

**MINUTES  
of the  
THIRD MEETING  
of the  
PUBLIC SCHOOL CAPITAL OUTLAY OVERSIGHT TASK FORCE**

**October 31-November 1, 2005  
Pete McDavid Lounge  
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque**

The third meeting of the Public School Capital Outlay Oversight Task Force for the 2005 interim was called to order by Representative Rick Miera, co-chair, on Monday, October 31, 2005, at 10:10 a.m. in the Pete McDavid Lounge at the University of New Mexico (UNM) in Albuquerque.

**Present**

Representative Rick Miera, Co-Chair  
Senator Cynthia Nava, Co-Chair  
Senator Ben D. Altamirano  
Representative Ray Begaye  
Pancho Guardiola  
Leonard Haskie  
Scott Hughes for James Jimenez  
Senator Carroll H. Leavell  
Elizabeth Marrufo  
Tony Monfiletto  
Bud Mulcock  
Antonio Ortiz for Veronica Garcia  
Norman Suazo  
Mark Valdes for Gary Bland  
Dr. Moises Venegas  
Representative W. C. "Dub" Williams

**Absent**

Senator Vernon D. Asbill  
Senator Joseph A. Fidel  
Representative Larry A. Larranaga  
Speaker of the House Ben Lujan  
Kilino Marquez  
Rey S. Medina  
Dr. Gloria Rendon  
Representative Henry Kiki Saavedra

**Staff**

Sharon Ball, Legislative Council Service (LCS)  
Robert Gorrell, Public School Facilities Authority (PSFA)  
Linda Kehoe, Legislative Finance Committee (LFC)  
Jeremy LaFaver, LCS  
Dr. Pauline Rindone, Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC)  
Stephanie Schardin, LFC  
Paula Tackett, LCS  
Doug Williams, LCS

**Guests**

The guest list is in the meeting file.

Copies of all handouts and written testimony are in the meeting file.

**Monday, October 19**

**Direct Capital Outlay Appropriations**

Antonio Ortiz, Public Education Department (PED), made a presentation concerning direct legislative appropriations for 2005. The following table sets out the distribution of appropriations by district and type of project.

<b>DISTRICTS</b>	<b>CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS</b>	<b>EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>TOTAL AMOUNT</b>	<b>TOTAL # OF PROJECTS</b>
Alamogordo	\$0	\$0	\$495,000	\$495,000	3
Albuquerque	8,491,068	8,437,519	2,484,714	19,413,301	300
Artesia	0	0	20,000	20,000	1
Aztec	230,000	0	0	230,000	2
Belen	475,000	0	40,000	515,000	5
Bloomfield	340,000	0	0	340,000	1
Capitan	120,000	0	430,000	550,000	11
Carlsbad	185,000	0	110,000	295,000	5
Carrizozo	0	0	100,000	100,000	2
Central	0	70,000	0	70,000	1
Chama	100,000	0	0	100,000	1
Cimarron	290,000	0	0	290,000	2
Cloudcroft	150,000	0	10,000	160,000	3
Dexter	50,000	40,000	75,000	165,000	4
Elida	50,000	0	30,000	80,000	2
Espanola	295,000	130,000	90,000	515,000	7
Eunice	50,000	0	0	50,000	1
Gadsden	325,000	0	520,000	845,000	7
Grants	70,000	0	0	70,000	1
Hagerman	55,000	0	45,000	100,000	4
Hobbs	725,000	0	0	725,000	3
Hondo	0	0	125,000	125,000	2
Jal	75,000	0	0	75,000	1
Jemez Mountain	100,000	0	0	100,000	1
Lake Arthur	100,000	50,000	0	150,000	2
Las Cruces	0	96,146	0	96,146	3
Las Vegas City	0	34,500	245,000	279,500	7
Los Lunas	355,000	0	40,000	395,000	4
Loving	150,000	0	10,000	160,000	4

