

**Floyd Hill
Focus Group #2 - Utilities**

Attendees:

Peggy Abeyta - Qwest
Les Pendleton - IREA
Robin Reilley - DRCOG
Fred Rollenhagen - CCC
Trent Hyatt - CCC
Bert Weaver - CCC
Pete Helseth
David Elmgreen
JoAnn Sorenson - CCC
Health Dept. - CCC
Don Berland - David Williams representative
Roger ?- David Williams representative
Peggy Stokstad - CCC Economic Development
Cindy Condon - Idaho Springs
Lookout Mtn Water District
Beaverbrook Sanitation District
Saddleback Mountain Metro District
Anne Pagano - Drexel Barrell, project team
Karen Grannan - Norris Design, project team
Elena Vossman - Norris Design, project team

Utilities Questions:

- What is your service boundary?
- What services do you provide?
- What is your capacity to expand?
- How is expansion funded?
- What are tap fees?

Discussion:

Saddleback Mountain Metro District-

- Plat of Saddleback mountain - 570 acres, 86 homes, well and septic
- Uphill Limited Liability Company owns another 1000 acres to the west, will be submitted to county for platting, 735 SF wells that can be developed - west slope water coming through Vidler tunnel, US 40, June/July - storage for rest of year.
- Process - once plats are approved, submit to state water engineer for well permit
- \$10,000 fee for water fees upon purchase
- This district would not be much affected by development at the bottom of FH - not interested in extending water and tap fees

Lookout Mountain Water-

- West side of county 1/5 miles up to treatment plant, 1.5 miles up to easement to upper reservoir, highway to Mt Evans

- 75 acres includes easement areas, 565 taps – according to state have no more taps!
- Service provided – 2 customers (CCC HS and 1 resident along Beaverbrook Dr.)
- Extensions funded from lending from state, federal and private arrangements – a few outstanding loans, no set future extensions
- Capacity is nebulous, depends on drought conditions and Jefferson County – District cannot accept more taps without water rights
- Existing tap fees - \$18,500 for inclusion fee for resident/commercial + tap ownership (\$30-50,000) + \$1,000 meter connection fee
- Mil Levy – 16.5, private loans, grants – funding for improvements

IREA –

- Substation at Floyd Hill, 2-12,500 volt circuits, 1 circuit on joint use w/ Xcel goes to El Rancho other goes to Hyland Hills
 - Xcel heats up substation – subtransmission from Xcel
 - IREA gets billed directly from Xcel
- Capacity – el ranch (1 ott) minimal conductor, 2nd is 4 ott
 - Capacity expansion a problem b/c existing wires may not have enough capacity
 - Need to talk to Xcel about expansion b/c underbuilt with them (contact is Steve Smith – Arvada)
 - Developers could rebuild to get capacity – overhead powerlines (not substations, but depends on loading)
 - Financial burden falls upon the developer
 - Need more ROW for expansion - need to work with property owners
 - Everyone wants you to bury it underground – 4 ott line is expensive
 - Substation doesn't need upgrade, just distribution system

Idaho Springs-

- Has water to sell and quite a bit
- Legal extension of water? Selling water outside of boundaries – limits to how much water you can sell (won't provide more information b/c water attorney is too expensive)
- Building pipe from Idaho Springs would be the major issue, pump station, storage tank
- Need approximately 3 miles of pipe from Idaho Springs to Floyd Hill
- City has capacity for 1.8 MGD, only using 0.512 MGD, and has more rights available
- Current pipe is 6 inch, don't know whether it would be a continuation of that or a new line
- Water is being extended from the City to Hidden Valley (Central City Expressway)
- Wastewater extension from IS has been talked about, but would be way down the road, and FH can be served by CCHS (has a lot of capacity)
- \$10,000 for out of city (all uses), plus cost of pipe line (developer would pay), usage rate=\$56/monthly tap rate (vs. \$28 for in-city), \$3.50/1000 gallons
- Discussion about alternate routes for pipeline (doesn't necessarily have to follow I-70)
- No studies have been done by the City for possible routing options

Beaverbrook Metro District-

- Misconception – IGA w/ school board, Beaverbrook water and sanitation, Beaverbrook private company – get a copy of this agreement** from Peggy Stokstad

