

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

January 9, 2024

1. CALL TO ORDER

This special meeting of the Santa Fe County & City Buckman Direct Diversion Board meeting was called to order by County Commissioner Anna Hamilton, BDD Board Chair, at approximately 11 a.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

2. ROLL CALL: Roll was called and a quorum was present as shown:

BDD Board Members Present:

Commissioner Anna Hamilton
Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth
Commissioner Anna Hansen [remotely]
Peter Ives, Alternate Citizen Member [remotely]
Tom Egelhoff, The Club at Las Campanas [non-voting]

Member(s) Excused:

J.C. Helms, Citizen Member
[One City vacancy]

Others Present:

Rick Carpenter, BDD Facilities Manager
Nancy Long, BDDDB Legal Counsel
Kyle Harwood, BDDDB Legal Counsel
Bernardine Padilla, BDD Public Relations Coordinator
Delfin Peterson, BDD Administrative Assistant
Randy Sugrue, BDD Operations Superintendent
Monique Maes, BDD Contracts Administrator
Joni Arends, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety [remotely]
Jay Lazarus, Glorieta Geoscience, Inc.
Jamie Cassutt, City Councilor – incoming BDD Board member
Michaelene Kyrala, Las Campanas Water Cooperative
John Evans, U.S. Department of Energy Attorney Advisor [remotely]

SFC CLERK RECORDED 02/06/2024

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

No changes were noted and Councilor Romero-Wirth moved to approve as published. Commissioner Hansen seconded and the motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTE: November 2, 2023

Commissioner Hansen noted a correction on page 2:

“COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Dr. Roach. Does this mean that we used our allocation or that we received it? That ~~was~~ wasn't really clear to me.”

Commissioner Hansen moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Councilor Romero-Wirth seconded and the motion passed without opposition.

5. ACTION ITEMS: Discussion and Action

- a. **Consideration and Possible Action on Resolution 2024-1, Relating to the Open Meetings Act and Adopting Annual Open Meetings Act Notice Requirements**

NANCY LONG (BDDDB Legal Counsel): Madam Chair and members of the Board, this is our annual requirement to consider by resolution what constitutes notice for our public meetings as required by the State Open Meetings Act. I know you have all seen these in your respective bodies too. We take the opportunity to look at it at a staff level and I ask are we doing this? Is this working? Certainly we have requirements but you can also set forth how you wish to notice your meetings within the parameters of the law.

There had been some physical posting requirements in our past Open Meetings Act and I was told by staff that we weren't doing that any longer. It is all on website and in addition we say in our resolution that we meet on the first Thursday of every month, which is what we do. We changed that. And then we also are allowing for virtual attendance or remote attendance if it is difficult or impossible for a board member to attend in like of more modern requirements, we didn't used to allow that a couple of years ago but now we have set it into our resolution. The changes were minor from our prior one. We have kept the ability that in the event of a public health emergency, because we just never know, that we can hold the entire meeting remotely or you can cancel a meeting or do whatever you need to do as the chair and the chair would decide.

And with that, I would recommend that we pass our Open Meetings Act resolution to provide what constitutes notice for our meetings this next year.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Excellent. Any questions from the Board?

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Move to approve.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Second.

CHAIR HAMILTON: I have a motion and a second. All those in favor please say aye.

The motion carried without opposition.

- b. **Request for approval of contract with Pumptech Holdings, LLC; DBA Alpha Southwest, an Impel Company in the amount of \$499,623.71 including NMGRT**
- i) **Request for Budget Adjustment Approval to reauthorize unexpended funds approved by the BDDB from the Major Repair and Replacement Fund for FY2023 to FY2024 in the amount of \$499,623.71**

RICK CARPENTER (BDD Facilities Manager) Thank you, Madam Chair and good morning. Members of the Board, Madam Chair, this contract with Alpha Southwest was originally approved many months ago. Over a series of delays through the finance department and procurement, it took awhile to get this through the system. By the time that that happened the contract had expired and around that time as well Southwest was purchased by Pumptech Holdings, LLC, so we had to reissue a new contract with Pumptech's name on it instead of Alpha Southwest. So staff is requesting approval of the new contract with Pumptech Holdings and approval to reauthorize the unrestricted funds from the Major Repair and Replacement Fund. With that, I'll stand for questions.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Excellent. Any questions? Seeing none, what is the pleasure of the Board?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I move to approve.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Second.

