

Las Cruces Utilities Board of Commissioners

Minutes for the Meeting on

Thursday, May 12, 2016

3:00 p.m.

Utilities Center

Conference Room 225

Board Members Present:

Gill Sorg, Chair
William Little, Vice-Chair
Steven Baumgarn, Commissioner
Jim Carmichael, Commissioner
Harry Johnson, Commissioner
Olga Pedroza, Commissioner

Board Members Absent:

Jim Ericson, Commissioner

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Jorge Garcia, Utilities Director
Robert Garza, City Manager

City Staff Present:

Robert Cabello, Assistant City Attorney
Susan Cerny, Business Systems Analyst
Carl Clark, RES/TS Administrator
Rhonda Diaz, Water Conservation Coordinator
Marcy Driggers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Paul Edwards, Business Systems Analyst
Lucio Garcia, Gas Distribution & Construction Administrator
Klaus Kemmer, Solid Waste Administrator
Chris Kiolbasa, Accountant
Viola Perea, Utilities Internal Auditor
Jose Provencio, Administrative Services Administrator
Mario Puentes, Gas Business Analyst
Joshua Rosenblatt, Regulatory Environmental Analyst
Dania Soto, Office Assistant Senior
Adrienne Widmer, Water Resources Administrator

Others:

Suzanne Michaels, Public Outreach Consultant
Steve Flinch, John Shomaker & Associates

Chair Sorg called the regular meeting to order at approximately 3:00 p.m.

1. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Chair Sorg: The first item on the Agenda is the Conflict of Interest. Is there any member of the Board or a member of the City staff that has known conflict of interest with any item on the Agenda?

There were none.

2. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Chair Sorg: Next item is the Acceptance of the Agenda.

Johnson: So moved.

Little: Second.



Chair Sorg: Moved by Commissioner Johnson, Seconded by Commissioner Little. Let's have a vote.

Roll call: Commissioner Carmichael – Aye; Commissioner Pedroza – Aye; Commissioner Little – Aye; Commissioner Baumgarn – Aye; Commissioner Johnson – Aye; Commissioner Ericson – Absent; and Chair Sorg- Aye.

The Agenda was Unanimously Approved 6-0.

3. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

- a. Work Session Meeting of April 14, 2016.
- b. Regular Meeting of April 14, 2016.

Minutes approved on consent.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Chair Sorg: Next item on the Agenda is Public Participation, is there any member of the public that wishes to address the Commission?

There were none.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Chair Sorg: We'll go right into the Administrative Report, Dr. Garcia.

Dr. Garcia: Yes, Mr. Provencio will start with Customer Service and the first and second items, which is the Financial Report for the last quarter.

Provencio: Good Afternoon Chairman and Commissioners. I'm here to give you an update on the activity on the business side of the recently completed Septic System Remediation Projects. The two that I will give you an update on are: Salopek & Sunrise Subdivision Phase I and the Lantana Sewer Project Phase II. I want to keep you updated as these projects are completed, we'll highlight and the number of hook-ups that are connected to the sewer system as these projects are completed.

In Salopek & Sunrise Subdivision it has a total potential number of connections of 36 connections. The good news is that as of April we have 11 customers that have hooked-up to that project.

The Lantana Sewer Project Phase II has a potential of 26 customers hooking-up to the system and as April we have 13 that have connected.

Chair Sorg: Mr. Johnson has a question.

Johnson: Is that amount of connections as of April unusually high, or low, or is it about where we thought we would be?



Provencio: Chairman, Commissioner. From our scoping of the projects I think that's pretty good. As these projects are completed there is no mandatory requirement for customers to hook-up. We believe this is a pretty good response in terms of completion. We expect things to probably move along as time goes on.

Chair Sorg: Dr. Garcia I think you have a word to say.

Dr. Garcia: Mr. Chairman, I concur, I think this is good compared to some other projects that we've done in the past. We have one project on the Stern Drive area that we did a few years back and I think probably half the customers have connected but it's been several years so I think this is good news. As you heard the projects are barely finished.

Johnson: Yes.

Dr. Garcia: This is good and I think it has a lot to do with the changes that you all made on the surcharge of the Impact Fee. On developed property they can now amortize a larger amount, it used to be just a small portion. Makes it much more probable for them to connect rather than stay with their permitted septic system.

Chair Sorg: Could I ask a question about Lantana Phase I? I believe the connections are quite good there aren't they? Do you recall? There's only 1 or 2 out of 25 that have not connected?

Provencio: I will defer to Carl on that one.

Clark: Chairman I wasn't part of that project but it's my understanding that it probably about 80% to 90% in there.

Chair Sorg: Okay, continue.

Provencio: That completes the update in regards to Customer Service. I'll move right along into providing a review for the Quarterly Financial Report for Utilities.

Looking at the actual-to-actual performance for the third quarter, Utilities is still within what we were projecting in terms of the revenue and expense side. Part of it reflects the seasonality of each of the respective utilities. Gas is coming out of their peak season, Water and Wastewater are starting to move into their peak season. The prime movers for Gas, of course, is the lower cost of gas compared to prior year. The O&M (Operations and Maintenance) expenses for Water and Wastewater are starting to ramp up as production has increased. The overall components for Solid Waste seems to be doing very well with an increase in commercial activity for that utility.

As we move on to the Budget, comparison of performance to the Budget or the projections. Overall, all of the Utilities are well within the thresholds for budget projections. I'll go through each one of these:



Gas displays both the impact of lower cost of gas on the revenue side and on the expenses also it's reflective and very correlated to that. The main comparison here is that we're well within the projections for the Gas Utility Operation.

Moving to Water Operation Performance, both on the revenue as well as the expense side well within the projections that we had planned from last year.

The performance is mirrored for Wastewater in the same manner. We have our projections for both the revenues and expenses as we have projected up to this point.

If I can forward you to the Solid Waste performance, on the expense side it's doing well as well as revenues as I mentioned earlier. An uptick in commercial activity and Klaus utility pretty much responded to that uptick in economic movement.

On the Shared Services side we're below the projection but mostly driven by our ongoing activity to fill vacancies at this point in time.

I'll stand by for any questions you may have.

Little: Question.

Chair Sorg: Commissioner Little.

Little: We are now passed winter and the cool weather. It's been a relatively warm winter, did our gas services and throughput accommodate that pretty well or did we get pinched?

Provencio: In terms of delivery of commodity is that correct?

Little: Yes.

Provencio: By all measures we did not see any issues with the delivery of throughput.

Dr. Garcia: Mr. Chairman, Mario Puentes can you come up please?

Little: Usually when it's warm, deliveries and revenues suffer and absorption costing is a problem.

Dr. Garcia: Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, and I'll answer yours in a minute. Mario, contractually can you explain, was there any issues with contracted amounts and not having used on the commodity side planned quantities since we had a little warmer winter?

