if you could go down to the last page is the distinction between our normal projects. As Greg mentioned, we did break them into categories. But the senior services, I wanted to highlight this specifically because we are now combining it with our normal ICIP, so it will be in the resolution you adopt, and these specific projects go to a different funding source. So these will be sent back to aging and long-term services, and I believe they're going to be recommended as a part of a general obligation bond at the state level. I also, we have Mattie Byers here from Senior Services to answer any questions you might have specific to Senior Services ICIP, but I wanted to mention that and we'll hold for questions, but I have backup for those if we need to.

The next list I wanted to really take a look at is Exhibit C. These are the list of projects that we're recommending for removal. As I mentioned earlier, there's a few reasons why I would recommend removing some of these projects. The biggest and the best reason to remove them is that we completed the project, and that's great news. And there's multiple on this list that we did complete including the Española Pathway Shelter project, which is near completion. Also if it was under contract at the time that we took a look at this, I took it off the list because we obviously were fully funded if we were able to contract. The other reason projects may have been suggested for removal they were planning projects so as Manager Shaffer mentioned, we're trying to move away from putting the pre-planning PER-type projects on the ICIP until those projects come to the BCC for you to be able to make a decision on whether it really is a project or not that you want to pursue.

And then as I mentioned, the specificity from suggestion from DFA to remove broad items, like broadband infrastructure expansion that didn't have a specific project or the 2025 Sustainability that was broad. We are suggesting to remove those as they're not specific. What we did do is add some specific projects to the ICIP that still represent some of those line item or those broader concepts. So 17 projects on the recommended for removal list. Those are the reasons why I would recommend that.

And now if I could look at the last list that we created, which was fiscal agent requests. Before I get into the fiscal agent requests, I'll mention that we received about nine project requests. Most of those were added to the ICIP new project requests. Most of those were added to the ICIP and/or slated for a preliminary engineering report so that we could evaluate whether or not those projects would move on and go forward further. The bulk of the new projects were the GSI projects, as Manager Shaffer mentioned. That report was given to the BCC a few months ago. And so we wanted to make sure that we programmed those new projects onto the ICIP.

So this list of fiscal agent requests, I'm going to start by mentioning that the very first project on the list was officially withdrawn this morning at the request of Interfaith. And they are here today. I think they would like the opportunity to be able to speak during the public comment part of our hearing. But I just wanted to mention that we're now down to five fiscal agent requests.

The way I looked at these fiscal agent requests was more whether or not there was a path forward for the County to even serve some of these requests. Taking out the ROCk because that's been removed. The Santa Fe Correctional Reentry Home purchase, EINNM, was put on our ICIP at the end of last year. They were funded for the 1.5 million they requested. They do have a path through the County through our affordable housing program, and we should be able to facilitate the transfer of those funds to them by utilizing the affordable housing program and if they agree to the agreement that we have for that. So I am not recommending we put them back on the ICIP for that reason.

Girls Inc. was a request that came in. They are a nonprofit. I did reach out to them, the contact that was provided to ask a few questions about whether or not they would be okay with one, maybe the County owning the building. That wasn't something they were very interested in. Therefore, we do have a true anti-donation concern and it would require a lot more finessing to be able to even think about how we might be able to transfer those funds to that particular nonprofit. Because of that I would not recommend that we add it to the ICIP.

Very similar with the Human Rights Alliance. It is a potential anti-donation concern, and instead the recommendation was to take a look at, to do a PER to take a look at their needs and see how through that process we might be able to facilitate an opportunity to help them facilitate funds. But right now I do see a potential anti-donation concern and from my perspective, I would not recommend putting it on the ICIP.

The next project this is what Commissioner Johnson mentioned, Cañada de los Alamos Water Line Extension. This is a little bit different. I will admit that they are their own local public body, and that is a big difference than the others that are either a nonprofit or a for-profit entity. So Cañada de los Alamos, I did not recommend moving it forward for a lot of reasons. The main one being some of the DFA guidance we got was that there should be one ICIP entry dependent on who's taking the lead on the project. Cañada de los Alamos is able to do their own ICIP, and if they did put this project on their ICIP and it is their only project, then they clearly would be the priority for their ICIP. The design is being led by them, and they continue to be the leader of the project until we come to an agreement of the County stepping in and taking over or assigning it as our own project. So I completely understand and respect Commissioner Johnson's perspective as a Commissioner but from staff perspective that's why I would not recommend necessarily putting it on our ICIP because they have the opportunity to put it on their own ICIP. And I think in future years, I would likely change that opinion as we develop the project further. Of course, at the end of the day, I do what you tell me to do. If that project is recommended, we will make sure it gets on the ICIP.

