



Perry Park Water and Sanitation District  
5676 West Red Rock Drive  
Larkspur, Colorado 80118  
[www.ppwsd.org](http://www.ppwsd.org)

## Regular Meeting - March 17, 2021

### Board Members Present

Brian Arthurs  
Judy LaCrosse  
Tony Lucas  
Jim Maras  
Gary Peterson

### Staff / Consultants in Attendance

Diana Miller – District Manager  
Will Parker – Semocor, Inc.

### Visitors

Mary Beth Bradley  
Ed Berchem  
Al Colton  
Holly Cronin  
John Curtiss  
David Cwynar  
Bob Dewald  
Kathy Ellis  
John Graboski  
Terry Haling  
Diana Jubiak  
Larry Martin  
Steve Ostrowski  
Julia McCusker  
Pam Petersen  
Craig Van Doorn

### Visitors (partial name)

Kristi  
Joe  
LHupp  
Ryan  
Sharon

### 1.0 Call To Order

The Regular Board Meeting was called to order at 13:04 via Zoom.

### 2.0 Customer Rate and Fee Increases

Director Peterson offered a history of the Perry Park Water and Sanitation District, improvements made to the Sageport Water Treatment Plant over the past two years and what improvements need to be accomplished at the Waucondah Wastewater Treatment Plant to insure future compliance. Director Peterson summarized the District's water rights both renewable and non-renewable, and noted that they are valued at approximately \$25 million. Director Peterson noted the importance of the Sandstone Ranch inclusion and the Remuda Ranch inclusion to bolster the District's renewable water rights portfolio.

Director Arthurs summed up the proposed Capital Improvement Fees and the Capital Improvement Plan. Director Arthurs noted that the Capital Improvement Plan is a

10 year plan that addresses all of the known improvements that the District requires to provide safe and reliable services. Director Arthurs noted that some of the capital improvements are critical and as such prioritized, other improvements are important but do not rate as requiring immediate funding. Director Arthurs directed interested parties towards the District's website [ppwsd.org](http://ppwsd.org) and the Dropbox folder the District Manager created to share the detailed documents.

Director Arthurs noted that the District incurred debt in 2018 of \$2.6 million to fund capital improvement projects, the Sageport Water Treatment Plant, Country Club Drive Loop and Bannock Lift Station projects were completed. Director Arthurs highlighted that the District is currently making in excess of \$233,000 a year in debt payments.

Director Arthurs focused on upcoming Capital Improvement Projects. Director Arthurs noted that the Waucondah Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) has moved to the highest priority due to odor and noise complaints as well as the completion of the plant evaluation. Director Arthurs advised that the plant was built in the early 70s and a great deal of the existing infrastructure is original. Director Arthurs directed the Customers interested in the detailed Waucondah WWTP Evaluation Report to the abovementioned Dropbox.

Director Arthurs offered that the District held three dedicated Work Sessions to delve into all of the issues at the Waucondah WWTP. Director Arthurs noted that the public Work Sessions were in October 2020, December 2020 and January 2021.

Director Arthurs offered that the District engaged TST Infrastructure, LLC, one of the District's engineering firms, to perform the Waucondah WWTP evaluation and as part of the recommendations included in the evaluation report, three options were formulated. The first option would be to do the absolute minimum to keep the plant up and running, essentially what the District has been doing for the past twenty years; the approximate amount for this option being \$3.2 million. The second option addresses a lot of equipment and treatment infrastructure that needs replacement. The approximate amount for this option being \$8.3 million. The third option is essentially a plant replacement. The approximate amount for this option being \$13.8 million. After hours of discussion with consultants, operations and staff the Board decided to move forward with a hybrid of options one and two to best fulfill the needs of the District's Customers. The approximate amount for the hybrid option being \$5 million.

Director Arthurs summarized how the District is planning to pay for the \$5 million hybrid option. The Board concluded that \$1.2 to \$1.3 million is going to be spent immediately on "immediate needs" repairs and improvements to address odor, noise and aesthetic issues and will be funded from the District's reserves. The remainder of the \$3.15 million, would pay for improvements that require Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment approvals, the approval process taking approximately one year.

Director Peterson asked Director Arthurs to discuss the work done with Ehlers and how the rate increase was determined.

