SUMMARY OF ACTION
FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, September 15, 2015

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL	Quorum	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved [amended]	1
APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA	Approved [amended]	2
CONSENT AGENDA LISTING		2-5
APPROVAL OF MINUTES – AUGUST 17, 2015	Approved	5
PRESENTATIONS		
CITY-WIDE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION NEIGHBOR TO NEIGHBOR FOOD DRIVE DAY		5
INFORMATIONAL AGENDA		
STATUS OF CITY'S CASH AND INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO AS OF JUNE 30, 2015	Information/discussion	6-8
CONSENT CALENDAR DISCUSSION		
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT – ON CALL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT FOR WATER DIVISION (RFP #15/41/P; CDM SMITH AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET ADJUSTMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF $136,016	Approved w/direction to staff	8-10
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN STACY COMMUNITY PROPERTY TRUST ALLOWING DISCHARGE INTO COUNTY WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM AND THEN INTO CITY WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM – STACY COMMUNITY PROPERTY TRUST LOCATED OUTSIDE THE PRESUMPTIVE CITY LIMITS IN AGUA FRIA VILLAGE; SANTA FE COUNTY	Approved	10

ITEM	ACTION	PAGE
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT UNDER STATE PRICE AGREEMENTS – THIRTY (30) REPLACEMENT VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015/2016 AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF $74,500; VARIOUS VENDORS	Approved w/direction to staff	11-21
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT UNDER STATE PRICE AGREEMENT – NINETY (90) FIRSTVU HD BODY CAMERAS FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT; DIGITAL ALLY, INC., AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF $42,741	Postponed to 10/05/15	21-26
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT – BUSINESS EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR SMALL BUSINESSES AND NON-PROFIT (RFP #15/38/P); SCORE	Approved w/direction to staff	26-27

****

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR DISCUSSION

****

DISCUSSION AGENDA

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET APPROPRIATION FOR FY 2015/16	Approved w/direction to staff	27-33
OTHER FINANCIAL INFORMATION	None	33
MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE	Information/discussion	34
ADJOURN		34

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
FINANCE COMMITTEE
Monday, September 15, 2015

1. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the City of Santa Fe Finance Committee was called to order by Chair Carmichael A. Dominguez, at approximately 5:00 p.m., on Monday, September 15, 2015, in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Carmichael A. Dominguez, Chair
Councilor Signe I. Lindell
Councilor Joseph M. Maestas
Councilor Ronald S. Trujillo
Councilor Christopher M. Rivera

OTHERS ATTENDING:
Oscar S. Rodriguez, Director, Finance Department
Teresita Garcia, Finance Department
Yolanda Green, Finance Department
Melessia Helberg, Stenographer.

There was a quorum of the membership in attendance for the conducting of official business.

NOTE: All items in the Committee packets for all agenda items are incorporated herewith to these minutes by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Finance Department.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Rodriguez said he would like to pull Item #26 from the Agenda, noting it needs paperwork that didn't get in the packet, and he would like to postpone it the next meeting of the Committee on October 5, 2015.

MOTION: Councilor Dominguez moved, seconded by Councilor Trujillo, to approve the agenda, as amended.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Councilor Trujillo moved, seconded by Councilor Rivera, to approve the following Consent Agenda as amended.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

****

CONSENT AGENDA

****

7. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO CONSTRUCTION SERVICES AGREEMENT – ON CALL ROADWAY AND TRAILS CONSTRUCTION SERVICES; GM EMULSIONS, INC. (MICHELLE MARTINEZ)

8. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT NO. 5 TO AMENDED AND RESTATED RAILYARD LEASE AND MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT – ALL SUBLEASES ENTERED INTO BY NON-PROFITS SHALL BE ASSIGNED TO THE CITY AND THE VALIDITY OF ANY LEASEHOLD MORTGAGES GRANTED TO THE NON-PROFIT'S SUBTENANTS SHALL NOT BE AFFECTED BY THE ASSIGNMENT; SANTA FE RAILYARD COMMUNITY CORPORATION. (ROBERT SIQUEIROS)

9. *[Removed for discussion by Councilors Maestas and Lindell]*

10. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF ON CALL MISCELLANEOUS HVAC SERVICES FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT UNDER EXISTING (BID NO. 15/07/B); YEAROUT SERVICES, LLC AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF $250,537. (KATHLEEN GARCIA)

11. *[Removed for discussion by Councilor Lindell]*

12. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF GRANT AWARD AND AGREEMENT – 2015 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANT PROGRAM SUB-GRANT AGREEMENT; NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY & EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF $62,660.48. (DAVID SILVER)

13. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT – ASSIST WITH OPERATIONS OF INTERFAITH COMMUNITY SHELTER; INTERFAITH COMMUNITY SHELTER GROUP #15-0539 AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF $5,000. (CHRIS SANCHEZ)

14. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST TO FUND PROGRAMS RUN BY THE FIRE AND HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT THROUGH RISK MANAGEMENT AND SAFETY FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT OF $140,000. (BARBARA BOLTREK)

15. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO INVESTMENT POLICY. (HELEN E HAUSMAN)

16. *[Removed for discussion by Councilors Lindell, Maestas and Rivera]*

17. *[Removed for discussion by Councilor Maestas]*

18. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENTS – CONTINUUM OF FY 2015/2016 HUD'S SHELTER PLUS CARE GRANT PROGRAM. (ALEXANDRA LADD)
    - SANTA FE COMMUNITY HOUSING TRUST
    - THE LIFE LINK/LA LUZ

19. *[Removed for discussion by Councilor Maestas]*

(CONSENT AGENDA) REAPPROPRIATIONS

20. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF REMAINING FY 2014/15 FROM BUDGET STATE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT (COMPETITIVE ALLOCATION) TO FY 2015/16 FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASES FOR OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COMMUNICATIONS/UTILITY SUPPORT PROJECT. (DAVID SILVER)

21. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF REMAINING FY 2014/15 BUDGET FROM STATE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROVIDING EQUIPMENT PURCHASES FOR FIRE AND POLICE DEPARTMENTS TO FUND OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT EXERCISE INITIATIVE FOR FY 2015/16. (DAVID SILVER)

(CONSENT AGENDA) LEGISLATION

22. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO EARLY VOTING; AMENDING SUBSECTION 9-1.7 SFCC 1987, TO AUTHORIZE THE MUNICIPAL CLERK TO ESTABLISH ALTERNATE EARLY VOTING LOCATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCH LOCATIONS. (MAYOR GONZALES, COUNCILORS DOMINGUEZ, RIVERA, DIMAS, MAESTAS, IVES, BUSHEE AND TRUJILLO) (YOLANDA VIGIL)) Committee Review: City Council (request to publish – approved) 09/09/15; and City Council (public hearing) 09/30/15. Fiscal Impact – Yes. ($11,120 for personnel and $1,000 for all other operating costs = $12,120)

23. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING A SECTION OF 23-4.13 SFCC 1987, TO INCLUDE SOUTHWEST AREA NODE (SWAN) REGIONAL PARK IN THE CITY SPORTS FIELDS. (COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ) (ROBERT CARTER) Committee Review: Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission (no quorum) 09/03/15; Public Works Committee (approved) 09/08/15; City Council (request to publish – approved) 09/09/15; and City Council (public hearing) 10/14/15. Fiscal Impact – No.

24. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING STAFF TO WAIVE THE PARK AND PAVILION FEES AT THE SOUTHWEST AREA NODE (SWAN) PARK FOR ONE YEAR (COUNCILORS DOMINGUEZ AND RIVERA). (ROBERT CARTER) Committee Review: Public Utilities Committee (scheduled) 09/02/15; and City Council (scheduled) 09/09/15. Fiscal Impact – Yes. (-$3,015 in revenues)

25. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION PROJECT "100 RESILIENT CITIES" AND REQUEST STAFF TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION AS ONE OF THE 33 CITIES TO BE CHOSEN FOR THE PROJECT (MAYOR GONZALES). (DAVID SILVER) Committee Review: City Council (scheduled) 09/30/15. Fiscal Impact – No.

26. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT MEOW WOLF AND THEIR PROJECT, THE HOUSE OF ETERNAL RETURN AND EFFORTS TO DIVERSITY THE ECONOMY, REVITALIZE AN ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED NEIGHBORHOOD AND PROVIDE A UNIQUE FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT OPTION FOR SANTA FE (COUNCILORS RIVERA AND LINDELL). (ZACKARY QUINTERO) Committee Review: Economic Development Review Subcommittee (approved) 08/04/15; City Business Quality of Life Committee (postponed) 08/12/15; City Business Quality of Life Committee (approved 09/09/15; and City Council (scheduled) 09/30/15. Fiscal Impact – Yes. ($60,000 – funds are included in the approved budget for economic development in FY 2015-16) This Item was removed from the Agenda and is postponed to the Finance Committee meeting of October 5, 2015.

27. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION DIRECTING STAFF TO EXPLORE THE FEASIBILITY OF STAGING A NEW YEAR'S EVE EVENT ON THE PLAZA ON DECEMBER 31, 2015; DIRECTING STAFF TO REPORT BACK TO THE GOVERNING BODY WITHIN 30 DAYS (MAYOR GONZALES AND COUNCILORS BUSHEE, IVES AND LINDELL). (JESSE GUILLEN) Committee Review: Public Works Committee (approved) 09/08/15; City Business Quality of Life Committee (approved) 09/09/15; Public Safety Committee (scheduled) 09/22/15; and City Council (scheduled) 09/30/15. Fiscal Impact – No.

28. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE APPLICATION AND RESPONSE TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS ISSUED BY THE NORTH CENTRAL NEW MEXICO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, NON-METRO NEW MEXICO AREA AGENCY ON AGING FOR CONTINUATION OF SERVICES FOR THE SENIOR CITIZENS OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE (MAYOR GONZALES). (RON VIALPANDO) Committee Review: City Council (scheduled) 09/30/15. Fiscal Impact – No.

29. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION DIRECTING STAFF TO ANALYZE THE CURRENT LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, CHAPTER 14-6.2,AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO SHORT TERM RENTALS (COUNCILORS MAESTAS AND IVES). (LISA MARTINEZ) Committee Review: Public Works Committee (approved) 09/08/15; and City Council (scheduled) 09/30/15. Fiscal Impact – No.

30. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION SPONSORING THE UPCOMING BEIRUT CONCERT, A FREE COMMUNITY EVENT, SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 4, 2015, ON THE SANTA FE PLAZA; AUTHORIZING THE CLOSURE OF SAN FRANCISCO STREET FOR THE EVENT TO ALLOW FOR FOOD VEHICLE VENDORS IN THE PLAZA AREA (MAYOR GONZALES AND COUNCILOR BUSHEE). (JESSE GUILLEN) Committee Review: Public Safety Committee (scheduled) 09/22/15; Public Works Committee (scheduled) 09/28/15; and City Council (scheduled) 09/30/15. Fiscal Impact – Yes. (Personnel $1,080; Fringe $432; other costs $480 = $1,992)

****

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

****

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – AUGUST 17, 2015

MOTION: Councilor Rivera moved, seconded by Councilor Maestas, to approve the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting of August 17, 2015, as presented.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

PRESENTATIONS

5.1 CITY-WIDE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION NEIGHBOR TO NEIGHBOR FOOD DRIVE DAY. (LINDA FLATT)

Linda Flatt read a proclamation into the record declaring Saturday, September 19, 2015, as City-Wide Neighborhood Association Neighbor to Neighbor Food Drive Day in Santa Fe.

Ms. Flatt thanked the City of Santa Fe and the community for their support of the Food Depot.

A representative of the Food Depot thanked the community for their effort to end hunger, she said her goal is to build this so that everybody stops on that one day to come together.

Chair Dominguez thanked them for their work, noting there will be a place for people to make food donations at the ribbon cutting for SWAN Park.

Councilors Lindell, Maestas, and Rivera and Trujillo joined the Chair in expressing appreciation for all of the work they do for the community to end hunger.

INFORMATIONAL AGENDA

6. STATUS OF CITY'S CASH AND INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO AS OF JUNE 30, 2015. (HELENE HAUSMAN)

A two-page information sheet entered for the record by Helene Hausman, is incorporated herewith to these minutes collectively as Exhibit "1."

Helene Hausman reviewed the information in Exhibit "1," which she said is to help to explain the information in her report. Please see Ms. Hausman's Memorandum of September 15, 2015, with attachments, which is in the Committee packet, for the full report. Ms. Hausman said the good news is we made $1.26 million in investment revenue this past fiscal year, which is more than the amount budgeted. She noted she has budgeted $1.089 million for 2015/16 and believes we will come in higher.

The Committee commented and asked questions as follows:

- Chair Dominguez said to be clear some of the cash in the report has to be used to pay debt that is already spoken for.

  Ms. Hausman said yes, a part of that shows under the 4000 series, noting she manages 12 debt funds, but there is also debt in the enterprise funds and that is included in the other funds that are here. The only very separated debt related account is at the bottom, the 2009 A & B bond reserve, which is a separate cash account the City is required to hold until the end of the bond issue.

- Councilor Maestas said the interest earned is good news. He said in the handout listing all the funds, he noticed the RECC Fund is minus $18. He said we aren't paying operational costs, but we are on the hook for capital costs. He asked if the County notifies the City of upcoming capital costs.

  Ms. Hausman said this was a typo. She said someone put the wrong line item on a deposit, noting she has corrected it, and it is now at zero.

  Mr. Rodriguez said regarding capital expenditures for the RECC, the Advisory Committee composed of City and County representatives has to agree on a capital program, and only after that happens do we set aside funds for that. He said at the last meeting the County said everything is still being worked out and one of the things they want to talk to the Committee about.

- Councilor Maestas said the investment portfolio review relative to the Bernalillo County Audit was really helpful for him to understand and to be reassured we're doing a good job. He said an investment advisor has helped to take a lot of the bias and subjectivity out of dealing with different investment firms. He said, "It sounds like that was a transformational move that continues to reap benefits for the City. It seems that you are much more comfortable having an investment advisor assist the City versus the prior arrangement. It was very good, very helpful."

- Councilor Rivera asked about the $8.6 million in the General Fund.

  Ms. Hausman said that is the cash balance that is recorded, credited to the General Fund at June 30th. She doesn't know how that breaks out, because she doesn't get involved at that level. Her guess is that since that this was run on August 19, 2015, and accounting was still posting some things that number may be a little different today, but it would be in the same neighborhood.

- Councilor Rivera asked if we factor carry-over into the next fiscal year, and how much was it.

  Mr. Rodriguez said, "We are fighting mightily against carry-forward funds. To answer your question, we have done an accounting of that, and at this point there is $1.6 million above what the Council had budgeted above the 1/12. If you look at the $8.6 million, almost all of that goes to the $6.4 million, 1/12 that we are required by the State to have in reserve. The amount above that is the amount the Council budgeted, at least the plan, to build our reserves up to 45 days, and we were able to get it to 35 days this year.

- Councilor Rivera said then the $1.6 million will go into reserves.

  Mr. Rodriguez said we will be bringing that back to you after we make the 1/12 and the extra 5 days in reserves, and his recommendation will be that the difference be put into capital budget for appropriation for capital project, noting you will see that in November.

- Councilor Rivera asked how much that might be.

  Mr. Rodriguez said $1.6 million in cash. He noted in the chart, of the $221 million, the biggest owner of the cash in the hub is the Water Utility with about $85 million, followed by the Wastewater Utility with $20 million. He said the General Fund has less than $9 million in cash in the hub.

- Councilor Rivera asked what goes into the $15 million for Special Projects.

  Ms. Hausman said that is all the 2000 series accounts, many grant related, matching fund. She didn't separate that out, commenting that this is purely a Cash Balance Report.

- Councilor Rivera noted the $11 million in SWMA, and asked if we are still the fiscal agent for SWMA, and Ms. Hausman said that is correct.

- Councilor Rivera noted the negative in the Airport Fund, and asked if that is a common occurrence from year to year.

  Ms. Hausman said the Airport gets a lot of grant money from the FAA and other sources, and sometimes there are delays. She said sometimes the City has to do the work and apply for reimbursements, so there are delays.

– Councilor Rivera said once those are paid the balance will be at zero.

Mr. Rodriguez said it will be closer to zero. He said as we've been reporting for some time, the Airport has been running significant deficit, some of it because of the slow collections of fees. He said Mr. Bulthuis said during the budget he believes we can recover everything due to the Airport in time. He said a big part of this could very well be that it's just a snapshot in time, commenting he is confident that is the case.

Chair Dominguez thanked Ms. Hausman for her report and for her good work on behalf of the City.

CONSENT CALENDAR DISCUSSION

9. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT – ON CALL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT FOR WATER DIVISION (RFP #15/41/P; CDM SMITH AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET ADJUSTMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF $136,016. (BILL SCHNEIDER)

Councilor Lindell asked how we arrived at the $625,000.

Bill Schneider, Water Resources Coordinator, said through the planning process over the past, internal to the organization. He said there is a table in the packet for proposed CIP expenditures for 2015/16, which summarizes the anticipated expenditures.

Chair Dominguez said it isn't in the packet.

Mr. Schneider said it was in the CIP packet. He said they arrived at the cost estimate was in trying to rank priority CIP projects that we need to synergize the work we're trying to accomplish right now under the current assets management plan as well as an assessment of our transmission-distribution system. Currently they are conducting stress areas to identify areas where there are high consequences of failure. He said there is a list of projects updating the Long Range Water Supply Plan, Transmission Distribution Plan, as well as conducting the stress test which he would deem as a well field optimization plan.

Councilor Lindell noted 3 firms were considered, and asked if this was a competitive bid.

Mr. Schneider said yes, noting the team independently reviewed the proposals and came up with an independent, unanimous selection.

Councilor Lindell asked if CDM Smith is a different company than CDM, and asked if they bid twice.

