Alamogordo City Commission

NOTICE OF MEETING

Regular Meeting Agenda

March 12, 2024 - 6:30 PM
Donald E. Carroll City Commission Chambers
City Hall, 1376 E. Ninth Street

Susan L. Payne .... Mayor
Sharon McDonald .... Mayor Pro-Tem, District 5
Nick Paul ....District 1
Stephen Burnett .... District 2
Warren Robinson ....District 3
Josh Rardin ....District 4
Mark Tapley .... District 6

Rick Holden .... City Manager
Ashley Smith ....City Attorney
Rachel Hughs ....City Clerk

MISSION STATEMENT as Adopted by the City Commission on March 24, 1995.
The City of Alamogordo is a Municipal Corporation that exists solely for the purpose of providing the best possible services to our customers, the citizens of Alamogordo. We are committed to providing these services with honesty, integrity, compassion, fairness, and a commitment to excellence.

We are committed to the long-term financial stability and responsible growth of the City and all decisions will be driven by our commitment to provide the best services possible in a financially sound and responsible manner given the economic realities facing the City.

In accordance with Section 10-15-1.D, NMSA 1978 (2010 Cumulative Supplement), this agenda has been posted on the east bulletin board located in the south of the City Hall and in the glass case located outside the north entrance of the City Hall, distributed to the appropriate news media, and posted on the City website: http://ci.alamogordo.nm.us within the required time frame. As a courtesy, the entire Agenda Packet has also been posted on the City of Alamogordo website: http://ci.alamogordo.nm.us

The Mayor and City Commission request that all cell phones be turned off or set to vibrate. Members of the audience are requested to step outside the Commission Chambers to respond to or to conduct a phone conversation. The Alamogordo Commission Chambers is wheelchair accessible. Other special assistance for disabled attendees must be requested 48 hours in advance by contacting the City Clerk's Office at 575-439-4100.

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Announce the presence of a Quorum.

INVOCATION & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

PRESENTATIONS

1. Tularosa Basin Downwinders Consortium presentation. *(Mary White, Tularosa Basin Downwinders Consortium Member)*

PUBLIC COMMENT

Residents must sign up with the City Clerk to address the City Commission. The standard allotted time is 3 minutes, but the Mayor reserves the right to change depending on the number of public comments.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

REMARKS AND INQUIRIES BY THE CITY COMMISSION

CONSENT AGENDA (Roll Call Vote Required for an Ordinance or Resolution)

All matters listed under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the City Commission and will be enacted by one motion. There will not be separate discussion of these items. If discussion is desired, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered separately.

2. Approve the minutes for the Regular Commission meeting on February 27, 2024. *(Rachel Hughs, City Clerk)*

3. Consider, and act upon, Ordinance 1686 for adoption and final publication to add Article 11-08, Section 08-010 - 08-040 to Chapter 11 Criminal Code, concerning Peddler and Solicitor Regulations. *(Ashley Smith, City Attorney)* **(Roll Call Vote Required)**

4. Consider, and act upon, Ordinance 1687 for adoption and final publication to add Article 11-07, Section 07-010 - 07-060 to Chapter 11 Criminal Code, concerning Alcoholic Beverage Regulations. *(Ashley Smith, City Attorney)* **(Roll Call Vote Required)**

5. Consider, and act upon, bid award IFB 2024-01 to AggTec for an estimated amount of $84,600.00 for the purchase of concrete to be utilized by various departments. *(Evelyn Huff, Finance Director)*

6. Consider, and act upon, Resolution 2024-19 requesting written approval from the Local Government Division of the Department of Finance and Administration, State of NM for the revised budget numbers computed as of March 12, 2024. *(Evelyn Huff, Finance Director)* **(Roll Call Vote Required)**

ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA REPORT
CITY OF ALAMOGORDO
CITY COMMISSION

Meeting Date: 3/12/2024 **Report Date:** 03/01/2024 **Report No:** 1.

Submitted By: Rachel Hughs

Subject: Tularosa Basin Downwinders Consortium presentation. *(Mary White, Tularosa Basin Downwinders Consortium Member)*

Fiscal Impact:
Amount Budgeted:
Fund:

Additional Fiscal Impact:

Recommendation: Presentation only.

Background:

The TBDC is a grassroots organization that was founded in 2005 to educate the public about the need for New Mexico to be included in the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA).

City of Alamogordo City Commission Meeting AGENDA REQUEST FORM
Today's Date: February 23, 2023

Request Date of Meeting: March 12, 2024

Name and Title: Address: Mary Martinez White, Tularosa Basin Downwinders Consortium (TBDC), Steering Committee Member, 360 El Prado Avenue, Las Cruces, NM **ZIP:** 88005

Phone Number: 505-629-8516

E-Mail Address: mwhite9409@gmail.com and **ednakayhinkle@yahoo.com**
website: www.trinitydownwinders.com

Item requested will be for Information only

We respectfully request the City of Alamogordo pass a Proclamation or City Resolution in their next meeting of March 12 or 26 to support the inclusion of New Mexico in the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act. To this end, we request the ok to give a 10-minute presentation.

Brief description of topic to be discussed: Please attach one original of any documents pertaining to the topic - We do not allow handouts at the meeting

The TBDC is a grassroots organization that was founded in 2005 to educate the public about the need for New Mexico to be included in the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA). The efforts of the TBDC in unison with many other organizations including post 1971 Uranium Miners, have received tremendous bipartisan support including the Western States Governors Association (letter attached). Many New Mexicans have suffered tumors, cancers and other negative health effects due to overexposure to radiation as a result of the Trinity atomic bomb. Our efforts are to help detect and fight cancer so people can return to productive lives.

Mary White requests 6 of the 10 minutes for her presentation and Edna Hinkle request 4 minutes to present on her family history.

Signature: _______Mary C. White______________________________

Rachel Hughs, CMC, City Clerk City of Alamogordo
1376 E. 9th Street
Alamogordo, NM 88310

TULAROSA BASIN DOWNWINDERS CONSORTIUM SEEKING TO HAVE NEW MEXICO INCLUDED IN RECA

NEW MEXICO IS A STATE OF PATRIOTS INCLUDING THE HEROES:

BATAAN DEATH MARCH

CODE TALKERS.

MORE NEW MEXICANS SERVED IN WWII THAN ANY OTHER STATE.

SIX MILITARY INSTALLATIONS INCLUDING ONE OF THE LARGEST LAND BASES IN THE WORLD - WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

HEAVY HITTING REPUBLICAN 'YES' VOTES

Voted yes	Voted no	Did not vote
Sen. Josh Hawley (R-Mo.)	Sen. John Barrasso (R-Wyo.)	
Sen. Angus King (I-R.I.)	Sen. Marsha Blackburn (R-Tenn.)	Sen. Tim Scott (R-S.C.)
Sen. Mike Braun (R-Ind.)	Sen. Ted Budd (R-N.C.)	
Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas)	Sen. Shelley Moore Capito (R-W.V.)	
Sen. Steve Daines (R-Mont.)	Sen. Bill Cassidy (R-La.)	
Sen. Mike Crapo (R-Idaho)	Sen. John Kennedy (R-La.)	
Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C).	Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.)	
Sen. Roger Marshall (R-Kansas)	Sen. Thom Tillis (R-N.C.)	
Sen. Markwayne Mullin (R-Okla.)	Sen. Todd Young (R-Ind.)	
Sen. Jim Risch (R-Idaho)		
Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.)		
Sen. Eric Schmitt (R-Mo.)		
Sen. J.D. Vance (R-Ohio)		

TYPES OF CANCERS COVERED BY RECA

INSURANCE PLUS A ONE TIME COMPASSIONATE PAYMENT OF $150,000
WHICH IS THE AVERAGE COST TO FIGHT CANCER
THERE IS NO EFFORT TO SUE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RATHER TO BE RECOGNIZED UNDER LEGISLATION ALREADY AFFORDED TO OTHER STATES THAT CAN HELP RESTORE PEOPLE TO PRODUCTIVE LIVES

Compensable Diseases for Onsite Participants and Downwinders			
Leukemia (but not chronic lymphocytic leukemia)		Multiple myeloma	Lymphomas (other than Hodgkin's disease)
Primary cancers of the:			
Thyroid	Male or female breast	Esophagus	Stomach
Pharynx	Small intestine	Pancreas	Bile ducts
Gall bladder	Salivary gland	Urinary bladder	Brain
Colon	Ovary	Liver (except if cirrhosis or hepatitis B is indicated)	Lung

HOW DID HARM TAKE PLACE

- IN 1945 THERE WERE APPROXIMATELY 500,000 PEOPLE LIVING WITHIN A 150-MILE RADIUS OF THE TRINITY ATOMIC BOMB, AND RANCHES WITHIN 12 MILES. THERE WERE 21 TOWNS AND 110 RANCHES, FARMS OR CAMPS WITHIN 40 MILES ACCORDING TO FIGURE 10-15 OF THE LOS ALAMOS HISTORIC DOCUMENT RETRIEVAL ARCHIVE.
- THE TRINITY BOMB WAS PACKED WITH 13 POUNDS OF PLUTONIUM BUT ONLY 3 POUNDS FISSIONED. THE MUSHROOM CLOUD PENETRATED THE STRATOSPHERE, RISING SOME 40,000 FEET HIGH. BY CONTRAST, MOUNT SAINT HELEN WENT 8,000 FEET HIGH. 10 POUNDS OF PLUTONIUM CONTAMINATED THE AIR, WATER, SOIL, ANIMALS, PLANTS, AND FAMILIES IN NEW MEXICO. PLUTONIUM HAS A HALF-LIFE OF MORE THAN 24,000 YEARS
- IN 1945 MOST COMMUNITIES INSIDE A 50 MILE RADIUS OF THE TRINITY BOMB SITE DID NOT HAVE RUNNING WATER IN THEIR HOMES. THE WATER SOURCES WERE RAINWATER, 55-GALLON DRUMS, CISTERNS, STREAMS, LAKES, HOLDING PONDS, HAND DUG WELLS AND DITCHES. AS A RESULT OF THE FALLOUT THE WATER SOURCES WERE CONTAMINATED.
- IN 1945 THERE WERE NO GROCERY STORES IN THE TOWNS SURROUNDING THE TRINITY SITE. THE MEAT, DAIRY AND CROPS WERE PRODUCED LOCALLY. THESE TOO WERE CONTAMINATED.

- INCREASE IN INFANT MORTALITY FOLLOWING TRINITY IN 1945:
- THE NATIONAL INFANT DEATH RATE WAS 38.3 DEATHS PER THOUSAND LIVE BIRTHS.
- THE AVERAGE IN NEW MEXICO WAS 100.8 DEATHS PER THOUSAND! THIS WAS THE HIGHEST IN THE NATION. SEE PUBLISHED PAPER BY TUCKER/ALVAREZ IN 2019, TITLED TRINITY: "THE MOST SIGNIFICANT HAZARD OF THE ENTIRE MANHATTAN PROJECT".
- IN NEARBY CARRIZOZO'S ST. RITA CHURCH, ONLY 2 INFANTS DIED IN 1944, BUT 9 DIED IN 1945!
- IN 1990 GEORGE HERBERT BUSH SIGNED RECA INTO LAW AS A "COMPASSIONATE" MEASURE.
- $2.5 BILLION DOLLARS PAID IN 34 YEARS.
- $50 BILLION PER YEAR TO MAINTAIN THE CURRENT NUCLEAR ARSENAL.
- NEW MEXICO HAS BEEN CONSPICUOUSLY LEFT OUT ALTHOUGH WE WERE THE FIRST PEOPLE IN THE WORLD TO SUFFER THE EFFECTS OF A NUCLEAR BOMB.

NUCLEAR BOMBS IN NEW MEXICO

- ONE TON TEST: MAY 7, 1945 WAS A REHEARSAL TEST SPIKED WITH RADIOACTIVE ISOTOPES
- THE TRINITY BOMB: JULY 16, 1945
- GAS BUGGY: DECEMBER 10, 1967 IN RIO ARIBA COUNTY WAS A 29-KILOTON-YIELD NUCLEAR DEVICE
- PROJECT GNOME: DECEMBER 10,1961 DETONATED 0.6214 MILES SOUTHEAST OF CARLSBAD, NEW MEXICO
- NEW MEXICANS WERE ALSO DOWNWIND OF THE 1,032 ATOMIC TESTS CONDUCTED AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE UNTIL 1992 - 200 WERE ABOVE GROUND
- WWW.TRINITYDOWNWINDERS.COM
- WWW.HOUSE-GOV/REPRESENTATIVES/FIND-YOUR-REPRESENTATIVE
- WWW.SENATE.GOV/SENATORS
- **THE ASK: PLEASE PASS A RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT THE PASSAGE OF RECA**

Proclamation

WHEREAS, *the world's first atomic bomb was tested in New Mexico on July 16, 1945, and the U.S. conducted 1,038 atomic tests in the Nevada Test Site, 215 of which were above ground tests; and*

WHEREAS, *in 1990 the U.S. passed the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA) to pay restitution and medical care to people that were exposed to radiation from these nuclear tests; and*

WHEREAS, *the U.S. government has been compensating the "Downsiders" in other states but the "Downsiders" in New Mexico have never been included although they were the first to be exposed to nuclear radioactivity via the Trinity atomic test; and*

WHEREAS, *there were some 500,000 families that lived within a 150-mile radius and as close as 12 miles from the Trinity test and the radioactive fallout caused cancerous diseases, such as Leukemia, Multiple Myeloma, and Lymphomas; and*

WHEREAS, *the RECA is scheduled to expire on June 10, 2024, so current congressional bills to extend and expand RECA have been introduced, including Senate Bill 1751 and House Resolution 4426 that would include the "Downsiders" of New Mexico for the first time; and*

WHEREAS, *the U.S. has approved a $50 billion budget per year for the last 33 years (total of $1,650 billion) to maintain its current nuclear arsenals but in the same period, less than one percent of that amount has been paid to those adversely affected by radioactive atomic tests.*

NOW, THEREFORE, WE, *the Mayor and City Council of Las Cruces, New Mexico, do hereby support the health, welfare, and safety of the residents of the City of Las Cruces by proclaiming the month of September as:*

"Proclamation in Support of the Extension and Expansion of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act"

Ken D. Miyagishima, Mayor

OF LAS CRU

AGENDA REPORT
CITY OF ALAMOGORDO
CITY COMMISSION

Meeting Date: 3/12/2024 **Report Date:** 03/07/2024 **Report No:** 2.

