CALL TO ORDER.

The regular meeting of the SSCAFCA Board of Directors was called to order by Dub Yarborough, Chairman, at 1:02 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

The Board was led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Dub Yarborough, Chairman.

ROLL CALL OF DIRECTORS.

Directors in attendance were John Chaney, Richard Deubel, Guy McDowell, and Dub Yarborough. Staff members present were David Stoliker, Executive Director, Bob Fogelsong, and Perry Baird. Bernard Metzgar, SSCAFCA's attorney, and members of the public were also present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Mr. Yarborough stated that he would like to move the Director's Comments to immediately follow the Roll Call of Directors and Approval of Agenda.

A motion was made by Guy McDowell to approve the Agenda as amended. It was seconded by John Chaney and passed unanimously.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS.

1. Action/Approval of Proposal to Dedicate and Re-name the Urban Pond System in Honor of Annette Hise Jones.

Mr. Yarborough stated that Ms. Jones was Chair of the original Corrales Watershed District Board. She was appointed to the original SSCAFCA Board and, through her work, SSCAFCA accomplished a lot of items that needed to be done.

A motion was made by John Chaney to re-name the Urban Pond System the "Annette Hise Jones Urban Pond System." It was seconded by Dub Yarborough and passed unanimously.
Ms. Jones addressed the Board regarding some of the history behind SSCAFCA and CWD and thanked the Board.

PUBLIC FORUM.

None.

CONSENT AGENDA.


A motion was made by Richard Deubel to approve the minutes of May 15, 2001 as presented. It was seconded by Guy McDowell and passed unanimously.

b. Action/Approval of Treasurer’s Report for 05/31/01.

A motion was made by Richard Deubel to approve the Treasurer’s Report dated May 31, 2001 as presented. It was seconded by Guy McDowell and passed unanimously.

ACTION/APPROVAL OF THE 100% DESIGN DEVELOPMENT SUBMITTAL.
(This includes probable construction costs, additive alternatives, lifecycle cost analysis, materials presentation, and furniture program.)

Ms. Kris Callori, of EDI, stated that the overall budget for the building, including design, is $842,545. Once the design fees are subtracted, there is a building budget of $745,668. Right now, the estimate is at $681,444. Once furniture is added, the budget is $741,000. She stated that a contingency for $30,000 has been included in the budget already.

Ms. Callori stated that Division 2 of the Statement of Probable Costs talks about the site, including some landscaping alternatives, which will be gone over by the landscape architect. Division 5 deals with the parking shade structure and the costs associated with it. Division 7 is a roof upgrade. The roof in the budget right now is a typical roof which comes with a ten year warranty. The roof upgrade they would prefer to go with is a $4,400 upgrade and comes with a 25 year warranty, with labor and materials included. Division 15 is a heat pump, which is something that might affect the energy bills. Division 16 is a security system. Right now, there is no alarm system incorporated into the building. If all these upgrades are added, the building will be over budget.
Mr. J. Stace McGee, of EDI, stated that they have modeled the building in a program so that they can understand how much energy it will use from the design. The most cost-effective way to make an energy efficient building is to add more insulation. The second thing they look at is stopping infiltration, which is air coming through poorly built windows and doors. The other thing they look at is conduction, which is cold or hot air transferring directly through the wall to the interior.

The graphs show that the typical office building that they compared with the as-designed SSSAFCA building uses almost twice as many kilowatts per hour. Demand electricity costs four times the amount of regular electricity and you don’t want to have to use demand electricity. The energy usage of the building has been cut a little more than half. The energy saving features are included in the base building budget. By using the sky lights to bring in the sunlight to help light the building, they can cut a substantial amount of the energy cost.