Director Arthurs offered that Ehlers are the District's financial consultants who assist the District in their financial planning. Ehlers reviewed the District's reserves, the revenues flowing into the District, the type of revenue flowing into the District, the operating expenditures flowing out of the District and the capital expenditures flowing out of the

District. Additionally, capital improvement projects were reviewed including the cost estimate and the timeframe for necessary funding. Ehlers had previously recommended a 5 to 10% increase annually in water and sewer fees to reduce the District's reliance on tap and development fees to cover operating expenses. The \$25 a month capital improvement fee - \$50 a billing cycle, is what Ehlers recommended to ensure that the District would have enough money to pay for the capital improvements and minimize our debt.

Director Lucas presented two graphs depicting nearby water and sanitation district monthly rates, one with 5,000 gallons of usage, the other 15,000 gallons of usage: <https://www.ppwsd.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Near-By-Water-District-Rates.pdf>. Director Lucas noted that on the 5,000 gallons of usage graph, the District falls into the lower half of other nearby districts and on the 15,000 gallons of usage graph the District falls in the middle of other nearby districts. Director Lucas offered that the District is non-profit, and all of the Board Members live in the District and pay the same rates and fees as other Customers. Director Lucas added the District employs two people full time and contracts operations for the treatment plants and the other associated infrastructure.

Director Peterson opened the Questions and Answers section of the Board Meeting.

## 2.1 Questions and Answers

Mr. Ostrowski thanked the Board for their efforts at transparency. Mr. Ostrowski indicated that his first question and of great concern, is from the Water Usage Memorandum that states there was "significant difference in the water usage vs water billed". He noted there was a lot of unaccounted for water usage in that report and was curious, if that water was found and if it was billed for, what impacts would there be to the budget.

The District Manager advised that the data used for the Water Usage Memorandum was from various sources in 2019. She added that the Water Usage Memorandum identified numerous sources of infrastructure water that are not metered, and that they are a large contributor to the unaccounted for water. She added that the infrastructure water, even when metered, will not be billed for in the future and therefore not have an impact on the budget.

Director Peterson added that when there is a water line break or something unforeseeable, there is a lot of lost water that happens at that point in time and there is no way of capturing how much it is. Director Peterson offered that there are other processes that are done that are not metered. For example, when fire hydrants are being flushed, they are currently not metered.

Director Peterson noted that the Water Usage Memorandum provides guidance on moving forward as to where the District can begin whittling away at unmetered infrastructure to reduce unaccounted for water.

Mr. Ostrowski asked if we "actually have the quantity or percent or something to quantify that "significant difference in billing vs usage"" as he didn't find it in the Water Usage Memorandum.

The District Manager offered that it is a challenge to truly calculate unaccounted for water in the District. She added that we know what the District is treating at the water

plants and that we are billing each month. She added that she would send him the Cost of Service Analysis, prepared by Ehlers that first used the 2019 water treated versus water billed gallons.

Mr. Ostrowski offered that a “resident posted on social media, that he sees Douglas County tankers filling up from our supply what looked like thousands of gallons of size” and asked if this was part of the unaccounted for water.

The District Manager advised that this is not the case; Douglas County is billed for water on a monthly basis. She advised that any Contractor who is taking water from the fire hydrants (not flushing), is billed for that water.

Mr. Ostrowski asked how that water is being metered, he thought hydrants weren’t metered.

The District Manager advised that Douglas County is billed by the truck load. For Contractors doing some type of construction project, they rent a meter from the District and we calculate the gallons from the hydrant meter, and then bill the Contractor.

Director Maras offered that the 2019 estimate from the Ehlers, Cost of Service Analysis, was 37% unaccounted for water.

Mr. Ostrowski stated “So that’s quite large right? I mean, 37% of missing revenue?”

Director Maras agreed, noting “that’s a lot of unaccounted for water, yes.”

Mr. Ostrowski asked “once we saw the amount, especially that large, wouldn’t it be wise to first investigate that and see how much revenue we can recapture before deciding on a rate increase?”

The District Manager noted that there is an assumption that the unaccounted for water is revenue generating water.

Mr. Ostrowski asked “does 37% sound right for that type of usage?”