MS. LONG: And, Madam Chair, there is a BAR that is attached to this request. I would take it that the motion includes approval of the BAR.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Commissioner Hansen, does your motion include approval of the BAR?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Yes.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Excellent, and your second?

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Second.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Thank you. So now we have a revised motion and second. All in favor please say aye.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- c. **Consideration and Possible Action on draft Buckman Direct Diversion Board Comments to New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) 2024-2026 State O New Mexico Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 202(d)/305(b) Integrated List of Assessed Surface Waters**

KYLE HARWOOD (BDD Legal Counsel): Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Board. As you all know this has been a busy time of the year to say the least. The notice for this comment period came out in early December. The comment period runs before our next Board meeting in February and so we attempted to prepare a comment letter for your consideration. In addition to the holidays we had some logistical challenges with getting you a draft of this. I did handout a paper version at

the beginning of the meeting that contains essentially two basic suggestions for this comment letter. One is that the integrated list does contemplate the preparation of what are called TMDLs, total maximum daily loads, and that schedule has been pushed out repeatedly in the revisions of the integrated list. So we are asking the Environment Department to prioritize that work for our Segment 114 which is the segment of the Rio Grande that the Buckman intake is located at.

And additionally, consultant Jay Lazarus, who is here today, has also added an additional issue that was not in the earlier draft that you saw of this letter that relates to the acknowledgement that EPA has made recently of the hydrology connection between LA Pueblo Canyon and the Rio Grande and asking that the LA Pueblo Canyon system be assessed in its entirety under the public water supply use.

As many of you know we have been circling between the holidays and the weather and other unanticipated issues to get you a consensus comment letter. It is due by the 24th and I have it dated as the 22nd because I just figured I didn't want to date it before you guys were able to consider and sign it. I have also removed Councilor Villarreal's name from the signature block at the end as was noted. With that, I stand for any questions and Jay is here as well.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Can Jay, Madam Chair, come up to the podium?

CHAIR HAMILTON: Sure.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I just want to have him involved in the conversation.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Appreciate it.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And I do have a couple of questions whenever you're ready.

CHAIR HAMILTON: By all means; I'm ready.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Just as a starting point, the two of you have worked on this letter and you're in agreement with its substance.

JAY LAZARUS (Glorieta Geoscience): Yes, Madam Chair.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: I'll just – I understand and Kyle mentioned a couple of times how difficult it's been given the holidays and other events to get something in front of us. And I'm just going to say publically, I don't like getting something of this length and substance. I was handed this five minutes before the meeting and so it makes it very challenging for us then to have to vote on it. So that's one issue. But that's where we are so I'm going to ask a couple of questions and see if I can get to a comfort level with what's in here in a quick passing but, again, I'm going to say this is complicated stuff. We have two consultants. We have Jay Lazarus and his company who is our contract environmental consultant and then Kyle, of course, you bring to the table other expertise on it as well. So that speaks to the nature of the complexity in this and then we're handed it and given five minutes to read it and vote it and represent the board as being in agreement and again, these are highly technical things. So I'm just going to express that.

I guess my more substantive question is around total maximum daily loads, the TMDLs. When I look at the packet material, Kyle, that you sent to us trying to kind of give us some background to get up to speed on this, it doesn't look like the New Mexico Environment Department what they're asking for comment on doesn't seem to be

specific to this TMDL issue and I think you said they haven't done what they said they were going to do and we'd like to ask them to do that. But is this the appropriate place to be commenting on that given that that's not the comment that they're asking the public for at this moment?