Lovington	315,000	0	0	315,000	3
Maxwell	80,000	0	45,000	125,000	2
Melrose	90,000	0	0	90,000	1
Mesa Vista	35,000	0	0	35,000	1
Mora	50,000	0	0	50,000	1
Moriarty	80,000	0	0	80,000	1
Other	0	20,000	0	20,000	2
Pecos	0	0	10,000	10,000	1
Penasco	205,000	0	0	205,000	3
Pojoaque	100,000	0	5,000	105,000	2
Portales	219,143	0	0	219,143	3
Quemado	0	0	40,000	40,000	1
Raton	30,000	0	0	30,000	1
Rio Rancho	131,000	200,000	1,995,000	2,326,000	9
Roswell	275,000	330,000	320,000	925,000	21
Ruidoso	30,000	0	60,000	90,000	4
Santa Fe	10,000	0	152,500	162,500	6
Santa Rosa	0	0	90,000	90,000	1
Silver City	80,000	0	0	80,000	1
Springer	0	0	45,000	45,000	1
Tatum	0	65,000	0	65,000	1
Texico	0	0	135,000	135,000	3
Tularosa	200,000	0	0	200,000	1
Wagon Mound	0	0	130,000	130,000	2
West Las Vegas	340,000	52,400	275,000	667,400	10
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$15,051,211</b>	<b>\$9,525,565</b>	<b>\$8,172,214</b>	<b>\$32,748,990</b>	<b>472</b>

There was a request for comparative details regarding direct appropriations by charter school and the percentages of total capital outlay of charter schools. Mr. Ortiz said that he would provide that information to the task force.

Mr. Monfiletto stated that it is difficult for charter schools to secure private funding. Also, it is advantageous for charter schools to occupy public buildings because then it is possible to secure public funding.

Senator Leavell asked for an explanation of the offset. Mr. Ortiz explained that the state/local share formula takes into consideration the school district's (1) membership count, (2) land valuation and (3) mill levy and that the offset reflects the amount of the local share percentage of the appropriation taken off against future Public School Capital Outlay Council (PSCOC) awards.

## Property Valuation

Al Maury and Tim Eichenberg, Taxation and Revenue Department (TRD), made a presentation concerning the "current and correct" statutory requirement for property valuation, explaining how "current and correct" is measured.

The basic property tax calculation is:

- Market Value - Appreciation +/- Appraisal Error = Assessed Value.
- Assessed Value/3 = Taxable Value.
- Taxable Value - Head of Family and Veterans Exemptions = Net Taxable Value.
- Net Taxable Value x Rate = Obligation.
- For the 2004 property tax year, the total state property tax base, rate and obligations were:
  - Assessed Value = \$107.35 billion;
  - Taxable Value = \$35.782 billion;
  - Exemptions = \$872.2 million;
  - Average Statewide Tax Rate = \$26.939/\$1,000; and
  - Total Obligations = \$940.4 million.
- Of the \$940.4 million, obligations were distributed as follows:
  - 32.6 percent counties;
  - 30.5 percent school districts;
  - 14.6 percent municipalities;
  - 9.5 percent higher education;
  - 8.9 percent health facilities;
  - 3.8 percent state debt service; and
  - 0.1 percent conservancy districts.

They explained a shift away from nonresidential rate. The growth trends show eight percent growth in residential property with only five percent growth in nonresidential property. The rationale they suggested is that development is driving this trend by taking vacant land and converting it into residential property.

The distribution of property values and obligations for tax year 2004 are shown in Attachment A.

Senator Altamirano asked about the cycle for property valuation. Mr. Eichenberg stated that some counties are on a one-year cycle and others are on a two-year cycle.

## Adequacy Standards and Related Issues

Bill Sprick, PSFA, made a presentation regarding standards for performing arts centers and gymnasiums and alternative construction materials. He explained that standards for performing arts centers are not required under the current adequacy standards, and PSCOC/PSFA is seeking guidance in this area from the task force. He presented several examples from other states. North Carolina's guidelines for performing arts centers specify

using the largest class size multiplied by eight square feet plus approximately 4,000 square feet for stage, storage and lobby; and for gymnasiums, North Carolina recommends building bleachers sufficient to seat the student body. North Carolina partners with local parks and recreation departments for combined school-community use and sharing of bleacher maintenance costs. Minnesota recommends joint school-community partnerships with respect to construction and operation of bleachers. Staff was directed to obtain copies of joint agreements from other states.

