

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

January 28, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:35 pm by Chairperson Ken Sheldon.

Members Present: Ken Sheldon, Jeff Mason, Kevin Tone and Cathy Proenza

Guests: Vija Handley

Staff: Pete Salas

Minutes: Ken moved to approve the November 19, 2015 minutes; Jeff seconded the motion and the motion passed with all in favor.

Plant Operations:

- a) Ramey monthly report – The group reviewed the monthly report. Kevin brought up the flow and load data and noted that there were a few spikes in the load which could be a concern if it should remain high over a long period. Kevin suggested that Ramey be asked what he thinks might be the reason for the fluctuation in load numbers. Kevin mentioned that they need to consider possibility that someone or a business is contributing to the spikes by perhaps putting fertilizer or other chemicals in the system. It was noted that there were no items of major concern regarding the activities of the plant.
- b) Invoices – The group reviewed the invoices and Pete noted that the regular monthly invoice for January plant operations invoice was not included because he had not yet received it. There was a brief discussion regarding the pump repair invoices with Pete mentioning that the larger amounts were for the pumps that Ambient had rebuilt and that those two rebuilt pumps came with one year warrantee.

Pete referred the group to a packet of invoices which were all the invoices which were processed since the November meeting. Pete mentioned that these invoice were in line with the current budget spreadsheet. Kathy asked whether the invoices were the total packet of invoices corresponding to the sewer line break. Pete said that some of them were but that the adjusted sewer line break invoice he had previously emailed was not included. Pete said that he had to have these invoices processed due to the fiscal year ending that they needed to be processed prior to the end of the fiscal year.

Kathy indicated that she understood that they had been paid but that she was interested in the bottom line regarding what the break expenses were. Pete indicated that the costs had not been divided out but that if you consider all the costs of repairs and time it could be calculated. It was noted that the following sheet contained the costs associated with the

break and the cost was calculated at \$12,984. Pete indicated that he provided the invoices so that the group would have them for their records and as the background data for reviewing the budget spreadsheet. Pete referenced the budget invoice and that the invoices provided were only the Ramey invoices and did not include SDSM, Xcel, McDonald Farms etc. Pete indicated that the 2015 expenses for the year were \$104,000.

Ken asked about the meeting with Wayne which resulted in a negotiated savings of approximately \$2,500. Ken thanked Kevin and Jeff for meeting with Wayne Ramey and asked what they thought the takeaway's from the meeting were. Kevin indicated that he thought the meeting went and that he also thought that they offended Wayne a little bit when they discussed all the charges. Kevin said that in the end Wayne felt justified with his actions given the information he had available and indicated that there was all around frustration regarding the level of information at hand. Kathy expressed a lingering degree of frustration regarding the event and apparent lack of responsibility on Wayne's part.

Pete indicated that he believes that the key takeaways from the incident and meeting with Wayne would be in the lessons learned for operations going forward. It was generally agreed that this is the case especially going forward with the development of protocol and standard operating practices.

- c) It was generally agreed that Ambient should handle the E-One pump repairs for the District.

Budget Review: Group moved on to the budget sheet with Pete indicating that the 2016 budget for the LID has been set at \$85,000. Kevin asked whether the 2015 budget could be included in the spreadsheet to compare the previous year's budget to the previous year's budget. Kevin expressed concerns relative to the amount of money spent on pump repairs during the year. The group then reviewed the equipment repair and maintenance spreadsheet that Wayne had previously provided. There was a brief discussion regarding the timelines for equipment replacements and that it appeared that the costs were being incurred sooner than anticipated.

Ken asked about the process for procuring the rebuilt pumps from Ambient. Pete explained that he had contacted Steve Hansen and discussed the issue of E-One pump repairs and as a result agreed to purchase the two rebuilt pumps. He also explained that Steve had agreed to let the District continue to use the 2 loaner pumps that are currently in the ground, until the financial situation could be reviewed and some decisions made going forward. There was a brief discussion regarding having Ambient do the pump repairs and that it seemed like having Ambient handle the repairs was a prudent decision.

Pete brought the group back to the budget spreadsheet and briefly discussed the increase in the budget revenue line. It was generally agreed that the budget as presented made sense with the recognition that the District was short on reserves and below the threshold that the group had set at the end of the year.

Staff Updates:

- a) Extension Line Project – Pete mentioned that Bart Fischer had completed the work and had supplied photos of the work that was done. Kevin mentioned that he had been down to the site and indicated that the site could use a little sprucing up. Kevin also discussed work that had been done with the tanks and that it appeared to be sufficient. It was noted that it appeared that the unexpended funds would be applied to the costs associated with the line break. Pete mentioned that he had included that unexpended project grant funds would be applied to the line break expenses and had not heard that it was not to be done.

New Business:

- a) 2016 Work Plan – Pete presented the Work Plan that he had developed for 2016. Pete asked the group to review the plan and feel free to provide suggestions or additions to the plan. Pete said that he would also provide the plan in a matrix format to utilize it as check-off spreadsheet. Pete explained the plan and the overlap that was built into the plan to help inform the other activities such as the RFP process.

Pete referred the group to the first item which he considered the first priority which is the discussion on a potential rate increase. Pete discussed the need due to the level of reserves falling far below the pre-determined threshold. Pete referenced the rate scenarios as a logical place to start. Kevin expressed a thought that in considering the rate scenarios, the group should also consider that though the estimated fund balance was approximately \$5,500 additional revenues would be realized due to the grant fund reimbursement and there might be other possible revenue sources. The question was raised regarding possible PIF's and the Griffith property was mentioned. Pete indicated it appeared that the Griffith project was stalled and he had not heard of anything as it relates to that effort. Pete also said that he had heard from a realtor regarding an undeveloped lot and sewer costs associated with construction but had no information beyond that.

Pete mentioned that there were a few other factors that needed to be considered. Pete brought up the issue as it relates to the expiration of REC's contract and possible costs associated with development of a new RFP new contract. Pete reviewed what he considers are options relative to a new contract as it relates to the RFP process.

Pete mentioned three options including; splitting the contract into a plant operation contract and a system maintenance contract, having a combination contract or having a single contract like currently in place. Pete also expressed a belief that regardless, costs would increase. Kevin indicated that he thought there is a possibility that a cheaper contract could be procured due to what he sees as the completion in the market place. Kevin said he thought that by breaking up the contract into plant operation and system maintenance contracts there could be a possible saving.

Jeff expressed a feeling that having experience with the plant operation over the years will help inform the group and provide for a better RFP development. Jeff indicated that he was in agreement with Kevin in terms of having two separate contracts.

Pete brought the groups attention to the timeline and key decision points in the timeline process. Pete indicated that he had built in sufficient time for the process given all the activities that needed to take place. Pete again requested that the group review the process and make sure they are comfortable with it so that the process could be complete by October.

Pete then went over the other priorities and when that they would help inform the rest of the process. Jeff mentioned the need to have the communication piece in place. Pete indicated that it was folded into the process and that's where the overlap informing the other priorities would occur. Cathy asked about who would be on a proposal review committee as suggested in the process. Pete explained that there were several options including having a sub-committee which might include outside experts to be responsible for the work involved such as the county purchasing agent.

Pete then noted the last item on the list as it relates to the system maintenance issues and that there appeared to be a consensus relative to having Ambient do the pump repair work. There was a brief discussion regarding this issue and how it would inform the RFP process and provide a greater degree of diligence to collection issues.

Pete brought the group back to the rate discussion priority and the timeline and his thoughts on how the public process would work. Kevin mentioned that the March 24th meeting falls during Spring break and that he and Jeff would probably not be available for that date. Pete indicated that the last item on the agenda relates to a review of the meeting dates.

Pete mentioned that he thought that if a rate increase is recommended it should take effect as of April 1st. Pete indicated that as it relates to informing the public, as long as during the process resident were informed, a decision could be made in March and go to the Commissioners during the first week in April with the effective date on April 1st.

Old Business:

- a) Meeting dates - The group then reviewed the calendar and possible dates explored. It was decided to move the March date from the 24th to the 17th. Pete asked the group to consider possible changes. It was suggested that perhaps the monthly meeting be moved to the 3rd Thursday of the month.
- b) Advisory Committee Recruitment – Pete mentioned that the recruitment process deadline is February 12th and that he had sent out a notice to residents informing them of the recruitment. It was suggested that perhaps the group be expanded to include anyone who might be interested. The question was asked as to whether they could have more than 5 members. Pete referenced the By-laws which indicated that there could only be 5 members of the group.

Other Business:

- a) Destroyed Control Panel – Pete brought up issue regarding control panel that was destroyed during the flood incident and the belief that Marion Zimmerman was responsible for the destruction. Pete distributed the letter that he had drafted and asked the group to review and offer up any suggested changes. There was a question regarding the costs associated with repair including an amount for labor. There was a brief discussion regarding the process and the need to take a soft approach in attempting to collect the costs.