The last project that was submitted was San Ignacio Flats. It is an affordable housing project. It came to us to be on the ICIP, but it also came with a request for a letter of support for Department of Workforce Solution funding. We would prefer to support the project in that manner than to recommend putting it on the ICIP. It's a total project of 73 million. It's very similar to our Nueva Acequia project. I believe they're pursuing 4 percent low-income housing tax credits. I'm not sure how far they've gotten along that process. I do know that we're further along in our Nueva Acequia process, and understanding the work it took to get where we are I would not recommend we put this on our ICIP at this time until they have a further solidification of their capital stack. Also this project is square in the middle of the city. It's right next to our Nueva Acequia project proposed site. There was a suggestion that they pursue the City and see if there's an opportunity for them to either support this, put it on the ICIP, or support the low-income tax credit in any way they can.

So those are the projects that were simply fiscal agent requests. We did not rate or rank those projects internally. We just brought those forward for you all to make a decision after doing a little bit of due diligence to reach out to each of them to understand what their project looked like. Again, I recommend not putting them on the ICIP, although understanding, again, the Board has different priorities, but the reason for my recommendation is what I mentioned earlier.

That's about what I will present to you at this time. I understand there's a lot of questions, so I want to be able to stand by and answer any questions I might be able to. If it's senior related, I'm going to be looking at Mattie for some help. And I may be looking at everyone else in the room for help, depending on what the question is. Thank you, Commissioners. I stand for questions.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Leandro. Commissioners, no, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Mine's super fast. This is a huge thank you so much. I know you've been working very, very hard on this. I just really want to thank you, Mr. Cordova, and everyone who's assisted in this process, because I know you really started to take a good look at it last year, and we were looking at a list as we started the whole meeting, that there was this wish list and things got moved around and however.

But I do really want to commend you on really tackling this and acknowledging that you have put a lot of effort into getting us to where we are in our ability to make some decisions. So thank you for that, sincerely

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. Commissioner Cacari Stone.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Thank you, Chair. I concur with Commissioner Bustamante. Thank you. You keep getting more organized around it, and I appreciate those efforts as well. Just in terms of the list, do you want us to vote today to archive or expire the list that you have in terms of recommended removal?

MR. CORDOVA: Madam Chair, I believe the official action I would request is the resolution to adopt the project list for recommendation. I wanted to make sure you saw the projects that were being recommended for removal in case you disagree and want to put one back.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Okay, I might have missed it. So that statement's already baked into the resolution to remove. Okay, gotcha.

So in terms of the six, usually I thought you rank and rate them in terms of health, safety.

MR. CORDOVA: No. And Mr. Chair, Commissioner Cacari Stone, I don't recall in my four years getting so many fiscal agent requests of this type. This year was a little unique in the fact that we got so many of them in this sense that I don't know if we ever really needed to address it separately in the past.

So that's part of why we looked at it a little bit differently. In the past some of the fiscal agent requests we got were actually closer to a project that could be scored. Some of these were far away from the type of project we're used to scoring. So that was the reason why we chose not to officially score them.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Okay. Just for clarification, so the list of six you're not recommending for funding- That is correct: in the short table? You're not?

MR. CORDOVA: Madam Chair, Commissioners, that is correct. I do not recommend from staff's perspective for the reasons I mentioned.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: And the ones you are recommending?

MR. CORDOVA: That would be the 57 or so projects in the first list and the six senior center projects. So the Exhibit B, I believe it is, sorry.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Right, I just want to be clear. And at what point are we -- you're going to rank them in terms of the scoring, rate them?

MR. CORDOVA: Given that we have the ability to amend the ICIP before November 1st. I'd like a little time to see if we get any additional guidance. Last year, we received guidance from the governor's office as late as September, and that helped shape some of the ways that we wanted to rank and arrange when we presented that back to you for amendment last year. So yes, by the, by November 1st, prior to that, we will certainly bring a more rated, ranked, and list that shows what our priorities would be that we would recommend to the Board.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Thank you, Mr. Cordova. So the Human Rights Alliance, the LGBTQI2S+ Center would be – it is on our list for a preliminary engineering report in that bucket. So we're going to take that first step, okay? I just want to be sure. Thank you. That's all I have. Thanks.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Commissioner Cacari Stone. Commissioners? Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Chair, thank you. Thank you, Leandro, for that presentation. Very clear and I like the way that it's presented. I do have a little bit more to say. I wonder if we might go to public comment.