Director Peterson offered that he thinks the number is high, but until unmetered infrastructure water is addressed and considering there are water events like firefighting and water line breaks that are unknown, it is difficult to truly understand how much water you’re losing until the known water loss areas can be rectified. Director Peterson added that Water Use Memorandum was commissioned at the end of 2020, and the Memorandum was received from TST at the February 2021 Board Meeting. Director Peterson advised that the Board is now looking at that data to decide where the greatest opportunity areas are, where some metering could be put in place that would be of the highest value to the District.

Director Peterson added that the Waucondah WWTP has surfaced as a priority right now, because of the seriousness of the needs, and the process to make the improvements will take two to three years and will have a very large price tag. Director Peterson noted that the District tries to work on projects in a manageable way to keep expenses under control.

Director Lucas added that the District's infrastructure is under-metered, and the Board understands that, but the Waucondah WWTP needs to be fixed now. Director Lucas noted that a SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) system is needed for water tank controls, as currently the water tank controls are manual, which is a contributing factor to the unaccounted for water.

Mr. Ostrowski responded "I would think that metering should be a net positive to your revenue" and indicated that he could not support a rate increase until the District understands where their unaccounted for water is.

Director Peterson reiterated that 37% is lot of water that is not billed, but again the District uses a lot of water that is not billable.

Mr. Grabowski requested clarification on the proposed 30% rate increase number that has been used in the question and answer session, his understanding is that the proposed rate increase for water and sewer rates is 10%.

Director Peterson confirmed that the proposed water and sewer rates increase is 10%.

Mr. Grabowski requested clarification on the capital improvement fee, it is \$25 a month, or \$50 bimonthly. The proposed capital improvement fee is primarily to address the capital needs for the sewer treatment plant.

Director Peterson confirmed that Mr. Grabowski's understanding is correct.

Mr. Grabowski noted that the 10% rate increase and the \$50 bimonthly capital improvement fee pay for different types of expenditures, and that you "pay it now or pay more later". Mr. Grabowski requested clarification on how the difference in billed versus generated water affects the base rates and if it affects the capital improvement fees.

The District Manager offered that the impact of billed versus generated water has more of an impact on the variable rates than the base rates. She added that the base rates are more the fixed costs in the District which include payroll, insurance, permits and other costs that are not impacted by the gallons of water treated. She confirmed that it would not impact the capital improvement fee.

Mr. Grabowski reiterated that the rate increase is not 30% and the water and sewer rate increase is not the same as the capital improvement fee increase.

Mr. Ostrowski offered that if you include the base and variable rate increase of 10% and the \$50 capital improvement increase it is 30%.

Mr. Grabowski agreed but stressed the importance of a capital improvement fee increase to pay for much needed upgrades to a wastewater plant, versus an increase in rates to cover operating costs. Mr. Grabowski added "I'm going to be very honest with you, I look at this and what I've heard today, all very informative. And, I give the Board a lot of credit for it". Mr. Grabowski surmised that the increase will be eye-opening to his neighbor but he believes his neighbors would be willing to pay \$25 a month to ensure proper sewage treatment and to remain in compliance with the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency).

With regard to 38% unaccounted for water, Director Lucas clarified that all residential and commercial Customers are metered and billed, adding some unaccounted for water is due to infrastructure that when constructed 30, 40, 50 years ago, did not include metering to monitor the District's water use. The District does not currently meter hydrant water for flushing. The District cannot meter water used for fire protection. The District cannot meter water that is lost from a water main break or a water service break on the District's side. The District cannot currently meter water that is lost due to tank overflows. Director Lucas offered that the District could spend \$1 million on infrastructure metering, and it may change the unaccounted for water gallons to nonrevenue generating water and not have an impact on the revenue collected by the District.

Mr. Cwynar with regard to the Waucondah WWTP, asked if the plant "didn't need these repairs that we know it needed now, would it be adequate to handle the added capacity from the Wiens development? I heard that it was at full capacity, prior to adding 91 more users."

The District Manager offered that the Waucondah WWTP is running at 52% capacity. The District Manager added that the trigger for the plant investigation was significant power related issues which the District believed were related to IREA power surges. A detailed investigation/evaluation of the plant ensued. The District Manager noted that the plant capacity is rated properly; but there are some older components that met the requirements of the design criteria of the day, not today. The biggest problem the District is having is aging infrastructure, about 40 years old, including electrical. There are similar issues at other plants; however, the District has always prioritized the water treatment plants.