Mr. Schneider said it is the same company, noting CDM Smith, HDR and NCS bid on the project.

Councilor Lindell asked if this contract is to 3 different engineering firms, or one engineering firm.

Mr. Schneider said there are 3 entities in the CDM Smith – CDM is the prime and they have subcontractors, teaming partners which are: Bohannan-Huston, Albuquerque, and John Shumacher, Albuquerque.

Councilor Maestas said he submitted a question prior to the meeting which shouldn't get in the way of making a decision on this request. It is a question about our strategy regarding CIP projects in the Water Division. We just adopted 5 Resolutions in response to some changes and interpretation to existing statutes by the Office of the State Engineer. He thinks the one that should concern us the most, is that if you don't use your water rights you will lose them. He said despite everything we've done in terms of water conservation, there is no indication the State Engineer will back off. The Resolutions ask for clarification of State statute to secure our permitted water rights. He asked if we should be looking at a 40 year plan and reconsider CIP to maximize the use of the groundwater production. He said we sometimes completely rest the water rights, but that's not helping us to create a history of maximizing use of our permitted water rights. He said the contract will help us with everything. He asked, "Am I an alarmist or should we start thinking outside the box."

Mr. Schneider said he would assure you that this is the germane purpose behind this contract. He said we need to synthesize our asset management in the context of looking at life cycles, our infrastructure, particularly in the City well field. He said the idea here is to be prepared to prove the 4,865 afy in the City well field, that we will have the capability to accomplish that goal. He said there are different issues with respect to the City well field as well as the Buckman well field. He said he made a presentation at PUC last month that listed the stress tests, so we know where the weaknesses are where that high risk of failure is. An example, coming out of the BDD, we have two sources of supply, the San Juan/Chama water and the Buckman well field water coming into one single pipeline built in 1974, which is problematic and has to be rectified. He said under the contract we will work on getting a PER completed for a dual pipeline so we have resiliency built into the system. He said, regarding the City well field, we have an aging infrastructure, noting some of these wells are 60 years old which is beyond the normal life cycle of wells.

Mr. Schneider said, "So, we'll be looking at not only the wells, our ability to pump sustainably, but also to distribute the water through our system with the challenges of limited storage and pressure issues in the distribution line. Again the whole purpose of this is to reconcile where these challenges are."

Councilor Maestas said perhaps we could get a briefing at the PUC on the existing 40-year water plan, and identify areas for revision to protect our permitted water rights, and the impact of climate change on our native water and imported surface water, wells taken off line because of contamination, arsenic and the need to blend our water. He said they are already attacking our focus on population growth.

Chair Dominguez said we need to reevaluate the entire Water Division CIP Plan, noting there is an $85 million balance, because we've allocated money for projects we might not finish any time soon, unless we grow that Division a lot more.

MOTION: Councilor Trujillo moved, seconded by Councilor Rivera, to approve this request.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Chair Dominguez asked that they remember to provide the missing document the time this goes to Council, and Mr.Schneider said he would do so.

11. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN STACY COMMUNITY PROPERTY TRUST ALLOWING DISCHARGE INTO COUNTY WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM AND THEN INTO CITY WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT SYSTEM – STACY COMMUNITY PROPERTY TRUST LOCATED OUTSIDE THE PRESUMPTIVE CITY LIMITS IN AGUA FRIA VILLAGE; SANTA FE COUNTY. (STAN HOLLAND)

Councilor Lindell asked what is the benefit of this MOU to the City.

Mr. Holland said it is money and the benefit of the treated effluent. He said this will be a County customer and we receive wholesale rates for that.

Councilor Lindell said she is unsure she understands this.

Mr. Holland said at this point, the City and the County looked at rates, and he has to rely on the fact that they made that call.

Councilor Lindell asked the reason this is before this Committee as opposed to 2012.

Mr. Holland said in 2012, the MOA was different, and there was also a master water meter being set up to serve the Village. He said what happened is that the County and City approved MOUs, and there was a disconnect, so the two MOUs didn't match up. And once that was discovered, the applicant withdrew the application, so it has been dormant.

Councilor Lindell asked if this will have a master meter.

Mr. Holland said he believes that is the case, but he does know it will be served by County water, not the Agua Fria Village water system.

MOTION: Councilor Rivera moved, seconded by Councilor Maestas, to approve this request.

VOTE: The motion was approved on a voice vote with Councilor Rivera, Councilor Maestas and Councilor Trujillo voting in favor of the motion, no one voting against, and Councilor Lindell abstaining.

16. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT UNDER STATE PRICE AGREEMENTS – THIRTY (30) REPLACEMENT VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015/2016 AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF $74,500; VARIOUS VENDORS. (JOHN SCHAERFL)

A copy of *Marked Units To Be Retired*, submitted for the record by Deputy Chief John Schaerfl, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "2."

Councilor Maestas said he sent his question in advance. He said you are asking to replace vehicles, and we recently insisted on a vehicle replacement policy and we have that. However, based on the information in the Memo it was difficult to ascertain whether the vehicles met the policy. He said of the proposed vehicles, only 13 of the proposed vehicles are going to Patrol, 13 to investigations and 4 to Animal Control. He said the replacement criteria are different for Investigations and Animal Control. He said he had asked for information the vehicles, and you supplied that information.

Chair Dominguez said he doesn't have a handout, and Deputy Chief Schaerfl provided copies to the Committee [Exhibit "2"].

Councilor Maestas, referring to Exhibit "2," said then marked units are patrol units.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said that is correct, noting some vehicles are marked that aren't in a patrol capacity.

Councilor Maestas said then the unmarked are for investigations.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said yes, but there are some administrators that have an unmarked vehicle, but those are primarily for investigations.

Councilor Maestas said in the replacement schedule, 13 vehicles would go to patrol. He said you indicated you will be choosing the oldest vehicles with higher mileage for replacement.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said that is correct, noting they have a triage and look at what is in the worst shape or costing the City the most to maintain and in mechanical order which will be the first ones that we will exit/out of use.

Councilor Maestas said it seems we have more than enough that meet the replacement policy. He said 13 of these new vehicles will go to investigations as unmarked units – the Taurus, the Fusion and the Fusion hybrid.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl reiterated that 10 of the 13 will be Fusions, 5 of which will be hybrids, and the other 3 will be unmarked Tauruses. He said these vehicles might also go to a Patrol Lieutenant or another mid-management person who wouldn't need a fully equipped, marked patrol car that could use an unmarked. He said Investigations is the primary recipient, but 2-3 of the 13 could be utilized in other capacities throughout the Police Department.

Responding to Councilor Maestas, Deputy Chief Schaerfl talked about the different uses for the different vehicles.

Councilor Maestas said you are replacing 100% of the unmarked unit fleet, but only half of the patrol division's fleet, and he said he would think the priority should be on the Patrol Division, noting the criteria is much more stringent for replacement.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said for the past 2-3 years, Patrol has gotten the lion's share of new vehicles because of their use, and this catches up that balance. He said some of the cars in the inventory aren't issued because of vacancies in the Investigations Bureau, but once the position was filled, he would need to issue a vehicle.

Councilor Maestas asked if this is in the replacement policy.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said, as written, everything has a life span, as well as they have to adhere to the POA, noting the union contract allows for equipment to be issued based on seniority. He said they are trying to satisfy the POA contract and the policy. He said at the Chief's discretion they can take the worst of the vehicles to roll those out.

Councilor Maestas said $1.3 million is a lot of money. He said he commented previously that the request for vehicles has "fluctuated wildly." He said for the purposes of the budget, the Department needs to look at a stabilized request from year to year and tailor the replacement around budget stability.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said the Department stayed well within its budget this year, noting there is $400,000 which was not used which also is other gear and equipment. He said the one variable is that they could have unaccounted for losses when vehicles are involved in crashed, or vandalized, or damaged beyond the vehicle being repaired. They have an ongoing communication with Risk Management and the City Fleet, so they always don't have the luxury of planning for 2 vehicles and only using 2, so there is a small buffer built into the budget in the event of an emergency, or catastrophe they still would be able to provide law enforcement services to the public.

Councilor Maestas asked if are we meeting the reserve.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said they have, but only because we have 18 vacancies, and 13 people in the academy. He said if there were zero vacancies the reserve would not be met. He said they won't send all of the cars to auction, because some are still functional and can be used in a non-patrol capacity.

Councilor Maestas said part of the action requested is to approve the use of a State Price Agreement, but he didn't find the price agreement for the materials in the packet, noting he did find it for the equipment. He asked Mr. Rodarte if the State Price Agreement is still in effect.

Robert Rodarte said he did get the entire CES Contract which is 1,180 pages long, so he pulled the first 40 pages that tie into what we're doing and it identifies the vehicles and equipment. He can whittle it down to 7 page for the Council packet.

Chair Dominguez asked if he needed that document.

Councilor Maestas said no, he just wanted to make sure it was still in effect. He said when he looked at the numbers didn't match up with the price agreement, and asked the reason.

Mr. Rodarte said there is a base price on the price agreement, and then we add all sorts of other things – switches, harnesses and such. The base price will remain consistent.