Puentes: No, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. Contractually we are not on the hook to buy anything that we don't need. We do lock up some prices for the winter but we usually try to set those at the levels that we know we would burn unless we had zero winter. No problem there, if there is a revenue decline it's mostly associated with the



actual cost of the gas but from the cost of service prospective I think we are right on line with the previous years.

Little: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Garcia: If I may Mr. Chairman, to add to the question of the Vice-Chair. In your packet there is another report, more detailed. It's a new format, the Manager's Office has asked us to tie now the revenue and expenditures to the Strategic Plan. If you go to that report it is done by fund. And it looks like this with an orange tab at the top. If you look at that, the first table has all the detail of the revenues of Gas and you can see that the Gas sales themselves. If you go to the bottom line, we say we're at \$16.5 million of revenue versus \$18.5, that's the cost of gas. In terms of sales we're about almost \$180,000 higher than prior years. The sales haven't been upset, because if you look at the bottom line it's lower revenue because of the value of the commodity but sales wise we are fine. That level of detail is not in these graphs but it's in this other report.

Little: Thank you. Of course, that's the one file that I didn't successfully transfer to my laptop.

Provencio: With that we'll return back to the regular Administrative Report.

Dr. Garcia: Just one comment before we go to the next item Mr. Chairman. This is a new format on the quarterly report, if you all have questions please email us and we can elaborate. It's a very nice format that the City Manager's Office has requested us to do and it's a great way of presenting every quarter what we have and how it ties to our Strategic Goal. If you have questions please review it, it's a little lengthy but it has all the numbers that add up to these charts.

Chair Sorg: Very good, what's next?

Dr. Garcia: We have a presentation on our Water-Level Monitoring Program. Steve Finch is a hydrogeologist and I'll let him introduce himself and all his experience. We've known him for many years, he's with John Shomaker & Associates, you met John last time and Annie McCoy on the 40-Year Water Plan. Steve has extensive experience with wells and he's taught us a lot about, not only monitoring but, well drilling techniques, and things like that so he's very well versed in dealing with wells so he'll tell us about the program and the report. The report was posted, today, right Carl?

Clark: Yes, sir.

Dr. Garcia: It's on our web page the 2015 Report. The complete report, which is a pretty thick document, is on our web page. Go ahead Steve.

Finch: Thank you Dr. Garcia. Chairman, and Commissioners. My actual background at John Shomaker & Associates, I'm a Principal Hydrogeologist-Geochemist. I go a little bit into hydrogeology all the way over to the chemistry side of things. Here I'm going to talk about water levels, which is a pure physical thing.



There's one of your very nice, well maintained, water supply wells. The first part of this project was to get your operational staff on board with how to collect the data, collect it properly, and then to use it as a tool. We've had several purposes to this program, which started about three or four years ago. First was establishing methods so we can have accurate data collection. In the past there were some measurements that were being collected but we couldn't make sense of them because things weren't matching up. There were some errors in the measurements, were it turned out to be, in the instruments, and various other things. The data is not very useful if it's not accurate so we established a good data collection methodology and your staff implemented it nicely.

Pedroza: Mr. Chairman.

Chair Sorg: Commissioner Pedroza.

Pedroza: May I ask a question?

Finch: Yes, please.

Pedroza: Does that mean you're quantifying how much water there is? Is that what the level monitoring means? I don't understand.

Finch: Okay, I'll tell you. On water-levels we're measuring the depth to the water in all the wells. It's not quantifying how much water is there, it's telling us how the aquifer is responding to pumping.

Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.

Finch: It can be used for many other things and I'm going to get to that.

Pedroza: Okay.

Finch: It's a very useful tool.

The second bullet item here is to track the performance of the supply wells. We can take this data and determine how the well is performing. Just like an auto repairman does with a car when you go and service it. The other part of this is to keep track and evaluate the aquifer conditions. We're not quantifying how much water, just tracking the conditions in the aquifer.

Pedroza: What kind of conditions?

Finch: If the water-levels are going up or going down, where it's happening, how the water is moving.

Pedroza: I see, thank you.



Finch: Sure.

All these little dots are wells and there's different kinds of wells. There's over 70 wells in this monitoring program. We break it up out into various regions; the first way to break everything in this map is, we have the City, is there. We have the horse, we call it, it's like a bedrock divide that separates the City from the Jornada Basin, which we also refer to as the East Mesa. There are six or seven supply wells over here and some observation wells. I will get to tell you what that means here in a minute between pumping and observation well.

Then we have the West Mesa down in the left hand corner. Here's more of a close up on the City. If you look at these different colored dots, you'll see ones that are yellow, some that are red squares, and then these have a different symbol. They all mean a different kind of well that we're measuring from. The yellow dots are pumping wells, wells that are actively pumping to supply the water you use. Then the red dots are inactive wells that aren't pumping, so we can use those. What you see up here, this is around the Old Foothills Landfill, those are monitoring wells around the landfill so we use the data from that too and we can combine all this so we get a really good picture of what's going on not only in the well but in the aquifer.

Chair Sorg: What's the green squares?

Finch: Pardon me. The green, those are designated observation wells, they're smaller diameter and they're completed in aquifer at different depths. We're able to track what's going on in different depths in the aquifer as far as how the water-levels are. I'll show you some graphs, those are very useful.

If this was just a slice of the earth and this is the land surface up here and these are wells. The two different kinds of wells we have are pumping wells and we have non-pumping wells. In the pumping wells we're measuring two different kinds of levels in the aquifer: one when the well is not pumping so you have a water-level that's equal to what's in the aquifer and second when it's pumping it's somewhere down in here above the pump; but it's going down while it's pumping. We can measure that drawdown in the well while it's pumping and then we also have what's going on in the observation well, it'll tell us what's going on in the aquifer without pumping any of the wells itself. You can take these things and get an idea of how well the aquifer is performing in relation to drawdown and pumping, or how well the supply well itself is performing, and that's just a real important thing to track.

I want to show you a couple of graphs from the report that Dr. Garcia showed you. It's full of a hundred different graphs, I'm just going to show you a few because I don't want to put you to sleep. This is called a piezometer, which is same as an observation well, this is in the East Mesa. This one is just a small tube that goes down in the ground and it's away from the pumping wells but it gives us an idea how the aquifer is responding. You can see here on this axis, that's the depth to the water in feet and then this is time on the X axis. I believe each one of those is a year and each one of



these is five feet. This is tracking how water-levels in the aquifer is changing over time with respect to depth.

Chair Sorg: That's only in the Jornada Basin? That graph?

Finch: Yes, sir.

Here's another example of a graph we plot. This is one of your active wells that you pump. Here on the axis on the left, the Y axis, what we call it, is the depth to water and we have time on the bottom and then over here we have pumping, which is an acre feet per month. We can plot all these things together and we have the blue dots that are non-pumping water-levels in the well and the red dots here at the bottom are pumping water-levels. We can compare that to how much is being pumped. This is a real powerful tool into assessing how the well is performing. If the well is starting to clog up, you might see a trend here that would show that the pumping levels are declining but the non-pumping levels aren't. You can use it in many different fashions.