Submitted By: Rachel Hughs

Subject: Approve the minutes for the Regular Commission meeting on February 27, 2024. *(Rachel Hughs, City Clerk)*

Fiscal Impact:
Amount Budgeted:
Fund:

Additional Fiscal Impact:

Recommendation: Approve the minutes.

Background: This is required by the Open Meetings Act.

CITY OF ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO
CITY COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
6:30 P.M., DONALD E. CARROLL COMMISSION CHAMBERS
February 27, 2024

SUSAN PAYNE, MAYOR
SHARON McDONALD, COMMISSIONER
JOSH RARDIN, COMMISSIONER
STEPHEN BURNETT, COMMISSIONER
NICHOLAS PAUL, COMMISSIONER
MARK TAPLEY, COMMISSIONER
WARREN ROBINSON, COMMISSIONER
RICK HOLDEN, CITY MANAGER
ASHLEY SMITH, CITY ATTORNEY
RACHEL HUGHS, CITY CLERK

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL / INVOCATION / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Payne called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll Call was taken by the City Clerk. City Clerk Hughs announced there was a quorum present. The Invocation was given by Pastor Joe Cantu from Cornerstone Chapel, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Rardin.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Pro-Tem McDonald moved to approve the agenda.
Commissioner Robinson seconded the motion.
Motion carried with a vote of 7-0-0.

PRESENTATIONS

1. Presentation by Yearout Energy on Energy Performance Contract and Energy Cost Savings. (Colby Greer, Yearout Energy)

Finance Director Huff said Jesse Miller and Tara Trafton from Yearout Energy will present this. They have been working on this for a year and a half, and we are getting to some of the final stages. There is an item under the Consent Agenda that ties in with this presentation. Ms. Trafton and Mr. Miller gave their presentation.

Commissioner Robinson asked about the cost to the City for the audit. Ms. Trafton said $75,000, but that project also gets funded through the savings. The City has not had to pay that yet. The goal is to identify enough savings to roll the development cost of the investment-grade audit into the project. Commissioner Robinson said it is a win-win.

Commissioner Rardin asked where the upfront capital contribution would be pulled from. City Manager Holden said it is purely based on the guaranteed savings to pay those capital costs. As Commission Robinson said, it is a win-win situation. Finance Director Huff said the initial plan was partially from the General Fund for the subsidized buildings for general buildings like City Hall. Water would also have a portion of it because many of their sites are having upgrades. It would be allocated between 11 and 81. Commissioner Rardin said the total cost we would have to come up with is $1,450,000. Finance Director Huff said yes, and then we would finance the additional needed pieces, minus the rebates we get back, and the savings are what we use to pay the debt service. This is all regulated by the State, so once Yearout provides their final report, it also goes to the State, who verifies all their financial measurements. If it does not pass with the State, it cannot move forward. The State requires them to certify that, going forward, they are meeting their targets. If those targets are not met, Yearout must write us back the difference.

Commissioner Burnett asked how long the project would take to complete. Mr. Miller said we were looking to start implementing in August or September of this year, hopefully finishing by spring of next year. Ms. Trafton said there would be a preliminary schedule in the final report.

Mayor Payne asked if the rest of Griggs Fields have LED lighting. Finance Director Huff said we have some that are done. We wanted to do all of them, but it was a huge outlay on the front end, and putting the numbers into something we did not think was possible. These fields will not get us fully LED sports lights, but they will get us closer. The report Yearout referred to is very useful to us because it is the first time we have had someone walk every inch of our buildings and go through every little nuance.

Mayor Payne asked if the savings would pay this back. Finance Director Huff said that is what pays the debt service. We have done pieces of all the measures Yearout is talking about here and there. We have some LED lights, but not all LED lights. We have newer HVAC but did not upgrade any thermostats when we put that in. Same thing with transformers; we put a transformer in when we built a building, but we have never replaced them. It is getting us all of these things in little pieces now together as a project. Once we have the final report, we will also make that available to you. Ms. Trafton said the State assigned a third-party reviewer to the project, who has been walking the sites with Mr. Miller for the past week to familiarize themselves with the scope of work. When they get the report, they critique it. They are an engineering consultant with the background needed to understand the savings we stated and whether they meet standards. Every year, we have to come back and prove we are meeting those savings targets. If we fail to meet that target and fall short, we have to write a check for the difference, so you are whole across the board. Mayor Payne asked what other cities were doing this. Ms. Trafton said we are New Mexico-based and have eighty-five percent of the market share, and she mentioned other cities and entities they have worked with.

Commissioner Paul said the projection is four point five interest rate. How do we plan to finance that? Finance Director Huff said that is just a projection. When we have the final report, we would first go to the New Mexico Finance Authority and ask what they have available and what they can do. The four point five interest rate is not locked in; it is here for the proposal to show you going forward. Whatever we are able to secure through NMFA would come through the Commission for approval. Commissioner Paul said that could make a huge difference in any potential savings. She replied that if we cannot get that, then we can come back to Yearout and say, this is what we can get, so where does that put us? Then, we can make those decisions. Yearout came to us with different scenarios, but we did not have the money for the higher-end scenarios. We got to this one, and it is not set in stone.

Commissioner Burnett said this says a twenty-year term, but it also says twenty-three years is the useful life. So, in roughly twenty years, we would have to do this all over again? Finance Director Huff said yes, with the caveat that if we maintain it, we have a better chance of extending its life. The big part is solar; we are trying to leverage buildings with open spaces. That will be huge.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Cheyenne Cervantes, Cruz Hernandez, Erin Carmody, and Maura Kuhn signed up to speak under Item 7.

John Davis said he previously invited the Commission for coffee and donuts, and only Commissioner Tapley joined him. He said he was here tonight because he wanted to ask the Commission to look at their mission statement on the agenda. It says what I would like to say. I believe in giving people every opportunity to do the right thing.

CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

City Manager Holden made the following remarks:
1. I am negotiating with the Sacramento Mountains Foundation, and they agreed to put new scoreboards out at Griggs Field for us. They will purchase the scoreboards and pay for the installation. Joe Wheeler and I have been working on the contracts. Once we complete those, they will buy the scoreboards, and we will go through procurement on our end.
2. We were not able to renew our Liquor Liability Insurance Policy, and it has ceased. The New Mexico League will not carry us for the liability. At this point, we will not have liquor opportunities. We will continue trying to find a private carrier to insure us for that purpose. We will look at the possibility of allowing third-party companies to be able to serve alcohol at Civic Center events. There are provisions in State law that would allow that. There may also be single-event coverage we could get.

Commissioner Burnett asked if this included the Golf Course. City Manager Holden said no, Grant Dalpes has a separate license. That will remain as long as he is there.

Commissioner Paul asked if other communities were going through this. City Manager Holden said we are not aware of any. We asked for an additional extension, and the insurance company said no. We will keep you advised as we find out the information.

REMARKS AND INQUIRIES BY THE CITY COMMISSION

Mayor Payne made the following comments:
She gave her condolences for the loss of Rhonda Merrick.

Commissioner Burnett made the following comments:
Can we look at removing the fence for Ms. Gonzalez at Incredible Court? She is having difficulties getting the trailer torn down. City Manager Holden asked if this was where the fire was at. Commission Burnett said yes. City Manager Holden said he did not believe we had the ability to do that. We cannot send a City crew out to do it. Commissioner Burnett said we put up a fence around her trailer, but she already has a fence up around her property. Code Enforcement Manager Sides said I cannot remove that until it is no longer a hazard. Liability is on the City now. We know about it and have condemned it. If somebody gets in there because I remove the temporary fencing and the building collapses, litigations could also happen to that family and the City. I will not remove that until there is no potential risk of anybody getting seriously hurt or killed. She has put her lock on there along with our lock. She has free reign to go in and out. Commissioner Burnett asked how she would get equipment in there. Code Enforcement Manager Sides said she could move the fencing out of the way. We put it right in her driveway. All she has to do is open up her fencing and our fencing. City Manager Holden said we could work with her to get a dumpster there. Code Enforcement Manager Sides said he would invite her to call him.

Commissioner Burnett said the blue house on Michigan has a roof that is starting to cave in on itself. I want to keep an eye on that since we have condemned it. Code Enforcement Manager Sides said he is scheduled to meet that property owner soon but could move that up.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Approve the minutes for the Regular Commission meeting on February 13, 2024. (Rachel Hughs, City Clerk)

3. Approve the statements related to the Executive Closed Sessions held on February 13, 2024. (Rachel Hughs, City Clerk)

4. Consider, and act upon, Ordinance 1691, Z-2023-0007(A) for adoption and final publication, a map amendment to change the current zoning of the property with the parcel number 01N4054097487344 (the parcel adjacent to 1901 S Hamilton Road) from MH-1 Manufactured Housing Subdivision District to C-1 Neighborhood Business District. (Sean McGranaghan, Assistant City Planner) (Roll Call Vote Required)

5. Consider, and act upon, Resolution 2024-18 authorizing the City Manager to execute an Energy Performance Agreement with a Contractor awarded on the Statewide Price Agreement with the State of New Mexico pending State approval, financing, and legal review of the contract. (Evelyn Huff, Finance Director) (Roll Call Vote Required)

Commissioner Rardin pulled item 4 from the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Robinson moved to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.
Commissioner Tapley seconded the motion.
Roll Call Vote was taken.
Motion carried with a vote of 7-0-0.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

4. Consider, and act upon, Ordinance 1691, Z-2023-0007(A) for adoption and final publication, a map amendment to change the current zoning of the property with the parcel number 01N4054097487344 (the parcel adjacent to 1901 S Hamilton Road) from MH-1 Manufactured Housing Subdivision District to C-1 Neighborhood Business District. (Sean McGranaghan, Assistant City Planner) (Roll Call Vote Required)

Commissioner Rardin said he pulled item 4 to abstain from voting like last time. This is the one for Lance Grace. Mayor Payne said she knew the owner, her nonprofit rented a storage unit from him, and she would abstain from voting.

Commissioner Burnett moved to approve.
Mayor Pro-Tem McDonald seconded the motion.
Roll Call Vote was taken.
Motion carried with a vote of 5-0-2. Commissioner Rardin and Mayor Payne abstained.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

6. Consider, and act upon, all evidence for and against the removal of approved Resolution 2024-13, due to the written objection by the property owner. The Commission will determine if the resolution should be enforced or rescinded. Resolution 2024-13 was to declare 613 Delaware Ave., to be so ruined, damaged, and dilapidated that it is a menace to the public comfort, health, peace, or safety and ordering its abatement. (Roll Call Vote Required)

City Clerk Hughs swore in Code Enforcement Manager Sides, Edward Summers, and Frank Martinez.

Mr. Summers said the 613 Delaware Avenue house has good adobe walls and a foundation. Considering the high costs of new building materials, I believe it is worth saving. An electric company put in a new electric meter to do this work. The house needs exterior work like painting, which I was planning to do this year. The inside can be made to look like new. I should not have a time limit to get that done since it will not affect the outward appearance. The fourteen foot by twenty four foot storage building in the back is in good condition except for the outside sagging in the back. It is worth saving and repairing. I put a new roof on it a year or two ago. That should allow me to do the outside work on these buildings by the end of the year or sooner. It does not matter to you how it looks on the inside if the windows are boarded up, people on the outside cannot see inside, and weeds are controlled. If you are determined for me to have this building removed, I will do it. I believe the City should pay to have it removed. It costs about as much to remove it as it does to repair it, so why not repair it? It will do somebody some good. This building is not occupied. How fair are some of the City laws, for instance, regarding Teresa Lane. Certified mail costs about fifteen mails as ordinary mail. Call me on the phone. I think some of the City people are disappointed in me for refusing certified mail. They are costing taxpayers a lot of money. I spoke to the Mayor some time ago, and she is in favor of retaining some things I disagree with. I didn't call the Mayor this time. Only Commissioners Paul and Rardin contacted me.