CHAIR GREENE: I'm happy to go to public. And I was just going to get

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So I'll yield until after public comment. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Commissioner Hughes. Great. Go for it.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you for allowing this. Chair, I do have one question, and I really look to Jonathan for this. ICIP is also available, and we're creating our arts and culture group, formalizing that as something. Is it premature for, I know they're working and have been working off of an existing plan, but the ICIP is an appropriate venue or source of money for those types of projects.

JONATHAN BUTLER (Community Development Director): Yes. We look to bring for you all's consideration we were anticipating doing at the last meeting in June. We are looking to do it in July the full presentation for you for our recommendations. At the current state, we have the resources we believe we need to be able to do what we anticipate next year in the next fiscal year. Maybe subsequently, you will be presented with information during that year that might ask you to consider something else. But at the present time, we think it might be premature to look at that.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, thank you, Jonathan.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Commissioner Bustamante. This is a public hearing. We would love to hear from all of you. I know that we have some people online, and we have some people in the chambers. If the folks in the chambers would like to approach and be ready to identify themselves and provide a two-minute commentary about this plan and any proposed thoughts that they might have. Are we swearing in? Guess what? You're going to have to swear on something. Would you raise your right hand and – sorry, I'm going to let the clerk do the official swearing in language.

[Duly sworn, Dave Weir, testified as follows:]

DAVE WEIR: My name is Dave Weir, and I reside at 1340 Canyon Road, and yes, I understand I'm under oath.

Good afternoon, Commissioners. As I just mentioned, my name is Dave Weir. I'm the treasurer of the board of Interfaith Community Services. This week, the Santa Fe councilors voted against putting The ROCk on its ICIP. Multiple councilors expressed the view that Interfaith and The ROCk are not ready for this investment. While we respectfully disagree, we also recognize that trust is earned over time. We remain committed to working collaboratively with elected officials, neighborhood residents, businesses, service providers, and community partners to continue to strengthen this project, listening to concerns and demonstrating our readiness through our actions.

For these reasons, we respectfully withdraw our request for the County to add The ROCk to its ICIP at this time. Thank you very much.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you very much. Thanks for working with us and all the work that you do. Just to, this is not the end of this conversation. I think you know that, and we are all in support of homelessness solutions, and we really admire the work you've done and the work you're doing. And we hope to be there, maybe not on ICIP, but there's fiscal agency. There's lots of ways that we can support you, so please don't go too far.

MR. WEIR: Chairman Greene, thank you very much, and councilors for that. And we look forward to continuing our partnership.

CHAIR GREENE: Great. Thank you. Yes. Is there anybody else in the chambers that would wish to speak to the ICIP list? Seeing none online, I think I saw a hand raised.

DANIEL FRESQUEZ (Media Coordinator): Mr. Chair, we have one person online, Chita Gillis.

CHAIR GREENE: Excellent. Ms. Gillis, would you please be sworn in?

[Duly sworn, Chita Gillis, testified as follows:]

My name is Cheetah Gilles. I live at 40 Cañada Village Road. And yes, I understand I'm under oath.

Okay. So I've been listening to, the discussion about Cañada de Los Alamos, and I want to let you know that it is on our ICIP. However, there's a problem because I do not believe the funders will move forward unless the County's commitment is very clear. Construction projects need to be shovel-ready, and the end status needs to be clear from the beginning, not a maybe. Maybe the County will be involved later. This is something that from the beginning is going to have to involve the County, so that's another argument for it getting on the ICIP.

Another issue that we have is we have spent a million dollars in coordination with the County staff, primarily utilities and infrastructure, on developing our design of this project. But we still have three hundred thousand plus dollars left, and what that is left for is we need to have the MOU. We need to know who is going to be responsible for what between our organization and the county in the final operation of the project. And then we also need easement agreements and the New Mexico Department of Transportation crossing permits to be in the County's name because it's not in our area. We have easement agreements that have to do with our community and our tank. But this is a 7.5-mile water line that comes from the Rancho Viejo tank and has, along the way, quite a few easement issues that will have to be in the end, that agreement will have to be with the County.

So again that is another reason for an argument some way forward to complete our design because, again, we can't go for construction money till that's done, and then also to show the commitment of the County to this project. So that's what I have to share at the moment.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Ms. Gillis. I can just say that we're, as well, we're behind you, and you've heard from a bunch of us here whether it's you do have lots of resources at your fingertips, and we will fill the gaps with the resources that we can as much as possible, I think, at the County. Thank you.

Is there anybody else online that would like to speak?

MR. FRESQUEZ: Mr. Chair, there are no other users online.

