

## **Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Minutes**

January 23, 2020

Rocky Mountain Fire District Station 6

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

**Members Present:** Ken Sheldon, Kevin Tone, Jeff Mason, Vija Handley

**Guests:** Gabby Begeman and Tom Schubert (ORC), David Levin

**Staff:** Mark Ruzzin, Pete Salas

### **Approval of Minutes:**

The board considered the minutes of the December 19, 2019 meeting:

**ACTION:** Kevin moved to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2019 meeting, as presented; the motion was seconded by Ken, and approved unanimously.

### **Plant Operations:**

Gabby and Tom presented the ORC operations report to the committee. Gabby mentioned that ORC reviewed the LID collection system maps and have located and replaced two of the four indoor E-one pumps. Gabby noted that the indoor E-one unit at Cathy Proenza's home was close to failing, and needed to be replaced; unfortunately, this unit is not viable for repair. Gabby said that the ongoing work with the indoor units would primarily involve preemptive measures. The committee briefly discussed the indoor units and measures that can be taken to insure they are properly functioning, including the possibility of moving all the indoor units outside and the costs and responsibility for doing so.

The committee took up the ongoing issues at Peter Spraitz's property. Gabby stated that it has been difficult to determine the problems at this property. Gabby and crew initially thought that the infiltration coming into the E-one pump pit was the result of a problem originating with the pit itself; hand digging out the pit and evaluation of the pump pit installation by Steve Hansen of Ambiente H2O revealed that there were no issues with the pit installation.

With infiltration still coming into the pit but the ground around the pit being dry, it was decided to scope the lateral line leading from the pump pit to the homes on the property. The camera video revealed that the pipe under the home closest to the pit was "bellying" from the vent stack to just outside the pit. This bellying is causing the line to never empty, thus creating a consistent and constant flow into the pump pit. Ken suggested that the old pipes are likely compromised, resulting in the infiltration of water, sand, and gravel into the pit and system. It was also suggested that there may be a break in the pipe which is contributing to the problem. Gabby suggested that this would explain the high level of pump replacements at the Spraitz property over the past year. In addition to the sand and gravel, Tom mentioned that there were other items like blue shop towels clogging the line.

Ken noted that this type of incident – which is clearly not a result of faulty LID infrastructure – is the responsibility of the homeowner, and that going forward expenses associated with the incident would be the responsibility of the homeowner. The committee had an extended discussion regarding both the need to bring resolution to the Spraitz situation and how to address these types of incidents in the future. Ultimately the decision is related to how to enforce the Rules and Regulations relative to homeowner-caused problems impacting the LID infrastructure and the costs associated with fixing those problems that are not the result of a malfunction of LID equipment or infrastructure.

Mark and Pete suggested that they will contact Peter Spraitz to inform him of the work that ORC has done, the nature of the problem as it is now known, possible solutions, and his responsibilities as property owner as defined by the Rules & Regulations. There was general agreement that the staff should proceed as recommended.

The committee reviewed the data included in the Operations Report. Kevin noted that there appeared to be some improvement in the plant operations. Tom noted that it has been helpful to have the pumps operating at full strength.

### **Operating Permit**

Kevin raised the issue of the WWTF operating permit. Mark handed out the latest information update from Jane Clary and Wright Water Engineers, regarding the work that WWE has been doing in support of advocating on behalf of the LID. Mark indicated that Jane and WWE do not believe that the supposed stream gauge at the first bridge is in fact a stream gauge, but rather Xcel Energy equipment. In regards to obtaining South Boulder Creek flow data, Mark indicated that the closest gauge was west of the Gross Reservoir Dam.

Ken said that it sounded like there was an interest in putting a gauge in place. Mark indicated that there are several parties, including the City of Boulder, that are interested in putting stream gauges in place on South Boulder Creek, including possibly at the first bridge. Ken suggested that this would be the best course of action and asked where a gauge might be placed. Kevin opined that there must be an easement by the bridge. It was noted that any gauge might have to be placed further downstream than the first bridge. Kevin indicated that he still feels that the data that Tod Smith provided was valid and should be used to indicate the level of base flows in the creek. Mark noted that the CDPHE-prepared fact sheet regarding the operating permit indicates that the state reviewed and considered the data submitted by ESLAC when determining the operating permit requirements.

There was additional discussion regarding possible courses of action and next steps in determining the base flow data in the creek in relation to working with the state. The committee concluded that in addition to pursuing an Alternatives Analysis, county staff should meet with CDPHE in an attempt to get clear guidance from the state on what will be needed to make a successful case for an operating permit modification. It was suggested that WWE provide a proposal outlining the most feasible and reasonable course of action relative to an Alternatives Analysis, including information on stream flow and engineering and financial limitations. This discussion included possibilities for stream flow gauge placements.