MR. HARWOOD: I think it is appropriate to go ahead and remind them that their integrated list has pushed the schedule out. They have asked for comments on the integrated list. They have asked folks to focus on a number of substantive issues but I do think that this schedule that continues to push out into the future is relevant. It is a key component to the integrated list process and it does – it's part of the critical path, sort of speak, to getting to a full regulatory implementation of the integrated list and so while they may not be asking for comments on their delayed schedule I do feel like it's an appropriate time and place to remind them that this is not what they've told the public in the past that they intend to do and that we are waiting for this work to be completed. So it is part of the integrated list process.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Right. I don't know, are you both in agreement on that or is this a point where maybe you have different ways of looking at it?

MR. LAZARUS: Madam Chair, I don't know that this is necessarily a point we have different ways of looking at it. There's other opportunity. I just left the Water Quality Control Commission meeting at the Roundhouse where this 303(d) 305(b) listing was one of the specific agenda items and they – just so you understand the schedule better and then I will respond to your question, Madam Chair. The public comment period closes before the next meeting, probably January 25th. They would like to have, the Environment Department would like to have a final draft for submission on February 9th and it will be submitted to the Water Quality Control Commission March 1st after they respond to the public comments and they will respond. They are required by EPA to respond to all of the comments whether they agree with them or not.

So in terms of the TMDL which is pushed out, and continually pushed out and continually pushed out, they will have to respond to the comment. We'll be hearing the integrated list at the March 12th Water Quality Control Commission meeting and then the list goes to EPA on April 1st.

It's our unfortunate experience that – you know, we represent a lot of other stakeholders in front the Environment Department and the Water Quality Control Commission – and I'm going on the record with this, so here it goes – it's our unfortunate experience that the department blows off a lot of public comment. They respond it in writing but in terms of taking action that's something that doesn't happen the way that a lot of stakeholders want. So in terms of going to the Commission – either I or my staff attend all Water Quality Control Commission meetings. When the agenda comes out for the March 12th meeting, there's no meeting in February because of the session, we depending on the Board's direction, we can present technical testimony to the Commission. The final draft will come out February 9th and fortunately we will have another Board meeting before the March 12th Water Quality Control Commission hearing. Commissioner Hansen, I'm sorry.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Two more.

MR. LAZARUS: Yeah, two more but we won't have their final draft until February 9th which puts us past our first meeting in February.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Good point, yes.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay. Maybe since we were just handed this memo, can either or both of you just kind of walk us through what it is we're saying. I jumped right into TMDLs but maybe I should have backed up and had you all describe what's in this letter. What are saying in terms of the comment that they're asking for.

MR. LAZARUS: I think on the TMDLs I'll refer to Kyle on that and I'll talk about the public water supply as it shows up later in the letter.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay. So on page one it says, "Segment 114 Rio Grande – Cochiti Reservoir to San Ildefonso boundary" and that's where we get into TMDLs. What essentially does that paragraph say?

MR. HARWOOD: Thank you, Councilor. So, yes, as you know the first two paragraphs are introductory. The first one describes our project. The second one describes the matter that we're responding to. Under the Segment 114 heading we note that we made this comment previously in 2022 comments, the same comment round for that integrated list comment period. And the Segment 114 water is listed as impaired and we're not then subject to TMDL despite that action being necessary to improve water quality. We pointed out that many of the TMDLs are intended to address years long impairments that were estimated to be listed even in 2021 and in those response to comments, NMED said that TMDLs are usually issued four years after the last water quality survey which was done in 2017/2018. So their further response at that time was that the next water quality survey would include Segment 114 would occur in the 2023/2024 and push out the issues of TMDLs until 2027.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: So, again, what we're taking issue with is that they're pushing that out so far.

MR. HARWOOD: Right. That they have now given themselves an extension of time, sort of speak, and it's not the first one. It is just the latest round.