Mr. Cwynar responded "Okay, thanks. So my question on the Capital plan, the 10 year plan, I assume that this is done every year looking 10 years forward" and "I assume that this is being done and updated every year. Is that correct?"

Director Peterson confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Cwynar added "So the question is, how did all of this then creep up on us all of sudden and why couldn't we have forecasted this? Because we knew the aging in the system a year ago, two years ago, three years ago, such that the rates could have been gradually increased instead of getting hit with this big ... right now. What's the big change right now that we didn't know about last year?"

The District Manager responded "we did know about it last year. It was in the 2016 Master Plan, well documented. We had to prioritize water projects over wastewater projects."

Mr. Cwynar added "okay, but, wouldn't we have known that there was going to be these other maintenance issues. Or shouldn't we have maybe raised the rates, the capital fee last year or the year before to be able to build a fund to be able to take care of this maintenance?"

Director Peterson responded "there have been rate increases on-going." Director Peterson added that the District has prioritized water projects and senior renewable water rights acquisition via inclusion agreements or purchase. Director Peterson added that

senior renewable water rights in the area are seldom available; and when the opportunity arises to acquire them, you must act or the opportunity will be lost to a downstream entity.

Ms. McCusker commented “I’ve lived in the District for about four years now and I’ve been attending these meetings regularly. I encourage everyone to be more active on an on-going basis. Because I think it would be helpful to hear from you. I am also concerned about the water loss. As the board knows, we did a study and we are trying to make progress towards it. I have wanted to get automatic meter reading in our houses. Because that would allow us to bill more frequently. That way your monthly bill could be spread out a little bit more. I am in favor of the increase. I think we need it and I’m supportive of it.”

Mr. Colton asked “on the Wiens ranch, did they give us all their water rights for the whole ranch or just a portion of the Remuda Ranch?”

The District Manager responded “we have all of the Wiens water on the ranch. We got it through the inclusion agreement as well as purchasing the remainder of it.”

Mr. Colton asked “can they add more developments beyond Remuda Ranch?”

The District Manager responded “no, their agreement was pretty tight. I think the Board was making sure that wouldn’t happen. They can’t increase the number of homes without dedicating the water and they have no water to dedicate.”

Mr. Colton responded “that’s well done. I congratulate you on that on the water cause that’s important. On the Sandstone Ranch, we’ve got their water rights. The question would be is if you have excess water rights we’re not using, can they be leased or loaned or sold on a yearly basis?”

The District Manager responded “absolutely. We lease the water to Tom Wiens on an annual basis if the board decides to do that. We’re trying to work an agreement with Douglas County to do the same thing because we want keep the water in the area.”

Mr. Colton responded “okay. I thought we had water rights out of Chatfield Reservoir that we’re working on. And I didn’t know how the things go down. What do you do with those?”

The District Manager offered that the District does not have water rights in the Chatfield Reservoir.

Director Peterson added the “Board is going to be looking for alternative sources of revenue above and beyond just our Customers” possibly outside of the District when excess water is available. The rates would be extraterritorial rates.

Mr. Colton asked if expense dollars for water main breaks is in the budget.

The District Manager offered that water main breaks is an expense item in the budget, Unscheduled/Emergency Repairs.

Mr. Martin offered that he lives in the Sageport area. He added that an answer has not yet been given as to why the capital improvement fee is increasing so much in one

year and not distributed over a longer period of time. He advised that he understands the urgency of the need, but had the Board considered placing a larger burden on commercial Customers or Customers that use more water?

The District Manager responded that there are only twelve commercial Customers in the District and that they pay their fees on a monthly basis, including the capital improvement fee, as opposed to a bi-monthly basis.

Mr. Martin commented that his question regarding Customers that use more water is still open.

The District Manager offered that the District's variable water rates escalate for Customers who use more water, and the variable rate is increasing as well.

Director Peterson added that a Customer that is using under 10,000 gallons over 2 months is paying \$2.43 per thousand gallons, a Customer that is using over 133,000 gallons during that time; the rate goes from \$2.43 per thousand gallons to \$14.72 per thousand gallons. Director Peterson noted that "most of the people in the District, on a regular basis, fall into the first or second tier levels."

Mr. Berchem commented that he uses little water and is not hooked into the centralized sewer system. He noted "everybody is getting hurt by this immense jack up in fees in all your other areas. I don't know if there is any way that can be proportioned or not. That would be something to look at." He then requested copies of the District's financial statement.