Councilor Maestas asked who gets the quotes.

Mr. Rodarte said the Police Department are specialists on their needs, "and they spec them out and then he looks them over."

Councilor Maestas said we have budget issues, this is a lot of money, and vehicle replacement and take-home policies have been large issues, and for future requests, he would like a snapshot of the fleet with a full explanation of what is being placed and the status of the vehicle replacement.

Chair Dominguez said there is a request for approval of procurement and a budget increase. He said the budget increase is for $162,000.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said it is for 74,500.

Chair Dominguez said there is an amount of $119,396 in the Memo which says BAR from cash. He if you add up all BARs in the Memo, it totals $162,000.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said the BAR was to address the two reclassifications for Animal Control vehicles, and is funded under Animal Control's budget, commenting "it just wasn't under the vehicle procurement line item and it is to purchase and upfit their two trucks." He said the initial replacement of the two existing trucks was already budgeted and didn't require a BAR.

Chair Dominguez said on page 2 of his Memorandum it indicates "AS Truck (4) $119,396. It has a business unit attached to it and it has a BAR from cash and print." He said so you're asking for $119,396.

Nancy Jimenez said the $119,396 is for four Animal Services trucks. She said, "Under 12188, we had budgeted, already approved, for two Animal Control trucks."

Chair Dominguez said the BAR is only for two of the four.

Ms. Jimenez said, "That is correct, and it is out of 22231, which Animal Services Revenue line. As you go further down where it's talking about the Animal Control Kennels and installation, again for two vehicles we had the kennels and installations approved during the budget cycle. then two expansion or reclassification Animal Services vehicles were appropriated in the budget approval, the 22231 need the kennels and installation. The only amount we're short for Animal Services for two vehicles is the $74,500."

Chair Dominguez asked how he can know that if it's not explained in the Memo. Chair Dominguez said then the $74,500 is not something that was budgeted.

Ms. Jimenez said, "No. We have $89,000 in cash."

Chair Dominguez said he understands, but the two vehicles were not budgeted.

Ms. Jimenez said, "Those two vehicles were not budgeted for, because at the time the budget was prepared, we didn't know that the reclassification of two vacant positions was going to happen for Animal Services, so we could not budget for or prepare for the two additional vehicles would be needed."

Chair Dominguez asked when they did the reclassification wasn't that something that was considered, or was it just assumed the Governing Body was going to give you a budget adjustment of $75,000.

Ms. Jimenez said the reclassification of the positions were just for the positions and there no talk of the vehicle, equipment, uniforms and anything like that.

Chair Dominguez said those positions come with equipment and vehicle, and you know what your fleet looked like, and had an idea about whether or not those two reclassified positions were going to need vehicles.

Ms. Jimenez said that is correct.

Chair Dominguez said so the vehicles were in bad shape.

Ms. Jimenez said the current vehicles all are in bad shape. The two additional vehicles are basically expansion vehicles.

Chair Dominguez asked, "When you reclassified those two positions, did you take into consideration the condition of the bad vehicles."

Ms. Jimenez said, "They were already taken into consideration during the budget cycle to replace two vehicles. But when the reclassification happened, then it's an actual expansion of two additional vehicles."

Chair Dominguez said, "So those two expansion positions, when reclassified and created, was there a consideration for the condition of the vehicles they would be inheriting. What I'm getting to, is I think the Police Department needs to spend a little more time in prioritizing not only its fleet but maybe it's positions. I'm not necessarily opposed to this, but don't forget the current fiscal condition of the City of Santa Fe is not at a place where we can start not asking questions about reclassifications and equipment and replacements. We have to ask these tough questions. I hope you understand that. I think the Police Department needs to do a little bit more prioritizing."

Chair Dominguez asked of all the market units, do we know which units are commuters.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said it is approximately ½ according to Eric Sanchez, Fleet Manager. He can get an exact number for the Chair.

Chair Dominguez wants that information. He said the Governing Body is going to want to know the cost of replacing these units for commuting than it is to come up with another program to keep officers in town.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said they do keep that information.

Chair Dominguez said we need to consider Animal Control Services in establishing the budget.

Councilor Rivera said there are 43 vehicles on the list, but he is only replacing 30. He asked if 13 are going into reserve status, or continue to be used in some capacity.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said they will rotate out those that are the least safe and/or costing the City the most to maintain. He said the budget doesn't exist to get rid of all high mileage/long term service vehicles. He said they can reclassify units to be used in other areas in the Police Department. He said, "For the short future, I would estimate the next few years, we're still going to be catch up and get all of the oldest units rotated out of active duty. There will still be an occasional vehicle on the street in excess of the years and age."

Councilor Rivera said, of the 25 marked units/patrol units, you are replacing about ½, and asked if they will continue to be used on the streets, and Deputy Chief Schaerfl said yes.

Responding to Councilor Rivera, Deputy Chief Schaerfl said, "With the exception of the BAR to address the two Animal Services vehicles, the rest of it is coming from the itemized line items that are within our approved budget for vehicle purchase for FY15/16."

Councilor Rivera asked what makes up the cash in the fund.

Ms. Jimenez said the approximately $89,000 is from fines, fees and everything collected from municipal court, noting the majority is used for training Animal Services Officers, and operating supplies. Anything not used each year goes into cash and accumulates.

Councilor Rivera noted on the handout on unmarked units [Exhibit "2"] there are some marked UK In-op, and asked what that means.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said that means that unit is not able to be activated to accurately read the odometer. It is a unit that may or may not have been redlined by fleet, but it has an electrical problem right and they couldn't get an accurate odometer reading.

Councilor Rivera asked about the Animal Control vehicle with 90,000 miles on it.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said he thinks this one would be held in reserve, and as a 2009 model, by the time replacements come it, it will have reached its maximum.

Councilor Rivera noted the Department is looking at Fusion sedans, and you're running a project using hybrids, and asked if he can talk about that.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said those vehicles have been on the street for a few months, noting we bought 4 fusions, 2 of which were gas engines and 2 which were hybrids. He said they have tasked the Lieutenants issued those cars to track their mileage and other associated costs and maintenance usage. He said the data is rather fresh and limited, but both agree they are meeting the expected mileage advertised by the manufactured, high 30's to 40 mpg. They are buying 10 Fusions in this purchase, 5 of which will be hybrids. He said the City isn't certified to do work on the Fusions, so an extended warranty is being purchased to take it to Ford for its service life.

Councilor Rivera asked if all the vehicles are ready to go and asked the reason the old equipment can't be transferred into the new car(s).

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said on a limited basis, some of it can. He said a few of the Tauruses will be sharing some computed related equipment, including scanners, printers, software, connection cables and in 2 instances, docking stations. He said the problem with the Fusion is because it is not a police package, no one manufactures a police upfit interior.

Councilor Rivera asked why all the equipment can't be transferred between Tauruses.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl reiterated that some of the older vehicles have software which isn't supported internally or digital ally. He said where they can they will transfer any equipment that is still serviceable and technologically compatible with the new car.

Councilor Rivera asked if the costs reflect brand new equipment for all 30 vehicles.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said the Radio Shop can tell him what is compatible with the new car. He said that was taken into account, and the majority of the equipment for the Tauruses is new, because light bars, siren controllers can't be converted from a Chevy product to a Ford product, additionally, some of the equipment is degraded, out of service or our of warranty.

Councilor Rivera asked where the light bars are included.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said it is under Emergency Equipment on page 2 of the memo, the $105,974 is the total price to upfit the Tauruses, including all emergency equipment, and anything not listed independently, which would be a docking station or a printer – all lights, control heads for the lights, the cages, the graphics package.

Councilor Rivera asked who installs that equipment.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said the City Radio Shop has installed all equipment on every car, whether a marked or unmarked unit.

Councilor Rivera asked if we are moving away from that.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said no, everything will be done in house except for the graphics which have to be done by the provider.

Councilor Rivera asked the reason the cost of the light bars wasn't put into operating equipment, instead of in the price of the vehicle.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said everything reflected in there is off the State Price Agreement by the supplier which is NHQ of New Mexico, an Albuquerque vendor recognized on the State contract for the light bars and the cages. The light bars are in the emergency equipment section. Anything listed in the last Operating Equipment is provided by a different State Contract Provider.

Councilor Rivera asked how Animal Services vehicles are equipped.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said besides having radios, light bars and such, they have the animal kennel that sits on the rear of the truck.

Councilor Rivera asked if the kennels off the old trucks can be used on the new trucks.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said no, the older ones are 10-15 years old and dilapidated and falling apart, so the new vehicles did require a new one just for safety purposes on that vehicle.

Councilor Lindell thanked Deputy Chief Schaerfl for answering her email questions on this. She has great concern we're not moving more quickly to the hybrid cars. She reads all over the internet that other police departments are moving in this direction – New York, Indiana, Los Angeles. She doesn't want to keep buying cars that aren't hybrids. Ford has fuel efficient police cars. She noted we are only purchasing 5 hybrids. She said this is the direction we're going and the quicker the better because it saves money. She looked into the idea of electric cars. She is finding that expense isn't what it used to be and is offset by the savings. She said the idea that we're not going in this direction because we don't have a certified mechanic doesn't make any sense to her. She said they will talk more about this at Council. She is concerned of the 30 only 5 are hybrid. She thinks we can do this and provide for the public safety.