Cathy mentioned the other issue regarding access to the plant property by community members. This was a result of neighbors observing Marion Zimmerman trespassing on the property on a regular basis. There was a brief discussion regarding what the group might do as it relates to people accessing the plant property as a walking/hiking access point. It was generally agreed that a sign indicating “service vehicles only”. It was also suggested that it be placed in a location where it is easily seen and anchored in a very sturdy manner.

- b) Other Items - Vija Handley commented that the informational flyer for the plant was nicely done and much appreciated. Pete indicated that it would go out on a regular basis. There was a question regarding who the mailer was sent to. Pete indicated that the mailer was sent to the service address listed in the billing spreadsheet.

Jeff mentioned that he had noticed that there appeared to be some construction occurring at a property near his resident and wanted to know if Pete had any knowledge of it. Pete said he had not been informed by Land Use of any construction work.

Public Comment: There was no public comment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

February 25, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:35 pm by Chairperson Ken Sheldon.

Members Present: Ken Sheldon, Jeff Mason and Kevin Tone

Guests: Vija Handley

Staff: Pete Salas

Minutes: Ken moved to approve the January 28, 2016 minutes; Jeff seconded the motion. Jeff mentioned that in the last paragraph, last sentence, that instead of the wording “Pete said that he had been informed” should read “he had not been informed”. The correction is noted and the minutes will reflect the change. The motion then passed with all in favor.

Plant Operations:

- a) Ramey monthly report – The group reviewed the monthly report with Kevin noting a pump replacement at 161 Artesian Dr. and asked what had occurred and the status of those pumps. Pete mentioned that those pumps were sent to Ambient for repairs along with the pumps that Ramey ESD had indicated were unrepairable. Pete referred the group to the invoice information provided. Pete noted that the report appeared to be rather routine in nature. Kevin noted that the discharge report looked good with the discharges appearing to be very normal. There was a brief discussion regarding the data presented and agreement that it looked good. Ken asked whether there could be an additional column added by which a comparison could be made for further clarification. Kevin agreed to contact Ramey staff to discuss placing the permitted amount on the spreadsheet which would show what the target range would be. Kevin provided a brief explanation of the verbiage used in the permitting and the Ramey report.
- b) Invoices – Kevin asked about the \$1,400 charge from Ramey regarding an annual insurance charge. Pete indicated that it was an annual charge that had been negotiated at the beginning of the Ramey contract and that this was an area that would be reviewed when the next plant RFP is developed. Pete reviewed the invoice, the various categories and related charges in relation to the budgeted amounts in the budget spreadsheet. Pete also mentioned the amounts that were going to be submitted to CDPHE for reimbursement. Pete noted that the state grants person had changed and that he would bring up the issue of whether there might be some additional grant funds available to apply to other line break costs. Pete indicated that the reimbursement funds were shown on the budget spreadsheet in a notation and the excess amount is noted in the rate scenario spreadsheets. There was a question regarding where the excess funds \$4,119

would be included in the reserve fund amount shown in the rate scenario spreadsheet. The group segued into a discussion of the budget as it related to the reimbursement funds. Kevin asked whether there are other line break expense bills that could be submitted to the state in the event there are additional state grant funds available. Pete stated that there are line break pump repair expenses that could be submitted.

Budget Review: The group segued into a discussion of the budget as it related to the reimbursement funds. Pete indicated that per Kevin's request in January, he had included a column with 2015 budget amounts for use in comparing with the 2015 expenses to the budgeted amounts. Jeff noted that there appeared to be a 3rd page with listing of invoices. Pete said that it had previously appeared on previous spreadsheets as a tab at the bottom of the page. Pete reviewed the various budgeted and expense amounts. There was a brief discussion by the members on the various categories and the minor fluctuations.

The group then engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the Capital Equipment Replacement spreadsheet. Kevin suggested that it was time to update the CER spreadsheet and see about getting some explanations from Wayne regarding the equipment maintenance. There was some concern that some of this maintenance charges should be part of the operator's contract and not additional expenses. There was a question regarding whether the plant operation maintenance expenses was consistent with the spreadsheet. It was generally agreed that there is a need to have it updated to reflect equipment replacements since the initial spreadsheet was developed in 2014.

Staff Updates:

- a) 2016 Work Plan – Pete brought up the Work Plan that had distributed at the January meeting and mentioned that he provided a matrix of the plan and expressed a hope that the group had taken another look at it. Pete went over the plan again and reiterated the various components and action items related to the steps in the plan. It was noted that the March 24th date had been changed to reflect the change of date to March 17th. Pete indicated that because of the date change, it would be possible for the Commissioners to adopt any rate increase prior to the effective date of April 1, rather than the April 5th date on the original Work Plan.

Pete went over the process and that on March 17th LID meeting there could be a public hearing as was done the last time the group discussed the rate topic. Pete also indicated that there would be another opportunity for public input at the time the Commissioners would consider a recommended rate increase provided, the group decided to move in that direction.

After some additional discussion Pete suggested that since there was a quorum present, it would be appropriate for a motion regarding the groups desire to move forward with a rate increase. Kevin reluctantly moved to continue with a rate increase as spelled out in the Work Plan and the timing associated with it. Jeff seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

Kevin suggested that it would be helpful for a notation to be made in talking points that indicates that the Advisory Committee had set a threshold amount of \$15,000 for the reserve fund and that the fund was now depleted below the agreed upon threshold. The point expressed was that the reserve might no longer withstand additional unanticipated system events and that this point needed to be made to the LID members during the discussion regarding the amount of the increase.

Ken then asked for a straw poll of the group to determine what the current thoughts are regarding what a realistic rate increase might look like. Ken expressed a desire to have a modest increase and still try to keep expenses as low as is feasible by continuing to look at ways to save money wherever possible.

Pete offered a couple of options in terms of how to proceed with a rate increase in terms of how to structure it. Pete indicated that the group could have phased in increases over a span of years or one larger increase with the expectation that it would suffice for a reasonable period. It was the general consensus of the group that a single increase to cover expenses for the foreseeable future would be best. Kevin indicated that the group needed to be good stewards for the community, yet acknowledge the insufficiencies in the budget which require a rate increase and not build a coffer without justification. Kevin indicated that he felt they should start at 10% and go from there. Jeff and Ken were in general agreement that 10% was a reasonable increase to start.

Pete said that he would in the next week send out a notice to the community informing them what had been decided and what the process would consist of regarding public participation.

Old Business:

Work Plan – Pete urged the group to take another look at the work plan so that at the April meeting the group could begin working on the RFP process in hopes that the work could be completed by the October meeting. Kevin agreed to provide an RFP example that the group could use as a starting point. There was a brief discussion regarding the need to consider changes based on the District expenses and what other districts are doing.

New Business:

Removed Property from the District - Kevin requested the committee to consider removing a lot from a buildable lot should also remove the debt service as a buildable lot. Kevin indicated that he purchased the lot next to his and it is no longer a separate buildable lot. Kevin expressed a feeling that since the lot technically exists, that it should no longer have a tax burden. The consensus of the group is that this is a question that should be pursued in the event that it happens in the future. Pete indicated he would look into the question with the legal staff and get back to the group.

Public Comment: Vija Handley said that there was a flashing red light at Betty Logan's house. Ken requested that Pete call David Levin to check and see if there is an issue with the lift station at that property. Pete said he would call David in the morning. Vija also brought up a question regarding transfer of development rights on a legal building lot and what would happen in terms of taxes. There was a brief discussion regarding the topic and it was suggested that maybe it be looked into but no formal actions or recommendations were made in this regard.

Vija brought up the issue of 104 Fowler Lane a property that was purchased at a tax sale and is being billed by the current owner as a buildable lot. Pete mentioned that the Land Use department had indicated that this lot was not in the District. Vija expressed concern whether this was a buildable lot and in her opinion it was not a buildable lot. Pete explained that a realtor had contacted him several weeks prior and wanted to know what costs would be associated with building a house on the property. Pete said that if the property was not in the District, the Commissioners approval would be needed for that to occur.

There was a brief discussion regarding the intent of setting the original district boundaries and the debate that ensued when the issue was discussed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

March 17, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:43 pm by Jeff Mason.

Members Present: Jeff Mason, Cathy Proenza and Kevin Tone

Guests: Vija Handley, Sara Distin and friend??

Staff: Pete Salas & Mark Ruzzin

Public Hearing: Kevin asked Sara & her partner if there was anything in particular they were interested in discussing. Sara indicated that they just wanted to know more about what was going on with the system. Kevin said that his was partly the purpose of the meeting, more specifically to discuss the issue of when things go wrong there is a cost involved that caused our reserve to diminish. Kevin said indicated that there was a need to make sure the District has sufficient reserve to handle emergencies. Kevin also mentioned that service contracts for the District would be coming up this year. Jeff added that another objective of the Committee going forward would be to improve communications to the community.

