

1 seconded by Vice-Chair Fernandez. Roll called and all present voted Yes. Motion
2 passed 6-0.

3 **D. Approval of Minutes**

4 Chair Roybal asked the board to review the minutes from the March 20, 2020
5 board meeting and asked if there was a motion. Commissioner Jaramillo moved
6 to approve the minutes for the March 20, 2020 RCLC board meeting. Treasurer
7 Izraelevitz seconded the motion. Roll called and all present voted Yes. Motion
8 passed 6-0.

9 **E. Public Comment**

10 Chair Roybal asked if there was anyone who wished to make public comment
11 and invited anyone attending via zoom or the conference call number to
12 announce if they wished to speak. There were no responses so Chair Roybal said
13 he would close public comments but reopen later in the meeting to allow late
14 arrivals the opportunity to speak.

15 **F. Treasurers Report (a)**

16 Chair Roybal asked Treasurer Izraelevitz for the treasurer’s report. Treasurer
17 Izraelevitz used “share screen” and highlighted important takeaways from the
18 monthly financial report.

19 Treasurer Izraelevitz noted that the RCLC received membership dues from the
20 Town of Taos. We are still waiting on three entities, meaning we have \$23,500 in
21 receivables in membership.

22 Treasurer Izraelevitz stated that under normal circumstances the DOE grant,
23 almost 2/3rds of the executive director services would have been paid for by the
24 DOE grant. The organization is reporting the breakdown for tracking purposes
25 right now, as we are not currently receiving the grant.

26 Treasurer Izraelevitz noted that the bulk of accounting and audit services has
27 been incurred primarily for audit services.

1 Treasurer Izraelevitz also noted that in addition to membership contributions,
2 the organization has also received \$10,000 that was distributed as a grant for
3 census complete count services in Taos and Espanola.

4 Treasurer Izraelevitz said our DOE grant was about \$100,000 per year and we are
5 still waiting to resolve if we will receive that grant for past years or for future
6 years.

7 Following the review of the financial report and status, Treasurer Izraelevitz
8 asked to make some comments about the current status as a start to our budget
9 discussions for the next fiscal year. Treasurer Izraelevitz developed a worksheet
10 to track expenditures and income which he shared on the screen and said that
11 currently the organization has total expenses of about \$215,000 per year, and
12 historically the income is about \$90,000 without the grant.

13 The monthly burn rate, in terms of our cash, which is about \$260,000 is about
14 \$10,000 per month. That means the RCLC has about 24 months until we are at
15 zero cash as an organization, assuming we continue at our current expenditures
16 and do not receive the DOE grant. Even with full contributions, we have 30
17 months of cash.

18 Treasurer Izraelevitz then reviewed the expenses of the organization and stated
19 the primary expense is the contract for the executive director (ED). A review of
20 possible reductions of the ED contract showed that without the DOE grant, a
21 reduction to 50% ED services then we can continue indefinitely.

22 Treasurer Izraelevitz stated it is a critical issue to resolve quickly whether we are
23 going to renew the DOE grant, otherwise, this institution is not sustainable.

24 Treasurer Izraelevitz stated the need to have a resolution of the grant, and if it is
25 not renewed, consider reducing ED services or use the remaining funds for the
26 orderly dissolution of the organization, which is not a position he supports.

27 Chair Roybal asked for questions from the board. Seeing none, Chair Roybal
28 stated that he is hopeful that we will get funding back from DOE, but it is better
29 to prepare and be proactive rather than reactive. Chair Roybal informed the

1 board that he has spoken with Congressman Lujan and Senator Heinrich's office,
2 and it appears that delegation staff is scheduled to hold a call with DOE to
3 inquire about renewing the grant. It may be helpful to have other elected official
4 to reach out and inquire if we will be getting this funding back.

5 Director Vasquez reported that he has been communicating with congressional
6 member staff, in particular the senate staff and recently let them know that
7 some of the RCLC board members may want to speak with the members of
8 congress. Their staff volunteered to help facilitate any such meeting.

9 Treasurer Izraelevitz asked Director Vasquez to facilitate an executive committee
10 meeting with personnel at DOE EM to resolve this issue. Chair Roybal agreed
11 and asked Director Vasquez to share contact information with the congressional
12 members with the board members directly. Director Vasquez asked for
13 clarification and Treasurer Izraelevitz voiced that it is preferable for Director
14 Vasquez to organize the meetings as a sub-quorum group, such as the executive
15 committee. Chair Roybal concurred and asked Director Vasquez to pursue this
16 action.