CHAIR GREENE: Excellent. Commissioners, further questions here? Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So I won't belabor the point. I have two questions for Leandro. So the first is that, actually yesterday we chatted a bit, and I think we were – I asked for some clarification, so I'm going to again. Can items be added to the ICIP between July 1st or November 1st, or is July 1st the deadline, and then we can adjust numbers, requests, details, et cetera, among the selected list after July 1st?

MR. CORDOVA: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Johnson, based on the DFA guidelines they said that we cannot add after today. We can simply amend and rearrange. That's based on the DFA guidelines. However, every year it seems like things have shifted and changed. So I don't want to say that it's an impossible ask. If it's the desire of the Board, we could definitely make the additional ask.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you for that answer. And last year we received, I mean, October 20th requests, so I think we should try to avoid that this year. Appreciate your work on this matter.

Second question. In the projects that for a fiscal agency it doesn't -- it sort of represents the total estimated funding gap for the next phase or total of the project. I'm wondering if we were to move the Cañada de Los Alamos waterline extension to the ICIP, to our ICIP, this $16 million ask, you know, is not going to happen in one fell swoop. Could we phase that ask in order to build the capacity and, begin in earnest with a $1.5 million request to right size the request? What is more reasonable then?

MR. CORDOVA: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Johnson, based on the DFA guidance, again, they do prefer that we look at either entire projects or phases that can be completed as a standalone phase. So to answer your question, I think we don't, without the design being complete, know what phases would look like for the construction. If we were to move in that direction, I think my suggestion would be to perhaps looking at the completion of the design phase they're in and say, Hey, here's the funding gap, that would just be my suggestion. I don't know if that works or if that gets us to our end goal.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you. I appreciate that. And so if we were to add it today and it had, the full price tag on it, we could adjust that request between July 1 and November 1 in coordination with a, you know, better understanding of this. I know that this is – that I am requesting my fellow commissioners to support this. But I also want to indicate that there, you know, I'm not trying to hog ICIP and the project's, you know, initiation is not immediate.

But I think Ms. Gillis' point is well taken, which is that showing legislators and being able to point to something for funding sources of County commitment is essential to them moving forward in their limited capacity as a, small mutual domestic. So I would – what I'm trying to say is I would request that we add it to the ICIP with the understanding that we get with the mutual domestic and identify the sort of right sized ask because we know that the full funding would not come through. It would be great if it did. But the pot is only so big, and so I wouldn't also want to take away from other projects. And also, I think strategically you want to make asks that are achievable. So that's my proposal. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Hughes.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah, I agree with Commissioner Johnson. I think that should be on our ICIP right now. It certainly doesn't hurt anything to put it on. I also would like to put permanent supportive housing on the ICIP. I know I discussed that with Manager Shaffer, and he thought this was maybe premature, but I do think we could spend any money we got in 2027. By the time we got it, we would easily be able to spend it on permanent supportive housing. And I think, given if we commit $10 million of ourselves, this is going to look very attractive to the state. And so, I think we ought to put it on the ICIP for that reason.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Commissioner. I do think that there's other sources of money, but maybe including it nonetheless. The laundry list can be big.

MANAGER SHAFFER: If I could and for the permanent supportive housing we don't have a number, so I'm just going to, in terms of moving forward we have rough order of magnitude estimates. So we don't have a total project cost that we could really show as, we don't have a site. We don't have any design what have you. So that was really the nature of my conversation with Commissioner Hughes.

Again it is your list, but I just wanted to be clear that in terms of trying to discuss it with legislators and funders at this point yes, we're committed, but we still have a ways to go to actually have a project to go and sell.

In terms of the Cañada de los Alamos I just want to be clear that our ICIP is our planning document, and so whatever number is on there, what we're trying to get at is that we're committed to that. And to put the full ask on it, like I said, you can amend it but I just want to provide that perspective of if it's trying to capture our commitment, putting it on the ICIP isn't a commitment of County resources. And so I think that there are other ways to potentially achieve it. But in terms of the number that you put on I would just, I think that's the point that Leandro is trying to capture is that, we haven't yet entered into an agreement that defines the roles and responsibilities. So in putting it on the ICIP are we putting on the full project cost or are we simply reflecting, what the Board may be willing to commit to in the future in terms of matching funds or loan repayment as we've done with other mutual domestics? So just some clarity around that point in terms of adding Cañada de los Alamos. Yes, you can amend it, but I think it would be useful as well to just think about what is it that we're putting on because if it's a commitment of resources, then it should reflect what we're reasonably committed to, and then it should be on the capital planning in order to reflect the fact that we're planning to make that commitment. So that's again how they go hand in hand. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Chair. I have a question about this, and because it is something that we don't have the absolute details but we know we want, and when we look at what could possibly be put in front of the legislature, I feel like that's something that as a state in the biggest picture everyone should be working on. And if we had something that it wasn't necessarily just a specific ICIP ask for a project we don't know what it would be yet, but to have them to start to commit to what this larger pot of money would be to assure that as projects come available and I say despite all the concerns that the ROCk had, right? That when something like that comes forth and we know there are state funds specifically for this, that would be our ask. We want this to be something that's available and not just the County project, but a more permanent solution to permanent supportive housing, if that makes a strong case for it.