- Peggy - will fax Anne a copy
- Don't have a boundary - Beaverbrook Land property owns water, high school owns sanitation district
- Get information from DRCOG - GIS** wastewater urban growth boundaries and facility locations
- Additional capacity - 40,000 gallons a day (can be doubled), sewer treatment plant owned by HS
- Water belongs to land company - available through use by wells

Qwest -

- Don't know boundaries (Idaho springs, others??)
- Copper and fiber optics in certain areas (business & residential)
- Electronic cabinets are used
- Fiber optic available in Saddleback
- Do provide service according to CO Utilities commissions
- Capacity - can always expand, don't expect any problems with expansion
- Developers help to pay for expansion
- Will need ROW or easements for expansion
- Development agreement - installation fee

CCC Water Bank - Bert

- 15 years ago - Basin-wide water augmentation plan
- Has 63 acre-feet direct flow delivery rights
- Water in June/July - through Vidler tunnel (64 acre feet flowing/ 30 million gallons) flows under Argentine pass, Basin-wide, stipulations with water users - including FH, not use wells with out approval of homeowners,
- Additional capacity - have potential for many other storage facilities
- Definitely have many legal water supply options
- Board decided it wasn't going to offer to Beaverbrook watershed areas (some of study does not include this area) - b/c of fear by landowners that their wells would go dry b/c of development of new wells (Needs further study)
- Distributed through wells
- Tap fees - wells \$2200/acre foot/per year
- Number of studies - 4 grants to go underway. (Turkey creek, Co geological study - ground water supply, 9 sites analysis - CCC reservoir 2/3/4, etc.)

Q & A - Should there be central water service for FH?

- Was a possibility until denied annexation - but still a possibility
- Should be considered to make subsequent buyers more comfortable
- No official studies
- There are many practical limitations - first developers are going to have to initiate, could set up structure for future developers to pay you back
- Need a development that would be near the size to support the cost
- Gigantic opportunity to get organized and get federal government to clean up water at top of Floyd Hill
- Future - depends on commercial/residential development

- What is the critical mass needed for a central water system – some of this will be answered by market assessment
- DRCOG – wastewater (no involvement)
- Would it be more cost effective to do wells than taps – maybe it's not a water district but more management issue
- Overall, agreed by most that central water service to serve any future development is preferred

Q & A – Natural Gas?

- Saddleback is on propane – not gas from Excel
- Excel currently serves parts of Floyd Hill with gas

Q & A – Storm water detention?

- Plan for it because...
 - Phase II, Cleanwater act
 - Groundwater recharge
 - Floodplain management
- Storm water is currently not required for water quality – erosion control required by the state (not for communities under 10,000 people)
- Use Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD) design standards
- High school has big detention pond
- Tim Vogel talks about it – may want to talk with him in individual interview
- Should we make it part of the master plan?
- LEED accredited design – best management practices

Q & A – DRCOG involvement –

- May need to be in an urban growth boundary before we get wastewater – based on DRCOG guidelines. Do have additional area– it is flexible
- County could request more, it is a process – next time in 2009, urban boundary working group is developing processes and banking policies
- County has 8.6 square miles of water allocated and mapped – have capacity
- Recently passed DRCOG study in Jan. 2008
- GIS Info from DRCOG – Robin Reilley**

Side-discussion with David Elmgreen

- Hidden Valley developer = Les Johnson 970-721-7070, can provide information on waterline extension from Idaho Springs
- Other developer in Idaho Springs = David Reed 970-674-2208, can also provide information on water system in I.S.

Side-discussion with Don Berlan (Representing David Williams)

- High School WW treatment plant is owned and operated by the High School
- High School wants to sell the treatment plant to Beaverbrook
- David William's project is planned to connect to the High School treatment plant

Action Items:

- DRCOG GIS
- School District representative re: Beaverbrook Sanitation Capacity
- Xcel energy (Steve Smith)
- Chris Etcheson at County
- Grants for CCC water bank review at Bert Weaver's office
- Get Beaverbrook agreement document from Peggy
- Meet with Tim Vogel - Site Development Director for CCC
- Contact Les Johnson (Hidden Valley developer)