This is Las Cruces Well 30, which is on the south end of town. This is one of the longer periods of records, it goes back to 1975. There's data collected by other people so we put this all this together, we have a complete historical compilation of all your water-level data. You can see the trend ends here, how we're starting to drawdown quite a bit in the last five years. The water-levels are going down, there's a lot of this going on. What I want to do is I want to focus in on that because not only are we doing hand measurements with water-levels, the Utilities has equipped a lot of these wells with sensors that take continuous monitoring of water-levels. This is the same well, this is just the last five years or four years, and you can see these reds dots are continuously monitoring and the little black circles are manually measured water-levels. You can see here we have plotted the pumping in the region. This is your peak on these little squares on this line, this is how your pumping is going up each month, that's in the summer, and at the same time the water-levels are going down so we can track this. The seasonal variations and the long term variations.

What are these lines? These are what I call the lines that represent the elevation or the surface elevation of the water table. What they tell us is where the water is coming from, where it's going and what areas are drawing down due to pumping. You can see here these blue lines, those are lines of equal elevation in the water table, these arrows signify the direction of the water, which way it's flowing. There are pumping wells in the City here, it's pulling in water from the north-west area near the river. This is your Griggs and Walnut site and this is intentional, we want these circles to be here and this shows that there is a drawdown and containment of the PCE plume. We have water flowing in from all four sides, which is exactly what we want to contain that clean. We are tracking that with this. We see other things that are going on, there's some water being pulled down here, I suspect maybe due to some of the pecan farmers on the south end. Overall this is not a bad map that shows a good healthy aquifer and you're having a drawdown affects and containment where you want it at the Griggs and Walnut site.



Another example of a graph here, we have the nested piezometers, which are observation wells and Las Cruces Well 59, which I believe is right outside here. We plot all this data together and since 59 is an actively pumped well. Here we have time here again, these little light blue X's, those are non-pumping water-levels in Well 59 and these X's down here are the pumping water-levels. We can see how these wells are in the area, they're down by the interstate, there's some observation wells where Motel and Lakeside interstate. We can see how this pumping is effecting wells in the area and these observation wells. Tracking this helps us understand the rate of decline, we can use that information to help manage the aquifer on regional pumping and also determine how the well's performing.

In conclusions, the Utility has successfully implemented the Water-Level Monitoring program and that's just the key component to your overall well maintenance program and asset management. It helps you to keep that engine fine-tuned. The Water-Level Monitoring Program is also important for tracking the effects in the aquifer, like I showed you, what's going on with the water table map, but also in each well that's being pumped. The regional drawdown is not only due to the City but we have other things going on around us so it's an intergraded thing that you're measuring across the whole aquifer area. What we see on average in whether it's in the City, West Mesa, or East Mesa the average drawdown rates are manageable, there less than two feet per year. I wouldn't call that excessive, you're going to have some mining when you're pumping water compared to most of the other aquifers that are being used at this rate and the state. I think this is a very manageable number. As I emphasized earlier, this data collection helps us asses and improve progress in the Griggs and Walnut remediation site. Because a lot of people when they do a remediation project they focus on what's going on right there at the project but having this regional data around it helps us really pull it all together and understand how efficient we are with taking care of that issue.

Chair Sorg: Thank you very much, that's very interesting. Commissioner Carmichael.

Carmichael: Would you say that this is a reasonable representation of the entire valley? I know that there's a lot of other wells other than the City wells and I don't know if those are being measured the way the City, with your help, is measuring the wells. Is this a good representation being filled or not of the entire aquifer?

Finch: You have a good representation of the City and the surrounding area. But as far as once you get out a certain distance, several miles maybe, there are different conditions. Those are the State Engineer and the United States Geological Survey measure levels in those other areas.

Carmichael: That is going on?

Finch: That is going on, yes sir.

Carmichael: Thank you.



Chair Sorg: Dr. Garcia.

Dr. Garcia: Steve can you say something about how you described the assistance that we have or how this helps the Griggs/Walnut. Talk about what we've learned with this program and the data that you've analyzed and collected at the landfill and the area in between because it's very important between the Griggs/Walnut and the landfill. You've come up to conclusions that are important to understand of what's going on because that area has been unlined and unpermitted for all landfills in the area; and the City Manager knows what I'm talking about in terms of the area by the new hospital over there. Your conclusions are very important in what you've determined in that area.

Finch: That's correct. This Water-Level Monitoring program has helped us understand for the Griggs and Walnut, not only the site itself but the region around it. The same thing with the landfill, the Old Foothills Landfill, that's been important in understanding the risk of some of the water quality issues. We've been able to identify how the aquifer behaves and better asses what the risk is. Does that answer your question?

Dr. Garcia: The water table in between the two areas is fairly flat?

Finch: It's flat and so that means it's not moving.

Dr. Garcia: Landfill contaminants to the supply source.

Finch: Correct.

Dr. Garcia: Without this program we wouldn't have known, that correct?

Finch: This is correct.

Chair Sorg: Very good. Commissioner Pedroza.

Pedroza: My question is answered, thank you very much.

Chair Sorg: Very good. Steve that's very interesting.

Finch: Thank you.

Chair Sorg: Looking forward to additional information in the future and see how we're doing at that time.

Finch: Thank you Chairman and Commissioners.

Dr. Garcia: Thanks Steve.

Chair Sorg: What's next Dr. Garcia?



Dr. Garcia: Griggs Walnut, a little project brief on the operational side. Adrienne is going to do that and Steve can jump in any time when we discuss conductivity versus PCE relationship that you've determined as well.

Widmer: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I know that last month we talked about water quality and you requested a presentation on that. We thought that the Griggs Walnut would tie in really well with the Water-Level Monitoring program and we're going to give you water quality next month. It coincides with us preparing and getting the Consumer Confidence Report together for you that is required for us to send out by the end of June of every year. We hope that you except just a little bit of a change of program here.

The Griggs Walnut project is actually a joint project between the City of Las Cruces and Dona Ana County. Normally you hear it called the Joint Superfund Project and we have more than one name for it but it is indeed the Griggs Walnut Project. To start off with, we finished our Annual Report, which covered the entire year of 2015, that report has been provided to Dona Ana County. They are the main keeper of the electronic data on their website. The first bullet we have up here is the actual link that you can use to get directly to that particular report. Based on that report what you'll see in there is that approximately 431 million gallons have been pulled out and treated. That over 40 pounds of the PCE has been removed. Modeling currently predicts the plume volume has decreased. This last little bullet here I think is quite important because we're going ahead and we're doing these annual sampling and reporting more as to get along with the EPA because legally we're not obligated to do that right now because we do not have a Unilateral Administrative Order (UAO) and we do not have a Consent Decree. In the spirit of cooperation, we go ahead and we do this because we know that we need to get this cleaned up anyway so we're just going to go ahead and keep cleaning it up whether we've got a UAO, a Consent Decree, or not.