CHAIR GREENE: I kind of wonder, this is I guess a question for Leandro and for Greg, that if we create a laundry list with some order of magnitude, not the 100 percent number, but we know that we're going to edit it by November, but we can't add anything between now and November, and we probably can remove things between now and November, and we're going to prioritize and seek guidance between now and November. Now we have to add everything And then we can pare it down and get harder numbers, maybe delay something and say, This is going to happen in a future year. Or am I wrong?

MR. CORDOVA: Mr. Chair, I think the purpose of the guidance from DFA is to avoid us adding everything. I think the reason why they gave us the direction to be specific, not be broad, find your funding sources, be prepared to spend and have a timeline, is so that the projects we put on truly are the type of projects that we can complete. I'll just tell you my concern is if we put on a project we're not ready to spend the money on and we get, say, a million dollars, say, somebody wants to give us a million dollars for Cañada de los Alamos and we need 16, we may be at risk of losing the million, and then that would be unfortunate. So we're putting ourselves ahead of our ability to spend the money.

CHAIR GREENE: I understand. I'm just saying if we have to add to the list by Wednesday, or skip a year, and then by Wednesday we put it on the list, it's into something, and then we have November to get to the point to know whether that million dollars is something that we could use in a timely manner and not give it back, then we're going to go move ahead and affirm that in November. And if not, then we're also going to come back and we're going to say, We're not ready.

But it's a challenge for you, for us, to get ready by November for whatever we think is the right number that we can spend in those years that we also go talk to the legislators, right? If we go talk and say this summer, Go talk to Senator Wirth. Go talk to Representative Szczepanski and whoever else is going to be a champion of this at the legislature and just say, Look, we're going to go for a million dollars. You think you can do that? And they go, No. Then maybe it's not worth bothering. But if it's not on the list, we lose all the opportunity.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: One hundred percent, thank you, Chair. So to answer your question, Manager Shaffer, I think it would be appropriate to sort of bookend, I'm losing my words, the matching funds. So that would be – we discussed this in a meeting the other day. I think that would be the appropriate amount. If that's 10 percent maybe it's 1.6, right?

So that sort of request is what I am looking for, not the 16 million as the price tag. I agree with what Chair Greene said. I think this is the right strategy for us today. It hopefully I have support on this, but add this to the ICIP, make the request 1.6, let's make it 10 percent. And then I am fully willing to spend as much time as needed, negotiating with Legal, with management, with Public Works, and understanding where we are 'cause the design is mostly complete. We need to do these easement works and things like that. So as, Chair Greene notes, there may be I admit, there may be something that comes up that it's not ready for this year. But we've still indicated support for it and, and are able to move forward with it until we're not. And I think we're missing the opportunity if we don't take it today. So that again, I request that we add this at 1.6. Thank you.

CHAIR GREENE: And in support of Commissioner Johnson's request here, the 10 percent goes to the greater project, but might be the assets that are ours at this point, and the mutual domestic is going to keep it on their list for the other large portion that is theirs, and we can find, like the pipeline that interconnects, that's going to be ours. Their project that is in their area, that's going to be theirs. Could be theirs. Could be ours. But I'm just –

MANAGER SHAFFER: No, I think just again, it's really they should be the lion's share. This is a line extension.

CHAIR GREENE: Of course.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: We're agreeing. Yeah, of course.

MANAGER SHAFFER: We're all agreeing. I just want to not lose the sight of that we get the maximum leverage by it being their project –

CHAIR GREENE: Absolutely –

MANAGER SHAFFER: Always and forever.