Mr. McGee highly suggested that the Board use the HVAC economizer, which is in the base budget right now. The heat pump system is substantially more expensive and the pay back period is much longer. The improvements that they did were in changing double windows to low-e windows because they perform much better. They changed the built-up roof, which is a ballast type roof that has rock on top, to some kind of a membrane roof that would be much lighter in color. They chose a stem wall, which is usually of concrete to one built out of foam because it has more insulation. On the outside of the building, they did not use OSB but they changed it to an eva system, which is an exterior insulating finish system. They chose this because it stops conductivity, it gives more insulation to the wall system, and it cuts down on infiltration. They added building shade structures (awnings) over all of the south facing windows so that the unwanted summer sun can be cut out, but the winter sun can be let in. They added bat insulation into the walls. The insulation is blown into the walls and then screeched off so the cavity is 100% filled. He is not suggesting blown insulation to be put in the ceiling.

Mr. Stoliker asked if the walls are built to meet fire code? Mr. McGee stated that the building is a “2N” building, which means that they do not have to fire-proof it because it does not have combustible materials. There is no sprinkler system incorporated into the building and it is not required by code. Sometimes you can get as much damage from water as you can from fire. It will cost approximately $1.50 per square foot to put a sprinkler system into the building. There would be approximately a 50% reduction on the yearly insurance costs if the building has a sprinkler system. The problem is, the insurance agent will not tell Mr. McGee how much the insurance costs, so he can’t tell what that savings is going to be.
Ms. Callori stated that the landscape budget included in the base building budget meets code, but is not real pretty. Mr. Cristiani, the landscape architect, stated that everything that is required by Rio Rancho city code is included. That includes a CMU block wall on the south end of the property where it adjoins residential property, including a line of evergreen trees. To fit in with the budget as it is would involve plantings at the entry where the public would park, and a small area of plantings where the employees would park. The minimum parking lot requirements are included in the base budget as well. Their goal is to preserve the maximum amount of existing vegetation on the remaining site. The largest advantage to that is that it is already there and doesn’t have to be paid for. Another advantage is that it minimizes erosion and looks better.

There are no high water use plants being contemplated at this point. The board room windows will look out on an “oasis” of sorts. Mr. Cristiani described the plants to be used in the landscaping.

A general discussion was held on the ground cover for weed control and the irrigation system. There is no vegetation being proposed for the area around the maintenance building.

A motion was made by John Chaney to approve the base landscaping, landscaping alternate 1 and landscaping alternate 2 as presented. It was seconded by Guy McDowell and passed unanimously.

A general discussion was held on the cistern and on the gravel parking lot.

A motion was made by John Chaney to approve the gravel paving, to approve the roof upgrade, and to approve the security system upgrade. It was seconded by Richard Deubel and passed unanimously.

Ms. Callori stated that the wall is a split face concrete wall. A gray stucco system will be on the curved walls. The darker stucco will be higher, with lighter stucco everywhere else. There will also be some metal around the top of the building. The gutters can be concealed, which is the general consensus of the Board. There will be a low wall at the entrance on which will be put the title of SSCAFCA, along with something in the entry way.

Ms. Callori stated that there are two choices with regard to the furniture. They can design it for SSCAFCA or they can incorporate a modular system. They put together an estimate for designing the furniture and would recommend it for two reasons. One being that it is a custom designed building, and the other is cost, in that it can be a lot cheaper to build
in furniture rather than bring in modular units. The modular units estimate came in at $90,000. Ms. Callori suggests that SSCAFCA have them design the furniture at a cost of $5,000 and that the furniture will most likely cost $50,000 additional. The $5,000 is included in the budget. Mr. Stoliker stated that Pam McGrath had obtained an estimate for a totally modular system, which did not include the board room table, which came to $89,000.

A motion was made by Richard Deubel to approve the design of the furniture to be done by EDI for $5,000. It was seconded by John Chaney and passed unanimously. (Note: The built-in furniture system will be pursued as part of this project.)

a. Action/Approval on the New Office Site Wall.