At present, New Mexico standards for gymnasiums call for bleacher capacity equal to the student population times 1.5. The task force discussed the need to look at shared use of space with the community, for example, in many of the rural communities the school space is the only space available that can accommodate the entire community. Representative Williams stressed the need for partnerships with communities in order to maximize the use of such facilities.

Wally Feldman, superintendent of the Zuni Public Schools, discussed the issues related to standards for isolated, rural and very small schools. He indicated that rural schools must provide all the services for the community. He explained that the costs are tremendously affected; he said he added an extra 10 percent contingency amount in addition to a 20 percent contingency amount just to get contractors to come to an isolated area. Then he explained that not only did he have to pay gross receipts taxes to the state, but the tribe imposed a TARO tax that must be paid and, in the case of Zuni, the district must get the approval of the tribe to do anything. The district pays for all infrastructure costs, such as lighting and sidewalks, and performs all environmental assessments and archaeological services as needed. Mr. Feldman said that if New Mexico focuses only on adequacy, then Zuni Public Schools will never be anything more than merely adequate.

It was noted that the equal application of adequacy standards to all schools may not be equitable because of the disparate needs of schools and the fact that costs are different from one region of the state to another.

Mr. Mulcock asked if the adequacy standards require a separate maintenance facility. Mr. Gorrell responded that the adequacy standards set forth the specifications for custodial and storage space but do not require a separate maintenance facility.

In terms of alternative building materials, prefabricated modular buildings were discussed as an option for use in some of the rural areas or in facilities where there is an ability to standardize.

## **Growth and Infrastructure**

Jim Owen, mayor of Rio Rancho, noted that 11,000 people per year are moving to Rio Rancho and the school district is growing at the rate of 16 percent per year. He indicated that a second high school will be required within the next two years and that Rio Rancho is the fastest growing city in the United States.

Mr. Owen said that the Chamber of Commerce has been a facilitator in promoting cooperation among the school district, city, county and businesses. The result has been an integration of city, school and county infrastructure projects and priorities in collaboration with the private sector.

Rio Rancho has a current population between 68,000 and 70,000, with a student population of approximately 12,000.

Barry Bitzer, chief of staff, Office of the Mayor, City of Albuquerque, described the efforts of the city to cooperate with the Albuquerque Public School (APS) district. He stated that Mayor Chavez is dedicated to excellence in education.

Dr. Venegas asked what the mayor's office means by "governance". Mr. Bitzer stated that the election cycle for school board members is out of sync with the general election and as a result most people do not know who their school board members are.

Dr. Venegas said that the APS charter schools seem to be focused on high achievers rather than disadvantaged populations. Mr. Bitzer described the "high tech high" initiative and stated that it is designed to assist all students.

Sandy Fish, Planning Commission for Bernalillo County, stated that the county is now working with APS in the construction of schools in the unincorporated areas of the county. This is a relatively new development because only recently did the county add the capacity to issue construction permits in the unincorporated areas of the county.

Kip Bobroff, professor, UNM School of Law, and a member of Albuquerque Inter-Faith, made a presentation concerning urban sprawl and impact fees. He also discussed the problem of how the current PSCOC process measures and incorporates growth into the rankings for projects. He recommended that the law be amended to (1) exempt school districts from paying impact fees and (2) allow charging developers impact fees when the creation of a new subdivision results in the need for a new school.

Senator Altamirano asked how to distinguish between impact fees for developers and other industries like Intel. Mr. Fish said that there is a formula that looks at services provided. A retail center is subject to certain fees, while residential construction is linked to schools and subject to other impact fees.

In response to a question about what schools are paying in impact fees, Mr. Fish said that there is a formula per student and that typically it results in about \$1 million per school.