It was mentioned that experience with the plant would help inform the process for the upcoming request for proposals related to plant management. Pete explained the consideration involved in the RFP process and potential for cost increases due to new contracts being entered into. There was a question regarding how the current reserve funds were attained. Pete explained the process relative to plant investment fees and there was a small reserve in place that came in as a result of new residential construction

Interim: Kevin asked about the situation regarding the recruitment for a new LID member. Pete explained that the Board was a little behind in the process and that a new member might be selected in the next few weeks.

It was decided that while waiting for Cathy and a quorum, the group would move on to the Plant Operation portion of the agenda

Plant Operations:

- a) Ramey monthly report – Pete reported that there did not appear to be any out of the ordinary activities that occurred at the plant during the last reporting period. There was a brief discussion of the costs associated with the contractual operations of the plant. Pete explained the nuances of the contract and costs that are passed on under the contractual agreement. Jeff noted that there had been a sludge haul during the last reporting period and asked whether there had been any complaints about the trees along the plant road.

Pete asked Kevin whether there were areas in the plant flow data that the group needed to be concerned about. Kevin indicated that with the exception of the “loads” data things seemed to be within acceptable parameters. Asked about the variations in the “load” data and reasons for the differences between measurement collection points.

(At this point, Cathy arrived at the meeting and introduced herself.)

It was suggested that perhaps we ask Wayne to explain why the variances existed relative to the permit requirements. Kevin indicated that he had intended to talk to Wayne about this issue but that Wayne had recently undergone surgery and he had not had a chance to discuss it with him. Cathy asked for some clarification regard some of the data. There was additional discussion regarding the flow data and the amount of water flowing in South Boulder Creek. Kevin provided additional information regarding the amount of flow required for adequate discharge of effluent.

- b) Invoices – Pete referred the group to the invoices for review. It did not appear that there were any great variances from the previous month and things seemed to be normal.

Minutes: Though there was now a quorum, since Cathy had not been at the last meeting, she could not vote to approve the minutes and so, official approve would need to wait until the April meeting.

Public Hearing: Jeff offered a brief explanation of the decision making process as well as, the public participation involved with the process. Jeff mentioned that the LIDAC would be reviewing the information before them and then make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. Pete provided additional background information regarding what had previously occurred. At a request from Jeff, Pete reiterated that the Board would be considering any recommendation on March 29th at 10:00 am. and that there would an additional opportunity to weigh-in prior to Board consideration on March 29th.

The discussion was opened to those in attendance. Vija asked for some clarification regarding the reserve fund and the desired amount for the fund. Jeff responded that the amount discussed was \$15,000 which is a percentage of the operating budget of around 20 percent. Kevin stated that there is a desire for some funds to be set aside in anticipation of equipment replacement and repairs in the future.

Vija suggested that it appeared that an increase of 15 percent seemed to be a good target. Kevin mentioned that there currently are some funds in reserve and that the group had previously discussed an increase of 10 percent might be feasible. Jeff explained that the reserve fund comes primarily from growth in the community and this notion runs somewhat counter to the prevailing attitudes of residents. There were several comments regarding what any development might look like. Pete provided a brief explanation regarding the development process in consideration of accommodating any new growth. Pete also mentioned the initial intent of how the plant was designed relative to its flow capacity and that growth issues were considered as part of those

early discussions. Jeff mentioned a previously discussed proposal to create a climbers lodge as an example.

Jeff brought up the notion to raise the rates by 10 percent as a starting point for the discussion. Pete reviewed the scenarios in terms of what the additional revenue might provide to the budget. Mark called provided some additional comments regarding the budget. There was question regarding what is meant by “EQR”. Jeff provided a brief explanation that the EQR stands for the equivalency rate which is a measurement that refers to the numbers of bedrooms and bathrooms in a resident and the flow generated by the household. A few examples were provided to illustrate the amount generated by the EQR.

Cathy mentioned that 10 percent might not be sufficient in terms of having another increase in a shorter amount of time. Cathy suggested that 10 percent might be cutting it a little close and that it didn’t feel as comfortable as she would like and that 15 percent might be more appropriate. Jeff also expressed a concern that 10 percent might not be enough going forward. Kevin indicated that he could not support an amount higher than 10 percent and it was his desire to keep things as reasonable as possible for the ratepayers in the community. Kevin said he feels that the current rates weren’t very equitable relative to other communities and if the LIDAC needed to come in for another increase, than that is what should occur.

Pete and Mark provided some input regarding steps that have been put in place over the last 2 years in terms of how the staff might address and future considerations by the group should another rate increase need be.

Jeff expressed the thought that the information had been laid out and suggested that it might be time to make a recommendation and let the Board decide. Mark recommended that the group make a formal motion regarding a rate increase amount for the record. Jeff made a motion that the group recommend a 10 percent rate increase to the Commissioners and all voted in favor.

Other Business: Pete provided a brief overview of the budget from the perspective that things seemed to be tracking as budgeted. Pete then reviewed what the group might expect in terms of the April meeting as well as, the groups work plan. Pete requested that the group take another look at the work plan and consider how we might proceed. Jeff asked about where the work plan was in terms of the communication issues that needed to be addressed.

Kevin asked about what determination was made regarding his issue of merging his lot to an adjacent lot. Pete explained that he had found a provision in one county resolution 2007-135 which appeared to resolve the issue by providing that the resident appeal to the Board when Land Use has determined that the land has been merged. Pete said he would sent the resolutions to Kevin

New Business: Mark brought up the issue of a construction loan balance that the LID owed to the County General Fund and explained the details regarding the loan. Mark explained in 2005 and 2009 the County loaned the district monies and that \$254,000 remained on the books which needed to be reconciled. Pete provided a little background on what had occurred during

construction which necessitated the infusion of General Fund monies. Mark explained that both he and Pete were only just informed about the loan and the issue had been discussed with the Board. The Board indicated that a loan forgiveness might be in order. Mark indicated that there was a need to have further discussions with the Board to resolve the issue. Kevin expressed concern about the costs information that was provided when the construction discussions were occurring and that this information involving the loans indicated the plant cost more than he had thought. There was some additional discussion with Pete providing a little more background which he gleaned from the records.

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 7:47 pm

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

April 28 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:35.

Members Present: Jeff Mason, Vija Handley, Ken Sheldon and Kevin Tone (Called in)

Guests:

Staff: Pete Salas

Minutes: Ken moved to approve the minutes of February 24, 2016 & March 17, 2016, Vija seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.

Plant Operations:

- a) Ramey monthly report – Pete reported that things appeared to be rather normal with no outstanding events or issues occurring during the month. There was a very brief discussion relative to a power outage that was noted in the Ramey monthly report. Pete noted that there was a charge in invoice that appeared to be associated with the outage. Kevin noted that the plant appeared to do well during the month with good treatment occurring. Kevin suggested that perhaps Wayne be asked about the wide swings in BOD loading at the plant from month to month.
- b) Invoices – Pete referred the group to the invoices for review. Pete mentioned that the packet included an invoice for a pump repair that had occurred in February prior to switching over to Ambient H2O for pump repair service. Pete also mentioned that a few days before the meeting he had Ambient pick up another pump for repair in addition to an invoice for chemical purchases. It did not appear that there were any great variances from the previous month and things seemed to be normal.

Budget Review:

Pete referred the group to the budget sheet and reviewed the changes since the previous month. Pete noted that the year-to-date capital expenses with largest expense on the current spreadsheet was relative to the charge from Fischer Construction for the work at the outfall. There was a question regarding the timing of the reimbursement. Pete reported that he had been informed that the documentation had been sent up to the billing office for processing. Pete indicated that the only possible hang up might be with regard to the desire of the State to have us provide pictures of the work in progress. Pete mentioned that problem centered on Bart Fischer's crew having some technical problems in downloading pictures from his phone, pictures that were taken during the trenching process. Pete indicted that Bart was intending to try to resolve the issue and

send Pete some pictures in the next day or two. In the meantime, Pete said he was going to call his contact at the State and explain the situation to see if before and after pictures would suffice. Kevin indicated that he thought that that was a good approach.

Pete also mentioned that he had asked about any additional available grant funds that could be applied to the line-break which the group had suggested we explore. Pete said that he was told that any funds that might be available would need to be for work not yet completed. Kevin mentioned that there are two other things that could be done including repair or replacement of the defective vault valve as well as, looking at having Fischer dig up the location of the 2014 leak to ensure that it was properly insulated. There was a brief discussion regarding the previous leaks and whether the repairs were sufficient to ensure potential future leaks. Ken took this opportunity to give Vija some background regarding the State grant funds that were secured to repair the discharge line as well as, for work that had been done to repair the line break which occurred in September. Pete explained how the funds would be used.

