

Regular Meeting – April 20, 2011

Board Members

Mike Hayes
Craig Johnston
Tony Lucas
Jim Matchett
Gary Peterson

Visitors

Will Koger – Nolte Associates, Inc.
Judy LaCrosse

Staff / Consultants

Diana Miller – District Manager
Scott Monroe – Semocor, Inc.

1.0 Call To Order

The meeting was called to order at 16:30.

2.0 New Business and Open Items

- 2.1 Meeting Minutes – A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-025) TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2011 REGULAR BOARD MEETING OF THE PERRY PARK WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT AS PRESENTED. The motion passed unanimously.

Related to Section 3.2 Monthly Reports, the District Manager confirmed that with regard to Board Member compensation, FICA and Medicare should be collected from both the employer and employee.

- 2.2 Water/Sewer Permits – No new permits had been approved.

- 2.3 Disbursements – A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-026) TO APPROVE CHECKS 20456 THRU 20476 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$95,093.10 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK WEST. The motion passed unanimously.

Associated with check number 20465, Director Peterson inquired as to why the District is making their mobile phone service payments to Nextel Communications as opposed to Sprint considering that Sprint had acquired Nextel Communications in 2005. The District Manager advised that the monthly invoice that the District receives is still from Nextel.

In reference to check number 20472 and 20499 Director Peterson noted that check number 20472 was issued to Tienken & Hill LLP and check number 20499 was issued to Alan Hill. The District Manager advised that Mr. Hill had joined Yates Law Firm, LLC located in downtown Denver to take advantage of a more productive business model. The District Manager noted that Mr. Hill was now much closer to the District and to the District's water engineering firm and that Mr. Hill had not increased his billing rate.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-027) TO APPROVE CHECKS 20477 THRU 20497 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$79,814.33 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK WEST. The motion passed unanimously.

After discussing check number 20484 issued to Fischer Enterprises, Inc., Director Peterson requested that a current Water Main Break report be available for discussion at the next Board Meeting.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-028) TO APPROVE CHECKS 20498 THRU 20506 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,165.74 TO BE DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK WEST. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-029) TO RATIFY CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS DATED MARCH 4, 2011 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,956.71 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK WEST. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-030) TO RATIFY CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS DATED MARCH 18, 2011 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,956.71 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK WEST. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-031) TO RATIFY CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS DATED MARCH 29, 2011 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$277.40 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM THE 1ST BANK CHECKING ACCOUNT. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-032) TO RATIFY CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS DATED MARCH 31, 2011 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$549.15 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK WEST. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-033) TO RATIFY CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS DATED APRIL 1, 2011 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,956.71 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK WEST. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-034) TO RATIFY CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS DATED APRIL 15, 2011 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,956.71 WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DISBURSED FROM WELLS FARGO BANK WEST. The motion passed unanimously.

2.4 Douglas County Regional Water Conservation Planning Program – Mr. Will Koger with Nolte Associates, Inc. was in attendance representing Douglas County. Mr. Koger summarized the purpose of the Conservation Program. He indicated that 17 water providers had been approached to participate in the program and 14 of those providers had adopted conservation plans.

The Board asked Mr. Koger to explain any benefit that the District might receive by adopting the proposed plan. He indicated that the draft plan was developed in a template that the Colorado Water Conservation Board had approved and that there was potential of grant funding for water conservation projects.

Director Peterson requested clarification on how the project was initiated. Mr. Koger offered that the project was initiated by the Douglas County Board of Commissioners and funded by grants from the Colorado Water Conservation Board. Director Hayes noted that grant funded is synonymous with tax payer funded.

Director Peterson questioned the timing of the project in relation to the Sterling Ranch proposed development with regard to the large quantity of water that the development needs.

Director Johnston provided copies of pertinent water, drought and seismology news articles for discussion.

Director Peterson offered that he was a past Denver Water Customer. During that time significant conservation measures were implemented by Denver Water with the result being that he utilized less water and paid a much higher utility bill.

Director Hayes expressed concern that there could be unintended consequences associated with adopting the draft plan. He added that the District would be in compliance with the plan for the short term but that there was no way of knowing what changes the State could make in the future that could have a negative impact on the District.

Director Hayes added that the District already has an effective Conservation Plan in place, which was clearly demonstrated by the data presented in the draft plan, and questioned the wisdom of spending constituents money on an effort that would not benefit the District.

The District Manager and Mr. Monroe advised the Board that significant effort had been spent by them on the Douglas County draft plan and that they felt that the exercise had been beneficial to the District's own conservation planning.

Director Peterson acknowledged their effort and suggested that the District Manager and Mr. Monroe utilize the work that they had already completed to draft a modified document that could be incorporated into the District's existing conservation plan that would be more appropriate for the District.

The Board agreed that the District should continue to use their existing Conservation Plan and not to adopt the Douglas County Water Conservation Plan draft or to be included in any Regional Water Conservation Plan.

- 2.5 Town of Larkspur, Exclusion – The District Manager advised the Board that she had not received any further information from Mr. Scott Krob, the Town’s legal counsel.

3.0 Staff and Consultant Reports

- 3.1 Perry Park Water and Sanitation District Systems Report – The members of the Board reviewed the monthly operations reports which had been submitted by Semocor, Inc.
- 3.2 Monthly Reports – The members of the Board reviewed the Monthly Staff Report which had been submitted by the District Manager.

The Board reviewed the Water Main Break report prepared by the District Manager which contained new information associated with the cause of the repair and location.

The Board reviewed the I.R.E.A. Analysis report prepared by the District Manager. Director Hayes highlighted the significant I.R.E.A. rate increase in 2010.

Director Matchett noted the improved clarity of the consumption reports.

The District Manager advised the Board that with the effort of Director Matchett the Year to Date Revenue Budget and Year to Date Expense Budget reports provided more meaningful information to the Board.

4.0 Old Business/Immediate Issues

Director Peterson advised the Board that the Denver Post had been publishing a number of interesting water related articles. Director Peterson requested that the District Manager distribute copies of the articles to the Board Members. He suggested that the District could use some of the situations that other water providers are facing as a frame of reference for decisions that the Board will make in the future. He suggested that the District continue to investigate financial opportunities.

5.0 Audience Participation

There was none.

- 6.0 Adjournment** - A motion was made and seconded; (RESOLUTION 11-035): TO ADJOURN THE REGULAR MEETING. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 18:30.

ATTEST:

Secretary