Then the new Draft Integrated Report shows that it is not subject to monitoring until 2025, nevertheless stating that it is a priority. So what this comment letter states is that the Board requests information about how NMED establishes these priorities and how Segment 114 is used as a source water and needs NMED's prioritization. And we further go on to say that the draft Impairment List, we quote, "procedures are in place under the purview of the Board," this is them referencing our Board/ LANL MOU. As you know – so they are somewhat responding to our comment by pointing out that we have our own separate ENS system and so what we do in counterpoint is say, it is important to recognize that these procedures are meant to augment and not replace the basic NMED water quality protections as timely development of TMDLs for this segment. The last sentence there before the new heading, "The Board requests that NMED accelerate THDL issuance for stream Segment 114 that are source waters for drinking water supplies."

We're calling out their continued delays and we're also pointing out that while they reference our BDD/LANL MOU with its ENS, that is meant to be our own supplementary approach on top of the state's baseline water quality approach which we feel that they are delaying to implement.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay, no, please go ahead.

MR. HARWOOD: The next segment is related to setting TMPLs in the LA Pueblo Canyon stretch and the paragraph that starts, "The US EPA Agency"

quotation here by the hydrologic connection, this is where Jay has picked up the request for an assessment of the public water supplies as it relates to the LA Pueblo Canyon stretch. And if – I believe I'll have Jay describe this section more fully.

MR. LAZARUS: Madam Chair, Board members, so NMED looks at different types of uses and through specific reaches have water quality sufficient to support those uses. They look at wildlife. They look at irrigation. They look at livestock watering and they look at public water supply. In what they've proposed for LA Canyon – let me back up a second. Rick asked me to look at EPA's stormwater analysis for Los Alamos County. That's where this quote comes from, from Lori Tanner, USEPA in Dallas, and I had discussions with her and her staff specifically about it where they identified specific constituents of concern in the canyon and described the direct hydrologic connection from Los Alamos Canyon to the Rio Grande. What we're asking them to do is look at this as this is our source – and even though we have the early notification system, that's just for certain flood events. It is not for specific flow events or anything that may be an underflow of the sediments during or below the dry reaches. So what we're requesting them to do is assess Los Alamos Canyon and its tributaries from their headwaters all the way down to our diversion as public water supply. We'll see how they respond to that. But the Board's real issue is Los Alamos Canyon and its tributaries and the reach from Los Alamos Canyon confluence Rio Grande to the diversion and that's what we're requesting. And even though there is no public water supply drawing water from the canyon distributaries there is a hydrologic connection to the main stem and then downstream to where we are.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And the concern is the legacy waste in that canyon and its potential to get into those tributaries; correct?

MR. LAZARUS: Legacy waste in the –

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And I may not be characterizing it correctly so give me the right – what are we concerned about in those canyons?

MR. LAZARUS: We're concerned about the tributaries to LA Canyon and LA Canyon itself.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: And what's in those tributaries that we're concerned about reaching the BDD intake?

MR. LAZARUS: Radionuclides, PCBs and heavy metals.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Okay. And you wouldn't characterize that legacy waste; you'd characterize it as something else?

MR. LAZARUS: No, no, it's definitely legacy waste and I don't know how much is currently being contributed. But definitely legacy waste.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: That's helpful to me. And I kind of jumped the gun on the TMDLs on whether it's appropriate for us to be commenting on that since that's not directly what they're asking for and that question was already answered.

I think I'll leave it there and allow other members to ask question and then see if I have any others. Thank you.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Kyle and Jay. I did read this letter yesterday afternoon when it was sent out and I made comments about Councilor Villarreal's name. But I think that it is really important that

NMED, EPA understand that the flow meter that we installed is only a flow meter that has no other ability. And so I find them using that as a reason not to be concerned about all of the other contaminants including the TMDLs seem absurd to me. The main reason we installed that flow meter was so we could protect and augment. It doesn't designate or track or do any of these other things plus all of this water – legacy contaminants are running through pueblo land.