Pete continued explaining the budget and what would be occurring with regard to the reserve fund as it relates to the reimbursement from the State and how the fund would come into play if there were a shortfall at the end of the year. Kevin asked whether Pete was aware of any additional capital expenses or pump repair work that may be forthcoming from Ramey Environmental. Pete indicated that there should be no addition billing from Ramey in this regard but there was a pump under repair at Ambient.

Kevin asked about the number of pumps that were on the shelf. Pete indicated that he thought there were at least 2 pumps on the shelf but that he would get with Wayne on exactly how many spare pumps are available. Pete reminded the group that there are 2 pumps in use that are loaners from Ambient and that at some point will need to be returned or purchased. Kevin then suggested that perhaps since some pumps were damaged during the September line incident, that if there are additional unexpended flood related grant monies, we might include the repair of the pumps as part of a request for addition reimbursement from the State. Pete said that it certainly would not hurt to ask the question.

Pete suggested that regardless, there was a need to be somewhat judicious regarding the use of reserve fund and perhaps wait until later in the year to see how the budget looks later in the year. Jeff asked about the invoice spreadsheet and had a question regarding an invoice from Wayne for the February charge which appeared to be twice as much as previous months. Pete explained that the February amount was due to delay in processing and that the February amount included the charge for the annual insurance charge which explained why the charge was higher than normal.

Pete concluded by reviewing the chemical charges and mentioned that things seemed to be tracking well and hope that there are no significant charges forthcoming.

Eldorado Springs Pool:

Pete noted that it was now after 7:00 pm and Doug Larson was not yet present as it relates to the pump issue at the pool. It was mentioned that Kevin would need to leave the meeting and his

input was needed. Pete Kevin expressed a concern with the idea that they would give Doug more ability to would send more, clean, basically spring overflow water into the system and surcharge the treatment plant. Ken agreed that there should be a basis to do this and the charge the entire community. The concern expressed by Ken and Kevin was about having a policy of opening up the line bigger and sending more water down the line and then having to treat it. Ken expressed a concern that there needed to be equity in how users are charged and verifying the amount of water going into the system. Is Doug planning to put more water than what was originally allowed to do.

Ken then referenced pages from the Frchetti/Aquaworks Utility Plan for the plant that Pete sent which contained the formula for determining the anticipated flow into the system including, the calculations for the Eldorado Springs pool. Jeff asked the question, are we going to do what was proposed for the Café and have Doug to put in a flow meter? A concern expressed was regarding whether the group could now have the pool put in a flow meter since their apportionment had already been set. It was mentioned that a policy had since been established when the Aquanaut Restaurant presented their idea for opening the restaurant and the impacts to the system.

There was a discussion regarding the original calculation for how much water was to be allowed to be put into the system. Pete cited the Frchetti/Aquaworks Plan during the discussion. The question for Doug should be whether the anticipated flow created by a larger pump would be changing the assumption in the treatment plant engineering plan. If so, if there is additional flow than originally planned for, does this constitute a change of use which would now fall into the amended rules and regulations and require a new fee. The follow-up question is whether putting additional clean water into the system is a good use of the system.

Pete mentioned that Steve Hansen had suggested that Doug should talk to Bob Frchetti and get some answers from him. Pete also said why they made a decision to use one pump instead of two and that the rationale was given for doing so. Vija questioned why had this now come up in the last year and why this wasn't this issue before. Pete indicated that Steve also suggested that Doug needed to certify via an independent source that won't be a negative impact on the system. Pete said that it was his opinion also that there was a need for an engineer to certify the impacts and that this should not be an expense of the district. Jeff mentioned that the restaurant folks presented their concept, they hired an engineer to present findings to the Committee.

Kevin suggested that Doug employ an engineer and evaluate how to get the additional overflow from the pool treated and diverted so it doesn't go into the system. Jeff suggested that Doug look at the Plan and tell if and why it was going to be different.

Pete mentioned that it appeared that Doug wasn't going to show up. Pete said that he had alerted Doug that he would be putting the pool pump issue on the agenda and assumed that Doug would be present. Pete asked the group to collect their thoughts and send them to him so that he could respond to Doug.

Ken said that one of his primary concerns is was regarding whether the pool is exceeding his original allotment and whatever Doug does, does not negatively impact or damage the system.

Vija wanted to know why this was now an issue and not before. Jeff indicated that his primary concern was that the system might incur additional costs that would be paid for by the community. Vija asked that Doug should say how he proposes to solve the issue himself. It was again generally agreed that Doug needs to figure out how to deal with problem and come back to the group with his analysis.

RFP Discussion:

Pete mentioned that he had distributed hard copies of the RFP and reminded the Committee that he wanted the group to review the RFP and make suggestions. Pete requested that the members perhaps create their own lists of items that they would like changed or added. Pete mentioned a few things that had been discussed and said that an overriding concern expressed by the group was whether there should be 2 separate RFP's and contracts, one for plant operations and one for collection system operations. Kevin expressed his thoughts that the community would best be served by 2 separate contracts.

Pete reiterated the timeline for distributing the RFP and contract awarding. Ken suggested that some of this business could be done via email and all agreed. Pete also asked Kevin about his presence at the meeting with the State WQCD. Kevin expressed his thoughts on what he thought should be presented.

There was some additional discussion regarding the development of the new RFP and the type of management needs that might be including the need to consider one or two separate contracts.

There was a brief discussion regarding the meeting with the State and the Public Notice regarding the permit renewal.

There was a brief discussion about whether to allow for more time for Doug to appear or to go ahead and adjourn. Pete indicated again that he would take the information the group provided and send it to Doug. It was generally agreed that Doug should be responded to and given some direction.

Public Comment: Just as the group was going to adjourn, David Levin showed up and expressed a desire to address the RFP item on the agenda. It was explained that the RFP discussion would be occurring over the next few months and what the expectation of the staff is in this regard. Part of the earlier discussion was reiterated for David.

David expressed a concern that there appeared to a shortage of pumps and that the pumps that Ramey had deemed irreparable should be sent to Ambient to see if they could repair them. Pete indicated that the pumps had already been sent to Ambient for repair. Pete indicated that he would verify the number of pumps currently available for service.

New Business: There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 7:47 pm

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

May 26, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:40.

Members Present: Jeff Mason, Vija Handley, Ken Sheldon, Cathy Proenza and Kevin Tone

Guests: Doug Larson, David Levin

Staff: Pete Salas

Minutes: Ken moved to approve the minutes of April 28, 2016, Vija seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.

It was suggested that the group change the agenda and move the Eldorado Springs Pool issue to the first item to accommodate Doug Larson.

- Eldorado Springs Pool Pump Replacement Request - Doug distributed a document which provided some background information relative to his request (See attached document). Doug went over the issue and explained that it was his opinion based on the data and his observations that it was not an excess flow issue. The overall objective was to abate the problem that confronts the pool when it is crowded. Doug referred the group to the write-up he had provided and reviewed and explained the information contained.

Doug explained that he doesn't know the specifications of the system and that he needs to know what they are so that he can comply with the requirements or recommendation of a pump or pumps to be in compliance. Doug agreed that he would be okay with buying with whatever complies with the requirements and for installing the pump. Doug expressed that he was concerned with Pete indicating in his last email indicating that Doug would be liable for system breaks. The issue seemed to be that if he put in a pump that was not compatible he could understand that he would be liable for damages. Kevin suggested that that was what he believed was the point that Pete was making in his email to Doug. It was generally agreed that if Doug put in a pump that was compatible with the system and in compliance relative to the specifications of the system he would not be held liable for other factors leading to damage to the system.

The group entered into a discussion with Ken saying that obviously Doug had compiled a lot of information and legitimately reviewed the monthly flow and that he was correct in determining that what he was using was what he was apportioned for. Ken stated that it appeared that the problem was relative to the peak usage of the pool.

At this point David Levin, Cathy Proenza and Alan Brown

Pete mentioned that it was his view that the question wasn't so much the compatibility of the pump but rather whether the additional pressure put on the system by a larger pump would be problematic. Pete mentioned that Steve Hansen had indicated that his concern was relative to pressure on the lateral and that a calculation needed to be done to determine whether the system could handle the larger pump.

Ken suggested that what might help Doug is to provide him with the engineering drawings. Pete mentioned that Frachetti Engineering had designed the system and that Doug should contact them to determine the capacity of the system. Doug again expressed a concern that even if he had an engineer approve of his installation he would bear responsibility should there be any kind of damage in the system whether the pool caused it or not. Vija suggested that that was not the case and that he would be liable only if his work caused the problem. There was an exchange between Doug and Vija regarding who might be liable and whether this is an issue.

Ken indicated that the best course of action would be to do as the Aeronaut Restaurant group had done, which was to hire their own engineer to evaluate the situation and bring forth an assessment which the LID could use in consideration of the proposal. Ken also suggested that Doug talk to Bob Frachetti since he understands the system and can help without taking too much time and effort.