Developers currently pay \$2,500 in impact fees per individual residence.

If impact fees are imposed at the state level, it could be done in two possible ways: 1) amend the development fees, whereby it could be left to each municipality or county whether to impose such fees; and 2) impose impact fees on developers promoting subdivisions where there is not sufficient school capacity to support development.

Mr. Valdes suggested that if impact fees are imposed on developers and those fees are passed on to the home buyer, then there could be a negative impact on the creation of affordable housing.

Mr. Bobroff commented on the objections to impact fees, saying that it is not fair to impose them now on the west side of Albuquerque when they were not imposed when APS built La Cueva and Eldorado high schools, and that it would hurt efforts aimed at affordable housing. He stated that most states allow impact fees for schools and, although there was some increase in housing cost, there was a significant increase in profits for land speculation, thus recapturing the value. He contended that the state is building facilities because of the *Zuni* lawsuit, which developers should be paying for. The task force discussed industrial revenue bonds (IRBs) and who should "have a seat at the table".

### **Procurement Alternatives and Other Issues**

Mr. Gorrell indicated that PSFA is attempting to devise ways to speed up the planning, design and construction of projects. He explained that building costs have gone through the roof and, thus, PSFA is exploring alternative building types, such as preengineered structures. In rural areas where there is great need, it would be possible to use more local labor and more preengineered buildings. He also indicated that use of preengineered buildings might provide standardization and cost savings when used in construction of gymnasiums.

He identified the lack of availability of contractors and lack of competitive bids in certain geographic areas of the state as a problem and said that PSFA is considering prequalifying contractors so as to guarantee the availability of contractors. Mr. Suazo asked if prequalifying contractors is compatible with the Procurement Code. Mr. Gorrell responded that there is no conflict with the Procurement Code. Mr. Valdes endorsed the concept of prequalifying contractors.

It was suggested that PSFA meet with the trade associations and bring recommendations to the task force.

When asked if PSFA had explored design-build, Mr. Gorrell said "yes"; however, design-build can be problematic if the school does not have a good management staff to oversee the project.

Senator Leavell suggested that the legislature might revisit the issue of requiring bonds of subcontractors.

## **Recess**

The task force recessed at 4:15 p.m.

## **Tuesday, November 1**

The task force was called to order by Senator Nava on Tuesday, November 1, 2005, at 9:15 a.m. in the Pete McDavid Lounge at UNM in Albuquerque.

## **Roundtable Discussion**

Mr. Guardiola, president, New Mexico School Superintendents Association, Carolyn Franklin, superintendent, Logan Municipal Schools, Al Sena, executive director of facilities, Rio Rancho Public Schools, and Barry Ward, facilities director of Silver Consolidated Schools, provided an update on implementation of the Facilities Information Management System (FIMS). Mr. Guardiola stated that work on implementing the system was slow at first; however, PSFA was very helpful in assisting and educating the maintenance staff. There is a learning curve for the maintenance and custodial staff. The FIMS is very helpful in routine maintenance because the system provides prompts for when fire extinguishers or exit signs needs to be checked. Also, the system has helped identify such things as electricity consumption. This is particularly helpful since everyone uses the gymnasium and the board may decide to assess a small use fee. Ms. Franklin stated that it took three years to correct the 3D/I database for Logan schools. Regarding FIMS, Ms. Franklin noted that she had to provide maintenance information because the maintenance person did not have a computer and did not know how to use one. Logan schools maintenance information is now complete. She indicated that there may be a problem in getting FIMS used in small districts. She said that PED indicated that Logan schools were the cleanest it had been in years. Ms. Franklin indicated she felt that PSFA did not take suggestions from the smaller school districts and that suggestions would be difficult to implement, but that small districts will attempt to comply. She meets with the maintenance person weekly to determine what needs to be done. She indicated that it would help if her district could get assistance with inputting the data.