CHAIR GREENE: And the 10 percent is a token, and is some infrastructure that would be maybe outside of their scope, but something that has value to us on the long term. Is that agreeable? Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Cacari Stone.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Thank you, Chair Greene. So Commissioner Hughes we have the 10.5 million on the unassigned fund balance, right, for permanent supportive housing. And then I'm looking at the report that Jen Lopez did with Project Moxie. What amount are you proposing to put on the ICIP? Because I support this, but I want to know what we're, what dollar amount.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Thank you. I was looking at her report too. And she, she estimates the total cost would be $17 million. And that's only an estimate, but I don't think we need more than an estimate on the ICIP, because we can change that if we get a different cost. So I would say $17 million.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Okay. So let me go backwards so I'm clear on what I can ally with you to support. We have 10.5 million proposed on the uncommitted assigned fund balance to permanent supportive housing. You're saying $17 million on top of that?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: No.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: I just want to be sure.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: No, $7 million on top of that.

MANAGER SHAFFER: Now, if I could, just to clarify, and I'm sorry to interrupt, but I want to be clear. The $10 million is primarily not capital. Again, the hardest money to get because it's not capital outlay and it doesn't come from low-income housing tax credits are the guarantees that you need for a permanent supportive housing, which are the operational guarantee and the services guarantee. That's separate and apart from the capital cost of the project.

So the capital cost of the project other than potentially the congressionally directed spending money, we're starting at zero. We put a placeholder as a $2 million funding gap if needed. But the amount that would be reflected on the ICIP would be the capital cost of the project.

And, again, the $10 million that would be allocated from unassigned and uncommitted general fund balance for the most part, that's not going to the capital cost. That's going to the guarantees that we have to have money in the bank for the project to actually go forward. So again, whatever the capital estimate is at this point without the site, et cetera, again we're scoring that as being fully unfunded because we don't have anything other than the congressionally directed spending, which I don't know that we've received a grant agreement for. So just for clarity.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: I like that clarity, and I think it's great to have it for the record. So we really do need, looking at the report, a total of $17 million. Do we want to put that on the whole thing or just shave it down a bit, Commissioner Hughes?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: The money we have from Senator Heinrich, that's capital, isn't it? Capital funding?

MANAGER SHAFFER: Chair Greene, Commissioner Hughes, I'd have to go back, but I believe, yes, it was for site selection and development cost is my recollection. So again, that could count, towards, the capital stack, and I'd want to go back and refresh my memory as to what the estimated construction costs were. But you have the report up, so I'm trusting that that is what in fact was estimated. So if anything, it would be the 17.5 less the 2.5.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Okay. So just Chair Greene and Commissioner Hughes, I'm looking at the blue highlights, the County required funding capital. If we went with the higher end model, it is 13.6 million. Do we want to put that in so that we're putting in the County portion?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Isn't the County – in Jen's suggestion of amount of money we put in, didn't she suggest that we put 2 million toward the capital part and the other toward – actually, only 5 million, I think, is the service guarantee.

MANAGER SHAFFER: So there are two separate, Chair Greene and Commissioner Hughes, there are two separate guarantees. One is the service guarantee, and the other is the operational guarantee. If I recall, one was about 5 million, the other was about 3 million. So one guarantees that the services that are necessary for the project to be qualified as a permanent supportive housing project can actually be delivered.

The other is an operational guarantee to make sure that the actual building itself and the permanent supportive housing complex can meet its maintenance and operational needs. The $2 million was really not meant to go towards the base capital, but so that we had set money aside as potential gap funding as we cobble together the capital stack.

So again, my suggestion would be the total project cost on a capital side would be the full estimated cost, which again is the current estimate, less the 2.5 from the congressionally directed spending, which would be the funding gap. So I would be putting on the ICIP the full cost of the capital the full capital cost of the project, and the only monies that we have secured towards that really are from the congressionally directed spending. So that would be the way I would respectfully suggest we approach it.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: So what – do you have a number in your head or do you need to go back and figure that out?

MANAGER SHAFFER: We can go back and figure that out. As I said, it's an estimate and we'd have to describe it as such. But if the Board, adopts the resolution with that addition, then we can, if you're giving us the leeway we could add that to the recorded version of the resolution what we estimate the capital construction cost to be.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. So I think that would be around 15 million, the same as what you said, but I think you should go back and look at it with a clear head.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: If it's 17 million minus 2.5, is that what you're saying? 'Cause that's 14.5 million.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: That's why I'm asking him to go back and figure it out.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: I think so. I think that's a good idea.

CHAIR GREENE: If I may, again, these are placeholders right now. I think we have months to firm up these numbers. We have months to go get other funding sources so that at the end of the day, you're not going to get 17 million unless we're not getting anything else. We didn't even get 13 million last year. So to ask for 15 million right now of capital outlay for one project, everybody else here sits here sad. So finding other sources, but scoping it out in a real number and looking for other alternative methods to finance this is the way to move this forward, to commit to putting it on our capital outlay list, hope for three, four million.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah, we're not expecting them to fund the whole thing. They know there's other sources.