17 **Invoices for review and possible action (b)**

18 Chair Roybal moved action to review of invoices and possible action. Councilor
19 Izraelevitz asked Director Vasquez to re-share the screen. A technical problem
20 prevented Director Vasquez from sharing the screen.

21 Chair Roybal interjected at this point stating that a public comment from Maire
22 O'Neill with the Los Alamos Reporter asking if the meeting is being recorded.

23 Director Vasquez stated that he had replied directly to her and yes, the meeting
24 is being recorded.

25 Director Vasquez was unable to re-share his screen so Treasurer Izraelevitz
26 shared the list of invoices for review.

27 Treasurer Izraelevitz presented the invoices ...

- 28 i. CPLC invoice for RCLC Executive Director services for March
- 29 2020, for \$14,107.33, plus GRT for a total of \$15,297.68.
- 30 ii. ZLS invoice for accountant services for a total of \$83.59

1 iii. Long, Komer & Associates invoice for legal services for a
2 total due of \$1,395.07.

3 The legal services invoice required a breakdown of previous invoices in order to
4 sort through backlog of past due services and deduct payments previously made
5 from four invoices dating to January 2020. A copy of all these past invoices was
6 sent to board members and is posted on the website for the April meeting.
7 Treasurer Izraelevitz reported that the total for these four invoices, minus
8 payments made is \$1,395.07.

9 Chair Roybal asked the board for questions or comments. Commissioner
10 Jaramillo had to step away so his alternate Leo Marquez stated that he had no
11 comments. Secretary Sanchez said he had no questions. Vice-Chair Fernandez
12 said he had no questions. Councilor Garcia stated he had no questions at this
13 time.

14 Chair Roybal then brought up each invoice individually for approval.

15 Treasurer Izraelevitz moved to approve the CPLC invoice for RCLC Executive
16 Director services for March 2020, for a total of \$15,297.68. Vice-Chair Fernandez
17 seconded the motion. Roll was called and all present voted Yes. Motion passed
18 6-0.

19 Treasurer Izraelevitz moved to approve the ZLS invoice for accountant services
20 for a total of \$83.59. Secretary Sanchez seconded the motion. Roll was called
21 and all present voted Yes. Motion passed 6-0.

22 Treasurer Izraelevitz moved to approve the Long, Komer & Associates invoice for
23 legal services for a total due of \$1,395.07. Secretary Sanchez seconded the
24 motion. Roll was called and all present voted Yes. Motion passed 6-0.

25 **G. Discussion/Action Items**

26 Chairman Roybal moved to item G. a, the review of fiscal years 2013-2018
27 audits, by contracted legal counsel Nancy Long. Ms. Long stated that she was
28 asked to review all audits completed for years 2013 through 2018. She reminded
29 the board that these audits were only recently completed and released, in
30 November 2019. The RCLC had previously believed they were not subject to the
31 New Mexico audit act so they had not been done until recently. The most recent
32 year was also completed. Ms. Long stated each individual audit contained

1 findings that were carried forward year after year. Meaning individual annual
2 audits are not as clear alone and it is more useful to look at all years together.
3 Many of the findings were about getting the audits done in time, fiscal policy,
4 and of course reimbursements and travel policy. Ms. Long said she took the
5 review to mean she would look at all of the three other reports that have been
6 done.

7 One of the other reports was an “internal audit report” prepared by the fiscal
8 agent, Los Alamos County, done in February 2018. That was primarily a review of
9 allegedly improper reimbursements to the former executive director, Andrea
10 Romero. That was a review of a 19 month period, July 1, 2016 through February
11 21, 2018.

12 The next report was an independent investigation performed by a law firm out
13 of Albuquerque called Adams + Crow, dated August 8, 2018. This report
14 reviewed a two-year period, March 2016 through March 2018, arising out of
15 reimbursements that were made to Andrea Romero Consulting and questions
16 arising from some of the reimbursements. This report was procured by Los
17 Alamos County, the RCLC fiscal agent. This report focused on the actions of Los
18 Alamos County’s role in approving the reimbursements, as well as travel policy
19 and reimbursement policy of the RCLC.

20 The third report was done by the New Mexico Office of the State Auditor and
21 published on August 7, 2018. This was done for a period of four years and looked
22 at all reimbursements to Andrea Romero and her predecessor organization.