Commissioner Burnett asked Mr. Summers what his plans for the house were. Mr. Martinez said Mr. Summers wanted to repair it. Commissioner Burnett said he has two years to do so. Mayor Pro-Tem McDonald said this is the second time we have been in the house at 613 Delaware. We were in it two years ago for a walkthrough, and nothing has been done since then. I would like to go on record saying I did not get a call at all. Commissioner Burnett said I did not either.

Mayor Payne said we send certified mail letters because it is the only way we have to prove that they got it. If he does not sign for it, then when it comes before the Commission, all we know is that a letter was tried to be delivered, and it was not delivered but returned. What I hear from that is you are not interested in what the City has to say. Mr. Martinez said I was there when the mailman came in. All he did was sign it and tell him to return it. That's a waste of taxpayer money. Mayor Payne said that only hurts him. Mr. Martinez said he tried to make Mr. Summers understand to take it so he can read it, but he won't. Mayor Payne said it was in his best interest to take the letter. Mr. Summers said he told them to call me on the phone. Send me a regular letter.

Mr. Martinez asked if Mr. Summer decides to repair the house, can he do it, or does he have to hire a licensed plumber and licensed electrician? Mayor Payne said he has to hire licensed persons. That is not a City thing like us saying this. That is the State requiring this. That happened on Teresa Lane, where I believe Mr. Summers tried to build his septic system. Commissioner Rardin said if Mr. Summers is not doing anything structurally to the building, like drywall, that is not the same. If he is doing basic plumbing like setting commodes, drywall, or painting, none of that requires a license or permit. Mayor Payne said this is going to require more than that. Commissioner Rardin said it just depends on if it is structural. As a homeowner, Mr. Summers should be allowed to work on some of that. If he is reframing roofs and stuff like that, he will need permits.

Mr. Martinez said he used to work in housing and is helping Mr. Summers. I am trying to make him understand we need licensed people. Mayor Payne asked if there was any electrical in the house. Mr. Martinez said it does, but it is outdated. Mayor Payne said that will require a licensed electrician. Mr. Martinez said the plastic caught on fire, so I think the majority of the wires burned up.

Mr. Summers said a paper on the house that says notice of condemnation was posted. The wind blew it off of the house. I did not remove it. Mayor Payne said that if Mr. Summers had picked up his letter, he would have known about this. Speaking for myself, it is probably pretty bad if you cannot get an insurance company to insure your structure. I think we can all agree you will not find an insurance company that would insure this. Can it be insured? If it cannot, we know there is no insurance. If there is no insurance, and some homeless kids get in there, and one is injured or killed, who do you think they will sue? Mr. Martinez said they did for a while. Mayor Payne said if we know about this as a City and understand it is a potential liability, which is why Code Enforcement Manager Sides went out there, and if we do not do something, then we are just as culpable. It is about someone being injured or killed in here. Mr. Martinez said Mr. Summers is not going to get insurance. He does not have insurance on his rentals. They will not insure it.

Commissioner Robinson asked Mr. Martinez if Mr. Summers had a family. Mr. Martinez said Mr. Summers has a son. Commissioner Robinson said as City officials, we are trying to protect the City. If Mr. Summers cannot understand that you may want to talk to Mr. Summers's son about moving this on. Mr. Martinez said that Mr. Summers's son already told Mr. Summers to sell everything and get rid of it. Mayor Payne said we are not picking on Mr. Summers, but it is not fair to homeowners in that area and is also a huge liability to him.

Commissioner Robinson said we have to move on. We cannot be mired in confusion. Code Enforcement Manager Sides said we must make the City safe. Mr. Martinez said I understand where that is coming from; I used to deal with housing and inspectors. So, does Mr. Summers have two years to work on this house? Commissioner Burnett said one year. Mr. Summers asked why the way it looks on the inside matters. Commissioner Robinson said it is not about how it looks; it is not in compliance. Mr. Martinez said the whole house has to be done in one year. Commissioner Robinson said Code Enforcement Manager Sides gave you that information. It's one year. Mayor Payne said there was obviously a fire here. The whole thing has to comply with our ordinances, which are on our website.

Mayor Pro-Tem McDonald moved to uphold the resolution.
Commissioner Burnett seconded the motion.
Roll Call Vote was taken.
Motion carried with a vote of 6-1-0. Commissioner Rardin noted nay.

NEW BUSINESS

7. Presentation and Discussion on new Natatorium. (Belinda Bass, Parks & Rec Director, ASA Architects)

Public Comment

Cheyenne Cervantes said she was here to discuss getting the Natatorium for the swim team and the general public. We have been struggling all year with being able to practice. We have gone to four pools, and training our athletes to reach their full potential is difficult. We have been training on the Base, at the New Mexico School for the Blind, and it is hard for us to train correctly. I believe the Natatorium would be a wonderful thing for everyone. It would also be good for the general public because swimming has many health benefits.

Cruz Hernandez said we have come a long way. About thirty times this season, we needed to move to a different location on the fly. Having a set location would be helpful for us. A core aspect of swimming is diving. We do not have a proper place to dive. We had to travel to WSMR to practice diving. Our girls made State this year without a defined pool. I believe with a proper pool for diving, we could make State on the boy's team.

Erin Carmody said she was a swim team parent and thought the pool would have multiple benefits for the community. We loved practicing in the REC Center pool through October. After that, we planned on using the Base's pool, but they were using it in the evening for kids' lessons. It would be great to have our own pool. It benefits the community because kids can learn to swim throughout the year. The elderly and disabled could also benefit.

Maura Kuhn said she was a parent to one of the swimmers. It would be great for us to have a year-round pool, and swimming has outstanding benefits.

Parks and Recreation Director Bass said our swimming pool is at the end of its life, and it is only a half-year pool. We want to get a replacement and mileage out of our dollars. George Deines and Rob

Price are going to do a presentation. Aquatics/Recreation Coordinator Michaud and Facility Manager Casebolt from the REC Center are here to answer questions about programming.

Mr. Price said he was from ASA Architects and is the principal architect in the Las Cruces Office, and George Deines is with Counsilman-Hunsaker, a national aquatic consultant. We were selected as architects and design team for this project through a City-issued RFP. We met with City staff and understood funding was not available yet. I suggested we do a needs assessment to home in on priorities, importance, funding, and the issues with the old facility. An assessment was done on the existing pool. We prepared some concepts, sight plans, floor plans, and renderings of the new pool. There was back and forth on what exterior the building should have. We also have preliminary cost estimates.

Mr. Deines said Counsilman-Hunsaker specializes in aquatic facility planning and design. He proceeded to give the presentation along with Mr. Price. Commissioner Rardin asked what the outside skin of the structure would be. Is it fabric? Mr. Deines said it is a tension fabric. I believe it is proprietary. Commissioner Rardin said so it is a steel structure with fabric stretched over it? Is it similar to the bubble we had? Mr. Deines said correct, but it was of higher quality than the bubble. There is no take-up and teardown that hurts the integrity of the structure. Commissioner Rardin said it says we will get a twenty-five year warranty on the fabric, but with our UV and climate, how long does it last? Mr. Deines said he would have to get more information from them to answer that. We did Castle Rock in the early 2010's, and it is still in really good shape. Commissioner Rardin said that is about fourteen years old. Mr. Deines said correct. That is something to consider with that type of structure.

Commissioner Paul asked if they had done any sprung structures in New Mexico. Mr. Deines said his firm has not. Commissioner Paul asked for the cost of something that is more of a traditional building. Mr. Price said you can take that $12,250,000 and up to about $15,000,000, give or take. He gave examples of different materials and said that given consideration of varying factors, it was roughly a $2,500,000 difference. There are also escalation costs and contingencies tacked on.

Mayor Pro-Tem McDonald said one of the questions was about air conditioning or heating. Does this stay at a certain temperature, so you don't need air conditioning and heating? Mr. Deines said this would have a dehumidification system. In some pictures, you can see the ductwork around the sides. You can also open the garage doors on a seasonal day to cut off the dehumidification system, but we recommend the system to help mitigate corrosion from chlorine in the pool environment. An indoor natatorium's air temperature is about two degrees warmer than the pool. You want about fifty-five percent relative humidity. Mayor Pro-Tem McDonald asked if air conditioning or heating was needed in the winter. Mr. Deines said the dehumidification would take care of that and regulate the temperature. She asked what the average temperature in the building would be. He said it would be around the eighty-five degree mark. Comfortable enough for people in street clothes watching their kids in swimming lessons, but the majority of people are getting in and out of the pool soaking wet, so you cannot have it too cold. Mr. Price said the rest of the building would have central. Commissioner Robinsons asked about the officer areas. Mr. Price said correct.

Commissioner Rardin said if we were to build this structure, what would we do with the existing structure? It looks like we are building an entirely new REC Center. Parks and Recreation Director Bass said the existing REC Center will remain. The only thing that will change there is that the pool will go away. It is at the end of its life. A natatorium is just that. It will not have a gym or those components. Commissioner Paul asked if the existing pool would be filled in and what would happen to that space. Mr. Price said the existing pool would stay open until this is built. Once built, the existing pool will be filled in. That would become a full recreational center that is not the pool. The pool would be a second space, and between them, a conjoined parking lot for everybody going between either building. Mayor Payne asked if the existing pool would become a parking lot. Mr. Price said no, the existing pool would become an option for other types of recreational space. Commissioner Paul asked for the anticipated cost of filling the pool in and if that would be included in this project's cost. Would it be another $1,000,000 to fill that in? Mr. Deines said demolition costs for pools range from $200,000 to $500,000. Commissioner Rardin asked if that was included in this estimate. Mr. Price said not at the moment, but it could be. At this point, these numbers are fluid.

Mayor Payne asked if there was any diving. Aquatics/Recreation Coordinator Michaud said we considered the diving area, but that is a low-use area. So, we put more towards the shallow end because that is where we get most of our recreational users. The diving component needed for competitive swimming is in the deep end. We are trying to keep the cost low for the pool area and the footprint small, yet we carry over a lot of programming. That was one area that we do not have now, so it is not something we have had other than a small diving board from years ago that was grandfathered in. It is not a loss, but not a gain, and not a necessary component to hit all four areas. Parks and Recreation Director Bass said there is also a huge liability with diving boards. We are trying to get the most bang for our buck. Aquatics/Recreation Coordinator Michaud said high dives is not something we have had for a long time. Mr. Price said the one we did in Las Cruces was a fifty-meter competition pool, and we had this same conversation with the university, City, and swim teams. The cost was considered, and we do not have it.

Mayor Payne asked if we could have competition with this pool. Aquatics/Recreation Coordinator Michaud said yes.

Mayor Pro-Tem McDonald asked how many meters this pool would be. Aquatics/Recreation Coordinator Michaud said it is in yards, so it meets short-course requirements for high school and college for competition, which is twenty-five yards.

Commissioner Paul asked what the target budget was. We are looking at a structure with a limited useful life running $12,500,000. For another $3,000,000, you get a potential structure that can be maintained and last forty to fifty years. Is there some budget constraint capping it at $12,500,000 and not going above that? What is the reason? If you are going to spend the money, at the end of the day, we are going to do whatever we need to pay for this thing. Mr. Price said this was the starting point, and we wanted to be as reasonable as possible. For an institutional building, you would get forty to fifty years out of the building for another $3,000,000. If $15,000,000 was something this could be funded at, it would be well worth having a brick-and-mortar building. That said, we wanted you to know there are less expensive options so you can get the things you need. Over the course of an institutional building's life, you are going to buy the sprung structure twice. Mayor Payne said if you do the brick and mortar, would you have the same thing with how it is built? Mr. Price said all the program requirements and features would stay the same. Commissioner Paul said on the render, I assume the lobby and locker room spaces are stick frame portions. The actual cover over the pool is the sprung structure part. Mr. Price said yes. Commissioner Paul said at some point in the future, could that be replaced itself? What cost are you looking at to basically reskin the thing? Mr. Price said whether we do the natatorium out of brick and mortar or sprung structure, the other spaces like the equipment, storage, and locker rooms would be load-bearing stud walls with bar joists and a TPO roof in parapets. The sprung structure, yes, at some point, can be taken down and replaced, but that is more challenging than building a building around it and the pool there interfering. Trying to get a lift out there where the pool is to put lights hung on bar joists up in the air is surgical. Commissioner Rardin asked if they had looked at a pre-engineered metal building. You could incorporate the whole deal if you did one hundred and fifty by one hundred and fifty. I am just not sure how the structure would hold up with humidity. Mr. Price said that is the challenge. This type of structure is the pool version of the pre-engineered metal building you use in other instances for that type of solution. Commissioner Rardin said it would be more cost-effective if it could be done like that. Mr. Price said the red iron creates a challenge; you must do things for it. Commissioner Rardin said they could galvanize it, but I do not know how long it would last. Probably not fifty years. Mr. Price said a brick-and-mortar building is the best option if it is affordable. You get the most lifespan out of it and will not have to replace it before the fifty years are up. You will have to maintain it, and you will have to replace the roof at twenty-five years, maybe thirty if lucky. You will have to do maintenance to the exterior, too. The building itself will last longer, but it is a capital investment on the front-end. We want to be sure the Commission knows there are options. It could be as low as a $12,500,000 project.