Pedroza: I have a question.

Chair Sorg: Commissioner Pedroza.

Pedroza: Can you tell whether the amount that has been cleaned up is the right amount for this period of time, is better than expected to be, or is it not as good as it was expected to be?

Widmer: Actually in accordance with the Record of Decision that was completed a few years ago. We are tracking along quite well.

Pedroza: Okay.

Widmer: The ROD, which is what the Record of Decision is normally called, estimated that the pounds to PCE was going to be similar between 242 pounds and 357. If it's closer to the 242, it's going to take about 15 years. If it's closer to the high one, it's about 22 years. We've been figuring out and I think we're right on track.



Pedroza: Thank you very much.

Widmer: You're welcome.

Chair Sorg: Commissioner Johnson.

Johnson: Please remind me, the 400 and some odd million gallons of water, where does it go after it's treated?

Widmer: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner. We treat the water and it goes into a tank, it's been treated to a zero level of PCE and then we actually then take it from there and we send it to our east Griggs tank, which is a distribution tank and then it's sold.

Johnson: It's treated and it's put back for water distribution?

Widmer: Putting it back for beneficial use, yes sir.

Johnson: That's what I thought I remembered but suddenly looking over 400 million gallons of water, I wondered where it went.

Chair Sorg: We transfer it.

Johnson: But it is immediately put into our distribution system. We're not pumping back into the ground and putting it into the groundwater to help delude the contaminants.

Chair Sorg: Who wants to go with that question?

Widmer: I think Dr. Garcia.

Chair Sorg: Dr. Garcia.

Dr. Garcia: I just want to bring up that getting to use the water was not easy. EPA wanted us to reinject back into the aquifer, sort of what NASA is doing.

Johnson: Yes, that's because I'm familiar with what NASA is doing.

Dr. Garcia: We had to fight and say, "No". Once we clean it to zero level we want to drink it because that's the only revenue source for the project. About \$1.03, I think Joe? Per thousand gallons, goes to the projects so it helps us fund the project. The utility funds the project and we use and consume the water but it wasn't easy. Originally the concept in their minds was you have to put it back into injection wells.

Johnson: That's what NASA was required to do.

Dr. Garcia: Correct.



Johnson: To build up on clean water barrier to prevent any further contamination moving.

Dr. Garcia: We were successful in convincing them that we would be better off utilizing the water and much cheaper too, to do that, than reinjecting.

Chair Sorg: Okay.

Widmer: Great. Many of you probably remember Carl talking, towards the end of last year in December, that we did complete the two new Monitoring Wells from a 2014 Legislative Grant, so those got completed. To give you an idea our total O&M cost through the end of FY15, which would be June 2015, was approximately \$558,000. That would be the gross amount, that's how much Operations spent to actually operate and maintain the system. That essentially means that the average monthly O&M costs are a little over \$14,600, which includes electricity, chemicals, system maintenance, and the water and air sampling. Just so you have an idea, through that we're utilizing probably, because we're getting revenues, we're selling it and then we've got the O&M, we're recovering probably around 76% of our O&M costs through the sale of the clean water. Anything beyond that ends up having to be paid for through the Environmental Gross Receipts Tax, so that makes up the difference. Just so you have an idea of that.

Another thing I wanted to give you is just a couple of figures that actually show up in the report. This particular figure is showing the estimated PCE plume boundary, that has changed over the years, this is kind of a composite of the two different layers. There's an upper layer and a lower layer because there's kind of a clay layer in between the two so this is kind of composites.

To give you an idea on the PCE concentrations that are recorded. This gives you starting from August '14 all the way through December '15 and the main focus in this report is July '15 through December '15. If you'll notice the blue line is the PCE concentration that we're pulling out of Well 18. The red is the PCE concentration we're pulling out of Well 27. Then the green one is the PCE concentration because those wells come together before it goes through treatment. What actually is going through treatment is the green line. Based on that green line, that's what the concentration is, and we want to make sure everybody understands that the produced water after it goes through treatment is zero. The MCL is five but when it comes out of our treatment systems is at zero.

One of the things that Dr. Garcia brought up was the conductivity. One of the things we ended up doing on Well 18 is we put in a conductivity probe because we changed how Well 18 was functioning. Based on that he was able to come up with this graph (Well 18 PCE-Conductivity Coorelation), that we can pass around so that those of you that really like this kind of stuff can take a look at it. If you have any questions you have the author right, there. That was really good timing too.

Chair Sorg: Steve?



Widmer: Yes, that essentially says that if the conductivity is higher than that means that the PCE concentration is higher. That's not true everywhere, it just so happens that they were able to look at samples, the water quality of it, the pumping of it, and they were actually able to make this correlation so this correlation is specific to Well 18. You can't pass it on to Well 27 or anything else, this only for Well 18, it's very special for it.

Chair Sorg: Commissioner Pedroza has a question and Commissioner. Johnson does too.

Johnson: Just looking at the tail end of Well 18. You've got about four or five data points looking like it's going back up, do you have an explanation for that? In particularly the last one is a definite jump up.

Widmer: It's very interesting that we have noticed that the data has fluctuated. Back in 2014 and 2015, see how it was kind of high and then it kind of goes down, I think this next line can partially answer that question for you. Here is the cross section of Well 18 and it's really interesting and I'm really glad that this was actually included in the report because I think it helps explain a lot of stuff to EPA. Well 18 is actually pulling out of this upper zone, this is kind of a representation of that one little cross-section of Well 18 over the PCE is above five. It hangs out here when we turn on the Well and we run it about four hours, there's two little arrows that kind of go down right there and right there. When you turn on the pump it's pulling this water in downwards and it takes approximately four hours to clear that out and clean water starts coming in. Also as part of the report has where there is more calibration that could occur at other Wells but that gives you an idea that working with our consultants we've actually calibrate what's best for Well 18 and we're doing, I believe, quite well because we're keeping the NCL above five in Well 18. Previous years we were pumping so much water that the majority of it was actually below the NCL. That just kind of gives you an idea.

Chair Sorg: When I was there it was explained that they changed the timing or the schedule of pumping it, as you would say, they shortened it up and had longer times in between pumps pumping from the beginning.

Widmer: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. That is correct and that helps this little bubble here recover. Because by the time this is pumped out of the end of the four hours, this is all yellowed in, clean water. It just gives it time to find its way back.

Chair Sorg: Did you have a question Commissioner Pedroza?

Pedroza: Just because I can't remember, was this the area where there had been some sort of a military base and they thought that it was because of them that the water had gotten polluted? Have we gotten anywhere with trying to get them to accept liability?

Widmer: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. That was in the area that the National State Guard were at, that is a discussion with a lot of legal people.

Pedroza: Okay, thank you.



Chair Sorg: So far we haven't I guess.

Pedroza: I guess not.

Widmer: Mr. Chairman no we have not.

Chair Sorg: Okay. Is there more? Dr. Garcia.