The District Manager stated that all of the District's financial information is available on the District's website <https://www.ppwsd.org/about-us/budgetaudits/>. The District Manager added that if he sends her his e-mail address, she will send him the link.

Mr. Van Doorn asked "what state and federal grants are available for these projects?"

Director Peterson advised "when I mentioned we will be looking at alternative sources of revenue, we will be looking at what state and federal grant opportunities there are."

Mr. Colton asked "is your financing set up to where you can refinance? If you had to or want to?"

The District Manager offered that the District did a lease purchase agreement for financing of the Sageport Water Treatment Plant improvements project, the Bannock Lift Station improvements project, and the Country Club Drive water line loop.

Director Arthurs added, "I have. But the main thing is there is a 1% pre-payment penalty. In other words, if you wanted to combine with the new loan and roll it over, you still have to pay 1%. And I think that's significant on the amount of the loan."

Mr. Colton commented "it goes into your calculations". He added, "All that cost to refinance, lease purchase, or whatever the terms are, goes into whether it's a good deal or



not. The interest rates are so low right now, probably won't go any higher for a while," hopefully there would be some cost savings with consolidation.

Director Peterson clarified that Ehlers is a municipal advisor, not a financing company. Ehlers analyzed our finances, capital improvement needs and how to fund them. Ehlers helped the District decide which type of funding would be the most cost effective for the District in 2018.

Mr. Ostrowski commented that interest rates are at historic lows, potentially, a great opportunity to borrow funds. Mr. Ostrowski added that funding options like grants and loans should have been investigated years ago. Mr. Ostrowski expressed his support of utilizing different usage/rate tiering to shift some of the capital burden and encourage conservation. Mr. Ostrowski asked two final questions; "are you open to sharing what the original terms of that deal was? And second, would you say, like, how does that compare to the market pricing on that?"

The District Manager advised that she would add the Remuda Ranch inclusion related documents to the abovementioned Dropbox.

Director Peterson asked for clarification on his meaning of "market pricing".

Mr. Ostrowski asked if different metrics were used to calculate the impact fee, for example did a larger lot constitute a larger inclusion fee over a smaller lot.

The District Manager offered that the District along with the District's legal counsel determined the inclusion fees based on historic property taxes and buy-in to the existing infrastructure.

Mr. Ostrowski questioned collecting inclusion fees at the time of inclusion as opposed to the time of infrastructure construction.

Mr. Ostrowski asked if the Remuda Ranch inclusion fees were paid in nominal dollars or adjusted to consider that the developments might not be built until a date in the future.

The District Manager offered that the inclusion fees were paid shortly after the inclusion agreements were executed.

Director Peterson added that the Remuda Ranch development is being constructed currently, and that the Remuda Ranch development is paying for all of the infrastructure in today's dollars and when accepted by the Board, the infrastructure will be deeded to the District. Director Peterson noted that the development is 91 units and will be developed gradually. Director Peterson added that Remuda Ranch property owners will be paying tap and development fees at the current rate.

Ms. McCusker requested that Director Arthurs address how funds are going to be separated to insure that capital improvement fees that are collected are paying for future capital improvements.

Director Arthurs advised that he had consulted with the auditors and financial consultants to discuss what other Districts are doing. Director Arthurs added that the

financial statements separate the revenue, and capital improvements are separated under the revenue column. Director Arthurs added that he is a firm believer in segregating cash. Director Arthurs offered that he is working on a usable method to further segregate the revenue that the District collects.

Director Maras offered to further address the grant questions. Director Maras advised that he spent 30 years with the federal government including work with utility finance programs. Director Maras noted that the issue that the Perry Park Water and Sanitation District has in receiving federal and state grants, is that those programs, as a general rule, are tied to demographic data, largely the income. Director Maras added that the District's median income is high, he believes in the \$96,000 range, and much of the competition for grant programs is with smaller, poorer communities.

Director Peterson advised the attendees that the next meeting will be on the third Wednesday in April, and thanked the attendees for their feedback and participation.

Mr. Colton offered that the discussion was helpful and he appreciated the Board's preparation.

### **3.0 New Business and Open Items**

3.1 Meeting Minutes – A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 21-016) TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 17, 2021 REGULAR BOARD MEETING OF THE PERRY PARK WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT AS PRESENTED. The motion passed unanimously.