So I think it's really important that we get some response from them and it was really noteworthy to me that Kyle mentioned or Jay whoever mentioned it, that they will respond to all public comments.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Thank you. Councilor.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to make sure that Commissioner Hansen has the most up to date letter. The letter that was sent yesterday is not the letter that we all are looking at here in the chamber. And so I don't know whether that was emailed to her or if it could be emailed to her because I do think there's a little bit of a difference in those two versions and that's what I was referring to, Commissioner, is that this latest letter was just handed to us in chambers right at the beginning of the meeting.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Okay. I did not have – had not received an update that I know of of that letter.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Right, that is the issue. I think the changes and I'm sure Kyle can summarize the changes briefly.

MR. HARWOOD: Yes, Madam Chair. And I will just mention to you, Commissioner Hansen, I just texted you the additional paragraphs that Jay suggested. I am sorry that I didn't have a chance to email the text out to you before the meeting but I think that we've discussed the additional two paragraphs and if it's okay with you, Jay, I'll just summarize those quickly.

The first paragraph just references that EPA jurisdictional analysis of waters in LA Canyon and points out the recognized federal hydrologic connection between LA Pueblo Canyon and the Rio Grande which I know, Commissioner, you are well familiar with. Then the second big paragraph that was not in the draft you saw yesterday was the Board requesting that NMED assess the LA Canyon for suitability as a public water supply which I also think is something that you and I talked about in the past. Perhaps you haven't seen this.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I was trying to follow the letter and I couldn't figure out what was going on because I couldn't find the first paragraph that you were talking about. So thank you for making that clarification. It would have been nice to know in the beginning that there was a new copy of the letter. Thank you, Councilor Romero-Wirth for pointing that out to me.

MR. HARWOOD: And did you receive that text, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Well, it's a little challenging to read in a text so I hope that you will send me an email with it.

MR. HARWOOD: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I understand what you're talking about.

MR. HARWOOD: Thank you very much.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Just a couple of things that I wanted to add – given that the TMDLs are the – you alluded to this, but just for clarity. TMDLs are one of the

mechanisms that are used to address water quality problems in listed segments. So I feel that it is valuable to list that because it is forcing continued – at least it opens the door for the continued interactions that we keep using that to get them to address the water quality problems. So it is not explicitly requested but it is an implied mechanism that is the part that is frankly meaningful to us because it's the water quality that we're trying to make sure that is retained at a high quality. And, Commissioner Hansen, are you comfortable because you've been working on this. I assume you're comfortable even though you haven't seen the updated letter given that we've gone through and had the technical details summarized during the meeting?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Yes, I am comfortable. I understood what was going on. I just wondered whether I was missing something so I kept looking for it. But I was also listening to Jay and listening to Kyle and I do agree with what they have added and I think it was important that we added this in.

CHAIR HAMILTON: That's good and I appreciate and probably agree and would just request that even if it doesn't make it into the packet, if we could get things electronically before the meeting so we can review things. That's just a general for all the materials, anything that is on the agenda to be able to review ahead of time. But I appreciate that you guys were working on this until the last minute so it is kind of a two-edge sword and appreciate that you summarized all of that for us. That was helpful.

Is there more discussion or what's the pleasure of the Board?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Madam Chair, I move to approve the letter and then they'll work on getting signatures from all of us and I'll get a new copy of the letter.

COUNCILOR ROMERO-WIRTH: Second.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Motion passes. And thank you, Board members, for working through this at the last minute. Thanks for working on this and Jay thanks for being here and contributing to this.

6. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

CHAIR HAMILTON: Is there anyone from the public wishing to speak? Do you want to come up, please and identify yourself.

MICHAELENE KYRALA: Hi, my name is Michaelene Kyrala and I'm the general manager of the Las Campanas Water Cooperative. So I'm actually not a member of the public. I'm supposed to be a Board member as well. We're just non-voting Board members.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Yes.

MS. KYRALA: So just as a reminder, we are a part of this organization and I would appreciate be included when materials are distributed as we are supposed to be helping be part of this. I look forward to working with everybody.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Do we not usually do that?