Mr. Yarbrough stated that Joiner Construction abuts SSCAFCA’s new property and he had suggested going into a joint venture with Bill Joiner regarding the site wall. He suggested that SSCAFCA could buy the material and Joiner could provide the labor. Mr. Metzgar suggested that a cost estimate should be prepared on the wall so that he could review the Procurement Code to make sure a joint venture would not be a problem. Mr. Stoliker stated that his initial estimate is $16,000 to $17,000 for the wall abutting Joiners property. Mr. Stoliker stated that just the northern portion of the property, where the maintenance building is located, could be done for security purposes for parking. It is not required that SSCAFCA wall the southern portion of the property at this point. In the future, if the neighbors complain, then the southern portion may be required to be walled.

CHAIRMAN’S REPORT.

Mr. Yarbrough stated that he was approached by the engineers on the Price’s Dairy development and asked what SSCAFCA might require. The fence that separates SSCAFCA from the development on both sides is right on the top of the berm of the Venada Arroyo. Property needs to be dedicated adjacent to that so that SSCAFCA will have a roadway on top of the berm. Price’s Dairy seems agreeable to doing that. Price’s Dairy will need to be charged in some way to discharge its water into the Venada Arroyo if the discharge creates more freeboard which might cause a problem with FEMA.

a. Action/Approval of Sale of Parcels 5-3 and 5-4, Dams 4-1 Project.

Mr. Yarbrough stated that the properties in Unit 17 have been advertised for sale. SSCAFCA has received some appraisals on properties in the Dams 4-1 Project that are about 25% of what SSCAFCA paid for them.
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a. **Action/Approval of Sale of Parcels 5-3 and 5-4, Dams 4-1 Project.**

Mr. Yarbrough stated that the properties in Unit 17 have been advertised for sale. SSCAFCA has received some appraisals on properties in the Dams 4-1 Project that are about 25% of what SSCAFCA paid for them.

Mr. Metzgar stated that in October 2000 the Board designated certain parcels as excess which were acquired in the Dams 4-1 Project that were not used because of the change in alignment. Appraisals were done on all of the excess parcels and when they came back, the only two that the Board felt were valid in terms of what SSCAFCA had paid for were parcels 5-3 and 5-4. Both parcels are over $35,000 and department of finance approval is needed for sale of those parcels.

A motion was made by John Chaney to declare parcels 5-3 and 5-4 as excess property and that SSCAFCA seek to sell these parcels in accordance with state law and DFA regulations. It was seconded by Dub Yarbrough and passed unanimously.

b. **Discussion of Remaining Excess Properties in Dams 4-1 Project.**

Mr. Metzgar stated that the appraisals of all of the seven other parcels that were previously approved for sale did not meet SSCAFCA’s costs of acquisition. These parcels include 1-A, 2-7, 3-10, 3-5, 3-11, 3-12, 3-13 and 3-14. Because of the low appraisals, he recommends that the sale of these remaining properties not go forward at this time. SSCAFCA can, of course, at some future time, sell the excess property.

A motion was made by Guy McDowell to not sell the remaining seven properties in the Dams 4-1 Project because of the low appraisals and that the properties be held for future sale. It was seconded by Richard Deubel and passed unanimously.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT.**

a. **Action/Approval of Final Construction Report; Final Change Order; and Final Pay Request for Urban Pond #4.**

Mr. Stoliker stated that he has received the final construction report, the final change order and the final pay request for Urban Pond #4 from ASCG. There is nothing controversial about the request. Mr. Stoliker requested Board approval to make final payment and close out the project.
b. Update on Loma Larga Roadway ASCG Continuation Task Order.

Mr. Chaney stated that this item should be dealt with in closed session.

c. Roskos Field Pond Project Update:

1. Action/Approval of the Information/Education Monument Signs.

Mr. Clint Dodge, of ASCG, stated that they are proposing to put signs on five concrete structures at Roskos Field. The purpose of the signs is to provide education about the history of Roskos Field, etc. and to educate the public on how the system is supposed to work. The signs are not within the amount originally budgeted by SCAFCA, but is still within the total amount available for the project. The change order for the concrete structures is approximately $20,000.