23 The special reports and audits focused on reimbursements, and looked for the
24 root causes for the improper reimbursements and actions. The special audits
25 included a list of measures to correct these problems, which the RCLC has
26 implemented.

27 Ms. Long stated the special audit report was the most comprehensive in time
28 and states that it looked at all documentation that was provided, and never
29 claims that it was missing anything, having received documentation from the

1 RCLC, Los Alamos and third parties. The Los Alamos prepared internal report
2 identified \$29,000 in total reimbursements, of which \$5,000 was identified as
3 being impermissible expenses. But by calculating the maximum allowable per
4 diem rate for days the executive director was on travel, the total unapproved
5 amount dropped to around \$2,200. That was the amount Los Alamos County
6 recommended Ms. Romero repay and she did so.

7 The Adams + Crow report from alter in the year disapproved with the method of
8 employing per diem and disagreed with the amount of \$5,000.

9 The OSA special audit looked at RCLC expenditures and revenues and obtained
10 additional documentation. They do not say their documentation was incomplete
11 and seems to be the best view of the total amount of impermissible
12 reimbursements. Ms. Long said she added up the five categories of what were
13 impermissible reimbursements listed in the OSA audit and it equals \$10,606.32.
14 These impermissible expenses included things like meals for public officers
15 within their home jurisdiction, and other impermissible guests. This was the
16 largest category with total impermissible reimbursements totaling \$5,799,
17 although looking at the list of 42 entries there are some individuals who are
18 clearly allowable public officers. There were also alcohol and entertainment
19 purchases, as well as personal expenses, which are not permissible. A GRT tax for
20 purchases was disallowed, as it would result in double taxation. There was also
21 some duplicate mileage. The OSA found that these expenditures violated state
22 travel law as well as per diem policy.

23 With this audit the RCLC was allowed to respond. Most of those the RCLC agreed
24 with the findings and agreed to fix the procedures and policies, which has been
25 accomplished. But for at least three of the findings the RCLC disagreed with the
26 OSA findings, arguing that in some cases the guests had charged back, or paid for
27 their meals. Ms. Long said she is not sure what these positions, but assumes it
28 was based on documentation held by the RCLC fiscal agent.

1 The yearly audits as well as the special audits had findings regarding travel
2 policy, board and fiscal agent oversight, the use of pooled funds within Los
3 Alamos County for RCLC funds. Ms. Long stated the RCLC board had addressed
4 these by implementing a travel policy that is compliant with state law and
5 regulations, as travel is now paid for by the respective government body and not
6 the RCLC. Approvals for reimbursements and expenses must be done through
7 multiple tiers of review to ensure adequacy and that they comply with RCLC
8 policy. You are now conducting your audits, your funds have been separated
9 from Los Alamos County, and reimbursements for the executive director are no
10 longer made but contained within his contract. So you have addressed the
11 oversight issues as had been recommended.

12 Ms. Long continues stating the RCLC has implemented appropriate safeguards
13 and policies and now needs to decide if there is anything else that needs to be
14 done in addressing these findings. Ms. Long stated that upon further evaluation
15 of the OSA special audit the RCLC could seek further reimbursement in the
16 amount up to around \$8,000 based on the numbers the OSA came up with. Ms.
17 Long reiterated that the OSA said they had all the documents they appeared to
18 need and it does not appear necessary to perform an additional special audit.
19 The RCLC board also has to consider the practical economic issues of how far
20 they would want to take that in terms of consultants and attorney fees that
21 would be incurred. And you also have to consider the counter argument that this
22 issue has already been resolved when the board sought \$2,200 reimbursement
23 in February 2018. But that reimbursement came before the investigation that
24 was done by OSA for the special audit. Ms. Long then stated that her
25 presentation was complete.

26 Chair Roybal then asked the board for comments and questions.

27 Treasurer Izraelevitz asked what is the fiduciary responsibility of pursuing this
28 reimbursement. Treasurer Izraelevitz said that Ms. Long's presentation said the
29 maximum amount recoverable as identified by the state auditor would be

1 \$8,000 but it could be less. There is also a cost to investigations, and legal efforts
2 so I want to know what is the appropriate prudent legal responsibility. Is this an
3 amount that we should prudently seek for reimbursement given possible
4 expenditure of other resources and time, or not?