Pete indicated that the issue of liability with regard to damage to the facility is covered in the Rules & Regulations which details the responsibilities of the user relative to misuse or damage caused by the user. If it is demonstrated that if a user did something caused damage to the system, they would be liable for repairs to the system. Doug countered that if he put a pump in on his own he would be liable but that he could not do that because it is against the rules. It was generally agreed that he could not do it without authorization by the Committee but that if upon review and approval by the Committee, Doug would not be liable.

Doug asked if there was list of approved engineers that he could contact. Doug was told that there was no list and that Bob Frachetti would be the best source for information on the system. Jeff indicated that this was the issue faced by the Aeronaut group and that they were advised to find an engineer to help them.

Ken asked a question regarding the original design of the system relative to the pool and why it was decided to place only one residential size pump at the pool. No one seemed to remember why this decision was made. Pete indicated that during his discussion with Steve Hansen, Steve said there was rationale for the pump decision centering on the need for a bigger tank but he couldn't recall exactly what the rationale was. Ken reiterated that Doug get with Frachetti and look into the commercial unit.

David Levin was what his knowledge was regarding the pump situation at the pool. David reviewed the situation with the pool relative to the situation at the Canyon View apartments indicating that the same reservoir was put in at the pool as at the pool and

detailed how the two operated. David also mentioned that he had put a counter in at the pool and there was almost full running for 72 hours and pumping continuously at the pool for that amount of time. David suggested that either the hourly gage was wrong or that ground water was being pumped through the system. David advised that they need to find out if that is the case.

Kevin asked Doug if there was anything he could do to find out if ground water was infiltrating the system with a line camera or something else. The group then had a brief discussion regarding ground water infiltration into the system and individual perspectives on where some of the infiltration might be happening. Cathy added that if it is leaking into the pump it might be worthwhile to relocate the pump to a less impacting location and get it out of the stream flow of ground water.

Ken suggested that the group needed to move on with the agenda. Doug indicated he would talk to Frachetti and to get an assessment of the situation. Pete agreed that Doug should get the information together and send anything to Pete for dissemination to the group. Kevin suggested in closing that maybe Doug could get rid of the unit at the climbing school and gravity to a new unit or relocated one.

It was reiterated that Doug needed to take steps to determine whether ground water was entering the system.

Plant Operations:

- a) Ramey monthly report – Pete reviewed the Ramey monthly activity report and indicated that it appeared to be a rather normal month with regard to those activities.
- b) Invoices and Budget Review– Pete also mentioned the invoices indicating that they were in-line with the activity report with nothing of note to be concerned with. Pete also mentioned the estimates in their packets from Ambient H2O for 2 pump repairs and that he directed the to go ahead and repair the pumps. Kevin asked about the reimbursement from the State. Pete said he had gone down to the outfall drain and took pictures to go along with the before pictures he had taken. Pete indicated that he was told by the State contact had told him what he submitted was fine and all she needed.

Draft Permit Renewal Public Notice

Pete provided a brief summary regarding the meeting with the WQCD indicating that it was a rather lively meeting. Pete mention that Tod Smith, local water attorney, attended and that Tod would be preparing an analysis of the situation relative to flow data which contradicts the State data. Pete said that the deadline for submission of our comments is June 15 and when Tod sends him his analysis Pete will attach it to the official county response. Pete said that it would be placed on the Commissioners agenda for approval and shipped off shortly thereafter. It was mentioned that Pete, Wayne Ramey, Tod Smith and Kevin were in attendance representing the County and Committee.

RFP Prep Process

Pete referred the group to the RFP scope of work that had previously distributed to the group. Pete mentioned that he had taken the first cut on trying to develop the scope of work for both the treatment plant and the collection system RFP's. Pete requested that the members of the Committee review the material before the June meeting and add whatever they would like to see so that he could develop a draft for review at that time.

Pete mentioned that they were just slightly behind with regard to their 2016 work plan and in order to meet the June RFP target they needed to have a draft to review at the June meeting. Pete then reiterated what the work plan calls for in terms of the timeline for the RFP process. Pete also requested that the group give some thought as to who else beside the Committee, might be involved in providing input or feedback relative to the RFP.

Cathy suggested that it would be useful to get input early and often from people who can provide 3rd party review and suggestions. Kevin mentioned that he would be out of country for the June meeting but that he had assigned one of his staff with related experience to provide some input relative to the scope of work for the RFP's. Suggested that perhaps they could talk about some of the concerns at this time if need be. Pete mentioned that there was a little cushion built into the work plan schedule but that they need to have something together by August in order to let the bid and have someone on board by the end of October.

Jeff mentioned that in his review of the current RFP, there were several items indicating that work was to be provided the County but that he wasn't sure who was supposed to deal with the reports and other material. Vija asked for some clarification regarding splitting the new contract into 2 separate RFP's and contracts with a concern with having 2 contracts as opposed to one. She asked if one company could be contracted to do both of the contracts shared a concern about whether a company might be discouraged from bidding. There was a brief discussion regarding the reasoning of doing 2 separate contracts.

Pete indicated that he had discussed the issue of two separate scopes of work and that the County Purchasing Office had advised that there should be 2 separate RFP's. It was suggested that there should be language right up front on the RFP which indicates that companies could bid on both or partner to do the work and descriptor should be provided. Jeff mentioned that it should be rewritten and that there should be clarification as to where deliverables should go, that the "county" is somewhat nebulous.

Ken suggested that they spend a few minutes reviewing the information at hand. Kevin mentioned that there appeared to be some inconsistencies relative to the differences between the collection system and treatment plant. Pete indicated that he was aware of and had made some of the changes in his electronic files and suggested that if the group had any additional information he would like to have it. Kevin mentioned that they should confirm some of the information such as, what the actual number of E-One units in service is. Are there 95 E-Ones as mentioned in the old RFP. David mentioned that there are 73 pumps in the ground and 4 in the house basement.

There was a brief discussion of the number of the pumps available. Kevin suggested they should have an As-Built drawing that indicates where every unit in the system is so that proposing contractors have that information prior to bidding. Kevin expressed a concern that there be an accurate map or drawing showing where every pump is located sometime between now and September. Alan Brown indicated that at the end of system construction there was a hastily prepared map prepared at Jeff Callahan's direction and that is needed to be updated.

Jeff requested that there be a picture of the electrical grid indicating where the breaker boxes are and the related equipment. Cathy suggested that as part of the RFP confirms the information on the As-built drawings. There was a general concurrence that this should be done. Kevin suggested there was a lot of overlap and redundancy in the drafts that needed to be clarified. There was a brief discussion relative to the redundancy and the need to be eliminated. Kevin also brought up the issue of licensing requirements indicating that the collection system operators do not need to be licensed.

There were ideas relative to issues such as, the collection system operator being available for emergency call outs and that perhaps we have the vendors propose what the emergency service needs to look like. There should be clear understanding of what is covered in the contract regarding call, visits to the plant, what is extra and not an additional cost. Jeff suggested that it be written into the RFP/Contract that the contractors be responsible for attending the LID meetings to report and be available for questions. Cathy said she would like the contractors to detail how they intend to communicate with the community in the event of emergencies.

Pete then briefly discussed the budget and what it would look like in 2017 and that it might need modification relative to either the treatment plant and collection system. There was a discussion regarding the process relative to feedback to Pete and how the process would work.

Public Comment:

Ken asked for public comment for the last few minutes of the meeting. Alan Brown mentioned that he wanted to thank Pete for his work with the group and that the committee was now a functioning committee and the county liaison was not just a paper shuffler and county reporter. Alan said he did not feel was the case a few years ago. Alan also thanked Pete for his assistance in connecting the Resource Conservation Office with the community and as a result funds had been made available to the community for the annual clean-up effort.

David mentioned that the pool location and pump installation was engineered by Doug's people at the pool and that Doug's presentation was somewhat misleading in that regard. David also expressed concern with the notion with the original RFP being split into 2 separate documents. Kevin shared his views that this was a valuable option to consider for a number of reasons.

New Business: There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 7:47 pm

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

June 23, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:40.

Members Present: Jeff Mason, Ken Sheldon and Cathy Proenza

Guests: David Levin

Staff: Pete Salas

Minutes: Ken moved to approve the minutes of May 26, 2016, Jeff seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.

Plant Operations:

- a) Ramey monthly report – Pete reviewed the Ramey monthly activity report and indicated that it appeared to be a rather normal month with regard to those activities. Pete mentioned that a couple of pumps had been picked up and repaired by Ambient. One of the pumps repaired was a pump from the pool.

The group reviewed the flow data on monthly activity report and there was a brief discussion regarding the BOD and ammonia data.