Dr. Garcia: Just one thing that we didn't put in here because we're in the process but we don't have a Consent Decree, the attorneys are still back and forth. However, on the technical side, the Statement of Work for cleaning the project the technical people have agreed with EPA as to what we will or will not do. Which some of the stuff we're already doing, that part is ready but there's issues with the legal document going back and forth things that we cannot live with. Both Marcy and the County Attorney and our attorney paid by insurance are dealing with EPA on that so it's a long process but the statement of work, we were able to agree as to what will be done that is reasonable and that's an attachment to the Consent Decree so we made progress at least on that. The technical issues are always easier.

Widmer: Thank you.

Chair Sorg: Thank you Dr. Garcia.

Driggers: If you all remember we'll flip back to August of 2015, the City filled a motion for summary judgement in the stream adjudication lawsuit concerning the year priority for the federal claim to water rights. The City lost that motion for summary judgement. We were contending as a matter of law the judge should rule a certain way. The judge said no. There were lots of issues of fact, as a result that trial went on. I'm not sure if any of you were able to attend part of the trial, Dr. Garcia attended as much as his schedule allowed but it went on for about one week. It was the City of Las Cruces and the State Engineers Office against the world, it's what it felt like over there. Logistically we were a small group compared to the group in opposition to the City's contention, which was the Bureau of Reclamation and their attorneys from the Department of Interior, EBID's attorney, the attorneys for the pecan growers, the attorneys for the road croppers, and attorney out of El Paso on behalf of the City of El Paso. It did look like us against the world.

The parties presented evidence as to who had the earlier priority, the City of Las Cruces has 1905 priority, which going in to this hearing we felt confident because the Feds for years had maintained that their earliest priority was 1906. But under a theory called relation back the Feds tried to disclaim all of their assertions for over the last 100 years that their priority was 1906. They're claiming that some survey work done in 1903, even though they hadn't picked an exact location, they did enough survey work that, that could be deemed to have been the site that was subsequently selected and they want 1903 priority because it gets them ahead of us. You always want to



have the earliest priority because then other users of the water are arguably at your mercy.

The briefs as well as the finding of fact and conclusions of law that Jay Stein filed with the court timely on Monday were attached for your quick review. The state of New Mexico argued the same position but on different theories that the Feds priority started in 1906 as far as controlling when they have a right to determine who uses that water. If you can see the quantities, in fact I didn't realize it that a minors inch is equivalent to an acre foot of water, above the water rights given to the Bureau of Reclamation that they are claiming, about 2 million acre feet of minors' inches. Our is a drop in the bucket compared to theirs, we don't know why they wouldn't just concede that our small amount had priority but it was a matter of policy and they spent an incredible amounts of money asserting that position. But as you can see from looking at the briefs, the tremendous work that was provided to the City by Doug Littlefield, the historian, because so much of the evidence presented at trial was a historical analysis paperwork of surveys done of newspaper articles that talked anything that could show that the Feds were looking to earlier priority. Showing that they had done enough work to lock in to the current location of the Elephant Butte Dam, no one disputes the Caballo Dam, that's 1939 because it was a lot cleaner.

That's the jest of those pleadings, again, I don't know when Judge Wechsler, who is the judge from the New Mexico Court of Appeals, he has the trial judge for the weeklong trial last September and August and he's also the judge who will make a decision on the Federal Priority Date. The briefs are in so I would expect, in the past he has ruled quickly, so I would think that he would have a decision within about one month. That's my executive summary of probably 200 pages of documents that we were given to review.

Chair Sorg: Thank you very much. Next.

Dr. Garcia: Marcy, the next one is Mesa Development, that's very brief because we put the ball back in their court, right? On the plats.

Driggers: This is become quite a tennis game. We were able to use the expertise of the City Surveyor, Scott Farnham, because one of the conditions of the Purchase Agreement with Mesa is they had to give us legally defined well sites so that the City owned an exact tract. Mesa Development hired Henry Magallanes who has acquired Moy Surveying. If you remember, Mr. Moy used to sit on the Utilities Board and he left Las Cruces moved to California and sold his surveying company to Henry Magallanes who is the son of his former partner. Henry did quite detailed, in fact they were easy for me to read because he had nice plats of survey and I can look at pictures, I can't read a meets and bounds description though. Scott Farnham, the City Surveyor, had some minor suggested changes and Scott and Henry have been working on them. We have not received verification back from Mesa's attorney that the finalized documents for the legal descriptions have been submitted to him. He gives them to us and then they become Exhibits to the Petition for Condemnation, which the City Council has



authorized us to file to acquire these two Well sites. One is clear, it's an actual subdivision lot, the other two have deficiencies. We're just waiting and have not received any calls from individuals within the Pettes family so the ball is in their court to give us Legal Descriptions that will be attached as Exhibits A through E for the petition. I expect them back on Monday, I am off tomorrow, I'll give Mr. Appel a call, to see the status on those, they were just minor changes that Scott had suggested to Henry.

Chair Sorg: Thank you Marcy.

Dr. Garcia: Thanks Marcy. Project Update, Carl.

Clark: Chairman, Commissioners. I'm going to give you the May 2016 Project Update. Two projects I selected: The Drilling and Development Replacement Water Wells 29, 31, 32 and the Downtown Church and Water Street Gas Main and Service Line Rehabilitation Project.

This next project, I just want to state to you, that we worked with John Shomaker & Associates on these Well Drilling projects, they helped me put the contracts together for these Well Drilling projects and they're also the inspector onsite watching the Well Drilling projects along with Fernando Ortiz, they share some of the duties and some of the work out there. I think you met Sherry Fritz at the ribbon cutting ceremony, she's a hydrogeologist as well, so we're happy to have such experts out there working with us on these projects. The contractor is Rogers & Company out of Albuquerque, New Mexico. The contract cost is approximately \$2.5 million dollars for these three wells. The contract time for the project is 270 calendar days, we had a start date of December 14th. This project was awarded by the Board back in October of 2015. The estimated completion date is September 17th, we're moving along pretty quickly, it is coming along. Percent complete right now is 25% in regards to payments, that's the easiest for us to track when you have three different wells going on. That price is low, I just signed off on paperwork for two more payments, that are rushing through right now, so that's going to jump quite a bit the next time I present this to you.

Summary of the project: Well 29, that's the one by the Fire Station off of Valley, that the original we started with and that one is getting ready to have the pump installed today so they can do their test pumping. That will be happening in the next couple of days, they'll test the well and see how well it can produce water for us and what it's going to yield to us.

Well 32 is the one where we had the ribbon cutting ceremony. The main borehole has been drilled, they're rigging up for reaming of that hole and they actually did the logging as well so the hole came out straight and clean. It's looking good and now we're going to go ahead and ream it and prepare it for our casings. We worked with John Shomaker & Associates, we actually worked with Roger Perry and he's the one that helps us decide what's screen slots we're using out there in the casing and what the well packing we will be using as well. I installed a couple of pictures there; the drill bit



that they used on Well 32, the drill collars are on the lower right photo down there, and the stabilizers for the pilot hole.