A motion was made by Dub Yarbrough to approve the information/education monument signs up to $20,000, as presented. It was seconded by Richard Deubel and passed unanimously.

2. Action/Approval of Task Order No. 2001-8-LH for ASCG to Evaluate Storm Drain Options and Costs for Replacing NM 528 Diversion Channel Conveyance Required as Part of the Proposed NMSR Widening Project, Including Effect of Two Possible Ponds in Rio Rancho, Development of Conceptual Conveyance Designs and Preliminary Cost Estimates. T & M NTE $51,000 w/tax.

Mr. Stoliker stated that the State Highway Department is looking at rebuilding 528 from the county line up to Southern. The cost of the project is about $23 million, of which $13 million is for drainage. The Highway Department wants to put the drainage into concrete box culverts. The Highway Department has asked for a cost estimate for drainage options from Mr. Dodge and the use of two pieces of property for potential ponds. One is at the library site and one is at East Lake. To do that and make the reports needed, it will cost $51,000 including tax. If they put it out to bid it would take them until October to get it started and they want to start design by October. They have asked SCAFCA, as its contribution, to see if it would be willing to provide this service and refine the cost estimate.

Part of the cost for ASCG to do this report is the negotiation that may have to go on with AMAFCA on whether or not the channel can be designed for 1,400 cfs or if it has to be kept at AMAFCA’s design requirement, which is 1,000 cfs. This study meets
SSCAFCA's criteria of greater than 500 cfs and SSCAFCA would get up to $13 million worth of needed drainage improvements.

A motion was made by Dub Yarbrough to approve task order No. 2001-8-LH as presented. It was seconded by Richard Deubel and passed unanimously.

FOR BOARD INFORMATION:

a. **House Bill 222 – Relating to Flood Control; Amending the Arroyo Flood Control Act to Provide for Election of Directors from Single Member Districts.**

   Mr. Stoliker stated that the entire House Bill 222 was enclosed. Mr. Metzgar stated that House Bill 222 does not affect SSCAFCA. Section 72-16 does not apply to SSCAFCA, but to AMAFCA. SSCAFCA’s statute is Section 72-19. However, since SSCAFCA may have to district sometime, House Bill 222 might help the Board to see how its statute would be amended.

b. **Amended Notice of Hearing (Village of Corrales v. City of Rio Rancho).**

   Mr. Stoliker stated that the notice of hearing included in the Board packet is old and there has been a new date set for September 10, 2001.

c. **Unit 17 Lot Sales are Currently Being Advertised.**

   Mr. Metzgar stated that the Unit 17 lots are currently being advertised for sale. Any bids received on the lots are contingent upon DFA or Board of Finance approval.

d. **The Staff Would Like to Express Their Sincere Appreciation to the Board for the New Vehicle that was Received on June 6, 2001.**

   Mr. Stoliker stated that the staff is very thankful for the purchase of the new vehicle.

CLOSED SESSION.

A motion was made by John Chaney to go into closed session for the purpose of discussion of potential litigation on Loma Larga Road in the Village of Corrales. It was seconded by Richard Deubel. Roll call vote: John Chaney, yes; Richard Deubel, yes; Guy McDowell, yes; Dub Yarbrough, yes. Motion passed 4-0.
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The Board went into closed session at 4:14 p.m.

RESUME OPEN SESSION.

A motion was made by John Chaney to resume Open Session. It was seconded by Richard Deubel and passed unanimously.

The Board resumed open session at 5:25 p.m. Mr. Yarbrough stated that the items discussed in Closed Session were related only to the issue stated and that no formal action was taken.

OTHER BUSINESS.

None.

ADJOURNMENT.

A motion was made by John Chaney and seconded by Richard Deubel to adjourn the meeting. It was carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

WM. C. YARBROUGHZ
Chairman

RICHARD DEUBEL
Secretary

DATE APPROVED: July 17-2001