Mr. Ward stated that the "School Dude" component of FIMS was already being used by Silver before the PSFA adopted it. He said that his maintenance staff is computer illiterate, except for the supervisors; however, the maintenance staff has embraced FIMS. Mr. Ward indicated that FIMS is an excellent tool for maintaining the Silver facilities. The number of phone calls for emergency repairs has declined and more work is being accomplished because the system identifies tasks. Mr. Ward noted that FIMS has helped identify which tasks are truly maintenance and which are actually capital projects. The system also assists in assigning labor and material costs to projects. Prior to FIMS, the school was operating in a reactive mode with respect to maintenance; now the school is much more proactive. FIMS has helped identify which items of equipment should continue to be maintained and which should be scheduled for replacement, e.g., air conditioning equipment. Mr. Ward mentioned one downside of the FIMS utility expense module: Silver was already using a more powerful utility expense software, so inputting the same data into

FIMS is duplicative and not helpful.

Mr. Sena stated that Rio Rancho is already using preventive maintenance software and is just now embarking on implementation of the FIMS "School Dude" module. He noted that there will be a seamless transition from its original software to FIMS. Mr. Sena noted that Rio Rancho is already tracking energy costs, but believes that the FIMS energy cost module will be helpful. The PSFA staff has been very helpful in supporting implementation of FIMS. With respect to updating the 3D/I database, Mr. Sena indicated that he is not clear on whose responsibility it is to maintain it.

Representative Begaye asked about the applicability of FIMS to consolidated school districts. Bob Bittner, PSFA, stated that FIMS is scalable to both large and small districts.

Representative Begaye asked about maintenance problems encountered with the school's 1932 building. Ms. Franklin stated that this building is a gymnasium and is used by both the school and the community. She stated that the intention is to convert the gymnasium to a library. It is structurally sound and was built originally at a cost of \$11,000.

Representative Begaye asked if PSFA permission is needed to perform routine maintenance. Ms. Franklin stated that she does not want to wait for PSFA approval to fix a toilet. Mr. Bittner stated that PSFA does not want to approve or control maintenance activities. Mr. Ward said that the PSFA regional manager requires certain paper work to be filed with PSFA. Mr. Gorrell stated that he will be in touch with Mr. Ward's regional PSFA manager to correct the situation. PSFA is not in the business of approving maintenance work; PSFA is only interested in tracking maintenance activities and gathering data.

Mr. Mulcock asked if PSFA is placing an undue burden on small school districts. Mr. Bittner responded that FIMS is suited to both large and small districts, but he recognizes that in small districts it may be the superintendent or a secretary who inputs work-order information into the system rather than a facilities director, as would be the case in a large district.

How can FIMS be made to work in small districts? There is a fear that this is a first step toward consolidation, and districts have been told they have to get approval to do any maintenance work.

When asked if there is a minimum amount of information required by PSFA, Mr. Bittner stated that there is no minimum information required. Ideally, a district should input information on tasks that take more than one hour to accomplish.

Mr. Haskie said that instituting a systems approach allows all of the staff to "fly like eagles in a straight line" rather than focusing on minutiae. He also said that school districts should work with architects to design buildings that are easier to maintain.

Senator Nava asked if PSFA is examining fundamental issues, such as working with architects in designing energy-efficient, state-of-the-art construction. Mr. Gorrell responded

that PSFA is actively engaged in these planning activities.

Senator Nava noted that the state needs to protect its investment because of the amount of money (\$229 million this year) being spent on construction and maintenance.

In a discussion about expediting projects, some of the issues included how much paperwork is necessary and the time it takes to get inspections.

Senator Leavell stated that he would actively oppose combining small school districts. He requested that a letter of concern be sent from the task force to the Construction Industries Division (CID), outlining the issue of lack of timeliness in accomplishing inspections and inviting CID to attend the next task force meeting.

Senator Altamirano suggested that the problem at CID is a lack of sufficient staff and computers.

It was also suggested that a problem at CID is that all employees are classified and are not paid sufficiently to ensure retention, and that CID employees holding multiple licenses would improve the efficiency of inspections.