Commissioner Rardin said we own that whole area out there. If we moved the pool to the other side of the existing REC Center and just did the pool portion, how much cost savings would be seen there? Where could we utilize existing facilities? Demolish the existing pool, then put a new one on the south side. Mr. Price asked if that meant not doing the parking lot. Commissioner Rardin said to expand the parking lot a little, but not quite as much. The project is a lot of money, and I do not know if we have the bonding capacity for something like that. Mr. Price said they considered that approach, and sketches were done. We wanted to see what it could be. The other challenge is having enough parking to meet the City's requirements. Could that be reduced some? Yes. I have seen who is going to the pool now, and you are not filling up that much parking. Could you move the pool closer and reduce some of that? Yes. Commissioner Burnett asked the maximum number of teams at a competition. Mr. Deines said two to three. Commissioner Rardin said the site construction cost is $579,973. Mr. Price said that is where we are for the building pad and utilities available at the site. We are guessing a little bit, but utilities are available. All of that is building pad, landscaping, and the parking lot. You reduce the parking lot, and that number comes down. Commissioner Rardin said an existing pool is a little further north of that parking lot. I am not sure where it is, but it was the old one before this one. It is either under that parking lot or just outside it. Commissioner Rardin said they bulldozed the top of the pool in, filled it in, and covered it up. I do not think they removed the existing pool when they did that. Mr. Price said that is the way to do it.

8. Presentation and discussion on the City's financing capacity. (Evelyn Huff, Finance Director, John Archuleta, Bosque Advisors LLC and Chris Muirhead, Modrall Sperling)

Mr. Archuleta said they put together a brief overview of the present situation. You would probably want to hear what your bonding capacity is. You presently have a bonding capacity of a little over $15,000,000. Numbers thrown around earlier were at $12,500,000. We could do anywhere between $12,500,000 and $15,000,000. The next important thing you folks were concerned about was what the cost would be as far as being able to have additional debt. With the $12,500,000 financing, as far as a general obligation bond issue, we would wrap it around the present outstanding existing debt. This would allow you to issue the $12,500,000, pay it back on a twenty year basis, and increase your taxes by about the same amount you are paying now, which is $1.79 per $1000 of assessed valuation. We will be looking at increasing the taxes by $1.79 for the next ten years. After the next ten years, we drop it down. We are not looking at any assumptions as far as growth in your assessed valuation. You have had constant growth in your assessed valuation, which is what is being used in being able to pay off the debt. That is the route going to the general obligation bond issue. The other option is to consider a gross receipts tax bond issue, but that is an avenue we have not done a really good analysis to come up with numbers. As far as interest cost right now, we are probably looking somewhere less than five percent, which would go through the New Mexico Finance Authority or the process of a public sale. We have several options depending on your best possible deal regarding the overall cost and efficiency of financing. The bottom line is, if you are going to do $12,500,000 or $15,000,000 financing, you could. The difference between the two is that if you go the $15,000,000 route after ten years, your mill levy will not drop down that much because we would have to pay off the additional amount. Your rate would probably remain the same for the twenty years of financing.

Commissioner Rardin asked how the gross receipts tax bond issue worked. Would we have to put that on the ballot, get it passed, and then that is what we pledge to pay the bond back? Mr. Muirhead said the difference between the general obligation bond and the gross receipts tax bond is a general obligation bond requires voter approval. You would have to take that step to put it on the ballot, and everyone would have the chance to vote on it. The gross receipts tax bond does not require voter approval, so you could look at existing gross receipts tax options. The most prominent one that municipalities use is your state-shared gross receipts tax revenue, which is your 1.225. It is based on the State gross receipts tax imposed on goods and services within the city. You also have about two percent local option gross receipts taxes. Those are imposed over the years for particular purposes. Recently, the legislature changed that those could be used for general purposes. However, they are still governed by the initial ordinance that put them in place at the municipal level. You would have to look at individual gross receipts tax ordinances to see what they are for. Generally, you have already dedicated them for specific purposes. They were either for infrastructure, public safety, and things of that nature. That is the norm when a governing body adopts those and puts them in place. They like to put some restrictions and have a clear dedication to how it works. To change those, most of them would just be an act of the Commission. However, if they were approved, and some were through an election, it would require an election to change those purposes. Issuing the GO debt on the bonds itself would require a vote. The gross receipts tax, let's use State share, is your largest, and you would not need a vote. You could do it as a Commission, and it would require three-quarters majority to approve, and it is subject to petition for referendum. If they got enough signatures, they could make it go to a vote. It is extremely rare, but it does happen. Generally, the gross receipts tax would not need a vote. With the GO bond, you are raising your tax rate to make it happen on ad valorum taxes. On gross receipts tax, that 1.225 does not fluctuate. That is the statuary gross receipts tax rate set by the State. So, you have to operate like a family budget. What are you using that money for already? You have some outstanding debt already with that gross receipts tax. There are three or four current New Mexico Finance Authority loans, and you pledged that. A lot of times with municipalities that is your primary source for operations. Commissioner Rardin said I am asking because I believe we have what they used to call a hold harmless, so we still have an additional one-eighth of a percent we could pass we have left. We have already passed a quarter of a percent for other things. In the past, I believe any GRT increase within City limits had to go through a vote. There is an ordinance or something people in the past brought forward. Could that one-eighth we have be pledged to the debt? We do not need a vote on that. We could just pass that by ordinance. Mr. Muirhead said yes, you could dedicate it for this. Commissioner Rardin said this would basically max us out if we bond this. Mr. Muirhead said yes, that would max you out on the GO bond at your maximum, $15,000,000. Commissioner Rardin said if we run this to the max, we cannot do anything for ten to twelve years. Mr. Muirhead said that is correct. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said they took away the hold harmless; we no longer call it that, and we no longer pass by one-eighths. We do have a total of .1875 that can still be passed, but of that, the Commission can pass .1125 without going to referendum. However, .075 has to go through a referendum. In addition, we have other taxes that can be reallocated that allow you to reauthorize that money.

Commissioner Rardin asked how much the debt service would be on this, how much it would be generated yearly, and where we are at. Finance Director Huff said the debt service would depend. Do you want to do $12,500,000 or $15,000,000? Commissioner Rardin said the worst-case scenario on the full $15,000,000. Run the numbers of the $12,500,000 and $15,000,000, and that will get us a ballpark of where we are and what we have. Finance Director Huff said conservatively, with what we have left to pass, it would probably bring in $1,500,000. Remember, if we pass it, it will not go into effect until a certain point in time. We will not receive the first payment for the gross receipts tax we passed for law enforcement until March. We do not have the money yet. Commissioner Rardin said if we pass something, it will not go into effect until July 1st, so we would not see it until September. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said if you want it July 1st, we have to have it to the State by April 1st. They will give us some wiggle room if they know it has passed the first reading and is going to the second, but it has to happen quickly if that is what you want. Finance Director Huff said some of it is dedicated by ordinance taxes that go into Fund 49, 61, and some of those. We can get you information on that as well. An option is rededicating to something that is not currently paying debt service but could be. There is some discussion regarding what can be done with the LEDA tax. Commissioner Rardin asked if that sunsets this year. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said December 2025, and it went to referendum. Do you want to let that sunset and take it back out to referendum, or in

November, do you want to say, we are dedicating this tax early? You would have to put that on the ballot, and what would happen to the fund balance? Commissioner Rardin asked what the one-eighth percent generated a year now. It used to be about $750,000. Finance Director Huff said $1,200,000 a year. Mayor Payne said so there is a possibility we could rededicate that. Commissioner Rardin said if we put that on the ballot in November. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said we talked with the State and they said the best practice would be to take it to referendum to let the voters decide on rededicating it. Commissioner Rardin said I think we have to on those. According to the State's auditors and lawyers, we do not have to if it sunsets. If you want to rededicate it tomorrow, it does. Finance Director Huff said if you go out to referendum and have them revote on it, you are talking about opening up $5,000,000 to $6,000,000 that would go quite a ways to brick and mortar. Then you are talking about being able to put $5,000,000 down and finance $11,000,000. That is a plus, but there are minuses on the economic development side. Mayor Payne said there is still a State LEDA. Finance Director Huff said right, those are some of the options. We wanted to let the Commission know where we were in terms of our general obligation bonding. The last time we issued a general obligation bond was in 2017. As Commissioner Rardin pointed out, that maxes us out. Commissioner Rardin asked if a mix could be done, like part GRT and part GO bond. Mr. Archuleta said sure, but the only bad thing about it is if you were to split out the GO portion and the voters did not approve it, then you are back to square one. Commissioner Rardin said in the event we have an emergency, then we would not be maxed out.

City Manager Holden said we have had a number of potential projects, including the natatorium. You are going to get to pick and choose projects. If you are not careful, you could bond yourselves out of business for a good while on other things that may come about, some of which may be equally essential. We have brought you a strong project tonight. Commissioner Rardin said we looked at the champagne version; we could always look at value engineering or scaling it back to something more budget-friendly, but we still get a pool, correct? City Manager Holden said yes. If you want to try to get the size of the pool to meet the needs of everyone from the REC Center to school, we could probably do some things, but I do not know if there will be a lot there to scale back. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said the pool proposed to you is much smaller than the current one. You could scale it back, but you lose functionality. There could be a loss of the zero-entry part or not being able to do starting blocks. This is not the champagne version; we cannot afford the champagne version.

Commissioner Rardin asked if there were any talks with the school board to help pay for that. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said they support it but have no interest in helping us fund it. Commissioner Rardin asked what about the Sacramento Mountain Foundation. City Manager Holden said they do not want to do any major projects entirely. If we talked to them, there may be a possibility we could ask them to consider a part of this. They did come to us and wanted to put a dome up. They would be willing to spend on that, so I think they may be willing to spend other money. Commissioner Rardin said it sounds like we have options where we could pull money together and not have to max ourselves out financially. City Manager Holden said we need to get the right mix of people and contributions. Do we want to use the GRT or bonding capacity? If you do the GO, you will have a tax increase whether you like it or not. Commissioner Rardin asked if we could do that on the primary in June, or if that was too close. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said if we pass it by May, it will be in time for the November Election.

Mayor Payne asked staff to put numbers together to rededicate LEDA and the GRT. Those are not bad options available to us. If we are going to build it, we should build it right. We have to think about the future. I do not like the idea of maxing out our bonding capacity. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said our direction was how the City could do this and not depend on anyone else. We tried to get a champagne version, but when it came down to dollar signs, nobody put in. Assistant City Manager Hernandez asked if the GO was completely out. Commissioner Rardin said we need to leave it on the table. I would like to look at all options. We could rededicate LEDA and use it as a portion of the downpayment, then maybe the GO bond for the financing portion so it is more secure. Our GRT goes up and down. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said we will present options for all GO bond, all GRT, and a combination. Commissioner Rardin asked for more information on this sprung structure. Where was one built? City Attorney Smith said it looks like there is a sprung structure in Church Rock, New Mexico. It is a casino, not a pool. They have had it since November 19, 2008. Commissioner Rardin said ours would be different because of the humidity inside the building. Assistant City Manager Hernandez said we will get the $16,000,000 and $12,500,000, all bond, all GO bond, all GRT, and a combination. City Manager Holden said we will also compare the brick and mortar with the sprung.

9. Consider, and act upon, the budget process and documents for the FY2024 - FY2025 preliminary budget. (Evelyn Huff, Finance Director)

Finance Director Huff said we had City Manager and Director budget meetings, and we are cleaning that up before moving on to personnel and capital before we bring the recommendation to the Commission in the first week of May. For several years, we gave every commissioner a binder with the summary sheets. Last year, we also sent it out electronically. Are you comfortable with that? We usually leave a few detail binders in the Commission office for you to take home if you choose, versus creating seven of those. We have a new software system, so it is not quite as cumbersome. We could send it electronically as well. So, you could receive the summary book and detail book electronically, a summary book for each person, and three detail books on loan. Commissioner Robinson said we are happy with that and will make it work. Commissioner Rardin asked if we were doing a bunch of capital this year. Finance Director Huff said we have not finished our first recap; we will probably have that by tomorrow. The departments have until March 17th to finish their capital submissions and submit them, then City Manager Holden will look at capital and personnel requests and make recommendations.

Commissioner Rardin asked if we received any ICIP money this year. Finance Director Huff said from this last session, yes, preliminarily, because nothing has been signed, we received all the projects we had requested. We received $400,000 for the zoo project, $350,000 for the zoo restroom, $147,000 for Dudley School, $350,000 for golf course irrigation, $125,000 for the library patio, and $340,000 for the police vehicles. We received an additional $695,000 for the golf course irrigation on a separate request. The County got some substantial money, and so did the college and Space Hall. Finance Director Huff said the first budget night is scheduled for May 6th. We also plan to bring additional information about the water rates and ask for action on the second night. It will be at least two nights.

Commissioner Rardin moved to adjourn at 9:04 p.m.
Commissioner Robinson seconded the motion.
Motion carried with a vote of 7-0-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Susan L. Payne

ATTEST:

City Clerk Rachel Hughs

(Prepared by Dylan Aleshire, Deputy City Clerk)
Approved at the Regular Meeting held on March 12, 2024.