MS. LONG: Madam Chair, yes, we do. There may have been a change in the alternate member that we didn't know about or it didn't get communicated. But, of

course, they would be included with all the materials and with notices of meetings. So we'll get that corrected.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Thank you.

MS. KYRALA: Thank you. The larger issue that is happening at BDD is that staff doesn't seem to be clear that there are four –

CHAIR HAMILTON: I'm sorry is your microphone on?

MS. KYRALA: Sorry. Just a reminder that there are four partners there. I am having trouble with the auditing firm also not understanding that there are four partners and they don't know who the organizations are that are part of it. We've had checks that have gone missing and we can't get answers on what we need to do – these are checks that are years and years out.

So I am really excited. I want this to be a positive relationship and these are issues that have come up and we haven't been able to get any changes through the normal channels so this is the chance I had. So I look forward to working with everybody in the future and Rick and Bernardine both have my email address if anybody wants to get in touch with me.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Excellent, thank you. Is there anybody else from the public? Yes, go ahead, Joni.

JONI ARENDS (CNNS): Thank you for this opportunity to speak members of the BDD Board and staff. I appreciate the work on the TMDLs and the other issues with regard to the New Mexico Environment Department.

I should introduce myself to Councilor Cassutt. My name is Joni Arends. I'm with Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. I've been watching the Buckman Board for 22 years now or manifestations of the Buckman effort to protect Santa Fe's drinking water.

So I do want to mention Chair Romero-Wirth made comments about the legacy waste and I think it's important to refresh folks' memory that the Manhattan project was based around Ashley Pond and to the north of Ashley Pond is Los Alamos Canyon – no, is Pueblo Canyon and to the south is Los Alamos Canyon and as you move further east through those canyon systems they merge at the Y and then the canyons, the Los Alamos and the Pueblo canyons merge and travel together down to the Rio Grande. And legacy waste was buried, was discharged, was emitted into the air for decades into those canyon system and I just want to emphasize that there are still waste disposal sites on top of the mesas on the sides of the canyons and all the way down through the canyon systems towards the Rio Grande.

And I look forward to working with you in 2024. Thank you.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Thank you. Is there anyone else from the public that wishes to make a comment? Okay, I'll go ahead and close public comment.

7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

CHAIR HAMILTON: Matters from the Board, yes, Commissioner Hansen.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I really appreciate the fact that there is now a better zoom link. I am under the weather and I did not want to come and share what I have gotten – what somebody shared with me. I'm really completely appreciate that.

Welcome, Councilor Cassutt, to this Board. Both Commissioner Hamilton and I have served on this Board for the past seven years and are really very committed to protecting our drinking water.

There is one other thing that I want to say is that Las Campanas Co-op is in my district and for many years Ginnie was the board members from the Co-op attended on a regular basis and for awhile there was no response from anybody from the Las Campanas Co-op to attend our Board meetings and I am happy to see that the executive director has come and that they plan on attending again. But there was outreach done to them extensively but nobody ever showed up. So we did have representatives a number of years ago and I think the pandemic just changed everything.

Thank you.

CHAIR HAMILTON: Thank you very much. Any other Board members?
Thank you.

8. **NEXT MEETING:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 at 4:00 p.m.

9. **ADJOURN**

Having completed the agenda and with no further business to come before the Board, Chair Hamilton declared this meeting adjourned at approximately 11:50 a.m.

Approved by:


Anna Hamilton, Board Chair

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Farrell, Wordswork

ATTEST TO


KATHARINE E. CLARK
SANTA FE COUNTY CLERK



SFC CLERK RECORDED 02/06/2024



COUNTY OF SANTA FE)
STATE OF NEW MEXICO) ss BUCKMAN DIRECT DIV MIN
PAGES: 11

I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for Record On The 6TH Day Of February, 2024 at 02:57:46 PM And Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 2027870 Of The Records Of Santa Fe County

Buckman Direct Diversion Board: January 9, 2024

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