Senator Nava requested that staff evaluate the cost of increasing the SB 9 guarantee to \$80.00.

### **Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Bonding**

Harold Trujillo and Susie Marbury of the Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department (EMNRD) made a presentation concerning "green buildings".

- A "green building" is a high-performance building, involving site selection, water, energy, atmosphere, materials and indoor environment considerations.
- Characteristics of high-performance school buildings include: (1) daylighting and connection to the outdoors; (2) a tight building envelope; (3) efficient heating, ventilating and air conditioning; and (4) individual control of the environment.
- High-performance buildings are good for students because they improve learning, save money on utilities and improve teacher productivity.
- The cost of high-performance buildings is typically two percent higher than conventional construction. This cost is recovered in the first few years of the life of the building.

Mr. Haskie asked about candlepower. He said that the federal government mandates 55 candlepower for the Navajo. Mr. Trujillo cited a minimum standard of 50 candlepower.

Senator Leavell asked about systems that serve to backup solar energy. Mr. Trujillo responded that solar energy systems are presently intended to support one classroom and assist with heating water. Senator Leavell suggested that if solar energy systems are going to be installed, they should be meaningful.

Mr. Guardiola noted that Vermont has sophisticated biomass energy systems.

Mr. Suazo asked about wind turbine applications in schools. Mr. Trujillo indicated that there are several geothermal applications currently in schools and that EMNRD is investigating the use of small wind turbines in schools.

Mr. Haskie asked if EMNRD can subsidize any PSFA projects. Mr. Trujillo stated that EMNRD would like to use its funding to supplement, not supplant, PSCOC funding. EMNRD makes energy conservation grants to schools in cooperation with PSFA.

### **PSCOC Report**

Tim Berry, PSFA, and Linda Kehoe, LFC, made a presentation concerning the status of PSCOC awards and the deficiencies correction program (see handouts).

Mr. Berry noted that approximately \$1.8 million in surplus SB 9 funds have been identified by school districts, which will be applied to roof deficiency correction.

Ms. Kehoe stated that the latest revenue forecast indicates that approximately \$198 million will be available for senior severance tax bonds in 2006. The amount available for supplemental severance tax bonds is approximately \$160.3 million.

Mr. Mulcock requested that the lease payment assistance presentation compare current year to prior year in terms of square footage being leased and the cost of the lease.

Representative Williams asked if the recent hurricanes are driving up costs in New Mexico. Mr. Gorrell noted that one current roof repair estimate has just doubled.

### **Charter School Advisory Committee Report**

Alan Armijo provided an update on the activities of the Charter School Advisory Committee. Key points discussed by the committee were:

- Santa Fe County's issuance of industrial revenue bonds for the Academy for Technology and the Classics;
- establishment of a process to locate charter schools in public facilities by 2010;
- inclusion of charter schools in a school district's master plan;
- the New Mexico Facilities Condition Index as it applies to charter schools;
- representation of charter schools on school district planning committees;
- proration of FY 2006 lease payment assistance; and
- creation of a state loan fund to finance charter school projects.

Mr. Monfiletto noted that there is a serious question about strategies needed to move charter schools into public space.

Dr. Rindone indicated that the LESC has been examining the issue of moving charter schools into public facilities.