CHAIR GREENE: Absolutely. That's right. So let's put it up there and let's move towards finding other sources, would be my recommendation in there. Let's firm up the number over the next few months, know that it's a priority, it's on our list, and if we can go get that.

I'm sorry, Sara, you told me that there was one more person that really wanted to speak online, and I had not closed public comment, so better late than never. Thank you very much. What is the person's name?

MR. FRESQUEZ: Mr. Chair, the speaker is Amanda Alberta.

CHAIR GREENE: Amanda, you've got two minutes. Would you please get sworn in by the clerk?

[Duly sworn, Amanda Alberta, testified as follows:]

AMANDA ALBERTA: Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Amanda Alberta. I live at 571 South Taft Street in Lakewood, Colorado, and I understand that I am under oath.

Thank you, Commissioners, for the opportunity to speak today on behalf of the San Ignacio Road project. This project is an affordable housing community situated right next to the Nueva Acequias project that, if successful, will house over 500 individuals in the County of Santa Fe. These units will be eligible to individuals who earn less than 60 percent of the area median income, which for an individual, that's earning less than $65,000 a year. And our rents that are offered in the 164 units range $1,200 for a one-bedroom to $1,900 for a four-bedroom unit. This represents a 30 percent spread to comparable market rents. And in the City of Santa Fe, we're not seeing any availability for four-bedroom units. So really, we're looking to support multi-generational households here. We understand that many New Mexican families live in multi-generational configurations, and we appreciate the opportunity to support these residents and also provide opportunities for collaboration with Nueva Acequia in terms of programming and sharing of spaces for residents.

Since the beginning of this project, we have engaged with both the City and the County to understand how each can help support this project as ultimately, it's supporting residents that are constituents of both the City and the County.

We would ask for your inclusion on the ICIP today to allow staff more time to assess project feasibility. Ultimately, the project will not be able to assemble a full capital stack unless we're supported for funding. And so we see this as an opportunity for the

County to convey to the state that this project, this provision of 500 affordable homes, is important to the County, and we will work with the city to determine the best path for funding this project. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you, Amanda. Just to give you my two cents here, like all of these other projects that are housing related, there are multiple financing mechanisms, and we'd love to hear more than a two-minute presentation about this probably to understand the scope of this and to understand how we can potentially support this in an appropriate manner. But thank you for presenting that to us today.

Commissioners. Okay, I'm going to take my – did you have -- I'll come back to you.

But first let me find out. We do not have to adopt this today, correct? We can have another little crack at the apple just to incorporate some stuff here, have a little bit of time to digest it, talk to you Monday, talk to you all up here on Tuesday, and be ready to adopt it on Tuesday, correct?

MR. CORDOVA: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, that is correct. However, I do want to just remind everyone that July 1st is the deadline for all of the data entry.

CHAIR GREENE: Understood.

MR. CORDOVA: So if we're here till midnight on Tuesday night it may be a challenge for staff. So if there's at least an indication that you're going to accept the rest of the ICIP, and you give us at least the nod to start doing data entry I would really appreciate that from our perspective.

CHAIR GREENE: Yes, I look at it as getting you started on this, but also allowing you to come back with our comments and incorporating our comments of today and say, We've heard you. Here's what permanent supportive housing is, instead of a pull it out right now, right? This is what we think is the right number for this year, and this is what, and so on. I think there's an opportunity to do both with that. Okay. Yeah.

So for my point here, I have two things that I see here maybe a third. One is a question about a project that was on a capital project, but also potentially on the ICIP list. And then two are other little projects that may not be on here yet, but I know we could spend the money, and I know the demand is there.

First one is when we see the broadband infrastructure expansion, we're in the process of working with a group, and maybe this could be used towards matching money more specific to County purposes. For instance, instead of saying we need $2.6 million for broadband expansion, if we lowered that number to five or $600,000 specifically for hooking up County facilities to fiber or to another tower for the E911, something related, so it isn't not a specific project per DFA, but has some specificity to match to the to the BEAD funding so that we could do that and maybe get more capacity out of that. And so that is a specific project maybe to an expansion of the project that isn't necessarily BEAD related, but it is tied into the BEAD project where County buildings would have fiber to them or some other BEAD related aspect. That's the first one.