5 Ms. Long responded saying that Councilor Izraelevitz summed up the
6 countervailing issues that must be considered. This appears to be a problem that
7 was born out of negligence, with none of the reports identifying any attempts to
8 mislead, conspiracy or criminal activity, and there is no evidence that the
9 expenses were not legitimate. With all these factors considered, plus the need to
10 maintain fiduciary responsibility, Ms. Long stated that she would not necessarily
11 spend much more time on this. Perhaps one more attempt to request a refund.
12 Treasurer Izraelevitz then asked how much board resources would be expended
13 to send out letters on the attorney's letterhead requesting a refund, and is it
14 cost effective.

15 Ms. Long responded that she would recommend only one letter be sent, to the
16 former executive director, and it would not be terribly expensive. She also stated
17 she is not sure if the board could expect a response to the letter.

18 Secretary Sanchez then asked Ms. Long if he understood the exchange as a
19 recommendation that it would behoove this board to send out one final letter in
20 request for this money and put this to bed.

21 Ms. Long stated that his summary was correct. Secretary Sanchez then asked
22 how the board could go ahead and direct the attorney to draft the letter.

23 Chair Roybal stated that so long as there is consensus of the board that he would
24 give direction to the attorney to that direction, but he would like to hear from all
25 the board first.

26 Commissioner Jaramillo stated his questions were answered in the presentation
27 and earlier questions.

28 Vice-Chair Fernandez thanked Ms. Long for her presentation and suggestions,
29 and stated his questions had been answered.

1 Councilor Garcia stated he had no further questions and thanked Ms. Long.
2 Chair Roybal then thanked Ms. Long for the report and based on questions and
3 answers stated we have been tasked by due diligence to take this extra step to
4 try and recover funds that were inappropriately distributed. Chair Roybal stated
5 it is important to give direction at this meeting so called on each board member
6 present to confirm if they want to give direction to draft and send out a letter.
7 Secretary Sanchez stated he would like to give direction to send out a final letter.
8 Commissioner Jaramillo said that he concurred with Mayor Sanchez. Councilor
9 Fernandez said he was fine with the proposal. Councilor Garcia said he would
10 support sending out an additional letter. Treasurer Izraelevitz stated Yes, the
11 proposal is the prudent step. Chair Roybal said he was in agreement as well and
12 that we have direction for our legal counsel, to draft a letter to the former
13 executive director requesting her to refund the amount previously discussed.
14 Ms. Long stated she understood the direction and will get to work on the letter.
15 Chair Roybal thanked Ms. Long for her presentation and efforts.
16 Chairman Roybal moved to item G. b, a presentation on the proposed Los
17 Alamos County regional investment fund. Chair Roybal asked Treasurer
18 Izraelevitz to present.
19 The proposal is to develop a capital fund for the region as is related to
20 employees and income of LANL. The idea would be for Los Alamos County to
21 develop a fund that would be invested in accordance to a permanent fund as
22 administered by DFA investment council, and to use the proceeds from the
23 investments for regional capital projects.
24 Los Alamos County hopes to provide a regular substantial investment into this
25 fund for several years, although covid situation creates some uncertainty. In
26 addition, Los Alamos County understands that a return will not be available from
27 the fund for the first few years so the plan to make an additional investment to
28 provide resources that can be immediately invested in local capital projects.

1 Los Alamos County is looking to the RCLC to be the recipient to the income and
2 determine what are the regional priorities and projects and how the funds
3 should be used. Los Alamos County would provide assistance and advice for
4 prioritizing capital projects, and recuse themselves from any vote for selecting
5 projects.

6 Treasurer Izraelevitz said the next step would be to provide direction to Ms. Long
7 to negotiate with Los Alamos County to determine how the earnings are to be
8 received, managed and distributed.

9 Chair Roybal stated that the proposal is a great opportunity for the regional
10 communities and appreciates the presentation.

11 Secretary Sanchez stated that he had been speaking with Treasurer Izraelevitz
12 previously and thinks this is an opportune time to make these investments and
13 bring the returns to the table.

14 Commissioner Jaramillo stated that this proposal is something big that could
15 help us regionally, and he would like to sit down and talk more about how we
16 see it moving forward and help each other, especially post-Covid as all our
17 communities will take big hits

18 Councilor Garcia thanked Treasurer Izraelevitz for the proposal and looks
19 forward to further conversation.

20 Treasurer Izraelevitz then asked if the board could make a motion and direction
21 for how the board wants to engage with Los Alamos County, and that he would
22 recuse himself from making a motion.