3.2 Disbursements – A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 21-017) TO RATIFY ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS DATED MARCH 8, 2021 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$11,012.07 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM 1<sup>ST</sup> BANK. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 21-018) TO APPROVE CHECKS 12955 THRU 12963 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$31,585.14 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM 1<sup>ST</sup> BANK. The motion passed unanimously.

In reference to check 12957, issued to Denali Water Solutions, Director Peterson requested that going forward the disbursement description separate the sludge hauling costs for the Waucondah Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Sageport Wastewater Treatment Plant.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 21-019) TO APPROVE CHECKS 12964 THRU 12982 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$113,850.50 TO BE DISBURSED FROM 1<sup>ST</sup> BANK. The motion passed unanimously.

In reference to check 12969, issued to Excell Pump Services, Director LaCrosse requested additional information regarding the *Pump Controller & Pump – Sageport WWTP*. Mr. Parker offered that the pump was over ten years old, and submerged in liquid during that time. Mr. Parker added that there were some electrical repairs required as well.

In reference to check 12968, issued to ERO Resources Corporation, and check 12976, issued to Lytle Water Solutions, LLC and check 12979, issued to TST Infrastructure, LLC, Director Arthurs noted that the bills related to the Gove Ditch continue. The District Manager reiterated that the preconstruction period for the measuring device and the navigation through regulatory agencies are now underway. The District Manager added that the District, TST Infrastructure, LLC, Douglas County Government and ERO Resources Corporation continue to work through cultural assessment related issues.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 21-020) TO RATIFY CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS DATED FEBRUARY 19, 2021 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,782.43 AND CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS DATED MARCH 5, 2021 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,320.68 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK. The motion passed unanimously.

- 3.3 Waucondah Wastewater Treatment Plant Power and Odor Updates – Mr. Parker advised the Board that there had been another motor issue at the Waucondah Wastewater Treatment Plant. Mr. Parker added that it was a motor bearing failure. Mr. Parker highlighted that the fence installation was complete.
- 3.4 Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) Grant Opportunities – As was discussed at the previous Board Meeting, Director Maras advised the Board that some of the District’s metering needs might qualify for the BOR Water Efficiency grant program. Director Maras advised the Board that the District would need a DUNS (Data Universal Numbering System) Number and register with SAMS (System for Award Management). Director Maras advised the Board that he would answer any applicable assurances and disclosures questions that the Board has. Director Peterson noted that the District’s legal counsel would need to be included in the review of documents.
- 3.5 IREA Easement for the A4 Well – The Board reviewed the Utility Overhead and Underground Easement Agreement between IREA and the District for the replacement of the irregular 480-volt Delta High Leg (240/415/480) power supply with a 277/480 Y, 400 AMP service. At the conclusion of discussion a motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 21-021) TO RATIFY THE UTILITY OVERHEAD AND UNDERGROUND EASEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN IREA AND THE PERRY PARK WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPGRADING THE POWER SERVICE TO 277/480 Y, 400 AMP. The motion passed unanimously.
- 3.6 Remuda Ranch Development – Conditional Approval – The Board reviewed the Remuda Ranch Water and Sanitary Sewer Conditional Acceptance Memorandum prepared by TST Infrastructure, LLC, Jay Blackburn, the project engineer. The Memorandum provided detailed information on the infrastructure that had been completed and the outstanding punch list items. At the conclusion of discussion a motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 21-022) TO CONDITIONALLY ACCEPT THE REMUDA RANCH WATER AND SANITARY SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE AND ALLOW INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT TO COMMENCE. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **4.0 Operational Status**

**March 17, 2021**

- 4.1 Perry Park Water and Sanitation District Systems Report – The members of the Board reviewed the monthly operations report which was prepared by Mr. Parker.
- 4.2 Monthly Staff Report – The members of the Board reviewed the Monthly Staff Report that was presented by the District Manager.
- 5.0 Old Business/Immediate Issues** – Director Peterson suggested that a Work Session be scheduled in the near future to discuss alternative sources.
- 6.0 Audience Participation** – There was none.
- 7.0 Adjournment** - A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 21-023) TO ADJOURN THE REGULAR MEETING. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 15:33.

---

Secretary, James Maras