AGENDA REPORT
CITY OF ALAMOGORDO
CITY COMMISSION

Meeting Date: 3/12/2024 **Report Date:** 02/23/2024 **Report No:** 3.

Submitted By: Maria Herndon

Subject: Consider, and act upon, Ordinance 1686 for adoption and final publication to add Article 11-08, Section 08-010 - 08-040 to Chapter 11 Criminal Code, concerning Peddler and Solicitor Regulations. *(Ashley Smith, City Attorney)* **(Roll Call Vote Required)**

Fiscal Impact:
Amount Budgeted:
Fund:

Additional Fiscal Impact:

Recommendation: Adopt the ordinance.

Background:

The ordinance was approved for first publication by a vote of 7-0 during the commission meeting on February 13, 2024.

Ordinance 1686 came before the commission for first publication at the December 5, 2023, commission meeting to **amend** Article 11-08, Section 08-010 - 08-040 concerning Peddler and Solicitor Regulations to Chapter 11. The strikeouts in the ordinance on December 5, 2023, were incorrect as the article and section cannot be amended because they do not exist in Chapter 11 yet, and there were article numbers that did not pertain to Chapter 11. Therefore, Ordinance 1686 is coming before the commission for approval of its first publication again.

ORDINANCE NO. 1686

AN ORDINANCE ADDING ARTICLE 11-08 PEDDLER AND SOLICITOR REGULATIONS TO CHAPTER 11 CRIMINAL CODE OF THE ALAMOGORDO CODE OF ORDINANCES

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, acknowledges that peddlers and solicitors shall not be a nuisance to the citizens of Alamogordo; and,

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, recognizes peddlers and solicitors shall abide by regulations to make our citizens feel safe; and,

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, considers it necessary to add Article 11-08 to Chapter 11 Criminal Code of the Code of Ordinances.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Commission of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, that Chapter 11, Article 11-08, Sections 08-010 - 08-040 of the Code of Ordinances read as follows:

CHAPTER 11 CRIMINAL CODE

11-08. PEDDLER AND SOLICITOR REGULATIONS

11-08-010. Definitions.

For the purposes of this article, the terms used herein are defined as follows:
Aggressive manner means and includes:

a) Intentionally or recklessly making any physical contact with or touching another person during the solicitation without the person's consent.

b) Following the person being solicited if that conduct is:

    1) Intended to or is likely to cause a reasonable person to fear imminent bodily harm or the commission of a criminal act upon property in the person's possession; or

    2) Is intended to or is reasonably likely to intimidate the person being solicited into responding affirmatively to the solicitation.

c) Continuing to solicit within five (5) feet of the person being solicited after the person has made a negative response, if continuing the solicitation is:

1) Intended to or is likely to cause a reasonable person to fear imminent bodily harm or the commission of a criminal act upon property in the person's possession; or

2) Is intended to or is reasonably likely to intimidate the person being solicited into responding affirmatively to the solicitation, it is prima facie evidence of an intention to cause a reasonable person fear of imminent bodily harm, if the person continues to solicit from a person who has asked him/her to stop.

d) Intentionally or recklessly blocking the safe or free passage of the person being solicited or requiring the person or the driver of a vehicle to take evasive action to avoid physical contact with the person making the solicitation. Acts authorized as an exercise of one's constitutional right to picket or legally protest shall not constitute obstruction of pedestrian or vehicular traffic.

e) Intentionally using obscene or abusive language or gestures:

1) Intended to or likely to cause a reasonable person to fear imminent bodily harm or the commission of a criminal act upon property in the person's possession; or

2) Words intended to or reasonably likely to intimidate the person into responding affirmatively to the solicitation; or

f) Approaching the person being solicited in a manner that:

1) Is intended to or is likely to cause a reasonable person to fear imminent bodily harm or the commission of a criminal act upon property in the person's possession; or

2) Intended to or is reasonably likely to intimidate the person being solicited into responding affirmatively to the solicitation.

An automated teller machine is a device linked to a financial institution's account records, which can carry out transactions, including, but not limited to: account transfers, deposits, cash withdrawals, balance inquiries, and mortgage and loan payments.

Automated teller machine facility means the area comprising one (1) or more automatic teller machines and any adjacent space which is made available to banking customers after regular banking hours.

Check cashing business means any business which represents itself to the public as engaged in the business of cashing checks, drafts, or money orders for consideration.

Peddler means any person who goes from house to house, place to place, or from street to street carrying, conveying, or transporting foods, wares, or merchandise, meats, fish, vegetables, fruits, garden truck, farm products, or provisions, offering or exposing such for sale or making sales and delivering articles to purchasers. The term "peddler" shall include the terms "hawker, huckster, transient merchant, and itinerant vendor." Peddler shall not include persons exempt from licensing under Section 7-23-1, NMSA 1978.

Public area means an area to which the public or a substantial group of persons has access and includes, but is not limited to, alleys, bridges, buildings, driveways, parking lots, parks, playgrounds, plazas, sidewalks, and streets open to the public, and the doorways and entrances to buildings and dwellings, and the grounds enclosing them.

Solicit means to request immediate payment, donation of money, or other things of value, including an order or promise of future payment, from another person, regardless of the solicitor's purpose or intended use of the money or other thing of value. The solicitation may be, without limitation, by the spoken, written, or printed word or by other means of communication.

Solicitation activities shall mean the practices of solicitors as listed in (1) and (2) under the definition of "solicitor," as well as the practice of peddling.

Solicitor shall mean any person, including an employee or agent of another, traveling either by foot, automobile, truck, or another type of conveyance, who engages in the practice of going door-to-door, house-to-house or along any streets within the city:

(1) Selling or taking orders for or offering to sell or take orders for goods, merchandise, wares or other items of value for future delivery or for services to be performed in the future for commercial purposes; or

(2) Requesting contribution of funds, property, or anything of value or of the pledge of any future donation or selling or offering for sale any type of property, including but not limited to goods, tickets, books, and pamphlets, for political, charitable, religious, or other noncommercial purposes.

11-08-020. Prohibited Solicitations

It shall be unlawful for any person to solicit money or other things of value or to solicit the sale of goods or services in the manner described in subparagraphs (a) 1 through 4. of this section.

a) Solicitation is prohibited as follows:

1) In an aggressive manner in a public area;

2) Within fifteen (15) feet of any entrance or exit of any bank or check cashing businesses or within fifteen (15) feet of any automated teller machine during the hours of operation of such bank, automated teller machine, or check cashing business without the consent of the owner or other person legally in possession of such facilities. Provided, however, that when an automated teller machine is located within an automated

teller machine facility, such distance shall be measured from the entrance or exit of the automated teller machine facility.

3) On private property if the owner tenant, or lawful occupant has asked the person not to solicit on the property or has posted a sign clearly indicating that solicitations are not welcome on the property; or

4) From any occupant of a motor vehicle that is in traffic on a public street, whether in exchange for cleaning the vehicle's windows, or for blocking, occupying, or reserving a public parking space, or directing the occupant to a public parking space; provided, however, that this paragraph shall not apply to services rendered in connection with emergency repairs requested by the occupants or passengers of such vehicle.

b) It shall be unlawful for any driver or occupant of a vehicle upon a roadway, while not parked, to invite, request, offer or encourage a person, not in the vehicle to solicit money or other things of value, or to solicit the sale of goods or services in the manner described in subparagraphs (2) 1 through 4 above.

11-08-030. Solicitation on or near street or highway.

a) The purpose of this section is to prevent dangers to persons and property, to prevent traffic delays, and to avoid interference with traffic flow. Roadways that have center medians often are designed to handle specific traffic flow problems. Any delay or distraction may interfere with traffic planning. Sometimes persons stand near intersections and near traffic lights to contact drivers or passengers in cars that are passing or that are stopped temporarily due to traffic lights.

b) It shall be unlawful for any person to solicit employment, business, contributions, or sales of any kind, or collect monies for the same, from the occupant of any vehicle traveling upon any street or highway when the solicitation or collection:

1) Causes the person performing the activity to enter onto the traveled portion of a street or highway.

2) Involves the person performing the activity to be located upon any median area which separates traffic lanes for vehicular travel.

3) The person performing the activity is located such that vehicles cannot move into a legal parking area to safely conduct the transaction.

c) For purposes of this section, the traveled portion of the street or highway shall mean that portion of the road normally used by moving motor vehicle traffic.

11-08-040. Penalties

Any person who violates any provision of this article shall be subject to the penalty provisions contained in section 1-01-100 through 1-01-120, inclusive, of this code.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this _____________ day of _____________, 2024.

CITY OF ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO
a New Mexico municipal corporation

By: __________________________________
Susan L. Payne, Mayor

ATTEST:

____
Rachel Hughs, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____
Ashley Smith, City Attorney

AGENDA REPORT
CITY OF ALAMOGORDO
CITY COMMISSION

Meeting Date: 3/12/2024 **Report Date:** 02/23/2024 **Report No:** 4.

Submitted By: Maria Herndon

Subject: Consider, and act upon, Ordinance 1687 for adoption and final publication to add Article 11-07, Section 07-010 - 07-060 to Chapter 11 Criminal Code, concerning Alcoholic Beverage Regulations. *(Ashley Smith, City Attorney)* **(Roll Call Vote Required)**

Fiscal Impact:
Amount Budgeted:
Fund:

Additional Fiscal Impact:

Recommendation: Adopt the ordinance.

Background:

The ordinance was approved for first publication by a vote of 7-0 during the commission meeting on February 13, 2024.

Ordinance 1687 came before the commission for first publication at the December 5, 2023, commission meeting to amend Article 11-07, Section 07-010 - 07-060 concerning Alcoholic Beverage Regulations to Chapter 11. The strikeouts in the ordinance on December 5, 2023, were incorrect as the article and section cannot be amended because they do not exist in Chapter 11 yet, and there were article numbers that did not pertain to Chapter 11. Therefore, Ordinance 1687 is coming before the commission for approval of its first publication again.

ORDINANCE NO. 1687

AN ORDINANCE ADDING ARTICLE 11-07 ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE REGULATIONS TO CHAPTER 11 CRIMINAL CODE OF THE ALAMOGORDO CODE OF ORDINANCES

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, acknowledges that offenses relating to alcoholic beverages regulations shall be enforced in the city of Alamogordo; and,

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, considers it necessary to add Article 11-07 to Chapter 11 Criminal Code, of the Code of Ordinances.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Commission of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, that Chapter 11, Article11-07, Sections 07-010 – 07-060 of the Code of Ordinances read as follows:

CHAPTER 11 CRIMINAL CODE

ARTICLE 11-07. ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE REGULATIONS

11-07-010. Definitions.

All words and terms used in this chapter shall be deemed to have and carry the meaning as defined by the laws of the state, particularly, but not limited to §60-3A-3 NMSA 1978. Where such words and terms are not defined by the laws of the state, then they shall be deemed to have and carry their common, ordinary meaning.

11-07-020. Location regulations.

It shall be unlawful for anyone to drink or to use any alcoholic beverages of any kind, whether lawfully purchased or not, in any public dance hall, poolroom, bowling alley or in any street or in any government building, whether state or federal, or in any other public place except establishments, or other public places having a license to dispense alcoholic beverages.

11-07-030. Selling or giving alcoholic liquor to minors; minor allowing self to be served.

a) The term "minor" used in this section shall mean any person who is under the age of twenty-one (21) years.

b) It shall be a violation of this section for any club, retailer, dispenser, bartender, waiter or servant or employee of any club, retailer, or dispenser, or for any taxi driver, hotel employee or any other person, to do any of the following acts:

    1) To sell, serve or give any alcoholic beverage to a minor.

2) To buy alcoholic beverages for, or to procure the sale or service of alcoholic beverages to, a minor.

3) To deliver alcoholic beverages to a minor.

4) To aid or assist a minor to buy, procure or be served alcoholic beverages.

c) It shall be a violation of this section for any minor to buy, receive, possess, or permit himself to be served any alcoholic liquor.

d) In the event any person except a minor shall procure any other person to sell, serve or deliver any alcoholic beverage to a minor by actual or constructive misrepresentation of any facts calculated to cause, or by the concealment of any facts the concealment of which is calculated to cause, the person, selling, serving or delivering such alcoholic beverages to such minor, that such minor is legally entitled to be sold, served or delivered alcoholic beverages; and actually deceiving him by such misrepresentation or concealment, then that person, and not the person so deceived by such misrepresentation or concealment, shall have violated this section.

11-07-040. Drinking in public places.

a) Drinking in public places consists of drinking or consuming alcoholic beverages (as the term is defined in Section 60-3A-3 NMSA 1978, (as amended) in any public place, private club, key club, whether operated for profit or not, or on a parking lot adjacent to an establishment licensed to dispense alcoholic beverages; provided, that this chapter shall not apply to drinking inside an establishment having a license to dispense alcoholic beverages.

b) It shall be unlawful for any person to commit the offense defined in this section.

11-07-050. Selling of alcohol in public places.

a) Selling of alcohol in public places consists of selling, serving, furnishing, or permitting the drinking or consumption of alcoholic beverages (as the term is defined in section 60-3A-3, NMSA 1978., as amended) in any public place or private club, or key club, whether operated for profit or not, except establishments having a license to dispense alcoholic beverages by the owner, operator, lessee, or proprietor thereof.

b) For the purposes of this chapter, "public place" shall mean: an area, whether enclosed or open, held out for use by the public and to which the public is invited, or in which the public is permitted, whether owned or operated by public or private interests.