23 Secretary Sanchez, as Mayor of Espanola made a motion to ask the RCLC legal
24 counsel to look into what the opportunity and requirements would be for
25 creating such a fund with Los Alamos. Councilor Garcia from Santa Fe seconded
26 the motion.

27 Chair Roybal then asked the legal counsel, to make sure if she understood the
28 motion. Ms. Long replied that she heard that there is a wish for her to work with

1 the attorney for Los Alamos County on adopting an MOU, if that is the
2 appropriate vehicle to put this into motion.
3 Secretary Sanchez confirmed that was the intent of his motion. Chair Roybal
4 then called for a vote. Roll was called and all present voted Yes. Motion passed
5 6-0.

6 Chairman Roybal moved to item G. c, the RCLC retreat report and discussion on
7 RCLC initiatives. Director Vasquez then presented the report that had been
8 prepared by the retreat facilitator, Naomi Engelman with QB LLC.

9 On February 8, 2020, the RCLC held an all-day (9 am – 3 pm) retreat at the Rio
10 Arriba County Annex, facilitated by Naomi Engelman of QB LLC with support
11 from Sandy Duran and Executive Director, Eric Vasquez. Eighteen (18) people in
12 total signed in, representing six member communities, but none of the pueblo
13 members.

14 The purpose of the retreat was defined as:

- 15 • To engage members and partners in the RCLC strategic planning process;
- 16 • To provide input for upcoming LANL cleanup decisions;
- 17 • To provide input of the economic impact of the lab on the communities;
- 18 and
- 19 • To provide input on CPLC collaboration opportunities.

20
21 Participants were placed into groups of four, for the purpose of discussing and
22 providing feedback/input on three presented clean up decisions. Individual
23 presentations of the three (3) issues were provided by representatives of DOE
24 EM/N3B. The first cleanup presentation was on MDA C. participants voiced
25 concerns over the visual impact of the proposed solution, the health and safety
26 risk to the community, groundwater protection, and the long-term impacts of
27 the proposed solution.

28 The second cleanup presentation was on RDX. Participants said they had no
29 specific concerns, but general concerns were raised for all three cleanup issues.

30 The Chromium plume was the third cleanup presentation. Participants expressed
31 concerns regarding communications to the communities and stakeholders.

1 Participants also voiced questions about the RCLC’s technical ability to vet these
2 projects and asked if there are independent resources available to help evaluate
3 projects such as these. Discussion also looked at the state’s role and if it is
4 possible to find an independent entity.

5 Participants also asked for a more complete understanding of how these projects
6 fit inside LANL’s overall cleanup mission. It was suggested that individual
7 community level meetings be scheduled to dig deeper into these issues with
8 more locals present or hold meetings in member communities to allow residents
9 to participate more easily. The board would also act to select specific areas for
10 the RCLC to focus on in 2020 and beyond.

11 The retreat then looked at the economic impact of LANL on the region. A well-
12 known economic development professional, Steve Vierck presented on the 2018
13 Economic Impact of Los Alamos National Laboratory report prepared by
14 University of New Mexico’s Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER).
15 Mr. Vierck had not been involved in the study preparation, but as BBER was not
16 available to attend in person, Mr. Vierck was asked to present as he has
17 extensive understanding in the subject matter. The presentation was based on a
18 slide deck prepared by BBER at the request of the RCLC. During the presentation,
19 participants requested access to the full report, which was emailed soon after
20 the retreat. The report noted that local tax revenue from LANL activities is
21 primarily captured by Los Alamos County. Concerns were expressed about the
22 uneven local tax receipts across the region. There is interest in extending the
23 economic impact of LANL more robustly across the region with the support of
24 RCLC members, LANL, N3B and associated subcontractors.

25 Concern exists about how to improve opportunities for employment.

26 Communities should make their concerns known to the RCLC (filter up).

27 Participants stated that member communities need more information regarding
28 regional efforts to improve employment opportunities such as the Regional
29 Development Corporation’s Workforce and Education Training Program.

1 Following Mr. Vierck's presentation, Roger Gonzales, Market President for
2 Chicanos Por La Causa (CPLC) New Mexico presented on the focus and mission of
3 his organization, which is also the organization contracted for executive director
4 services with the RCLC. This was misstated in the retreat report and board
5 members asked that it be clarified.