Any questions on these two?

Chair Sorg: No.

Clark: The Well Pump test will be coming up on the 29th if anybody might be interested, we'll be moving some water.

The next project is the Downtown Church and Water Street Gas Main Replacement. You haven't heard too much about this, this was done with in-house forces. Basically what's going on is Public Works and the City continues to move with their Downtown Revitalization Project. Public Works came to us and they're going to be doing a Mill and Overlay in Water and on Church. They notified us and the Gas Section went ahead and got started with the replacement of the 2-inch Steel Gas Main in anticipation of that pavement project. We're going to have some other work that's going to be done in there, minor sewer and we're going to be replacing in the existing AC waterline that goes around the racetrack there, so we'll be replacing that. That's part of Public Works job when they do their portion of the work. They'll hire a consultant, we'll work with them on that, and then they'll hire a contractor, the contractor will go install the AC line.

Chair Sorg: Where West Hadley is all tore up, is that going to have utilities replaced too?

Clark: West Hadley, that's a separate project from us and yes I do believe they'll rehab everything. I believe they're just doing a water tie-in coming up. They replaced the lines in there.

Chair Sorg: Thank you.

Clark: The Gas Section replaced approximately 4,100 lineal feet of 2-inch Steel Gas Main with 4-inch poly. That went from Hadley to Amador on Water Street and from Amador to Hadley on Church is what they did, so it's a lot of work. There is still additional work that they have to get done, they actually started this August of 2015 and the completion date will be the end of this month when they make the two final tie-ins. There's going to be a tie-in off of Church today and then they're going to have a final tie-in off of Water Street at the end of the month on the 31st. I would assume prior to that, I think the 31st is a Monday, it's a holiday.

Carmichael: It's actually a Tuesday.

Clark: Tuesday. The gas line will complete that task and that one will be done, the only thing that would be remaining is the patching, which Traffic goes in there and replaces those patches. They followed up on the mainline and now after we're done with the tie-in, they'll go in and replace the patches. I installed a photo there, one of our crews out



there – as you can see he has all the safety gear on - and they're working on the hole and making the gas tie-in and preparation for it.

Any questions?

Chair Sorg: Questions? Some of us may have driven through that just to get here.

Clark: Several of us have driven through it, I drive through it quite a bit too.

Chair Sorg: Okay.

Clark: That's the end of my projects but I also need to introduce our newest member of my team. Rhonda Diaz, she's the Water Conservation Coordinator. Vice-Chair Little met her at the Water Festival and she did a great job putting that Water Festival together.

Little: She really did.

Clark: She's going to come up here and let you know a little bit about herself.

Chair Sorg: Welcome.

Diaz: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, hi. As Carl said, my name is Rhonda Diaz, a little bit about myself. I have a Bachelor of Science Degree in Horticulture with an emphasis on Landscape Design from NMSU. I have worked in the commercial and residential landscape and irrigation industry for over 15 years. My duties included: administrative, landscape and irrigation design, and estimating as well as project management. I live a little way from here, which is El Paso, but maybe not for very long because I love this town it's a great little town so hopefully I'll be coming up here. As Carl had said, I came in in the middle of March and my first task was to coordinate the Water Festival.

Clark: 30 days.

Diaz: 31 days actually, I was told. I think it was a great success, we had just to throw out some numbers we had approximately 780 third and fourth grade children from Las Cruces Public Schools. About 80 teachers and chaperons, 40 volunteers from various organizations. Some City of Las Cruces Water Utilities Section, helped an awful lot. We had the opportunity to use ASNMSU on their volunteer day, which worked out wonderfully because we had 24 volunteers that were able to fill over 800 Water Festival bags in less than 20 minutes. It was wonderful I just couldn't believe it so that was really good. Nineteen (19) organizations volunteered their time and their expertise as presenters and the City of Las Cruces Water Utilities provided 11 buses for the children to get to Young Park.

As Vice-Chair Mr. Little knows the weather was beautiful, no winds, sunshine. Something I'd like to share with you, we had some great feedback especially from the



kids. This is just a small example of some posters that they sent to me just depicting their favorite exhibit or presentation and writing a story on it. This is just a small example, I have several and we have them on the board outside of the Water Conservation office as well if you'd like to stop by and see them.

While I'm up here I'd like to talk about another event that the City of Las Cruces Water Conservation Program will be hosting. It is an education event in our Demonstration Garden, we're calling it the Garden Stroll so that will be on May 25th, from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. We'll have coffee and donuts and we'll discuss Water Conservation using appropriate plants and irrigation requirements as well as a discussion and a demonstration on using our classic compost that is free through the City of Las Cruces Utilities. That's a really good point to show people that it is free, it is great to use as a soil builder as well as a fertilizer. I would love for you all to be there.

Chair Sorg: Sure, thank you Rhonda, that's very good.

Diaz: Thank you very much.

Dr. Garcia: We're ready for Resolutions Mr. Chairman.

6. RESOLUTIONS ON CONSENT AGENDA:

Resolution 15-16-173: A Resolution Requesting the Purchase of New Self Contained Breathing Apparatus and Accessories from Artesia Fire Equipment, Inc., of Artesia, New Mexico, in the Amount of \$131,890.00 Using Bernalillo County Contract #0045-13-CS.

Resolution 15-16-173 was Approved on Consent.

7. RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

Chair Sorg: The first Resolution for Discussion is **Resolution 15-16-LCU001B**. A Resolution Approving Amendment No. Two (2) and Authorizing an Indefinite Quantity and Indefinite Cost for the Remainder of Fiscal Year 2015/2016 Subject to Approved Budget Appropriation for a Legal Services Contract with the Stein & Brockmann, P.A. Law Firm Specializing in Water Rights and Water Litigation Matters for Professional Legal Services Under the Existing Contract as Amended.

Is there a motion to approve?

Baumgarn: So moved.

Little: Second.

Chair Sorg: Moved by Commissioner Baumgarn, Seconded by Commissioner Little. Question is, do we really need more money? Explain please.

Dr. Garcia: Mr. Chairman, this is an issue of the size of the Purchase Order (PO) not a budgetary issue.



Chair Sorg: Okay.

Dr. Garcia: I have plenty of money to pay the remaining two months or so for Jay Stein. Marcy explained what Jay has been doing. The prior amendments that we did limited the size of the PO, this one ties it to the budgeting. I apologize, I should've asked Alma to do a tie to the budget because we knew we were going to have the trial. We've spent today about \$473,000 but if you see the first line item, the first account up there we only have \$12,000 and that is capped. All we want is flexibility of the PO now to be able to pay the final bills. On the bottom right, the bottom left is just a plot of the same number but from the bottom left we can show you that we are \$473,000, prior year total was \$463,000, so we will exceed the prior year about, and Dania and Alma did a good job of separating the costs. I told them "I want to know out of those \$473,000 how much was really the trial and the experts and anything associated with those two weeks for legal and the actual trial that Marcy described." And \$279,000 of that were the trial costs. You can see that just by going into court that has more than half of the expenditures. All this action does is uncap the PO and ties it to the budget so we can pay the bills. The budget is available because otherwise I would have to have your recommendation and go to the Council to amend the budget. No, monies are there it's just that the PO is capped.