11-07-060. Penalties.

Violation of any of the sections in this chapter shall be a misdemeanor punishable by up to five hundred dollars ($500.00) per day and up to six (6) months in jail per day of each violation.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this _____________ day of _____________, 2024.

CITY OF ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO
a New Mexico municipal corporation

By: ___________________________________
Susan L. Payne, Mayor

ATTEST:

____
Rachel Hughs, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____
Ashley Smith, City Attorney

AGENDA REPORT
CITY OF ALAMOGORDO
CITY COMMISSION

Meeting Date: 3/12/2024 **Report Date:** 02/28/2024 **Report No:** 5.

Submitted By: Cynthia Quairoli

Subject: Consider, and act upon, bid award IFB 2024-01 to AggTec for an estimated amount of $84,600.00 for the purchase of concrete to be utilized by various departments. *(Evelyn Huff, Finance Director)*

Fiscal Impact: 84,600.00
Amount Budgeted: $0.00
Fund: Various Funds

Additional Fiscal Impact:

Recommendation: Award IFB 2024-01, to AggTec for the estimated amount of $84,600.00.

Background: IFB 2024-01 was advertised on February 04, 2024, and opened February 16, 2024. The City received one (1) responsive bid.

The purchase of concrete will be used by various City departments, with primary usage being for the Public Works/Street Department. This is an estimated quantity, multi-term contract commencing on March 13, 2024, through March 12, 2025 for the first term. The contract extended for three additional one-year terms. Quantity is determined on an estimated annual maximum usage.

BID TABULATION
Concrete
CITY OF ALAMOGORDO IFB Bid 2024-01
February 16, 2024 2:00 PM

ITEM NO.	ESTIMATED QUANITY TONS	DESCRIPTION	AggTech	
			Unit Price	Total Price
1	450CY	Class A, Cast-in-place Structural 3000PSI	$171.00	$76,950.00
2	21 EA	Delivery charge for 1.5 cu. Yds., or less	$150.00	$3,150.00
3	10 EA	Cost for tying up a truck for more tha one hour	$0.00	$0.00
4	300 EA	Fiber per cu. Yd.	$7.00	$2,100.00
5	200 EA	Calcium by percent (%) per Cu. Yd.	$340.00	$2,400.00
TOTAL BASE BID				$84,600.00

AGENDA REPORT
CITY OF ALAMOGORDO
CITY COMMISSION

Meeting Date: 3/12/2024 **Report Date:** 03/05/2024 **Report No:** 6.

Submitted By: Evelyn Huff

Subject: Consider, and act upon, Resolution 2024-19 requesting written approval from the Local Government Division of the Department of Finance and Administration, State of NM for the revised budget numbers computed as of March 12, 2024. *(Evelyn Huff, Finance Director)* **(Roll Call Vote Required)**

Fiscal Impact:
Amount Budgeted:
Fund:

Additional Fiscal Impact: Beginning Cash Balances - $92,951,619
Revenues - $5,655,191 Increase
Expenditures - $204,863 Increase
Transfers In - $30,240 Increase
Transfers Out - $30,240 Increase

Recommendation: Approve the Resolution Request

Background: The City Commission adopted the FY 2023-2024 budget on July 28, 2023. The Department of Finance & Administration granted approval of the City of Alamogordo's Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Annual Budget on August 15, 2023. Resolution 2024-19 amends the budget to reflect a more true and accurate projection of the actual revenues and expenditures. A summary and explanation of the revisions are attached for your review.

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-19

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION, STATE OF NEW MEXICO, APPROVE REVISED BUDGET FIGURES FOR CERTAIN LINE ITEMS IN THE CITY'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023-2024.

WHEREAS, the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico wishes approval to change some of the budget line-item figures of various funds; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Finance and Administration, State of New Mexico, gave its written final approval to the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico's annual budget on August 15, 2023, for fiscal year 2023-2024; and

WHEREAS, the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, has tabulated on the following pages the additional resources and expenditures for fiscal year 2023-2024.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO, that the City's annual budget for fiscal year 2023-2024 be and hereby is revised as of March 12, 2024, to reflect a more true and accurate projection of the actual revenues and expenditures for fiscal year 2023-2024 as shown on the following pages.

NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO, that the Department of Finance and Administration, State of New Mexico, be requested to give its written approval to the revised budget figures computed on March 12, 2024, as a more true and accurate projection of the actual revenues and expenditures for fiscal year 2023-2024.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico, at a Regular Meeting held this 12th. day of March 2024.

CITY OF ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO,
A NEW MEXICO MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

By: ______________________________
Susan L. Payne, Mayor

ATTEST:

____
Rachel Hughs, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

____
Ashley N. Smith, City Attorney

1/12TH REQ RSRV
1,775,091
1/12TH REQ RSRV
0
Fund Reserve Policy
468,745
Bal. Remaining
5,305,057

ALL FUNDS SUMMARY
BUDGET 2023-2024

FY24 BUDGET - RESOLUTION 2024-19 (#9) MARCH 12, 2024

FUND NO.	FY 2023-2024 FUND DESCRIPTION	UNAUDITED BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	ESTIMATED REVENUES	TRANSFERS IN	TRANSFERS OUT	NET CASH TRANSFERS	BUDGETED EXPENDITURES	ESTIMATED ENDING CASH BALANCE	LOCAL RESERVE REQUIREMENTS UNAVAILABLE FOR BUDGETING	ADJUSTED ENDING CASH BALANCE
11	GENERAL OPERATING FUND	15,423,967	25,086,245	311,577	11,971,807	(11,660,230)	21,301,089	7,548,893	2,243,836	5,305,057
12	INTERNAL SERVICE FUND	10,000	241,739	5,160,056	0	5,160,056	5,411,692	103		$103
15	CORRECTIONS-JAIL	90,675	54,734	0	0	0	113,240	32,169		$32,169
16	LODGER'S TAX-PROMOTIONAL FUND	353,179	2,067	0	0	0	213,750	141,496		$141,496
17	POLICE COURT BOND	8,638	0	0	0	0	0	8,638		$8,638
19	COURT AUTOMATION FUND	6,033	35,000	37,089	0	37,089	71,709	6,413		$6,413
20	LODGER'S TAX-CITY	536,427	80,898	183,295	87,553	95,742	598,393	114,674		$114,674
21	D.A.R.E. DONATIONS FUND	21,005	2,195	0	0	0	13,092	10,108		$10,108
24	GRANT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	0	8,595,249	1,579,500	0	1,579,500	9,662,114	512,635		$512,635
27	MUNICIPAL COURT OPERATIONS	5,000	13,000	506,784	0	506,784	524,732	52		$52
28	POLICE CONTINGENCY	75,078	650	0	0	0	10,000	65,728		$65,728
31	CEMETERY-PERPETUAL CARE	860,280	21,642	0	40,000	(40,000)	0	841,922		$841,922
32	COMMUNITY SERVICES	13,775	515,192	6,673,223	0	6,673,223	7,198,672	3,518		$3,518
33	FIRE PROTECTION	1,113,851	1,203,473	0	0	0	2,236,012	81,312		$81,312
35	HIDTA GRANT FUND	780	12,400	0	0	0	12,400	780		$780
36	LAW ENFORCEMENT FUND	68,724	159,500	0	0	0	228,224	(0)		($0)
37	STATE HIGHWAY FUND	115,832	51,280	0	0	0	57,316	109,796		$109,796
38	TRAFFIC SAFETY FUND	77,507	14,581	0	0	0	10,000	82,088		$82,088
39	STATE JUDICIAL	2,393	34,000	0	0	0	34,000	2,393		$2,393
42	1984 GROSS RECEIPTS TAX	3,872,525	2,476,789	0	4,056,487	(4,056,487)	43,067	2,249,760	252,119	$1,997,641
44	TRANSPORTATION FUND	22,581	1,289,106	5,113,144	361,436	4,751,708	5,975,798	87,597		$87,597
48	NEW MEXICO C.D.B.G.	0	382,515	1,161,308	0	1,161,308	1,407,044	136,779		$136,779
49	1986 GROSS RECEIPTS TAX	4,547,832	2,484,214	0	896,490	(896,490)	842,363	5,293,193	268,391	$5,024,802
50	PROPERTY ACQUISITION	85,010	0	0	0	0	0	85,010		$85,010
53	GENERAL OBLIGATION	989,996	1,201,162	0	0	0	1,183,245	1,007,913	557,029	$450,884
54	REVERSE OSMOSIS PROJECT RSV	21,967	0	0	0	0	10,447	11,520		$11,520
56	99 GRT FLOOD CONTROL BOND PROJ	8	0	269,404	0	269,404	269,404	8		$8
59	REVENUE BOND P & I FUND	172,412	8,300	2,357,973	0	2,357,973	2,357,973	180,712		$180,712
61	MUNICIPAL INFRASTRUCTURE .0625%	1,872,040	619,633	0	260,000	(260,000)	10,767	2,220,906		$2,220,906
63	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	2,500	0	462,723	30,105	432,618	432,712	2,406		$2,406
69	1994 GROSS RECEIPTS	4,040,006	2,469,660	0	2,426,640	(2,426,640)	43,067	4,039,959	553,051	$3,486,908
71	ALAMO SENIOR CENTER	14,430	897,856	785,907	0	785,907	1,691,650	6,543		$6,543
74	ALAMO SENIOR CENTER GIFT	136,021	11,078	0	0	0	26,286	120,813		$120,813
75	SENIOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM	10,107	139,307	2,802	0	2,802	151,932	284		$284
81	WATER/SEWER OPERATING	16,271,347	11,262,553	658,461	3,795,718	(3,137,257)	14,349,964	10,046,679	1,463,850	$8,582,829
82	98 JT WATER/SEWER BOND P&I	1,149,309	15,226	1,863,751	0	1,863,751	1,863,751	1,164,535		$1,164,535
86	SOLID WASTE COLLECTION SYS.	996,061	2,495,198	240,000	158,629	81,371	2,771,383	801,247	178,583	$622,664
88	BONITO CAMPGROUND	395,878	4,138	150,000	0	150,000	174,456	375,560		$375,560
89	ESGRT .0625%	1,800,843	631,401	0	278,683	(278,683)	1,154,655	998,906		$998,906
90	GOLF COURSE	0	1,715,450	246,082	0	246,082	1,960,026	1,506		$1,506

S:\UsrFinance\Budgets\FY2024\REVISIONS\#9 Budget Resolution 2024-19 March 12, 2024
FY23 RECAP

1/12TH REQ RSRV
1,775,091
1/12TH REQ RSRV
0
Fund Reserve Policy
468,745
Bal. Remaining
5,305,057

ALL FUNDS SUMMARY
BUDGET 2023-2024

FY24 BUDGET - RESOLUTION 2024-19 (#9) MARCH 12, 2024

FUND NO.	FY 2023-2024 FUND DESCRIPTION	UNAUDITED BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	ESTIMATED REVENUES	TRANSFERS IN	TRANSFERS OUT	NET CASH TRANSFERS	BUDGETED EXPENDITURES	ESTIMATED ENDING CASH BALANCE	LOCAL RESERVE REQUIREMENTS UNAVAILABLE FOR BUDGETING	ADJUSTED ENDING CASH BALANCE
91	AIRPORT	20,000	735,112	216,500	45,736	170,764	921,064	4,812		$4,812
94	OTERO GREENTREE REG LANDFILL	3,444,133	1,878,240	0	5,000	(5,000)	2,642,103	2,675,270		$2,675,270
96	SELF-INSURED FUND	581,219	140,317	0	276,600	(276,600)	181,121	263,815		$263,815
98	PAYROLL CLEARING	242,872	0	0	0	0	0	242,872		$242,872
104	UTILITY DEPOSITS	628,617	0	0	0	0	0	628,617		$628,617
105	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	6,821,364	1,311,024	0	0	0	1,238,455	6,893,933		$6,893,933
107	SELF INSURED/LIABILITY	1,081,582	8,050	0	0	0	535,000	554,632		$554,632
109	2004 GRT CAPITAL OUTLAY	15,640,173	5,046,196	0	3,140,527	(3,140,527)	4,834,999	12,710,843	534,452	$12,176,391
114	SIDEWALKS REVOLVING LOANS	146,446	1,722	0	148,168	(148,168)	0	0		$0
115	CORP ESCROW ACCOUNT RESERVE	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,000		$1,000
119	2012 GRT REF/IMP REVBD	199,317	3,085	0	0	0	192,557	9,845		$9,845
121	2015 GO BONDS-FUN CENTER	92,226	1,081	0	0	0	0	93,307		$93,307
122	2015 GO BONDS-STREETS	178,708	2,095	0	0	0	0	180,803		$180,803
124	AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT	7,226,672	75,043	0	0	0	7,119,553	182,162		$182,162
125	CANNABIS GRT	0	204,000	0	0	0	202,238	1,762		$1,762
901	HOUSING LOW RENT OPERATING	899,290	0	0	0	0	0	899,290	86,881	$812,409
903	HOUSING HOMEOWNERSHIP OPER	18	0	0	0	0	0	18		$18
904	HOUSING CAPITAL FUND PROJECTS	563,966	0	0	0	0	0	563,966		$563,966
	TOTALS FY2024	**92,951,619**	**73,633,396**	**27,979,579**	**27,979,579**	**0**	**102,283,515**	**64,301,500**	**6,138,192**	**58,163,308**