6 Mr. Gonzales highlighted the various services available to New Mexicans via
7 CPLC and its subsidiary partners. Participants were interested in learning more
8 about using tax strategies as an opportunity to grow their local economies.

9 At the end of the retreat participants asked additional questions and requested
10 more information on them. This included, what is happening with newly
11 generated waste, a desire to better understand the whole cleanup universe of
12 both legacy and newly generated waste, and a strong interest in learning more
13 about the Triad side of the LANL equation.

14 Additional community meetings and other actions were recommended as follow
15 up actions. In addition, the RCLC has also recently adopted a few subcommittees
16 that can start to look deeper into some of these recommendations.

17 Chair Roybal stated that he would be talking about later in the meeting.

18 Chairman Roybal moved to item G. d, the executive director update.

19 Director Vasquez provided a summary of the update as an update on recent
20 activities.

21 Director Vasquez reported that in a response to the March 5 letter Senators
22 Udall, Heinrich and Congressman Lujan submitted to William White, Senior
23 Advisor for EM, are communicating with staff from Senators Heinrich and Udall's
24 offices and Congressman Lujan to push for a response and move to next steps in
25 resolving the grant issue. Director Vasquez said that he had been speaking with
26 DOE staff and was advised that the Covid-19 situation is slowing response time
27 to many inquiries. As noted in the treasurers' report, this issue affects the RCLC's
28 budget drafting process and is time sensitive.

1 Director Vasquez reported that following the March 20 RCLC board meeting he
2 has communicated with the complete count census facilitators in Taos and Rio
3 Arriba and advised them of the board’s interest in allowing them to make the
4 changes needed to their scope of work to meet the changing situation around
5 complete count activities. Since then a new timeline for enumerator activities
6 was announced pushing census count activities back three months.

7 Director Vasquez brought to the attention of the board that EM LA and N3B have
8 convened a Technical Working Group for the purpose of engaging community
9 leaders and staff in deep drilldowns of legacy cleanup objectives and plans.

10 Several of our communities have been represented by key staff and/or elected
11 officials. The group has met twice now, most recently online. The next meeting is
12 scheduled for May 6 at 3:00 and any members interested should contact him or
13 N3B to receive participation instructions.

14 On April 22 Director Vasquez attended an ECA hosted webinar with Chris
15 Hanson, professional staff member for the Senate Appropriations Committee
16 Mr. Hanson briefed ECA members on updates and insight on the appropriations
17 outlook for this year and FY21, especially in light of the Covid-19 crisis. The
18 presentation indicated a great deal of uncertainty on how Congress will balance
19 the Covid-19 expenses with the proposed regular FY21 bills. In addition, there is
20 expectations that there will be an infrastructure stimulus bill to help boost the
21 economy once the lockdown is lifted. Director Vasquez pointed out that a similar
22 stimulus bill was passed in 2009 and LANL EM projects received over \$200
23 million in special cleanup funding. Mr. Hanson spoke specifically about shovel-
24 ready EM projects being easy and effective projects for Congress to fund for
25 quickly putting money into the economy.

26 Director Vasquez reported that in subsequent conversations with delegation
27 staff, RCLC staff have confirmed that potential FY21 cuts are a major concern to
28 the delegation, and the possible stimulus bill is an opportunity to fund additional

1 EM cleanup. The House has stated they want all spending bills marked up by July
2 4, but the Covid-19 crisis could delay that date.

3 Director Vasquez also provided the updated calendar for meetings for FY21 and
4 then provided a list of policy issues for the policy committee to review.

5 Councilor Izraelevitz asked if the RCLC has heard what, if any expenditures have
6 been made using the grant funds.

7 Director Vasquez replied that Rio Arriba County has subcontracted the activities
8 out and that he has spoken directly with the subcontractor, and the Taos County
9 complete count committee coordinator. They are currently delaying activities
10 because the Census has delayed enumeration activities by three months in
11 response to the Covid-19 situation.

12 Councilor Izraelevitz asked who the subcontractor is and what their plans for
13 engagement are, in light of the changes.

14 Director Vasquez stated that the contractor is Roger Montoya and the original
15 plan in Rio Arriba had been to hire youth for door-to-door outreach in targeted
16 areas. The current plan is to move towards social media, texting and phone calls.
17 Taos had originally planned a library kiosk with attendant in the Town of Taos
18 library, but it is closed, and that they too are looking at social media and phone
19 calls.