Councilor Lindell said on vehicles from Don Chalmers we have a confirmation in July 2015, and asked if we have ordered these vehicles, and Deputy Chief Schaerfl said no.

Councilor Lindell asked the reason we have a vehicle order confirmation.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said when Don Chalmers provides us with a quote they have to spec it to Ford, Inc., because some are police packages. And on a police package vehicle it is usually a build order, and the Fusions may or may not be in their inventory.

Councilor Lindell said she would like to be more supportive, commenting we're not in a position to spent one penny more than we need to and she thinks we are driving policy with this vehicles with not having a certified mechanic. She said we can do better than that.

Councilor Trujillo said Councilor Dominguez requested a list of where the vehicles are driven to and from. He would like clarification on the ones that are driven to Albuquerque, Espanola, Los Alamos, Rio Rancho – he doesn't need the patrolman's name, he just wants to know how many.

Councilor Trujillo asked the criteria for replacing vehicles in terms of the number years the vehicles have been in service.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said, "For the first time there is an actual replacement plan based on age of the vehicle or mileage. He said historically it was subject to what was needed and what was allotted in the budget."

Councilor Trujillo asked what is the current practice.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said for patrol vehicles it is 5 years or 100,000 miles, at the determination of the Chief. If there is a vehicle more than 5 years old with low mileage, that vehicle can remain in use.

Councilor Trujillo said what he wants the Department to do is to keep an eye on how many miles are going on the cars in the 5 years.

Responding to Councilor Trujillo, Deputy Chief Schaerfl said the policy provides that it's not an automatic replacement.

Councilor Trujillo said his concern is with the market units. He said when he sees an unmarked unit 11 years old, he thinks we should get rid of them, but something at 6 years at 110,000 miles, he believes we can get another 15,000 miles out that vehicles.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said Eric Sanchez did a lot of research on the cost to maintain, noting that sometimes a vehicle that is in the 5-7 years already has a failing transmission. He said an Impala costs more in a 5-6 year time frame to replace the transmission than the car is worth. So they have a conversation with Risk Management and they say it's no longer an asset and it's costing money.

Councilor Trujillo said this is the kind of information we need to make these decisions.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said only the patrol vehicles are 5 years, 100,000 miles, and everything else, unmarked, investigations and animal services trucks are 7 years and 100,000 to 150,000, noting an F250 can go more than 100,000 miles.

Councilor Trujillo asked how many marked units will be hybrids.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said none at this time.

Councilor Trujillo said this has been his concern. He said everybody is gung-ho on hybrids, and his concern has been the battery life. He said the Highway Department has have purchased hybrid cars and at 50,000 the batteries go, and these batteries cost thousands and thousands of dollars. He does have reservations about pursuing hybrids. He wants to see the data on performance. We have better options. He would like to buy a Ford or a Chevrolet to be able to make a comparison on the hybrid and which is the best car to buy.

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said it would be challenging to press a hybrid into service as a patrol car, because there are no manufacturers of internal police equipment. He said, for example, no one makes a cage for a Ford Fusion, or a Chevy or anybody else, because it's a hybrid which isn't a full size car. He said no one makes a computer standard or center console for a hybrid. It would have to be a custom made build, and difficult to create a patrol based car. He thinks this will change in the future, as well as extending the battery life and can be classified as a pursuit vehicle. He said we have to operate under industry standards that the vehicle is rated for pursuit use – sustained travel at over 100 mph the way the SO or State Police and the brakes and engine cooling are robust enough to get to an emergency call.

Councilor Trujillo said, in response to Councilor Lindell, he agrees that we need to get a mechanic with the knowledge to fix hybrids. However, the reality is it will cost a lot of money to train them, and once they come here they aren't paid very much. So once they are certified, they will go elsewhere to get more money.

Councilor Lindell said, "Then you're telling me that none of these departments that are moving into hybrid cars...everything I read says they are using custom interiors on all these cars."

Deputy Chief Schaerfl said, "The research I've done, and maybe it was you who afforded me a link to a video that I watched. The majority of the bigger departments are using them in a non-patrol capacity. However, some of the bigger agencies could benefit because the non-patrol capacity speaks to much larger numbers. The video I watched of the Arkansas based agency which are using some Toyota Camry hybrids to patrol have a very unique position, in that the upfit of those vehicles is a little easier. In looking at the video, they don't have any computers or radars in the car that he could see. Every single one of our patrol units has a computer docking station in it which is attached physically to a center console which is not the center console in my personal vehicle. It's a big, robust, steel assembly. At the moment, no major commercial manufacturer of that equipment makes them for most of the hybrids that are out there. Will that change in the near future. I'm sure it will. So I'm not excluding the agencies that are using them in a patrol capacity. I just think they either upfit or build their vehicles differently which may allow that to occur easier for them."

Councilor Lindell wants to do more research on that to be sure.

Chair Dominguez said without getting into the debate about whether hybrids are fast enough, or powerful enough, the point is that the City is in a financial situation, as Councilor Lindell said, where every penny counts. We need to make sure we maximize all our investments and the dollar to the fullest extent as it pertains to the Police Department.

Chief Gallagher said, "With regard to the hybrid discussion, we have not ruled it out, and we will explore the option. All the concerns that the Deputy Chief mentioned are valid and I will do some homework. I will make contact with my colleagues in New York. And I believe what they are probably doing is using them for non-patrol purposes. They have lots more different types of units and assignments, but I'll find out and see what I can learn from that.

Chair Dominguez said public safety is always important to the Governing Body, and there has never been a time where we haven't indicated that public safety isn't important. He said, "What I'm hoping for, quite frankly Chief, is that as we continue to move forward and explore the challenges we have with our budget, that we're not going to be put in a position where all of a sudden we don't support something that we're not in support of public safety. So my question to you, is do you not see the operation of the Police Department changing in such a manner that would require a reprioritzation of these vehicles, or some of these positions, or some of the action you're asking us to take here tonight."

Chief Gallagher said, "My mission statement of the Department that we have come up with jointly, one of which is to effectively manage the public resources that we've been entrusted with. So with that said, I am still currently doing an evaluation of the Department in that regard, including, I just finished a functional reorganization of the department and that's where I am right. So eventually, yes that will filter down to the rest of the department and a cost/benefit analysis will be part of it."

Chair Dominguez asked Chief Gallagher to please consider the action we will take tonight and probably at the City Council when you start to look at the Department and establishing the organization.

Chair Dominguez asked how much revenue does Animal Control produce.

Ms. Jimenez said it is about $38,000 annually, but it fluctuates with the penalties with the fines.

Chair Dominguez asked if the $38,000 goes to the General Fund.

Ms. Jimenez said, "No sir, it is a specific funding source for the Police Department for Animal Services through a Resolution and an Ordinance."

Mr. Rodriguez said, "Your statement generally is correct, it goes to general government services. One of the ways the City has put those costs off the balance sheet is to create funds and this is one of them."

Chair Dominguez said his point if we're going to look at different sections in a department and considering them as an enterprise, it may not be a fair assessment. He said obviously Animal Control won't generate sufficient funds to support itself.

Mr. Rodriguez this winter, Chief Salbidrez made a detailed presentation in two different meetings on the vehicle policy, and what you have here is that policy rolling forward, and it was approved by the Council. He said, "I will just point out to you that a lot of what they doing here and the priorities that they are bringing forward is just following that policy. So if you want to revisit that, I think that's the place to do

it. I would urge you to do it at that level, rather than at every different procurement. There was one other bit of information that was presented and available at that presentation, I took great note of it, and so did you. Your reaction was notable. And that is that the cost to replace vehicles was going to be about $1.5 million a year, given conditions, maybe a little bit more, a little bit less. but the general estimate was that, and what you have here is that plan rolling forward at about $1.2 million. They asked for $1.5 million, but if you recall in the budget, that was cut back to less than $900,000 and they would take that cash to make up the difference from precisely these different funds they have right now, so all the cash there would be used. They're doing basically what they were told."

Chair Dominguez said we need to make sure other departments doing the same.

MOTION: Councilor Trujillo moved, seconded by Councilor Maestas, to approve this request.

DISCUSSION: Councilor Maestas said some of the vehicles slated for replacement barely meet the criteria, particularly the unmarked units. He would like to revisit the replacement policy, and up the mileage for unmarked vehicles and Animal Service units that is commensurate with the age trigger of 7 years, and 100,000 to 150,000 which he thinks is more realistic. He is concerned about the problem of recurring maintenance costs, and we don't have that data.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Chair Dominguez summarized the direction given to the staff by the time this goes to the City Council that the following be included: The State Price Agreement information and be sure it is in the Memo, and clean up the Memo in terms of the BARs, where they are from and how much they are; and get the list of commuters in police vehicles to him and Councilor Trujillo.

17. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT UNDER STATE PRICE AGREEMENT – NINETY (90) FIRSTVU HD BODY CAMERAS FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT; DIGITAL ALLY, INC., AND APPROVAL OF BUDGET INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF $42,741. (PATRICK GALLAGHER)

Deputy Chief Salbidrez presented information regarding this matter from his Memorandum of August 18, 2015, which is in the Committee packet. Please see this Memorandum for specifics of this presentation.

Chair Dominguez said part of the idea here is to promote transparency to be sure get it right and we have the evidence and proof to get it right. However, he is concerned about the lack of a policy on how we will promote that transparency, and what the public can expect from the City. He asked if it is more important to get the cameras in place before we have a policy, or should we have a policy first to determine whether or not we need these cameras or any cameras at all.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said there is a draft policy proposal which would include when to record, what is redactable, what is privacy, is there continuous recording. These questions have been asked by different organizations, and if the continuous recording is an encroachment into the lives of people. He said they will set parameters as to when recording is done, what critical incidents and what kind of investigation is being done. He said if we capture information which is protected by IPRA or a domestic violence victim going through an advocacy how will we redact that information. He said this company has said by the time the cameras are installed they will have a redaction program we can use. The policy will indicate which incidents must be recorded. He said for example, he wouldn't record a conversation with a Councilor if everything is peaceful.

Chair Dominguez asked, what if the Governing Body wanted him to record those conversations.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said they would have to talk to legal.

Chair Dominguez said that goes to his concern that we should have parameters in place before we actually purchase the cameras.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said if the Councilors prefer, they could hold off on the purchase until they present the Committee with a policy to see if the scope reaches what you are looking for. He said at that point, with the City Attorney's approval they can go in that direction.

Chair Dominguez said he is in support of this technology and concept because he wants to make sure we get it right. He asked if it is his attention that the Governing Body approve such a policy. He said there are gray areas such as he isn't going to approve whether or not you use your baton in certain instances, but this is a little different, because ultimately the Governing Body will answer to the public about whatever decision is made on cameras.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said, "What I would say is we are here to listen to you, and to receive guidance from you, and will produce a policy, and accepted by the Chief and the City Attorney's Office, that's what we adopt. If we need to back and change something, that's what we'll do. It won't be a perfect policy the first time around. It's going to be a dynamic policy and we can continue to build and improve on it."

Chair Dominguez said, "I appreciate and understand that. I'll speak for myself. This is a collective effort and I would like to see the policy first before we get too far down the road on purchasing cameras. I think the public needs to know exactly what is expected, and exactly why these are being used and what the rules will be in terms of how they will be governed. There's a part of me that is reluctant to have the Governing Body go down that far and start approving those kinds of policies. At the same time it's an interesting issue that may need Governing Body input."

Councilor Maestas doesn't think we necessarily have to approve the policy, but thinks our approval of this request should be subject to the final approval of the policy before the cameras are deployed. He said in the Memo it implied we're still wrestling what would be subject to IPRA. He sees a lot of involvement from legal counsel in almost every instance, because the video footage will be evidence. He

said if there is footage not fit for public consumption, then Legal has to sign off on the redactions. He wants to make sure this is a really robust policy with "Risk Management all over it." He said a lot of cities have been using these cameras for a while. He supports the deployment of the cameras.

Councilor Maestas said the caption of this item indicates that the State Price Agreement will be used to purchase the cameras, and the price agreement expired in July. He said you included a Houston-Galveston area Council Price Agreement that is still in effect. He asked if the Department intends to use the HGAC Price Agreement.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said that is correct, and it should have been pulled. He said they have been trying to move this forward for some time, and got to the point where the State Pricing Agreement expired. He said when they learned it expired, they spoke with Digital Ally who provided this to use, where it shows where we can still go back and purchase through another agreement. He said to avoid confusion, they should have pulled this one.

Councilor Maestas asked if this is a significant change in caption and can we still act on this today.

Chair Dominguez asked if this is time sensitive and Deputy Chief Salbidrez said no.

Chair Dominguez would like to continue the discussion, but believes this will have to be readvertized to take action.

Councilor Maestas said it doesn't quite follow the BAR, noting it includes "the total not the half, not the $29,156.50."

Ms. Jimenez said this a two-year grant received in 2014, and it is good until 2016. They didn't spent the money last fiscal year so it has to be reappropriated which means the Santa Fe County portion and the City portion to put it back into this fiscal year's budget and the reason the entire $42,000 needs to be reallocated.

Councilor Maestas said the lapel cameras are $70,885, so $29,956, which half the grant is going for that, and asked the source of the balance.

Ms. Jimenez said whatever is left over is coming from the Police Property Tax.

Councilor Trujillo said he has no questions and definitely supports this purchase. He said this provides transparency and it will protect the officers and the public. He wants to approve it, and the sooner the better, and wants to look at policy as quickly as possible.

Councilor Rivera said he supports this, and thinks it's a good way for us to do business and be as transparent as possible.

Councilor Rivera asked Mr. Rodarte if we would be okay moving forward with this.

Mr. Rodarte said they need to change the title to a cooperative contract using HGAC Digital Ally. He said the quote was obtained through HGAC and he put the entire contract in the packet, but he made a mistake in the caption and he didn't include the original quote from Digital Ally on the expired contract. He said everything else is in the packet. He said we can make changes to the caption to indicate Digital Ally and include the information he spoke about, it would be complete.

Councilor Rivera said on page 1 of the memo under Items Requested, the last paragraph provides: *"The Police Department is also requesting approval to use this price agreement for additional parts and equipment if needed until 06/30/2016."* He said in reading this language, he thinks he is asking for an open P.O., and asked how he knows he won't spend another $150,000 or $5,000 for that matter.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said he won't spend $150,000, because they don't have it. He said the intent is outfit everybody, including Animal Services and Sergeants, and after discussions of the Chiefs, higher maybe. He said that means we're looking at a new grant in the near future to support the purchase of additional body cameras, and would ask your permission to do when that times comes.

Councilor Rivera asked if it would it need to come back to this Committee and the City Council to approve additional equipment and/or cameras.

Mr. Rodarte said by acting today to approve the HGAC contract, you are moving forward with a procurement over $50,000. He said in the event they have to buy other things, it will be under $50,000, and there is a cooperative contract for smaller purchases that has been approved by the Governing Body. He said the reason that was included is there will be tiny things they might have to buy. If they go over $50,000 before 06/30/16, it would have to be brought back for approval.

Councilor Rivera asked if there is contingency built into every contract, like 10%.

Mr. Rodarte said contingencies are common with construction contracts, but here, we pretty much use a threshold as a guide to when you need to come back for approval.

Councilor Rivera asked about a stand alone unit and storage of video footage.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said the server has been designed to support Digital Ally, the upload, wirelessly, manually from docking stations. It only works with that system, and not everybody in the City has access to it. It's a secured system for the purpose of storing evidence.

Councilor Rivera asked if IT has looked at it for compatibility with our systems.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said they went to the IT Governance Committee and presented it to them and they gave us advice on what we would need to upgrade our storage capacity and the man-hours it would take if we needed support on the system itself.

Councilor Rivera asked if IT can work on this equipment.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said Mr. *[inaudible]* has been working on it since we got the system and he helped them to develop the server and updates.

Councilor Rivera asked if that is reflected in the Memorandum.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said a business plan was drafted and provided to the IT Governance Committee who provided input regarding the purchase of these cameras.

Councilor Rivera would like to include that business plan in the packet before this goes to Council.

Councilor Rivera asked about the annual $44,000 maintenance contract.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said no, although he explored cloud storage for options on how to store this video, and Digital Ally, it would cost about $44,000 annually. He felt it was better to have in-house storage. He said the cost to update the terabytes was $15,000 to the current server.

Councilor Rivera said this places Digital Ally as the sole source, and his concern is that we find out that it can't be transferred if we decided to take this in house.

Deputy Chief Salbidrez said the storage capacity is accessible beyond going through the server and we don't have to use their system. He said it is one company over another, and all of them are here to take us in that direction.

Councilor Rivera said he would like IT to add something to the letter or the memo addressing his concern before this goes to the Council.

Chair Dominguez said we need to see this in two weeks. He gave the following direction to staff before this comes back: get the caption correct and get the two procurement items taken care of in terms of Digital Ally and the previous quote. He would like to have a statement from Legal regarding IPRA. He asked Mr. Rodriguez to talk to Legal to make sure they understand our concerns and that they provide a statement. He asked Deputy Chief Salbidrez to provide a general overview of the policies, so we have a clear idea of what it will be in general.

Chair Dominguez asked Councilor Rivera if he wants the whole plan from IT, or for them to reassure us that they are involved and they checked it out.

Councilor Rivera said it was mainly so he knows they were contacted and involved in this, and have looked at and approved the purchase, and they can work with the company, and they have assured us that once we purchase it that we're not stuck with this company, and there are ways out in 5 or 10 years when we have exhausted our relationship with this company and decide to move on and things are in place to make it as seamless as possible.

Chair Dominguez agreed.