## **Adjournment**

The task force adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

## Attachment A

### New Mexico Property Tax Values and Obligations by County: Tax Year 2004 (\$ in millions)

County	..... Net Taxable Values .....				..... Obligations .....			
	Residential	Non-Residential	Other	Total	Residential 1	Non-Residential	Other	Total
Bernalillo	7,266,947.6	2,825,013.0	0.0	10,091,960.6	260,812.1	120,733.3	0.0	381,545.4
Catron	27,248.6	47,279.9	0.0	74,528.5	417.8	566.6	0.0	984.4
Chaves	331,805.7	294,467.6	93,834.4	720,107.7	8,388.6	7,996.6	2,091.9	18,477.1
Cibola	85,501.8	133,619.0	0.0	219,120.7	2,212.7	4,163.7	0.0	6,376.4
Colfax	249,450.7	150,186.9	39,802.3	439,440.0	3,988.6	3,088.0	762.2	7,838.8
Curry	238,555.2	188,853.5	0.0	427,408.7	5,903.5	4,399.5	0.0	10,302.9
DeBaca	8,724.0	27,347.6	0.0	36,071.6	240.6	732.7	0.0	973.3
Dona Ana	1,428,829.1	824,663.5	0.0	2,253,492.7	36,101.3	25,515.1	0.0	61,616.4
Eddy	299,066.1	434,034.4	1,233,590.6	1,966,691.1	5,871.9	8,529.4	21,972.1	36,373.5
Grant	256,532.4	170,688.8	65,157.3	492,378.5	3,724.6	3,568.7	1,363.3	8,656.6
Guadalupe	22,557.7	68,794.5	0.0	91,352.2	597.3	2,156.9	0.0	2,754.2
Harding	3,469.1	14,857.4	8,313.4	26,639.9	73.0	354.1	198.0	625.1
Hidalgo	17,028.3	103,858.4	0.0	120,886.6	342.7	2,098.2	0.0	2,440.9
Lea	233,518.4	328,616.4	1,133,639.6	1,695,774.4	6,272.8	8,996.2	28,654.3	43,923.3
Lincoln	437,133.7	178,169.5	0.0	615,303.2	8,755.4	4,512.4	0.0	13,267.8
Los Alamos	520,368.1	89,700.7	0.0	610,068.7	8,785.4	1,753.9	0.0	10,539.3
Luna	140,214.4	147,167.7	0.0	287,382.0	2,596.6	3,224.5	0.0	5,821.1
McKinley	198,732.3	358,511.2	381.3	557,624.8	5,985.9	12,636.6	12.2	18,634.7
Mora	40,131.3	27,062.9	0.0	67,194.2	702.5	681.8	0.0	1,384.3
Otero	426,009.7	203,955.4	0.0	629,965.1	10,220.2	5,924.6	0.0	16,144.8
Quay	44,358.8	67,550.9	1,262.5	113,172.1	931.9	1,809.3	28.8	2,770.1
Rio Arriba	303,251.0	274,742.9	799,260.2	1,377,254.0	5,366.7	5,844.0	17,663.1	28,873.7
Roosevelt	91,735.1	115,182.3	9,406.1	216,323.5	1,755.2	2,300.0	161.8	4,217.0
San Juan	688,355.2	1,285,536.7	1,279,494.7	3,253,386.7	14,939.1	30,618.3	27,170.3	72,727.7
San Miguel	242,753.2	127,219.3	0.0	369,972.5	5,432.0	3,953.6	0.0	9,385.5
Sandoval	1,220,143.9	364,789.6	3,896.2	1,588,829.7	31,107.6	10,449.9	95.9	41,653.4
Santa Fe	3,228,093.5	1,146,501.2	0.0	4,374,594.7	56,088.3	27,723.5	0.0	83,811.8
Sierra	116,562.3	75,677.6	0.0	192,239.9	2,371.6	1,825.3	0.0	4,196.8
Socorro	93,885.0	69,077.6	0.0	162,962.6	2,435.7	2,111.5	0.0	4,547.1
Taos	470,340.9	264,820.2	0.0	735,161.1	6,228.4	5,301.4	0.0	11,529.8
Torrance	105,175.3	125,653.9	0.0	230,829.2	2,604.1	3,118.5	0.0	5,722.6
Union	23,786.2	65,229.8	9,009.7	98,025.7	492.2	1,466.0	178.0	2,136.2
Valencia	535,657.5	235,626.1	0.0	771,283.6	12,875.7	7,258.9	0.0	20,134.7
<b>Totals</b>	<b>19,395,922.0</b>	<b>10,834,456.4</b>	<b>4,677,048.4</b>	<b>34,907,426.8</b>	<b>514,621.7</b>	<b>325,413.1</b>	<b>100,351.7</b>	<b>940,386.5</b>