20 Leo Marquez, alternate for Rio Arriba County then asked Director Vasquez to
21 confirm if Roger Montoya was still working on the Census project. Director
22 Vasquez said he had received an email as recent as April 23 from Mr. Montoya,
23 but that he would inquire to confirm the contract status.

24 Treasurer Izraelevitz then stated the reduction of funding in the FY 21 budget for
25 legacy cleanup and a formal statement from the RCLC to the delegation would
26 be appropriate. Chair Roybal asked Director Vasquez to work on a draft.

27 Chair Roybal then returned to public comments.

28 Suzie Schwartz, a resident of Taos asked to speak. Ms. Schwartz asked that her
29 public comments and letters previously sent to the board be included in the

1 minutes of the meeting. She also requested that meetings be livestreamed and
2 that video recordings and audio recordings from the meetings be placed on the
3 website. She also noted that the old website is still live and not forwarding to the
4 new page.

5 Ms. Schwartz then commended the RCLC board for weighing in on the proposed
6 FY21 budget and asked the board to consider some additional issues. These
7 include the NNSA's planned tritium released at LANL through venting that has
8 been temporarily postponed, the discovery of contaminated waste by utility
9 workers this year, a request that the RCLC take a position on extending the
10 public comment periods for the DOE supplemental analysis and NNSA's massive
11 plan for pit production at LANL, and call on the DOE to conduct a site wide
12 environmental statement.

13 Chair Roybal asked Director Vasquez to look into the website issues. Director
14 Vasquez replied that they are working to fix the forward function on the old
15 website.

16 Maire O'Neil, with the Los Alamos Reporter blog then requested to speak in
17 public comments as a private taxpayer.

18 Ms. O'Neil agreed with the prior comments saying it is high time that the
19 website be updated. She went on to say that there was no call to create a new
20 website, but just update the current one. Ms. O'Neil also said that in previous
21 years the items on the agenda were longer and items currently in the directors
22 report were listed in the agenda. Ms. O'Neil then said many issues in the
23 directors report should be covered more fully and meetings were better
24 attended and people looked forward to them. Ms. O'Neil said that is where she
25 met Commissioner Roybal and Councilor Fernandez. Ms. O'Neil said these are
26 positive suggestions. Ms. O'Neil then suggested the RCLC publish more news
27 releases about some of the positive initiatives it is undertaking. Ms. O'Neil said
28 that the only news releases she has seen go only to one publication.

1 During public comments a computer failure led to Director Vasquez being cut off
2 from the meeting and the recording was cut off. Using s separate computer
3 Director Vasquez was able to rejoin the meeting at the 2:07 mark. The video
4 recording was lost, but the audio recording continued, with the blank of three
5 minutes.

6 Following public comments Chair Roybal moved to item H, Board Comments.
7 Chair Roybal stated that he spoke with some members previously about their
8 preferences and then asked other attending board members for their
9 preferences. After speaking with board members Chair Roybal stated that
10 member of the board will be assigned to two committees. Those members not
11 present at the April 24 meeting will be assigned in the near future. Chair Roybal
12 announced that the Budget Drafting Committee would be chaired by Treasurer
13 Izraelevitz. Other members would include Commissioner Leo Jaramillo, Councilor
14 Michael Garcia, and Chair Henry Roybal.

15 The Policy Committee would be chaired by Vice-Chair Darien Fernandez, and
16 other members would be Secretary and Mayor Javier Sanchez, and Councilor
17 Michael Garcia.

18 The Executive Director Contract Review Committee would be chaired by Vice-
19 Chair and Councilor Darien Fernandez. Other members would include Treasurer
20 and Councilor Izraelevitz, Secretary and Mayor Javier Sanchez, Commissioner Leo
21 Jaramillo and Chair and Commissioner Henry Roybal.

22 Director Vasquez would work to schedule the meetings.

23 Chair Roybal asked if other board members had comments. Treasurer Izraelevitz
24 asked that a teleconference with DOE EM be scheduled as soon as possible.

25 Chair Roybal then asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Jaramillo moved
26 to adjourn and Treasurer Izraelevitz seconded the motion.. Roll was called. All
27 present voted Yes. Vote was 6-0. Motion passed and meeting adjourned at 3:57
28 P.M.
29 END