S:\UsrFinance\Budgets\FY2024\REVISIONS\#9 Budget Resolution 2024-19 March 12, 2024
FY23 RECAP

ALL FUNDS SUMMARY

BUDGET 2023-2024

1/12TH REQ RSRV
1,775,091
1/12TH REQ RSRV
0
Fund Reserve Policy
468,745
Bal. Remaining
5,305,057

FY24 BUDGET - RESOLUTION 2024-19 (#9) MARCH 12, 2024

FUND NO.	FY 2023-2024 FUND DESCRIPTION	UNAUDITED BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	ESTIMATED REVENUES	TRANSFERS IN	TRANSFERS OUT	NET CASH TRANSFERS	BUDGETED EXPENDITURES	ESTIMATED ENDING CASH BALANCE	LOCAL RESERVE REQUIREMENTS UNAVAILABLE FOR BUDGETING	ADJUSTED ENDING CASH BALANCE
11	GENERAL OPERATING FUND	15,423,967	22,109,972	311,577	11,941,567	(11,629,990)	21,264,286	4,639,663	2,243,836	2,395,827
	Revision #1-Zoo River Cane Bush Removal				30,240	(30,240)		(30,240)		(30,240)
	Revision #2-Revenue Projections to Year End		348,446			0		348,446		348,446
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		2,627,827			0	36,803	2,591,024		2,591,024
	Total Revised Fund 11	**15,423,967**	**25,086,245**	**311,577**	**11,971,807**	**(11,660,230)**	**21,301,089**	**7,548,893**	**2,243,836**	**5,305,057**
12	INTERNAL SERVICE FUND	10,000	241,739	5,160,056	0	5,160,056	5,411,692	103		103
	Total Revised Fund 12	**10,000**	**241,739**	**5,160,056**	**0**	**5,160,056**	**5,411,692**	**103**		**103**
15	CORRECTIONS-JAIL	90,675	54,734	0	0	0	113,240	32,169		32,169
	Total Revised Fund 15	**90,675**	**54,734**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**113,240**	**32,169**		**32,169**
16	LODGER'S TAX-PROMOTIONAL FUND	353,179	2,067	0	0	0	213,750	141,496		141,496
	Total Revised Fund 16	**353,179**	**2,067**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**213,750**	**141,496**		**141,496**
17	POLICE COURT BOND	8,638	0	0	0	0	0	8,638		8,638
	Total Revised Fund 17	**8,638**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,638**		**8,638**
19	COURT AUTOMATION FUND	6,033	35,000	37,089	0	37,089	71,709	6,413		6,413
	Total Revised Fund 19	**6,033**	**35,000**	**37,089**	**0**	**37,089**	**71,709**	**6,413**		**6,413**
20	LODGER'S TAX-CITY	536,427	80,898	183,295	87,553	95,742	598,393	114,674		114,674
	Total Revised Fund 20	**536,427**	**80,898**	**183,295**	**87,553**	**95,742**	**598,393**	**114,674**		**114,674**
21	D.A.R.E. DONATIONS FUND	21,005	2,195	0	0	0	13,092	10,108		10,108
	Total Revised Fund 21	**21,005**	**2,195**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13,092**	**10,108**		**10,108**
24	GRANT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	0	8,595,249	1,579,500	0	1,579,500	9,662,114	512,635		512,635
	Total Revised Fund 24	**0**	**8,595,249**	**1,579,500**	**0**	**1,579,500**	**9,662,114**	**512,635**		**512,635**
27	MUNICIPAL COURT OPERATIONS	5,000	13,000	506,784	0	506,784	524,732	52		52
	Total Revised Fund 27	**5,000**	**13,000**	**506,784**	**0**	**506,784**	**524,732**	**52**		**52**
28	POLICE CONTINGENCY	75,078	650	0	0	0	10,000	65,728		65,728
	Total Revised Fund 28	**75,078**	**650**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10,000**	**65,728**		**65,728**
31	CEMETERY-PERPETUAL CARE	860,280	21,642	0	40,000	(40,000)	0	841,922		841,922
	Total Revised Fund 31	**860,280**	**21,642**	**0**	**40,000**	**(40,000)**	**0**	**841,922**		**841,922**
32	COMMUNITY SERVICES	13,775	515,192	6,642,983	0	6,642,983	7,168,432	3,518		3,518
	Revision #2-Zoo River Cane Bush Removal			30,240		30,240	30,240	0		0
	Total Revised Fund 32	**13,775**	**515,192**	**6,673,223**	**0**	**6,673,223**	**7,198,672**	**3,518**		**3,518**
33	FIRE PROTECTION	1,113,851	1,203,473	0	0	0	2,236,012	81,312		81,312
	Total Revised Fund 33	**1,113,851**	**1,203,473**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2,236,012**	**81,312**	**0**	**81,312**
35	HIDTA GRANT FUND	780	12,400	0	0	0	12,400	780		780
	Total Revised Fund 35	**780**	**12,400**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12,400**	**780**		**780**
36	LAW ENFORCEMENT FUND	68,724	159,500	0	0	0	228,224	(0)		(0)
	Total Revised Fund 36	**68,724**	**159,500**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**228,224**	**(0)**		**(0)**
37	STATE HIGHWAY FUND	115,832	51,280	0	0	0	57,316	109,796		109,796
	Total Revised Fund 37	**115,832**	**51,280**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**57,316**	**109,796**		**109,796**

38	TRAFFIC SAFETY FUND	77,507	14,581	0	0	0	10,000	82,088		82,088
	Total Revised Fund 38	**77,507**	**14,581**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10,000**	**82,088**		**82,088**
39	STATE JUDICIAL	2,393	34,000	0	0	0	34,000	2,393		2,393
	Total Revised Fund 39	**2,393**	**34,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**34,000**	**2,393**		**2,393**
42	1984 GROSS RECEIPTS TAX	3,872,525	2,121,677	0	4,056,487	(4,056,487)	37,016	1,900,699	252,119	1,648,580
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		355,112			0	6,051	349,061		349,061
	Total Revised Fund 42	**3,872,525**	**2,476,789**	**0**	**4,056,487**	**(4,056,487)**	**43,067**	**2,249,760**	**252,119**	**1,997,641**
44	TRANSPORTATION FUND	22,581	1,200,328	5,113,144	361,436	4,751,708	5,974,285	332		332
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		88,778			0	1,513	87,265		87,265
	Total Revised Fund 44	**22,581**	**1,289,106**	**5,113,144**	**361,436**	**4,751,708**	**5,975,798**	**87,597**		**87,597**
48	NEW MEXICO C.D.B.G.	0	382,515	1,161,308	0	1,161,308	1,407,044	136,779		136,779
	Revision #5-Reclassify Transfers In/Out-Close Fund 114 Sidewalk			0		0		0		0
	Total Revised Fund 48	**0**	**382,515**	**1,161,308**	**0**	**1,161,308**	**1,407,044**	**136,779**		**136,779**
49	1986 GROSS RECEIPTS TAX	4,547,832	2,129,102	0	896,490	(896,490)	736,312	5,044,132	268,391	4,775,741
	Revision #3-Land & Water Rights Legal Fees					0	100,000	(100,000)		(100,000)
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		355,112			0	6,051	349,061		349,061
	Total Revised Fund 49	**4,547,832**	**2,484,214**	**0**	**896,490**	**(896,490)**	**842,363**	**5,293,193**	**268,391**	**5,024,802**
50	PROPERTY ACQUISITION	85,010	0			0	0	85,010		85,010
	Total Revised Fund 50	**85,010**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**85,010**		**85,010**
53	GENERAL OBLIGATION	989,996	1,201,162	0	0	0	1,183,245	1,007,913	557,029	450,884
	Total Revised Fund 53	**989,996**	**1,201,162**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,183,245**	**1,007,913**	**557,029**	**450,884**
54	REVERSE OSMOSIS PROJECT RSV	21,967	0	0	0	0	10,447	11,520		11,520
	Total Revised Fund 54	**21,967**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**10,447**	**11,520**		**11,520**
56	99 GRT FLOOD CONTROL BOND PROJ	8	0	269,404	0	269,404	269,404	8		8
	Total Revised Fund 56	**8**	**0**	**269,404**	**0**	**269,404**	**269,404**	**8**		**8**
59	REVENUE BOND P & I FUND	172,412	8,300	2,357,973	0	2,357,973	2,357,973	180,712		180,712
	Total Revised Fund 59	**172,412**	**8,300**	**2,357,973**	**0**	**2,357,973**	**2,357,973**	**180,712**		**180,712**
61	MUNICIPAL INFRASTRUCTURE .0625%	1,872,040	530,855	0	260,000	(260,000)	9,254	2,133,641		2,133,641
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		88,778			0	1,513	87,265		87,265
	Total Revised Fund 61	**1,872,040**	**619,633**	**0**	**260,000**	**(260,000)**	**10,767**	**2,220,906**		**2,220,906**
63	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	2,500	0	462,723	30,105	432,618	432,712	2,406		2,406
	Total Revised Fund 63	**2,500**	**0**	**462,723**	**30,105**	**432,618**	**432,712**	**2,406**		**2,406**
69	1994 GROSS RECEIPTS	4,040,006	2,114,548	0	2,426,640	(2,426,640)	37,016	3,690,898	553,051	3,137,847
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		355,112			0	6,051	349,061		349,061
	Total Revised Fund 69	**4,040,006**	**2,469,660**	**0**	**2,426,640**	**(2,426,640)**	**43,067**	**4,039,959**	**553,051**	**3,486,908**
71	ALAMO SENIOR CENTER	14,430	897,856	785,907	0	785,907	1,691,650	6,543		6,543
	Total Revised Fund 71	**14,430**	**897,856**	**785,907**	**0**	**785,907**	**1,691,650**	**6,543**		**6,543**
74	ALAMO SENIOR CENTER GIFT	136,021	11,078	0	0	0	26,286	120,813		120,813
	Total Revised Fund 74	**136,021**	**11,078**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**26,286**	**120,813**		**120,813**
75	SENIOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM	10,107	139,307	2,802	0	2,802	151,932	284		284
	Total Revised Fund 75	**10,107**	**139,307**	**2,802**	**0**	**2,802**	**151,932**	**284**		**284**
81	WATER/SEWER OPERATING	16,271,347	11,262,553	658,461	3,795,718	(3,137,257)	14,349,964	10,046,679	1,463,850	8,582,829
	Total Revised Fund 81	**16,271,347**	**11,262,553**	**658,461**	**3,795,718**	**(3,137,257)**	**14,349,964**	**10,046,679**	**1,463,850**	**8,582,829**
82	98 JT WATER/SEWER BOND P&I	1,149,309	15,226	1,863,751	0	1,863,751	1,863,751	1,164,535	0	1,164,535
	Total Revised Fund 82	**1,149,309**	**15,226**	**1,863,751**	**0**	**1,863,751**	**1,863,751**	**1,164,535**	**0**	**1,164,535**
86	SOLID WASTE COLLECTION SYS.	996,061	2,495,198	240,000	158,629	81,371	2,771,383	801,247	178,583	622,664
	Total Revised Fund 86	**996,061**	**2,495,198**	**240,000**	**158,629**	**81,371**	**2,771,383**	**801,247**	**178,583**	**622,664**
88	BONITO CAMPGROUND	395,878	4,138	150,000	0	150,000	174,456	375,560		375,560
	Total Revised Fund 88	**395,878**	**4,138**	**150,000**	**0**	**150,000**	**174,456**	**375,560**	**0**	**375,560**
89	ESGRT .0625%	1,800,843	542,623	0	278,683	(278,683)	1,153,142	911,641		911,641
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		88,778			0	1,513	87,265		87,265
	Total Revised Fund 89	**1,800,843**	**631,401**	**0**	**278,683**	**(278,683)**	**1,154,655**	**998,906**	**0**	**998,906**
90	GOLF COURSE	0	1,715,450	246,082	0	246,082	1,960,026	1,506		1,506
	Total Revised Fund 90	**0**	**1,715,450**	**246,082**	**0**	**246,082**	**1,960,026**	**1,506**	**0**	**1,506**