- b) Invoices and Budget Review– Pete also mentioned the invoices indicating that they were in-line with the activity report with nothing of note to be concerned with. Pete also mentioned that the invoices included the invoice from Ambient H2O for 2 pump repairs. Pete noted that the packet included an estimate from Ramey for the purchase of a new SBR pump. Pete indicated that when he asked about the estimate, he was told that the pump had basically reached its estimated life span and it would cost almost as much to repair as to replace. There was a brief discussion regarding the pump and the need to repair.

Pete directed the group to the budget, specifically the capital expense information. Jeff mentioned that upon reviewing the capital equipment replacement sheet and the estimated life span for various pieces, he noted that there were a number of items that might be in need of replacement in 2016. It was generally agreed that the group could expect additional capital expenses before the end of the year.

Pete mentioned that the reimbursement check for \$8,000 from the State had been received and that it would be added to the Capital Reserve Fund. Pete briefly reviewed the capital reserve fund and the anticipated amount that would now be in the reserve fund.

It was mentioned that the amount budgeted for 2016 was not sufficient to cover the current and anticipated expenses. Pete indicated that the rate increase would produce three-fourths of the anticipated annual revenues which would offset some of the additional capital expenses.

David Levin – Pump update

Ken asked David to present the information he had for the group. David presented data regarding in-flow readings between January 4th and January 9th he was getting between 42,000 and 48,000 gallons per day. He expressed a concern that the plant appeared to have reached capacity and that in his opinion it might be time to consider measures to upgrade the system.

David indicated that the counter was not functioning properly but has since been corrected. It now appears that the system flow was approximately 21,000 gallons per day and the previous heavy flow issues have been resolved since Doug Larson did some repair work at the pool. David reviewed the rest of the data he had been collecting relative to the system flow.

David indicated that his current concern is with regard to ammonia levels he has been measuring and that it appears to be too high. David speculated on the causes for the high ammonia levels and will be following up in the next few weeks. He suggested that the group be provided with in-flow rates to help determine the cause of other flow issues. It was noted that the monthly Ramey report contained information on the average flow. David continued to express concerns about the flow and his interest in the group keeping ahead of the curve with regard to attention to flow data.

Jeff indicated that this would be a good opportunity to consider the additional data that the LID might request as part of the new RFP. The group engaged on a lengthy discussion regarding the flow calculation and David's concerns about the flow levels.

Ken expressed a desire to consider some type of motion which would indicate that if a resident should cause a ground water flow issue, they should be liable for any damages. Pete explained that the District had Rules and Regulations in place and if the group wishes to add additional system requirements, they should consider amending the rules to reflect Ken's concern.

Jeff suggested that with regard to the new RFP it would be nice to have a spreadsheet with a flow counter at each grinder pump and have the new collection system contractor provide a monthly report with the flow data for each residence. Pete suggested that if there was going to be a discussion regarding RFP information, it should be done when they discuss the RFP agenda item.

Pete indicated that he would attempt to contact Wayne to get his opinion on what the flow for June is since Wayne is the Operator in Charge and that he is the responsible person regardless of David's concern. Cathy suggested that if there were going to be a link to the RFP, that if the flow was peaking too high then it would be the responsibility of the collection system operator to find

out what the problem. It was decided to leave this item for the RFP discussion. Pete indicated that this was the same concern raised in 2014 and that Wayne gave a very logical explanation of what cause of the high flow levels at that time. Pete said he could not remember exactly what the issue was and that it might have been related to the pool.

RFP Discussion

The group moved on to the RFP discussion with Pete providing a brief overview of the situation relative to what had occurred to-date. Pete gave a brief review of the changes in the document and what might be added. Jeff expressed a concern that certain informational requirements be added to the RFP and that the group determine what that information might be.

Pete referred to the draft RFP documents that had been sent out to the group and suggested that they review the docs and add what they feel should be in the document. Pete suggested that each member email they're additions and changes before the July meeting. Pete indicated that after each member provides they're information, he would send it back out for the group to review prior to the July LID meeting. Pete offered up an explanation of how he was going to proceed including meeting with Kevin to review the document for essential components.

Pete reviewed the timeline indicating that by the end of August, at latest, a final draft should be prepared and ready to go. Pete indicated that he would like to have a final draft prepared before the end of August and have the RFP ready to go by mid-August. Pete reiterated the details of the project timeline and the expectations associated with the proposed deadlines. Pete also expressed a concern that there be some cushion in the process to allow for a situation whereby all the bids come in over budget. Pete reminded the group that the more they want relative to the scope of work, the higher the cost will be. Pete mentioned that in the event the bids come in over budget, the options would be somewhat limited.

There was some additional discussion regarding the RFP and what the current RFP contains relative to what the expectations are for the new RFP. There was also a general agreement that the members would do another review of the Draft RFP's and return their feedback by July 8 so that a final draft could be reviewed at the July 28 meeting. At the request of Jeff, David provided a suggestion that the RFP contain a request for the provision of information relative to those days when daily flow and high chemical analysis occurs.

There was some discussion regarding documentation of grinder pumps in terms of how this data might provide information relative to tracking the maintenance and repair of grinder pumps. Various views were expressed on the need for the information and whether this data should be specified in the RFP and if so, what the wording might look like.

Pete once again reiterated the need for the group to provide their feedback on the RFP as soon as possible.

New Business: Pete gave brief update on the CDPHE permitting issue stating that all the paperwork and public comment had been submitted and we are awaiting word from the State. Pete also mentioned that the \$8,000 anticipated reimbursement had been received by the County. There was a brief discussion regarding the groups desire to investigate the possibility of obtaining addition grant funds for equipment needs of the District.

Public Comment: David Levin expressed a concern regarding the Advisory Committee's desire to let 2 RFP's. David's concern was primarily that having 2 different firms would ultimately result in increased costs, given the work he does and his experience with the system. There was a brief discussion regarding David's concern but no one expressed a desire to reconsider the idea of letting 2 RFP's.

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 7:59 pm.

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

July 28, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:40.

Members Present: Jeff Mason, Kevin Tone, Vija Handley and Cathy Proenza

Guests: David Levin

Staff: Pete Salas

Minutes: Kevin mentioned that the minutes looked fine but he wanted to mention that the LID should be expecting a PIF from Christian Griffith of around \$3400. Jeff then asked about the Mosely property and the non-permitted work that had been done. Pete explained the situation regarding the non-permitted work and that a Stop Order had been issued. Pete further explained that he was waiting to hear from the Land Use Department which would inform as to what work had been done and what the next steps are in that regard.

There was a discussion regarding what could be done with regard to Mr. Mosely's property and who's responsibility it was to inform the homeowner and what steps would be taken. Pete explained that when the Rules & Regulations were updated all the ratepayers were informed of the policy and what their responsibility is in this regard. The group then had a brief discussion regarding what constituted an increase relative to bedrooms and bathrooms which then led to a discussion specifically related to Mr. Mosely's property in terms of what previously existed and what had been added.

Pete said he would provide a status update as new information was provided by the Land Use Department. Pete also mentioned his discussions with SDMS related to information that Mr. Palumbo has given him about his sewer bill.

Cathy moved to approve the minutes of June 23, 2016, Kevin seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.

Plant Operations:

- a) Ramey monthly report – Pete referred the group to the monthly report. Kevin had a question regarding what the 2 separate sludge hauling indicated was all about. Kevin expressed concern about the comments and high ammonia levels and that after the second haul the ammonia levels were optimal. There was a brief discussion regarding the sludge hauls, why there appeared to be 2 hauls and what was the cause for having to need the 2 hauls. Members discussed the effluent data relative to past months BOD levels and determined that they would continue to monitor the situation. It was suggested that Pete

check with Ramey to find out the particulars regarding the 2 hauls which Pete agreed to do.

Kevin asked a question regarding charges for pulling pumps and whether there is a charge for delivering the pumps to Ambient to repair. David mentioned that he assumed that the pumps were delivered to Ambient but Pete said that when he received a notification that a pump had been pulled, he calls Ambient and tells them to pick up at Ramey's. There was a question regarding a pump that had been pulled which Ramey's staff and David indicated had recently been repaired by Ambient but failed when it was installed. It was generally decided that this is an issue which they would follow to determine if repairs were problematic and Pete would check on.

- b) Invoices and Budget Review– Since the invoices had been reviewed with the activity report the group moved on the budget. Kevin indicated a concern with the budget and that there was no indication as to why the \$8,000 grant revenue did not appear to off-set the capital costs. Kevin noted that previous budget spreadsheets had provided a table which showed the information relative to capital reserve additions and balances and indicated that this information was necessary.

There was a discussion regarding the need to show the revenue sources to make valid comparisons relative to current expenditures and fund balance. Pete indicated that the budget as presented was the officially approved budget and expenditures and that revenue additions or revenue estimates were not included in the spreadsheet but would be accounted for. Pete said that he would work with the Finance Office to add a table indicating additional sources of revenue and a clearer picture of what the fund balance or reserve would be. Pete indicated that essentially, whatever funds were not expended at year's end would constitute the fund balance going into next year.