Second one is we've discussed in the past Tano Road waterline extension and a tie-in. Tano Road is technically one side of the street is, was once upon a time part of Aamodt but it was taken out of Aamodt. Some folks on that area have some issues with water. There's also not necessarily the need to tie in waterline for personal use, but there is for fire use. And so the concept of putting a half mile, one mile waterline down Tano that ties into. Not only to the city's lines, but also in the interconnect. Since we're putting the interconnect there and we're going to be taking potentially some water out of the basin, technically some of that water could stay in the basin and extend to the Tano area. And I have some constituents that have asked for fire coverage there and for water coverage. And so if it was possible to have that added on, and by Tuesday, some scope of work, whether it's $800,000, a million, that seems to be an extension of county utilities.

MR. CORDOVA: Mr. Chair, what you're describing sounds to me like a need for a PER. I couldn't really give you estimates that you're asking for without some pre-planning and then appropriately a design plan. So I think we'd really be making a lot of guesses on that one if we didn't have at least some preliminary engineering or some sort.

CHAIR GREENE: Right. I could get you a PER pretty quickly. But okay. But it's a waterline extension. We do these all the time. We kinda know a scope of work of running a water line down a road with a – you don't have to go all the way to the full engineering of it, but you know that a waterline costs in an order of magnitude $8 a foot or $20 a foot, whatever it is. We could pretty easy look at a tie-in some valves, and so on. But, it's a challenge for Tuesday.

Lastly, there was discussion somewhere about Rio en Medio and Chupadero open space in the capital plan, and I want to circle back to that to see if there anybody here that knows about that, that can speak to that? Because I want to hear it out loud and understand what that project is.

MR. CORDOVA: Mr. Chair, the project that we had identified was specific to a parking for Rio en Medio open space. And that's been accounted for. Is there something-- I'm sorry if I missed your question.

CHAIR GREENE: Does it show up on the ICIP, or does it show up –

MANAGER SHAFFER: No, because it's not a project yet.

CHAIR GREENE: It's not?

MANAGER SHAFFER:. It's still a preliminary engineering report. Again, we're only trying to put things on the ICIP that the board has committed to as a project, meaning you're committed to funding.

CHAIR GREENE: Gotcha.

MANAGER SHAFFER: And we know what the costs are. The potential parking lot is being explored as part of preliminary engineering report. And if the Board so chooses in the future, then that would make its way into an actual project.

CHAIR GREENE: Perfect answer. Thank you very much. That's it for me. Those three projects were of curiosity to me, and I wanted to make sure that they were brought up.

Commissioners, where are we with this?

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: Chair, if it's the board [sic] of the Commission, I make a motion we vote on the final resolution this coming Tuesday, but asking Mr. Cordova to move forward with what's on the list and doing your entry so we don't put you at a huge burden.

And then that we end the meeting.

CHAIR GREENE: And then we have a great weekend.

COMMISSIONER CACARI STONE: And we have two amendments.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: So yeah, I'll second just as a friendly, but add the specificity that the permanent supportive housing discussed by Commissioner Hughes and the Cañada de Los Alamos waterline extension discussed by District 4 are the items that Commissioner Cacari Stone mentioned as to be updated.

CHAIR GREENE: Tano Road, everything that was brought up have some specificity provided, and we could go over them, re-review them and –

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: With additional specificity to the District , Commissioner and Chair of this Board.

CHAIR GREENE: Thank you. We have a motion from Commissioner Cacari Stone with some guidance for Tuesday. A second from Commissioner Johnson. All in favor say, "Aye."

The motion passed by unanimous [5-0] voice vote.

CHAIR GREENE: Great job, guys. Thank you. I know it's more work, and it's a weekend soon, now. I didn't officially close public comment, but that's fine.

3. Concluding Business

A. Announcements

CHAIR GREENE: So one little thing. I do want to say, Brian, thank you for getting the crews up to Chimayo yesterday. I heard lots of thank yous last night and this morning. We need to look at ways to support that up there, but thank you very much.

B. Adjournment

Upon motion to adjourn by Commissioner Johnson and second by Commissioner Hughes and with no further business to come before this body, Chair Greene declared this meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Approved by:

Justin Greene, Chair
Board of County Commissioners

COUNTY CLERK
KATHARINE E. CLARK
SANTA FE COUNTY NEW MEXICO

ATTEST TO:

KATHARINE E. CLARK
SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK

Respectfully submitted:
Karen Farrell, Wordswork

BCC MINUTES
PAGES: 47

:OUNTY OF SANTA FE)
;TATE OF NEW MEXICO) ss

[Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for
Record On The 15TH Day Of July, 2026 at 02:46:28 PM
And Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # **2087729**
Of The Records Of Santa Fe County

Witness My Hand And Seal Of Office
Katharine E. Clark
Deputy ________________ County Clerk, Santa Fe, NM

SFC CLERK RECORDED 07/15/2026