91	AIRPORT	20,000	735,112	216,500	45,736	170,764	921,064	4,812	0	4,812
	Total Revised Fund 91	**20,000**	**735,112**	**216,500**	**45,736**	**170,764**	**921,064**	**4,812**	**0**	**4,812**
94	OTERO GREENTREE REG LANDFILL	3,444,133	1,418,772	0	5,000	(5,000)	2,642,103	2,215,802		2,215,802
	Revision #2-Revenue Projections to Year End		459,468			0		459,468		459,468
	Total Revised Fund 94	**3,444,133**	**1,878,240**	**0**	**5,000**	**(5,000)**	**2,642,103**	**2,675,270**	**0**	**2,675,270**
96	SELF-INSURED FUND	581,219	140,317	0	276,600	(276,600)	181,121	263,815		263,815
	Total Revised Fund 96	**581,219**	**140,317**	**0**	**276,600**	**(276,600)**	**181,121**	**263,815**	**0**	**263,815**
98	PAYROLL CLEARING	242,872	0	0	0	0	0	242,872		242,872
	Total Revised Fund 98	**242,872**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**242,872**	**0**	**242,872**
104	UTILITY DEPOSITS	628,617	0	0	0	0	0	628,617		628,617
	Total Revised Fund 104	**628,617**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**628,617**	**0**	**628,617**
105	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	6,821,364	1,133,468	0	0	0	1,235,429	6,719,403		6,719,403
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		177,556			0	3,026	174,530		174,530
	Total Revised Fund 105	**6,821,364**	**1,311,024**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,238,455**	**6,893,933**		**6,893,933**
107	SELF INSURED/LIABILITY	1,081,582	8,050	0	0	0	535,000	554,632		554,632
	Total Revised Fund 107	**1,081,582**	**8,050**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**535,000**	**554,632**	**0**	**554,632**
109	2004 GRT CAPITAL OUTLAY	15,640,173	4,335,972	0	3,288,695	(3,288,695)	4,822,897	11,864,553	534,452	11,330,101
	Revision #4-Gross Receipts Tax & Admin. Fee Projections FY24		710,224			0	12,102	698,122		698,122
	Revision #5-Reclassify Transfers In/Out-Close Fund 114 Sidewalk				(148,168)	148,168		148,168		148,168
	Total Revised Fund 109	**15,640,173**	**5,046,196**	**0**	**3,140,527**	**(3,140,527)**	**4,834,999**	**12,710,843**	**534,452**	**12,176,391**
114	SIDEWALKS REVOLVING LOANS	146,446	1,722	0	0	0	0	148,168		148,168
	Revision #5-Reclassify Transfers In/Out-Close Fund 114 Sidewalk				148,168	(148,168)		(148,168)		(148,168)
	Total Revised Fund 114	**146,446**	**1,722**	**0**	**148,168**	**(148,168)**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
115	CORP ESCROW ACCOUNT RESERVE	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,000		1,000
	Total Revised Fund 115	**1,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,000**	**0**	**1,000**
119	2012 GRT REF/IMP REV BOND	199,317	3,085	0	0	0	192,557	9,845		9,845
	Total Revised Fund 119	**199,317**	**3,085**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**192,557**	**9,845**		**9,845**
121	2015 GO BONDS-FUN CENTER	92,226	1,081	0	0	0	0	93,307		93,307
	Total Revised Fund 121	**92,226**	**1,081**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**93,307**		**93,307**
122	2015 GO BONDS-STREETS	178,708	2,095	0	0	0	0	180,803		180,803
	Total Revised Fund 122	**178,708**	**2,095**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**180,803**		**180,803**
124	AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT	7,226,672	75,043	0	0	0	7,119,553	182,162		182,162
	Total Revised Fund 124	**7,226,672**	**75,043**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,119,553**	**182,162**		**182,162**
125	CANNABIS GRT	0	204,000	0	0	0	202,238	1,762		1,762
	Total Revised Fund 125	**0**	**204,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**202,238**	**1,762**		**1,762**
901	HOUSING LOW RENT OPERATING	899,290	0	0	0	0	0	899,290	86,881	812,409
	Total Revised Fund 901	**899,290**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**899,290**	**86,881**	**812,409**
903	HOUSING HOMEOWNERSHIP OPER	18	0	0	0	0	0	18		18
	Total Revised Fund 903	**18**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**18**
904	HOUSING CAPITAL FUND PROJECTS	563,966	0	0	0	0	0	563,966		563,966
	Total Revised Fund 904	**563,966**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**563,966**		**563,966**
	TOTALS FY2024	**92,951,619**	**73,633,396**	**27,979,579**	**27,979,579**	**0**	**102,283,515**	**64,301,500**	**6,138,192**	**58,163,308**

FUND NO. JOURNAL NO.	PROJECT NO.	LINE ITEM NO.	LINE ITEM DESCRIPTION	ORIGINAL BUDGET AMOUNT	INCREASE (DECREASE)	REVISED BUDGET AMOUNT

REVISION #1

This budget revision is to provide funding, with transfer from the General Fund, for removal of the River Cane Bushes at the Alameda Park Zoo for compliance with City Ordinance and because they providing unsafe shelter for homeless people.

32	**COMMUNITY SERVICES FUND**					
		Transfers In				
1274		032.000.0000.0000.49011.	Trans fr (11) General	6,024,995	**30,240**	6,055,235
			Total Transfers In	**6,024,995**	**30,240**	**6,055,235**
		Expenditures				
1274		032.300.6306.0000.54527.	Services-Professional	23,000	**30,240**	53,240
			Total Expenditures	23,000	**30,240**	53,240
11	**GENERAL FUND**					
		Transfers Out				
1274		011.000.0000.0000.59032	Trans to (32) Community Services	6,024,995	**30,240**	6,055,235
			Total Transfers In	**6,024,995**	**30,240**	**6,055,235**

REVISION #2

This budget revision is to adjust Revenues in Fund 11 & 94 to projected year end amounts after budget review.

11	**GENERAL FUND**					
		Revenues				
02		011.000.0000.0000.40220.	Fees-Business Registration	50,000	**(42,500)**	7,500
02		011.000.0000.0000.40221.	Fees-Business Reg-Penalty	1,800	**(1,800)**	0
02		011.000.0000.0000.40222.	Fees-Misc. License	0	**1,500**	1,500
02		011.000.0000.0000.40402.	User Fees-Rental	0	**2,500**	2,500
02		011.000.0000.0000.40403.	User Fees-Vending	0	**21**	21
02		011.000.0000.0000.40601.	Misc. Revenue-Donations	0	**10,000**	10,000
02		011.000.0000.0000.40608.	Misc. Revenue-Refunds	1,029	**3,945**	4,974
02		011.000.0000.0000.40610.	Misc. Revenue-Insurance	0	**54,145**	54,145
02		011.000.0000.0000.40612.	Misc. Revenue-Reimbursements	0	**5,577**	5,577
02		011.700.1201.0000.40501.	Fines-Court	200,000	**(65,000)**	135,000
02		011.700.1201.0000.40503.	Fines-Court Administration	30,000	**(11,200)**	18,800
02		011.700.1201.0000.40512.	Fines-DWI Screening	0	**3,098**	3,098
02		011.400.4104.0000.40612	Misc. Revenue-Reimbursements	0	**72,488**	72,488
02		011.500.3104.0000.40611	Misc. Revenue-Abatement	0	**315,672**	315,672
			Total Revenues	**282,829**	**348,446**	**631,275**
94	**LANDFILL FUND**					
		Revenues				
02		094.000.0000.0000.40409.	User Fees-Member Disposal	1,000,000	**75,000**	1,075,000
02		094.000.0000.0000.40410.	User Fees-Non-Member Disposal	110,000	**65,000**	175,000
02		094.000.0000.0000.40482.	User Fees-Asbestos Disposal	250,000	**300,000**	550,000
02		094.000.0000.0000.40608.	Misc. Revenue-Refunds	2,500	**1,468**	3,968
02		094.000.0000.0000.40801.	Investment Income	40,422	**18,000**	58,422
			Total Revenues	**1,402,922**	**459,468**	**1,862,390**

REVISION #3

This budget revision is to provide funding for legal services related to land and surface water rights research in High Rolls, La Luz-Fresnal Canyon, and Alamo Canyon.

49	**1986 GROSS RECEIPTS**					
		Expenditures				
1923		049.000.0000.0000.54520	Services-Contract	30,000	**100,000**	130,000
			Total Expenditures	30,000	**100,000**	130,000

REVISION #4

This budget revision is to adjust Gross Receipts Tax revenues and GRT Administration Fees expenditures to Projected FY24 Year End actual amounts.

11	**GENERAL FUND**					
		Revenues				
03		011.000.0000.0000.40110.	Taxes-Gross Receipts .5%	4,166,383	**710,224**	4,876,607
03		011.000.0000.0000.40113.	Taxes-Gross Receipts .125%	1,041,596	**177,556**	1,219,152
03		011.000.0000.0000.40303.	State Shared-Gross Receipts 1.225%	10,207,639	**1,740,047**	11,947,686
			Total Revenue	15,415,618	**2,627,827**	18,043,445
		Expenditures				
03		011.000.2400.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee	281,893	**36,803**	318,696
			Total Expenditures	281,893	**36,803**	318,696
42	**1984 GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FUND**					
		Revenues				
03		042.000.0000.0000.40112.	Taxes-Gross Receipts 1/4%	2,083,192	**355,112**	2,438,304
			Total Revenue	2,083,192	**355,112**	2,438,304
		Expenditures				
03		042.000.0000.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee	37,016	**6,051**	43,067
			Total Expenditures	37,016	**6,051**	43,067

44	**TRANSPORTATION FUND**					
		Revenues				
03		044.000.0000.0000.40114.	Taxes-Muni Infrastructure GRT .0625%	520,798	**88,778**	609,576
			Total Revenue	520,798	**88,778**	609,576
		Expenditures				
03		044.500.2400.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee	9,254	**1,513**	10,767
			Total Expenditures	9,254	**1,513**	10,767
49	**1986 GROSS RECEIPTS FUND**					
		Revenues				
03		049.000.0000.0000.40112.	Taxes-Gross Receipts 1/4%	2,083,192	**355,112**	2,438,304
			Total Revenue	2,083,192	**355,112**	2,438,304
		Expenditures				
03		049.000.0000.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee	37,016	**6,051**	43,067
			Total Expenditures	37,016	**6,051**	43,067
61	**TRANSPORTATION FUND**					
		Revenues				
03		061.000.0000.0000.40114.	Taxes-Muni Infrastructure GRT .0625%	520,798	**88,778**	609,576
			Total Revenue	520,798	**88,778**	609,576
		Expenditures				
03		061.000.0000.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee	9,254	**1,513**	10,767
			Total Expenditures	9,254	**1,513**	10,767
69	**1994 GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FUND**					
		Revenues				
03		069.000.0000.0000.40112.	Taxes-Gross Receipts 1/4%	2,083,192	**355,112**	2,438,304
			Total Revenue	2,083,192	**355,112**	2,438,304
		Expenditures				
03		069.000.0000.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee	37,016	**6,051**	43,067
			Total Expenditures	37,016	**6,051**	43,067
89	**ESGRT .0625% FUND**					
		Revenues				
03		089.000.0000.0000.40114.	Taxes-Municipal ESGRT .0625%	520,798	**88,778**	609,576
			Total Revenue	520,798	**88,778**	609,576
		Expenditures				
03		089.000.0000.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee	9,254	**1,513**	10,767
			Total Expenditures	9,254	**1,513**	10,767
105	**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND**					
		Revenues				
03		105.000.0000.0000.40113.	Taxes-Economic Development .125	1,041,596	**177,556**	1,219,152
			Total Revenue	1,041,596	**177,556**	1,219,152
03		***Expenditures***				
		105.000.0000.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee	18,508	**3,026**	21,534
			Total Expenditures	18,508	**3,026**	21,534
109	**STREET CAPITAL GRT**					
		Revenues				
03		109.000.0000.0000.40112.	Taxes-Gross Receipts 1/4% 08 STR	2,083,192	**355,112**	2,438,304
03		109.500.9003.0000.40112.	Taxes-Gross Receipts 1/4% 04 STR PROG	2,083,192	**355,112**	2,438,304
			Total Revenues	4,166,384	**710,224**	4,876,608
		Expenditures				
03		109.000.0000.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee 08 STR	37,016	**6,051**	43,067
03		109.500.9003.0000.55504.	Fees-GRT Administration Fee 04 STR PROG	37,016	**6,051**	43,067
			Total Expenditures	74,032	**12,102**	86,134
			Revenues	28,435,568	4,847,277	33,282,845
			Expenditures	513,243	74,623	587,866
				28,948,811	4,921,900	33,870,711

REVISION #5

This budget revision is to eliminate the Sidewalks Revolving Loans Fund and move existing funds to the New Mexico C.D.B.G Fund. Also, reduces the transfer from Fund 109-2004 Streets GRT that is allocated to NM CDBG Fund.

48	**NEW MEXICO C.D.B.G. FUND**					
		Transfers In				
04	**EN2013.TRNI.LOCL**	048.000.0000.0000.49114.	Trans fr (114) Sidewalk Revolving Loan Fund	0	**148,168**	148,168
04	**EN2013.TRNI.GGRT**	048.000.0000.0000.49109	Trans fr (109) 2004 GRT	1,161,308	**(148,168)**	1,013,140
				1,161,308	**0**	**1,161,308**
114	**SIDEWALKS REVOLVING LOANS FUND**					
		Transfers Out				
04		114.000.0000.0000.59048.	Trans to (48) New Mexico CDBG	0	**148,168**	148,168
			Total Transfers In	**0**	**148,168**	**148,168**
109	**STREET CAPITAL GRT FUND**					
		Transfers Out				
04		109.000.0000.0000.59048	Trans to (48) New Mexico CDBG	1,008,338	**(148,168)**	860,170
			Total Transfers In	**1,008,338**	**(148,168)**	**860,170**