RFP Discussion

The group then began the review of the draft RFP for any additions and/or corrections. Pete noted that the copies that one of the copies that were distributed was not correct and that the same scope of work for the Plant Operations was inadvertently inserted into both of the copies. There were enough original copies for the group to share and review so this was not an issue.

Kevin asked about dates for the RFP. Pete gave the projected timelines indicating that the group would review the RFP drafts and make any final changes this evening. Pete mentioned that the feedback he had requested at the last meeting had been incorporated and reviewed by Kevin, Pete and Mark.

The group began the review with the Treatment Plant RFP and Pete indicated that he would make changes directly into the file on his laptop. The group then spent the remainder of the meeting reviewing the two documents by reviewing the background followed by a point by point review of each item in the Scope of Work.

Items discussed and resolved included; language regarding informing potential contractors that they can respond to both RFP's, separate RFP cost analysis', sludge hauling language, monthly flow data as a possible attachment, report data, Class B licensing requirements, numbers of required site visits, contact info, and language clarifications to the previous draft.

New Business:

Public Comment:

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

August 25, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:40.

Members Present: Jeff Mason, Vija Handley, Cathy Proenza and Ken Sheldon

Guests: Alex North

Staff: Pete Salas

Minutes: Cathy moved to approve the July 28, 2016 minutes, Jeff seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Committee member Ken Sheldon was not present when the minutes were voted on.

Plant Operations:

- a) Ramey monthly report – Pete referred the group to the monthly Ramey report and indicated that the report appeared to be fairly regular with no apparent concerns. Jeff commented that the alarm had gone off at his place, he called the number and was told that someone would be out but he never heard back nor was he aware that someone had come out. Jeff suggested that one of the things that should be required for the new collection system contract is that the contractor be required to follow-up with homeowners when the alarm goes and a contact is made. It was generally agreed that this was something that needed to be included in a new contract. Pete suggested that going forward in the new year the monthly report should indicate the resolution.

Cathy referred to the item regarding the magnesium hydroxide mixer and noted that it appeared that it had taken 3 weeks to deal with and why it took so long. Cathy just expressed a concern that it had taken so long and that there was insufficient info in the report.

Jeff noted that the plant capacity loading numbers appeared to have gone up and that it raised a concern for him. Jeff indicated that it appeared to be a trend and asked Pete to ask Wayne for an explanation in this regard. There was a brief discussion regarding the loading and sludge hauling as it relates to the loading factors. During the discussion Pete mentioned that the info was presented to those present at the pre-bid meeting the proceeding Tuesday along with the flow capacity of the plant.

- b) Invoices – Pete referred the group to the current invoices. Pete noted that the Ramey invoice appeared to be rather normal with no outstanding issues related to the charges. Pete mentioned the Ambient invoice for the repairs of the pumps that had been previously

picked up. The group reviewed the Ambient invoices and there were no major concerns expressed regarding the invoices. There was a brief discussion regarding the tracking of pump repairs and Pete indicated that the tracking was something that he was going to be working on going into the new year. There was also a brief discussion how this might be handled with any new contractors.

- c) Budget Review – Pete referred the group to the budget sheet for review. Pete mentioned that as requested at the last meeting, he had added a table to the spreadsheet to indicate the revenue sources like what had been included in 2015 spreadsheets (member Ken Sheldon arrived at this time). Pete reviewed and provided explanations for the items in the new table which he thought would provide greater clarity relative to revenues for 2016. The new table provided information regarding the estimated fund reserve and as well as, revenue collected year-to-date and Pete gave the details of the revenues. Pete also reviewed the expenses and estimates going forward based on year-to-date expenses.

There was a question regarding where the anticipated PIF from Christian Griffith might be relative to the spreadsheet and revenue table. Pete indicated that the anticipated amount would appear in the revenue table once it had been paid but its not clear if that will be realize this year or next.

There was a question regarding the number of sludge hauls indicated on the spreadsheet invoice page. There was a concern that it seemed like the number of sludge hauls appeared to be somewhat excessive. Pete noted that the sludge hauling costs were still on budget and that in general, the budget was in good shape.

There was a brief discussion regarding the expenses for pump repairs and a concern expressed that repair expenses seemed to be too high. Pete provided a little historical perspective relative to the pumps and initial reviews on the expectations of pump performance. There was general agreement that the situation with the pumps and other infrastructure cost were not something that the LID had much control over.

RFP Discussion

Pete gave a brief review of the process to-date and the pre-bid meeting which was held on the previous Tuesday morning. Pete mentioned that Kevin and Cathy were both present for the meeting and were able to provide a LID perspective. Kevin was able to explain some of the details of the plant operation. Pete indicated that there was good attendance for the meeting and he distributed copies of the sign-up sheet of the meeting.

Jeff brought up the issue of insurance and what appeared to be the large increase in what was being required by the RFP. Cathy mentioned that one of the contractors indicated that it had been priced out and the cost was going to be in the neighborhood of \$15,000 per year. Pete indicated that Ramey Environment was currently carrying that amount and

he had not mentioned a concern in this regard. Cathy mentioned that Kevin had indicated that in his experience there had not been an event that resulted in that high of damage.

Pete indicated that he had discussed this issue with the County's Risk Management Office and share concerns relative to why given the size our operation and the need for such a high requirement. The Risk Manager mentioned that the level required was the amount recommended by the County's insurance broker who had indicated that this represented the industry standard. He also reiterated that our current plant manager was now carrying this amount.

Cathy expressed a concern that smaller operators might be constrained by the level of insurance provided and indicated that she would hope that there might be opportunities to discuss this further. Jeff questioned whether since we were looking at having two separate contracts, would there be a requirement for both contractors have the same level. Pete reiterated that this was a decision of the county Risk Management Office and represented their recommendation.

The Committee had a lengthy discussion regarding their concerns over how the insurance requirements were determined and their desire to get some clarity in this regard. Cathy suggested that perhaps at the very least, the county request that when contractor respond, they break out the line item for insurance costs. Cathy would like the Committee to be able to see what impact the insurance costs might have on the bids and to determine whether or not this is going to be a factor in deciding to award the contractor.

Pete was directed to take continue the discussion with the Risk Management Office and be sure that the views and desires of the Committee are made know in no uncertain terms. There was additional discussion regarding the insurance costs and the need to reconsider and evaluate the impact of the requirement. Pete indicated that he would again talk to the Risk Manager and see if there is any way to adjust the amounts in question.

There was further discussion on the insurance issue with previous considerations reiterated and with Pete providing additional information regarding the initial plant RFP's and some of the details involved in that decision process.

There was a discussion on what the process was going to be going forward after the responses were received. Pete reviewed the process and that at the September meeting the Committee would have an initial review of the RFP responses and decide if an interview process is necessary. Pete reminded the group that the potential bidders were informed that a decision on the contract/s would be made by November 1st and that prior to then, the Commissioners would need to officially approve the selection. It was decided to consider changing the date for the next meeting to October 20th in order to meet the deadline to have the Commissioners approval.

Public Comment: The Committee was joined by Alex North who arrived just as the meeting was ending. Alex mentioned that he had been talking to Kurt Aranow and had mentioned to him that he was considering installing a bathroom in one of the cottages on his property. Kurt suggested that he might want to attend the LID meeting to get information regarding modifying his property. Pete indicated that he should contact the Boulder County Land Use Department to discuss what he will need to do to modify the property to add a bathroom and get the appropriated permits. Pete also said that he should read the Eldorado Springs Rules & Regulations to be informed as to the fees he might incur relative to the District requirements. Pete gave Alex his contact info and encouraged him to contact him should he need additional information or assistance.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:04pm

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

September 22, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:35.

Members Present: Jeff Mason, Kevin Tone, Vija Handley, Cathy Proenza and Ken Sheldon

Guests: David Levin

Staff: Pete Salas

The Committee agreed to move the RFP Submittal discussion up on the agenda in deference to Kevin who indicated that he needed to leave early to take care of some personal business.

Initial Review of RFP Submittals

Treatment Plan Proposals

Pete started the discussion by directing the group to the RFP assessment sheets he had prepared as a tool for evaluating the firm's responses to the RFP's. Pete explained that there were two different tables. One table was a list of items from the RFP related to Scope of Work and the Submittal sections. The other table contained the rating criteria mentioned in the RFP's. Pete gave a brief review of both of the tables. Pete also explained that he had filled out the SOW and Submittal tables based on his reading of the RFP's but that he would provide blank sheets for the Committee to use.

There was a brief discussion regarding the current Ramey contract, the amount of the contract. This discussion centered on the base amount of Ramey's contract and the associated expenses included in his monthly invoices in relation to what the RFP respondents included in their proposals. The concern expressed was that the Committee in reviewing the proposals, should consider both the base amounts proposed and, the other expenses that are included in their cost explanations. Kevin expressed that based on his reading, the proposals looked good from a cost perspective and in line with what the District is currently spending for services. Kevin noted that the variable in comparison is related to insurance costs.