Chair Sorg: Thank you. Any further questions or comments by the Commission? In that case I'll just go ahead and take a vote.

Called for the roll on the Motion to Approve **Resolution 15-16-LCU001B**. Commissioner Johnson-Aye; Commissioner Baumgarn-Aye; Commissioner Little-Aye; Commissioner Pedroza-Aye; Commissioner Carmichael-Aye; and Chair Sorg-Aye.

The motion was Unanimously Approved 6-0.

Chair Sorg: Next Resolution on the Agenda is **Resolution 15-16-LCU023**: A Resolution Authorizing Las Cruces Utilities Staff to Make Administrative Revisions to the Water Tariff.

Little: Move to approve.

Baumgarn: Second.

Chair Sorg: Moved by Commissioner Little, Seconded by Commissioner Baumgarn.

Provencio: Chairman, Commissioners. This Resolution 15-16-LCU023 adds specific language for terms and conditions for water service connections to the water network. The specific language, the administrative addition or the administrative revision for the terms and conditions for the tariff explicitly define processes and consequences in terms of penalties for illegal connections to the water system. Just to clarify we have penalties



for tampering with exiting connections on the system. This addresses strictly new connections as new construction and development progresses in our service area.

If you have any questions I'll stand by to answer any of your questions.

Chair Sorg: Are we good here? I just was wondering, I thought we passed a Resolution like this not too long ago, it had to do with tariff for illegal connections or something, did we not?

Dr. Garcia: Mr. Chairman, I think that's what Joe clarified. We have the tampering portion. Joe give an example of what we're talking about.

Provencio: Okay. With respect to new construction this addresses only new construction and tapping into the system illegally. The process is that a permit is pulled for construction and construction commences usually the first utilities that want to be hooked up for construction purposes are water and electricity. However, when crews are dispatched to install the meter for the service system, to deliver water, and there's already water or there's a tap into the system this is the condition we're addressing here that there's no record of any other request to hook up to the system to get water. This is very defined and addresses an issue that we have to keep an eye on and police very closely.

Chair Sorg: Do they just cut into the pipe?

Provencio: That's what it ends up being.

Dr. Garcia: If I may explain Mr. Chairman. On a new construction we have the stub out, in other words, you don't need to dig to the line and tap it. There's a service line but there's no meter. There's been some situations and people trying to not pay the fees up front when they pull a permit and when they actually want to register to be our customer, staff goes out there and there's a house. The water to build the house came from somewhere and if we can prove and we see that they tapped into that valve or just opened the valve, connected to the polyethylene service line, there's no meter there. We're trying to educate builders and working with Community Development to provide information to explain to the builder that when they request a building permit they have to go and pay the impact fee and we need to issue a meter. First it goes to the builder and then the builder says, "the homeowner assumes responsibility of that account." But we've noticed that there are some circumstances where staff goes out there to install the meter and the house is already there, so now there will be penalties to do that.

Chair Sorg: Commissioner Johnson.

Johnson: How common is this? Once a year, once a week that you find that happening?

Provencio: I'll hand that off to Adrienne. It's her crews that come across this.



Widmer: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. It's not overly common but when you go out there you realize that something has occurred that should not be and we're even working with Community Development that actually hands the permits, because that's over the counter when it comes to residential permits, once a week they're sending us a list of all the new residential permits that they have provided. It goes over to New Connections, New Connections is able to actually pull up those to find out if they've actually gone in and paid for and requested water service so that way they can go out and double check. It's not a huge issue but enough of these occur and years ago it was a real problem where you would have one developer would tie into one meter and then he was using that meter to build the whole block. One lot, one meter.

Chair Sorg: Thank you Adrienne, does that answer your question?

Johnson: Yes.

Chair Sorg: Any other questions on this. Then I will take a vote.

Called for the roll on the Motion to Approve **Resolution 15-16-LCU023**. Commissioner Carmichael-Aye; Commissioner Pedroza-Aye; Commissioner Little-Aye; Commissioner Baumgarn-Aye; Commissioner Johnson-Aye; and Chair Sorg-Aye.

The motion was Unanimously Approved 6-0.

Chair Sorg: Next Resolution is **Resolution 15-16-169**: A Resolution Awarding an Architectural and Engineering Services Contract for the Jacob Hands Wastewater Treatment Facility New Water Quality Laboratory, Project No. 15-16-169, to ASA Architects of Las Cruces, New Mexico, for a Total Award Amount of \$358,559.28.

Ruiz: We need a motion.

Chair Sorg: Yes, thank you, we need a motion.

Baumgarn: Move to approve.

Chair Sorg: Commissioner Baumgarn moves.

Johnson: Second.

Chair Sorg: Commissioner Johnson seconded.

Clark: Ready for a little background on this?

Chair Sorg: Please.



Clark: The current Water Quality Lab was built in 1987. In the mid 90's it was identified as needing expansion at that time. Currently the lab that my staff is working with is approximately 1,000 square feet, they always have six people that work in the lab directly all the time, they also have the Co-Ops that help out, and then the temps that help out. IPP uses that same lab too. You can imagine there's a lot of people in there, things are moved around, there running out of counter space, and they're just working really hard over there and this is about due.

The new Water Quality Lab is going to be build north-west of the exiting lab building. My sight is a little bad right now but this is the existing building right in here so the new Quality Lab is going to be housed over here to the north-west. This would be Amador Avenue and then the entrance to the facility. We'll have a new entrance to the facility that will bring the public in away from the Treatment Plant personnel, not that we don't want them to associate with public but so that it doesn't interrupt their work.

ASA Architects is the architectural firm, they're on our on-call agreement right now, some of their projects that they have completed in the City that you know of: Centennial High School is one of them, that a big one and Las Cruces Fire Station No. 7, they designed that one as well. The Dona Ana Magistrate Court that we have here and they were also part of the NMSU new Arts Building. They were a sub-architect firm to the lead firm out of New York. They helped with a bunch of other things in contacting and stuff.

Johnson: Hopefully they didn't do the color scheme.

Clark: I don't know who did that but I guess beauty is in the eye of the beholder. The building design is also going to include the Civil Engineering, the drainage, the swpp, that we're going to have, the specifications in the contract, the landscaping consultant, the materials testing that's going to happen, and the geotechnical reports is all going to be under this contract. We have the LEED design fees and the LEED registration that's also going to be a part of this project. As you know the Strategic Plan says that any new City Building has to meet LEED certification so that's what we're going for here as well. There will be some construction administration and they'll prepare the documents as well.

