

Eldorado Springs LID Advisory Committee Minutes

December 19, 2019

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 & Cathy Proenza

Guests: Gabby Begeman, ORC (phone)

Staff: Mark Ruzzin, Pete Salas

Approval of Minutes:

The board considered the minutes of the November 21, 2019 meeting:

ACTION: Kevin moved to approve the minutes of the November 21, 2019 meeting, as presented; the motion was seconded by Jeff, and approved unanimously.

Plant Operations:

Gabby Begeman with ORC joined the meeting by phone to provide the Operator's Report. Gabby discussed the TIN numbers, mentioning that things seemed to be going well. She expressed a minor concern regarding the methanol application at the plant relative to the TIN numbers, including the need for additional data to help understand if methanol application is the answer to maintaining lower TIN numbers. Kevin asked about a lack of December numbers regarding flow at the plant. Gabby mentioned that flow seems consistent with this time of year, and that more info would be available at the end of the month (not all data included in the Operator's Report is collected by the time the mid-month ESLAC meetings are held).

Kevin asked about other miscellaneous issues such as road base work and tree stump removal on the plant access road. Mark indicated that this has been an ongoing conversation with the county Transportation Department, and one that staff plans to include on the LID's 2020 work plan. Kevin asked about the recent water main break on Barber Lane; Gabby indicated that an HTPE pipe broke that was about 3 feet below the road, and which was likely the result of truck traffic disturbing the pipe. Gabby indicated that the repair work was difficult, and the break raises some questions about the long-term durability of the HTPE water delivery piping.

Ken asked about the grinder pump work that was being done at the Spritz residence. Gabby mentioned that she has been onsite and overseeing the hand digging that has been necessary to excavate the pump pit and see below the pump; excavating the pit revealed that the pump pit was dry. Steve Hansen from Ambiente come out to look at the situation; they pulled the pump out and it appears that water is flowing into the pit from a pipe joint into the pit. Gabby suggested that there is a need to do additional investigation of the internal aspects of the pit since water isn't coming from an external source.

Ken mentioned the previous discussion regarding the theory that there is a crack in the pit casing and that the casing needs to be replaced. Ken asked if that was now not the case. Gabby said that they excavated around the pit and there was no crack or water infiltrating externally into the pit through the pit casing.

There was additional discussion regarding the possible sources of infiltration. Gabby suggested the additional possibility that there is an obstruction in the gravity pipe between the pump and the residential units, which might

be the source of the problem and the reason for the back-up issues the residents are experiencing. Gabby noted that there was a lot of grease in the pit which may have come from the line leading back to the homes.

Kevin asked whether it is the LID's responsibility to tell the home owner that they have to clean out the lateral line. Gabby indicated that the pump will have to be pulled to clean the line. There was additional discussion regarding the nature of the problem, possible solutions, logistics for the additional work, and how to proceed with informing the homeowner of the nature of the work and associated costs.

The committee also discussed the collection system, the homeowners with indoor pumps, and the possibility of relocating the pumps outside. Cathy mentioned her indoor pump and the issues she has been having and requested that Gabby send a crew to inspect or replace the pump. Mark asked about the difference between the indoor pumps and outdoor pumps and whether there were spares available; Gabby indicated that there was a spare available.

The committee briefly discussed the first bridge stream gauge and the flow data that is needed for the CDPHE operating permit.

Committee Updates:

Cathy and Ken indicated that they might not be available for the January 16, 2020 meeting, which has been scheduled to be a work session to develop a 2020 work plan for the LID. There was a brief discussion regarding a new meeting date. It appeared that at least four members are available for a meeting on Jan. 23, so the committee agreed to change the meeting to that date. There was a brief discussion about the residents with the indoor pumps and confirming who they are.

Invoices and Budget Update:

Pete referred the committee to the budget spreadsheet for review. Jeff noted what appeared to be high monthly chemical costs. Mark reminded the committee that the county finance team is still working through identifying the proper budget categories for the LID's expenses, and in the meantime, a number of non-chemical expenses are logged in this budget line item. The finance office is sorting out the best ways to track these expenses. The committee engaged in a brief discussion regarding LID expenses.

The committee discussed the LID's total fund balance. Mark mentioned that he and Pete have been working with the county Budget Office to determine the current LID reserve, or fund balance. Mark distributed a spreadsheet provided by the Budget Office which detailed the total financial picture of the district, including total assessment revenues, debt service, taxes, and fund balance. The budget summary indicated that the LID is in good financial position, with a solid fund balance, but it also notes that caution should be taken relative to potential future uses of the fund balance. For example, primarily due to unanticipated equipment purchases, Pete and Mark indicated that the LID is going to be over budget in 2019, and there will be a need to request a budget supplemental from the County Commissioners.

The committee had a lengthy discussion regarding the LID budget summary, including potential uses for the fund balance, such as capital improvements and other capital investments. This discussion also included the staff and committee's thoughts on the future of the LID's revenue sources when the current tax assessment expires at the end of 2025.

Old/New Business:

Kevin asked for an update on the issues with the CDPHE operating permit. Mark indicated that he had a recent conversation with Jane Clary at Wright Water Engineers to explain the concerns the committee raised at the

November meeting.

Jane noted that WWE had rerun South Boulder Creek stream flow data and concluded that the water dilution argument was not going to be successful as far as the state was concerned. Jane indicated that the likely path forward was to complete an Alternatives Analysis. Mark indicated that he had explained that there was a lack of clarity regarding which stream gauge data was used in the WWE analysis; the impression of the committee was that WWE had just rerun the flow data that the state had used in determining the operating permit parameters.

Jane indicated that WWE would be willing to review the data and run the model again once there was clarity on which gauge to use, and specifically, if the first bridge data could be located. Mark said that Jane will be sending him a screen shot of a Google map to indicate which gauge WWE has used for the model run. In short, WWE is willing to recheck or rerun the data to get a more comprehensive analysis. Jeff reiterated that the committee wants to know which gauge was used.

Kevin noted that he had recent conversation with Tod Smith regarding the importance of WWE understanding that the gauge is not the only thing that matters relative to base flow in South Boulder Creek. Kevin explained that the Lafayette diversion returns water to the creek that bypasses the upstream gauges, and that the Artesians do not use all their water and significant amounts of spring water is returned to South Boulder Creek. Kevin said that this is water flow that can only be measured at the first bridge.

Cathy asked Mark to reiterate how WWE came into the picture. Mark explained that Boulder County Public Health was letting a large contract with WWE for a variety of water related projects, and BCPH agreed to add \$5,000 to the contract in order to assist the LID with the permit issues. Cathy suggested that the group consider developing an action plan to deal with the entire situation with the permit, the state, and the gauge issues. The group had a brief discussion regarding what might be done to explore options given various potential scenarios. Cathy requested that staff provide additional info as soon as possible, ideally before the next meeting.

Lastly, Mark said that Jane mentioned that in her conversations with the CDPHE staff, staff indicated that they are open to reviewing the permit relative to any new data. With regard to a follow-up question by Cathy regarding flow data and dilution and TIN number, Mark said that based on his discussions with Jane, the plant would need to obtain a 0.25 cubic feet per second flow rate in South Boulder Creek in order to consistently get a 7 or 8 TIN number. There was some brief additional discussion regarding this point.

Committee recruitment:

The committee discussed the ongoing recruitment period for seats on county boards and commissions, potential new ESLAC members, and who the committee might have in mind to contact.

Other business:

Pete reminded the committee that the January meeting would consist of considering items for the 2020 work plan, and asked that everyone think about what they would like included on the agenda for January.

Public Comment:

There was no public comment and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.