A question came up regarding the water delivery agreements that were attached to the studies done in 2010. Mark said that he would forward the Intergovernmental Agreements between the City of Boulder, City of Lafayette and the State of Colorado. There was a brief discussion regarding any existing commitments to return water to the creek and how these agreements may impact flow data collection needs.

The committee moved on to a discussion of a work plan for 2020, to identify key work items for the 2020 calendar year. A few of the items included upgrades and improvements, such as a new SBR pump, methane digester, defensible space requirements, the indoor E-Ones, and proactively replacing E-one pumps. Reaching closure in respect to the operating permit should be completed by the end of the year. Mark also mentioned the need to update the Rules & Regulations as they relate to commercial properties.

### **County Staffing Changes**

Mark briefed the committee regarding the recent organizational changes that have occurred at the county. The primary changes involve a change to a County Administrator system and the reorganization of the County Commissioners' management structure. Mark provided the specifics regarding the various changes. As part of this discussion, Mark noted that over the coming months the ESLID would be placed under the authority of the new Public Works Department. Kevin asked what this change will mean for support of ESLAC and the LID when the transition is complete. Mark indicated that he and Pete would do everything possible to ensure that the level of commitment ESLAC and the community receives will remain the same or even improve. There was a brief

discussion regarding the transition and what it might look like going forward.

At this point David Levin joined the meeting.

Kevin asked Tom and Gabby to provide their thoughts on the value of adding a digester and sludge holding tank to the existing treatment process. Gabby described the current process and the lack of consistency relative to removal of solids from the tanks. The current system forces the plant to store these solids until they can no longer be stored and removal is absolutely necessary. This causes a peak and valley type of treatment cycle which is problematic and difficult to manage. Gabby suggested that having a digester would allow for the removal of sludge on a more consistent basis and result in better operational outcomes. Gabby also indicated that there would not be as much material to remove. There was a brief discussion regarding the potential savings of having a digester, possible sizes of a digester, and what type of tank might be used.

Pete asked for final thoughts from Gabby and Tom relative to equipment needs. Gabby mentioned that previous discussions had involved the possibility of replacing a percentage of the E-One pumps on an annual basis. The general conclusion is that some standard should be developed and put into place.

**Committee Updates:**

**EAS Memorandum of Understanding:** The group moved on to a discussion regarding the Memorandum of Understanding with EAS. Mark explained the nature and scope of the MOU and that the suggestions for improvements being asked of Doug could not be made a requirement of the building permit. The question arose regarding why the MOU was written since it was not a condition of the building permit. Mark explained staff's view on the benefit of bringing the MOU to EAS. Vija recalled that it was her understanding that it was going to be part of the Rules & Regulations. Mark suggested that the components of the proposed MOU could be used in future revisions to the Rules & Regulations. Kevin expressed frustration regarding his understanding of the MOU in terms of enforceability as opposed to voluntary compliance on the part of EAS. After some additional discussion regarding the MOU, it was decided to pursue changes in the Rules & Regulations to address future commercial development.

**Invoices and Budget Update:**

Mark referred the group to the budget spreadsheets. There was a question regarding the blank spaces in the spreadsheet; Mark explained that several invoices had not yet either been received or had not yet been paid. Kevin asked about the work at Peter Spraitz's property. Pete explained that the camera work in the piping was approximately \$390 and that the initial charge for digging the pump pit was estimated to be around \$550. It was noted that some of the work can be charged to Peter Spraitz. There was additional discussion regarding the budget and capital reserve funds. Pete mentioned that the Budget Office will have paid all 2019 invoices by the end of January, at which time there should be a true accounting of 2019 total expenses.

**Public Comment:**

David Levin provided a brief summary of the number of pumps that EAS currently has. David asked about the EQR apportionment for EAS; he expressed concern that a fixed apportionment had not been assigned to EAS. It was explained that there was a fixed EQR number of 7.25 assigned to the ballroom/snackbar and 7.0 for the pool/bathhouse. David expressed satisfaction with the responses to his concerns.

Vija expressed a concern regarding extraordinary use and asked if it was part of the MOU since it does not appear in the Rules & Regulations. Mark indicated that this notion – i.e., how to handle situations when a ratepayer's use of wastewater treatment services is higher than what should be expected based on assigned EQR – would be one of the points of discussion in any proposed changes to the Rules & Regulations.

There was no additional public comment and the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.