I put another larger photo of the footprint of the area. This is a conceptual, not saying it's going to be exactly like it, but we're pretty sure it's going to be very close to it. We contracted with them earlier to give us a conceptual 15%, they let us get to this point quickly, now we're ready to move forward once you all approve, we can get this building designed, and get it under construction as soon as possible. If you all recall the first set of Bonds that we went for in 2015 is where the money is coming from. It's approximately 3.2 million dollars that we have for this project.

Chair Sorg: Very good. Anybody have any questions?

Little: One question.



Chair Sorg: Sure Commissioner Little.

Little: LEED certification of what level?

Clark: The way it works is there's LEED Certified, LEED Silver, LEED Gold, and LEED Platinum. We're at the bottom at LEED Certified.

Little: Okay, thank you.

Clark: We did ask them for LEED Silver or Gold but we can't quite afford that so we're going to go for what we can.

Chair Sorg: I have just one question. Would it be roughed in for solar anywhere on the parking lot or the building or anywhere? Would it be added on easier later?

Clark: We had discussed a little bit about that with the consultant, some of the stuff was the heating of the water in the building and stuff that we had talked about but still we were at 15%, we didn't go into that kind of depth with them. We'll still look at that item and it may be a possibility, if we can afford that.

Chair Sorg: Like we did to the parking lot at City Hall there.

Clark: We do have a Co-Gen that is going to be going on over there and there may be a possibility that we'll be getting some power off of there too.

Chair Sorg: Off which?

Clark: The Co-Generation project.

Chair Sorg: Oh yes. Quite a large building a lot of little rooms. What are the little rooms for?

Clark: Dr. Garcia.

Chair Sorg: Offices?

Dr. Garcia: My fourth or fifth office are there too. One of the things that I failed to mention in the budget and I remember it afterwards is when we requested the Board, and I talked to the Manager about splitting Water/Wastewater Administration, one of the plans is to move the Wastewater Operation complete to the Plant including the Administrator. There is some office space for the Wastewater Operation, I want to integrate all of the Wastewater because we already have three Plants, we have the Collection crew here in the building and we have the Administrator. As part of this plan is moving the Administrator, the Administrative Assistant to the plant so they have immediately access to the largest plant and eventually probably put a metal building where we can house the Vactor trucks and everything consolidated at the Wastewater Plant. That's the plan so there's some office space, three or four offices.



Clark: Yes, for the wing for Wastewater.

Dr. Garcia: There's a wing for Wastewater there.

Clark: Administration is going to be right in here with some of their supervisors, the Administrator, and the Assistant. Then we also have the IPP group who's going to be moved in there as well. They have their own little satellite portable building that they're in right now, they'll be moving in there as well, and then we do have some conference rooms and some training rooms. Then you have the big labs and they are separate labs because we're going to separate Water and Wastewater, we need to do that.

Chair Sorg: Okay.

Dr. Garcia: If I may Mr. Chairman. That's a very important point in this and that's why it's so large because in our current lab we're sort of grandfathered in but we have both operations in one lab and you can't have it. Therefore, we decided to do it right because it has to be two separate laboratories basically Water and Wastewater. This is going to be a state of the art laboratory. We're going to be very proud of it.

Chair Sorg: Okay, any questions or comments from the Commission? We'll take a vote.

Called for the roll on the Motion to Approve **Resolution 15-16-169**. Commissioner Johnson-Aye; Commissioner Baumgarn-Aye; Commissioner Little-Aye; Commissioner Pedroza-Aye; Commissioner Carmichael-Aye; and Chair Sorg-Aye.

The motion was Unanimously Approved 6-0.

8. OLD BUSINESS

Chair Sorg: Moving on to Old Business, is there any Old Business?

Dr. Garcia: Not from staff Mr. Chairman.

9. NEW BUSINESS

Chair Sorg: Any New Business?

Dr. Garcia: Mr. Chairman. As you know we're going to have a small reception for our City Manager, this is his last meeting. We're going to give him a token of our appreciation, you will, outside.

The second thing is the City Council reappointed Commissioners Little, Baumgarn, and Johnson. There is some paperwork that if you want to fill it up here, Alma has copies and you can do that, you were duly reappointed.

Chair Sorg: Good.

Dr. Garcia: That's all I have Mr. Chairman.



11. BOARD GENERAL DISCUSSION

Chair Sorg: Is there any discussion by the Board? Commissioner Johnson.

Johnson: You sent out a notice that henceforth you are going to have to click on there where you go out to get some files.

Dr. Garcia: Do you want to explain what we're trying to do?

Johnson: I think I understand but I do have a question but I wanted to bring it up.

Ruiz: Chairman, Commissioners. The City has moved to Office 365, which we ran in to last month an issue with size limitations for email attachments so we made a decision to follow the formatting of the City Council where they provide links to all of the documentations, which actually reduces the size of the Agenda Packet that we'll be sending out. We tested it this month, we sent the attachments as normal and then yesterday we send an Agenda that just has all of the links to the outsource documents that you can access. I know Commissioner Carmichael really liked that version and was able to access it but we also said if you're experiencing problems with that or have questions please let us know.

Johnson: I did and it may be my fault. I could access it and look at it very well but when I went to store it, there was no way to save it.

Ruiz: I will look into that option because you should have that option to save.

Johnson: Yes, definitely if you're going to get it that way and I typically save everything electronically and maybe in six months from now I finally have something I go back and look at that.

Ruiz: To reference, sure.

Johnson: I only pulled about three of them down but I couldn't find any way to save it.

Ruiz: We will look into that with our tech support for Laserfiche.

Johnson: But I think it's a good idea obviously. It makes it easier for you instead of having five different packages come through.

Ruiz: Exactly because in the past we've had to send several emails, one of three, two of three, three of three. Any other questions?

Chair Sorg: Do you happen to know the size of these document limitations approximately? Because I send out from City.



Ruiz: We found that it was less than 10MB. However, Dr. Garcia then contacted the IT Director and they've increased that to approximately 25MB but we don't want to take that chance with these documents.

Chair Sorg: Yes, some people can't even download.

Ruiz: Correct.

Dr. Garcia: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the new system got restored to what we used to have before. However, even with the old system we've had issues with some of our thick Agenda's so we thought this other method is the way to go when we have large packets. We will look into saving because I agree you need to be able to keep the document yourselves electronically so Alma will send an email to everybody explaining how that can be done.

Chair Sorg: Very good, thank you so much Alma.

Ruiz: Thank you.

Chair Sorg: Thank you Dr. Garcia.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Sorg: Reminder, everybody has to go to the lobby here after the adjournment. I'll take a motion to adjourn the meeting now.

Baumgarn: So Moved.

Chair Sorg: Second?

Pedroza: Second.

Chair Sorg: All in favor say aye. We're adjourned.

The motion to adjourn was Unanimous 6-0.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:28 p.m.


Gill Sorg
Las Cruces Utilities Board Chair


Date