Pete suggested that the group consider the insurance costs associated with the proposals. Pete directed the group to the ORC insurance form included in their proposal, indicating that they were currently carrying a pollution liability amount of \$4,000,000. Pete asked the group that if the County's Risk Manager would be willing to accept the \$4,000,000 in coverage, would the group find that an acceptable compromise. Kevin indicated that this amount was more than most municipalities are carrying. Jeff noted that this requirement might price RH Water out of contention for the contract because they don't currently carry this amount. Kevin mentioned that

RH did provide a cost figure for complying with the county requirement and the group reviewed those numbers.

Kevin expressed his opinion that if they take a lot of different things into consideration, he would feel a little more comfortable recommending ORC to the community. Kevin explained his rationale as such; Richard Hoppe, the owner of RH, is a one man show, he lives in Evans, is fully employed by the City of Greeley and this appears to be a side business. By comparison, ORC has 5 operators who are Class A, a staff of 20 plus people, are closer in Wheatridge and operate the water system in Eldorado Springs and already have \$4,000,000 vs. \$1,000,000 in pollution liability insurance. Kevin noted that he didn't feel comfortable with RH due to what he had already mentioned and the fact that the concerns that RH worked with were close to his business as opposed to Eldorado Springs. A concern was expressed that the distance could be an issue in relation to responding to emergencies. Kevin also referred the group to the evaluation spreadsheet and that RH did not respond to several of the SOW and submittal requests.

Jeff noted that it appeared that ORC's proposal was higher for half the system than Ramey's was for the entire system and wanted clarification. After review it was expressed that when the additional insurance was removed from the equation, the monthly cost is considerably less. Jeff indicated that he was satisfied with the clarification. Cathy expressed some confusion relative to the differences for insurance costs as presented by the respondents regarding their current insurance provisions. It was generally agreed that if the insurance requirements could be reduced to the \$4,000,000 range then that would be optimal. Kevin then gave a brief explanation of how insurance claims are generally handled by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. Pete reiterated that he had shared the Committee's concerns with the County's Risk Manager.

Kevin suggested that in addition to insurance issues, the group needs to consider the other items in the RFP and RH's lack of response to several items. Kevin indicated that the responses or lack thereof are important in considering the proposals.

Collection System Proposals

Kevin started the discussion by expressing that at this point he is a little swayed by Ambient H2O's proposal because they are the distributors for the E-One pumps. Kevin suggested that the group should consider the situation with the E-One pumps since the collection system is primarily the pumps and Ambient's focus is E-Ones. Jeff asked about the insurance requirements and if both systems would require the same coverage. Pete stated that if ORC were to get both contracts, they would be covered by virtue of their current coverage, provided Risk Management approved the amount. Pete said that if Ambient were to get the contract, they would then be required to have the same amount that the treatment plant manager would have to carry. Kevin expressed an opinion that he disagreed with having the collection system manager carry the \$4,000,000 pollution liability coverage. Kevin stated that he didn't feel the risk associated with pollution liability was as great for the collection system vs. the treatment plan. It was suggested that Pete confer with Risk Management in this regard.

The discussion then moved on to the one-time fees associated with the Ambient proposal. One of the items noted was the proposal for producing a map of the system. Jeff asked if that wasn't an item that the County was working on. Pete responded that one of the County's GIS staff was in the process of mapping the system but wasn't sure it was the same thing. It was generally agreed that this could probably be removed from the cost list. Pete mentioned number of one-time fees and the amounts associated with them.

Cathy expressed a concern that the ORC proposal did not discuss the E-One pumps considering the role of the pumps in the system. Cathy mentioned that there is no mention of the replacement or repair of the pumps and how they would handle this item. Cathy noted that on the other hand Ambient did not discuss the maintenance of the line itself. Kevin indicated that his biggest concerns with the Ambient proposal was with regard to all the disclaimers included in their proposal primarily the Terms and Conditions section of the proposals. Kevin referred specifically to item # 15 on page 6 which referred to Boulder County agreeing to perform/mandate routine tank maintenance for removal of debris in the grinder tanks. It was generally agreed that there was a need for clarification regarding this and other items on the list. Kevin suggested that perhaps some of the references be checked out. Kevin suggested that perhaps Ambient's involvement might be in the best interests of the community.

Pete mentioned that as it relates to going forward with the process, the group is scheduled to meet on October 18 and consideration should be given to how to proceed. Pete reviewed some options the group has in terms of conducting interviews including deciding on either the plant operation or collection system at this time. Pete stated that if the group felt strongly about one firm now, they could make the decision at this time.

The group then had a discussion regarding higher effluent flows into the system. A concern was expressed that it appeared that there appeared to be higher flows than normal. Issues discussed in this regard were past issues with the pool and possible marijuana grows which might be contributing to the higher flows. David Levin was able to provide additional information regarding the pool, indicating that various repairs were done in July and the issue was now resolved. It was suggested that perhaps some flow meters be installed in a few locations to try to determine if there is excessive flow occurring and if so, what is the cause. David indicated that he would talk to Ramey about the possibility of installing meters and costs involved. There appeared to be general agreement that flow meters might help inform the issue but no formal recommendation was made in this regard.

Approval of minutes:

Cathy moved to approve the August 25, 2016. Vija seconded the motion and it passed with all in favor.

Activity Report:

Pete reviewed the monthly Ramey activity report, indicating that it was a rather long report but that there didn't appear to be anything out of the ordinary. Pete indicated that there is one item

relative to the delivery of chemicals which seemed to indicate that it took two visits to determine the need and deliver to the plant. Pete reviewed the charges on the invoices relative to the activity report and that everything seemed to correspond. Jeff raised a question regarding the previous month's concern with ammonia levels and if Pete has looked into it. Pete responded that he was told by Ramey that an additional sludge haul was conducted which had the effect of lowering the ammonia levels. Pete also mentioned that this appeared to be an annual event and that it did not put added pressure on the sludge hauling budget. Pete then went over other invoice charges that had come in.

The group then reviewed details of the budget spreadsheet with Pete explaining the spreadsheet and additions to it. There were no significant changes outside of the monthly operation and maintenance charges previously discussed.

RFP Process Discussion

Pete explained the process going forward indicating that the plan was to have a contractor or contractors selected by November 1. Pete noted that the Committee's recommendation needed to be forwarded to the Commissioners prior to the end of October, probably the week of October 24th. Pete also indicated that the group compile questions that they have for Ambient and ORC which can be provided when the interview dates are set. Cathy suggested that the group might want to work on the questions. It was decided that they would submit their questions as they had previously discussed, to Pete for emailing to the Ambient and ORC. Pete reviewed possible questions scenarios for the group to consider.

It was suggested that the list of Terms and Conditions that Ambient had included in their RFP response be submitted to the County Attorney's Office for review. Pete said he would send it to the County's contract specialist for review and advice. There was a brief discussion regarding the aforementioned Terms and Conditions and what the intent of several items is.

Other Business:

Vija asked whether the Committee had a written mission statement that indicates what the Advisory Committee is charged with. Pete referred Vija to the County website and how to access the page with the relative information. Pete gave a very brief summary of the Committee's role.

Cathy suggested that the Advisory Committee webpage link be included in the next mailing.

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2016
4390 Eldorado Springs Drive
Boulder, Colorado 80303

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:35.

Members Present: Jeff Mason, Kevin Tone, Vija Handley, Cathy Proenza and Ken Sheldon

Guests:

Staff: Pete Salas & Mark Ruzzin

RFP Recommendations

It was suggested that the Committee move the discussion of the RFP considerations to the front of the agenda and there was no objection to this suggestion.

The primary concern as it relates to the RFP's was relative to the Collection System. The group decided to discuss the interview with the Ambient H2O representatives and the ORC representative. The group engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the pros and cons of each proposal and the information gleaned from the interviews. Each member gave their initial views regarding the presentations and their impressions.

There was an extended discussion regarding whether there was a need for additional information and what specifically was needed. After

The more salient points of the discussion were relative to:

- Experience of firms
- Experience with E-one pumps
- Comfort level with RFP responses scope of work
- Communication protocol & planning
- Equipment repair & maintenance
- Staffing
- Benefits of separate vs. combined operators
- Insurance costs & impact on total system costs
- The need for additional information prior to a decision

At the conclusion of the discussion Ken suggested that they take a straw poll to see how the group was leaning. the group if they felt they had fully vetted the issue they should decide on whether to vote on the issue.

Kevin moved that the Advisory Committee approve recommending that Boulder County award contracts for RFP's #6503 Collections System and RFP #6504 Wastewater Treatment Plant to ORC Water Professionals. Jeff seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

It was decided to suspend the rest of the agenda until the November meeting.

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.