MOTION: Councilor Trujillo moved, seconded by Councilor Maestas, to postpone consideration of this item to the next meeting of the Finance Committee on October 5, 2015.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

19. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT – BUSINESS EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR SMALL BUSINESSES AND NON-PROFIT (RFP #15/38/P); SCORE. (FABIAN TRUJILLO)

Councilor Maestas said he supports this action. He said on page 1 of the contract under Scope of Services, Paragraph A, it provides, "*Implement a business education program for Santa Fe Area businesses, entrepreneurs and non-profits which furthers the City of Santa Fe's Economic Development Goals...*" He asked what are our economic development goals are, and doesn't believe those have been debated and approved by the Governing Body. He asked what is our most recent vision and goals for economic development.

Fabian Trujillo said this is operating from the last Economic Development Policy approved by the Council – the Economic Development Implementation Strategy in 2008 implementing the 2004 Angelou plan. He said however some of the things that are still relevant that we are looking to do is to launch the Office for Business Growth, an expansion of the Business Development Program. He said this falls directly with the new expansion, and we'll be expanding the business ombudsman services with a robust business assistance program to help existing businesses, entrepreneurs and help any kind of recruitment coming into Santa Fe.

Councilor Maestas asked Mr. Trujillo if he sees a need for us to discuss revising our economic development vision. He said we had a difficult debate when we talked about CIP projects, which he thinks need to play into these discussions.

Mr. Trujillo said in 2011 we created the existing Economy Subcommittee and the Future Economy Subcommittee and recategoried some of these goals. He said that is something to be discussed among the Governing Body. He said there has been talk about redoing our Economic Development Plan. He said we've implemented the Outdoor Recreation Strategy, noting they currently are working on the Film Policy Programs. He said if there are specific changes the Governing Body would like to address or the community wants to do he is willing to do so. He said a substantial community process was undertaken in 2003 to get there, and it was also expensive, about $100,000. He said most Economic Development Policy recommends you change your economic development practice within a 5-10 year period. He said they have gone through some of these sessions within the past 4 years or so.

Councilor Maestas said clearly a lot has been done. He said he would like to assess the goals and establish a consensus by the administration and the Governing Body. He said, "We can't keep on making decision on capital improvements in a vacuum without really knowing where we're going from an economic development standpoint." He wants to be reassured that the Economic Development Policy is still valid and relevant today he thinks it's time for that debate.

MOTION: Councilor Lindell moved, seconded by Councilor Trujillo, to approve this request.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Councilor Maestas asked Mr. Trujillo to provide the Economic Development goals by the time this goes to the Council.

****

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR DISCUSSION

****

DISCUSSION AGENDA

31. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET APPROPRIATION FOR FY 2015/16. (OSCAR RODRIGUEZ)

A copy of *FY 2015/16 City of Santa Fe Capital Program BARS $50,000*, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit "3."

Chair Dominguez referenced the information in the packet and the handout.

Mr. Rodriguez reviewed the more recent version [Exhibit "3"] with the 2 changes.

Mr. Rodriguez noted the language on page 4 in the middle of the page, saying he wants to make it clear, "GRT bond money was programmed for salary and this was the plan when those bonds were issued and wanted to point this out. You will recall Resolution 2015-50 that said, don't be using, again, bond money to pay for salaries. The reason it is in here and I wouldn't dare put something in here that you guys indicated not to do any more, but the reason it is in here is that Resolution referred to G.O. Bond money and the money here is all Gross Receipts Tax money or CIP money."

Mr. Rodriguez noted that the projects in the 2012 G.O. Bond are not included in this document, and they plan to bring them forward in the future when they present the capital budget on November 10, 2015. Responding to the Chair, he said some of the 2012 G.O. Bond projects are done already or in the works. He said this will be in the capital plan which will be submitted to this Committee in November. He said the reason they held back those projects is they have received bids for projects in the 2012 bond package and they are considerably above what was is in the bond package. Staff will be coming back with a plan to cut back the scope/scale of the projects, or transferring money into the projects to complete them as they are, or to revisit the policy on the use of the City's force account or City labor to be paid from those G.O. Bond proceeds. He thought it would be more prudent to come back with a complete package.

Chair Dominguez asked if there will be a BAR associated with that.

Mr. Rodriguez said it is more likely that it will be part of the capital budget, the Capital Plan you will be asked to approve on November 10, 2015.

Chair Dominguez said then we may need to reestablish priorities which will impact the budget and it will be an adjustment to that budget.

Mr. Rodriguez said he was speaking of the budget for those projects and not necessarily the budget that was approved by the Council, because it will be being seen for the first time. He said a BAR happens after you have approved a budget.

The Committee commented and asked questions as follows:

- Chair Dominguez thanked Mr. Rodriguez for his work. He asked if it is Mr. Rodriguez's intent that this list be approved by the Governing Body.

  Mr. Rodriguez said yes, noting DFA looks at this document as a budget adjustment.

- Chair Dominguez said there are salaries scattered throughout this document, for example salaries for Small Sidewalks on page 1, and for Small Drainage Projects. He asked if the $50,000 listed under salaries is all going to salaries, and Mr. Rodriguez said yes.

- Chair Dominguez said since that is the case, we can calculate the total cost of what is going to salaries and Mr. Rodriguez said yes, commenting there two kinds of salaries, one for workers and the other is the project manager.

- Chair Dominguez said some salaries are paid from the Bond and some from the grant. He said, for example, the GCCC has a GRT allocation to it that was mandated by voters for salaries. He asked if there is a way to differentiate the salaries versus legislation versus staff's decision to use bond monies for salaries.

  Mr. Rodriguez said to be absolutely clear, staff can 't decide to use bond monies for salaries, because the Council has to approve all of the adjustments. He said when the package was put together for small sidewalks, it was put together in a way that recognized that work was going to be done by a force account.

- Andy Hopkins, Finance, said, "The allocation of GRT to the GCCC is a completely separate thing that is not at all involved here. That only supports operations of the center. It supports actually the people who work at the Center. The amounts you are seeing here, for example, you saw something under 52722 GCCC CIP, that would be for force account crews only, for amounts involved in projects where there would be no operational staff or ongoing staff expenses in there. All of the salaries here, and in fact, by convention, all of this gets budgeted in salaries, but at the end of the day, when you look at the actuals, there's really a little bit of benefits. Force account crews, by their nature, don't get a lot of benefits, but there are things like FICA and other things accrued in there, so it's not purely salaries. What happens at the end of the year, the amount of time that the force account crews worked on those various projects were allocated to those projects, and capitalized as part of the project, because the labor itself becomes part of the value of the overall project, if that makes any sense."

- Chair Dominguez said it does. He said then none of those funds go for capital improvements.

  Mr. Hopkins said, "No, not for capital improvements. Possibly some capital outlay like Zambonis or whatever, but not for capital improvements."

- Chair Dominguez said it would be helpful to know the location of the bridges or sidewalks that are being worked on.

  Mr. Hopkins said the project managers are here and might be able to provide more detail on what bridges or sidewalks are currently under project.

- Councilor Lindell said she doesn't need for someone to speak for each one of these, and thinks that needs to be indicated in the document. She wants a better explanation of what these projects are.

  Mr. Hopkins said these are tied to individual contracts, and suggested Mr. Pino can speak better to this issue.

  Mr. Pino said the bridge rehab is DeFouri which is an ongoing project with different pots of State funding, and CIP funding. He said the small sidewalks is for the 2014 CIP bond, which is $450,000 to build sidewalks and $50,000 to project oversight and management.

- Councilor Lindell said, "You know what all of these are, but it doesn't say that anywhere on my sheet, so I wouldn't know that. For me to go through all 8 pages of this would take a while."

- Chair Dominguez said there are some areas where it is specific such as Road Sharrows on West Alameda, Siringo Road, San Mateo/Galisteo, and that is helpful. He said he can go back for the most part and show this document to his constituents. He said this is a very valiant effort to get us there, and we're almost there.

- Chair Dominguez said there is a part of him that wants to have this categorized by District. He said when we talk about equity in a progressive community like Santa Fe, we need to be able to show that a certain demographic or population is receiving its fair share of services and improvements. He said, "But I'm not going to go there, because this is really a huge improvement as it is."

- Chair Dominguez said we need to take action.

- Councilor Maestas said we need to commit ourselves to making this a public document, and understandable to the public, with District maps showing the improvements. He wants to make this part of our institutionalized public documents that this is a publicly consumable description of our capital improvement plan for this fiscal year. He doesn't want to hold it up, but they are having a town hall tomorrow night and it would be nice to describe what's going on his District, and to let the public know we're making basic improvements as well as addressing some of the deferred

maintenance. He believes we eventually can create a first class document understandable and appreciated by the public. He supports this request.

- Chair Dominguez said as we move forward, this document will get better and better and be a very good public document. He said he knows there is a way to input all this information into a GIS and pop stuff out, but "I'm not going to go there because that's not my job as a policymaker, but I know that the technology allows it."

- Chair Dominguez asked if there is a way to get a total of salaries in this document.

  Mr. Rodriguez can get that information on a sidebar, but they're trying to organize everything by project or types of projects. He said they have given the Committee this document in Excel, so they can match it any way you want or staff will be glad to do that as well. He said this will be on the website.

- Chair Dominguez said then some salaries are paid out of both grants and bonds, and Mr. Rodriguez said yes. He asked if there is a way to determine that.

  Mr. Hopkins said, "Just one clarification. As Ike just reminded me, we virtually never pay any salaries out of grants. Grants are only for materials, cost, construction and design. The salary portion of any of these will be paid from the bond portion or other revenues, and not out of grants.

- Chair Dominguez noted on page 3 of 8 under Sal Perez it has both a G and a B.

  Mr. Hopkins said that is because the overall project is supported by both grants and bonds, although the salary portion should just say B.

- Chair Dominguez said the $10,001 is for salaries is out of the bond and not out of grants.

  Mr. Hopkins said that is correct, noting salaries are ineligible for virtually any grant, so costs are structured so the grant does not pay for any salaries.

- Councilor Rivera said in places it indicates, "funding to pay locals for work."

  Mr. Rodriguez said that is the locals group, and that is for salaries.

- Councilor Rivera said then it's the City crew that goes out to work, and we're not hiring local plumbers and such.

- Councilor Rivera asked if it is okay for the locals to be paid from bond proceeds.

  Mr. Rodriguez said yes, they're being paid from GRT bonds, not General Obligation Bonds.

- Councilor Rivera said on page 2, near the bottom there is $80,000 for Municipal Facility Repair for a filing system already in place, and said those funds would be reallocated to other projects. He asked does that need to be on the list or has that already been reallocated.

  Mr. Rodriguez said the only way it can be reallocated is if the Governing Body approves it. He said this is how we intend to reallocate it, if it is approved.

- Councilor Rivera said on page 4, there is $78,000 and then $1.2 million salaries under parks maintenance, and asked the reason those amounts are so significant.

  Mr. Hopkins said because of the set-up, one of things they tried to avoid was giving you a bunch of Codes and had to redo the one in the packet. He said some of the line items have a 7 digit suffix after a period, and those indicate bond amounts. The Code indicate the year of issue, the type of issue and so on, and the reason you will see duplicates. He when they put this into the budget, they will have to put them in separately because there are different account codes for them.

- Councilor Rivera said the $1.2 million is separated into many different subsections.

  Mr. Hopkins said the $1.2 million is all one type of subsidiary, so that is probably the amount that is going into no subsidiary and isn't tied to any specific bond issue. The $78,000, most likely given the numbers, is tied to a specific bond issue.

- Councilor Rivera asked if Classified Full time is one position.

  Mr. Hopkins said no, that's just a nomenclature difference and it really should just say salaries.

  Mr. Rodriguez asked Robert Carter to speak to this issue.

- Robert Carter said, "This money has been happening for about 3 ½ years and it comes up every time as a CIP project. It comes out of the GRT, and does not come out of a GO Bond. He said if this does not continue to be funded through a CIP fund, we'll lose about half of our crews from Arterial, Park, Ballfield maintenance, Sanitation and Irrigation. It would also affect the amounts of money we put toward operating supplies, capital equipment, repair and maintenance, and if we pulled our guys for special events, we wouldn't be able to take care of all the areas we're taking care of. So this amount of money that's budgeted every time to a CIP basically helps run half of the Parks and Recreation Department."

- Councilor Rivera said then this isn't truly salaries. It's salaries, equipment and other.

  Mr. Carter said everything that starts at Park Maintenance and goes all the way down to just before the MRC is part of that whole nut there for the amount of money. So it not only goes to salaries, but goes to equipment, radios and all kinds of different things that have been budgeted over the last 3½ years.

Mr. Rodriguez said we borrowed money and part of the debt is paying for operations. He said we discussed this in detail about one of the many bridging strategies that were used over the years to get us to this point.

- Chair Dominguez said we've talked for a number of years about moving salaries out of CIP and making CIP more of a Capital Improvement Program and not a way to keep people employed.

- Councilor Rivera asked if the repair, maintenance, furniture, fixtures, equipment are being paid from the GRT or are those bond moneys.

  Mr. Carter said it is all paid out of the GRT that is used to pay debt service on bonds. He said it gets a little confusing because there are different words using bond. As you know, you have a 2012 Park Bond and then the CIP Bond which comes from the GRT.

- Councilor Rivera said then perhaps we have a G & B and other categories to separate it out further so we know if its GRT. He agrees with Councilor Lindell that the project or projects should be specifically listed, commenting that would be extremely helpful.

  Mr. Rodriguez said the challenge here is, for example, in Operating Supplies, there is not a specific project it is allocated to. He said what this does is reflect over time that capital money is being used for operations.

- Councilor Rivera said in addition to the $1.2 million and the $78,000 for salaries, all of the other items down to the MRC are things that the funding is going to go away after this year, noting Mr. Rodriguez said we would dwindle down money for salaries.

  Mr. Rodriguez said the proceeds from the 2014 issuance are almost done. The only way you replace that is to issue more bonds, and we're already pretty heavy in debt to go out to the market, and based on that he is recommending that we not go out to the market "until we get a little lighter in debt so we have a better looking profile." He said, "Yes, we're in a box here. It's quite a conundrum here that if you don't issue more debt to keep going the way you have kept going, you are looking at people being laid off and a cut in services taking place. On the other hand, if you go out for debt, we're played that card so much that we risk going out to the market, and the marking saying gosh, you guys are pretty heavy in debt, and for that we're going to downgrade you."

  Mr. Carter said, "Councilor Rivera, just to clear up, there are no salaries for the MRC. This is only in the Parks Division. The MRC is more operation and maintenance just to clear that question up."

- Councilor Rivera said, "So really, being in this conundrum we're in, what are the ways out. Either we increase revenue, we cut services, or we find way to bring more tourists to Santa Fe."

  Mr. Rodriguez said the solution is in all of these, times two perhaps.

- Councilor Maestas said we got dinged heavily in the 2008 bond, and one of the issues was our inability to implement project management, even though we were doing the work internally. He said this document should reinforce the fact that we are following project management principles. He wants to know, from a lessons learned standpoint, that we have fully implemented project management in all of these projects.

  Councilor Rodriguez said Councilor Maestas said he doesn't have the timeline or the thing that says X-project by this time, and the Governing Body approves it. And from that point forward, you look at it and say how is that looking. The intention was not to put that here, but we want to keep the projects rolling, and our intention is to put that information in the Capital Budget, the CIP, so you can see over five years, and over time, the progress, and to get the organization more into the custom of viewing/reviewing projects on that basis as opposed to the way we've been doing it. He said there is a lot of staff that works hard on these things and gives their best effort, and a lot of projects are moving forward because of that effort. He said what we are doing is changing how the information they generate is reported and this our best effort to date.

Chair Dominguez asked Mr. Rodriguez to prepare a Memorandum before it goes to the Council and include as much information as possible to make all of this more clear for members of the Governing Body who don't serve on the Finance Committee.

MOTION: Councilor Rivera moved, seconded by Councilor Lindell, to approve this request, with a recommendation to expand the projects, where possible, to list specific projects in column 4, and expand that to include an indication of a GRT bond.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Rodriguez said toward the end the Public Utilities columns are blank because "it's being paid out of cash straight ahead."

Chair Dominguez asked if that is the $5.2 million from water and Mr. Rodriguez said yes.

Chair Dominguez asked why the utilities enterprise is included in this capital program.

Mr. Rodriguez said it is because your approval is needed to move forward. He said at this point projects are done either through the proceeds of issued debt or from grants.

VOTE: The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

32. OTHER FINANCIAL INFORMATION

There was no other financial information.

33. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Councilor Maestas said Item #26 was removed from the Agenda because of his question about possible violation of the anti-donation clause, because it is calling for $60,000 in support in exchange for Economic Development Services. He said staff agreed that we should pull it because we need a professional services agreement and thinks that was the intent, but it wasn't included in the packet. He said the action throughout the policy track has been to approve the Resolution, but it's going to be amended to approve a Resolution and a Professional Services Agreement, and asked if that needs to go back through the policy track, noting the track in the Committee review excludes the Finance Committee. He said if it comes back to Finance, it still will precede the originally scheduled City Council action on September 30, 3015.

Chair Dominguez said ultimately it has to come to Finance. He said at the least the item is postponed to the next meeting on October 5, 2015. He asked staff to be sure the caption for the item is correct.

Councilor Rivera said he would think it would have to come back to Finance because there is a substantial change to the caption, because you're now adding a contract which he presumes will have the Economic Development portion of it, what it will entail and how we will measure it.

Councilor Maestas asked if we will still pay them if they don't deliver on the matrix.

Mr. Rodriguez said he will get the Department Director to address that question, and to write a Memorandum to the Committee addressing the issue of what happens next.

34. ADJOURN

There was no further business to come before the Committee, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

Carmichael A. Dominguez, Chair

Reviewed by:

Oscar S. Rodriguez, Finance Director
Department of Finance

Melessia Helberg, Stenographer