

ECPC Minutes 12-8-10

In Attendance: MJ Minton, Frank Dertzbaugh, Jim DiMeglio

Budget: Total Expenses are \$230,258.53.

Total M&T requisitions are \$206,713.73.

Total LLA requisitions are \$9,875.88 for fiscal year 2010/2011.

M&T account is \$177,973.24

The LLA HOA has been allowing a yearly budget for the Aspen North property owners to be used from their yearly HOA due, for the CDA expenses. The new LLA board of directors is evaluating their expenses for the upcoming fiscal year. ECPC sent a letter to the LLA board asking that the yearly allotment continue for the fiscal year. Brandon Frazier and Steve Ekanger sent their continued support in an email. Tom Roland confirmed his support too in a phone conversation. While the 2012 budget has not been finalized Aspen North is expecting a continued line item of \$34,500 to be used for CDA expenses.

Harris & Smariga issued a credit of \$4,455, leaving a balance of \$5609.97. They took 50% off the water & sewer comments billing in May and adjusted the pump station bill to a 23.8% completion rather than the 30% previously billed. This was as a result of our meeting with them on November 8, 2010.

CDA Extension: A resolution was drawn up as per the BoCC approval of the CDA extension for a final hearing on November 30. At the final moment the Commissioners decided to not take action on this matter and let the new incoming commissioner's vote. We will have to reschedule an appearance in front of the new commissioners and explain our situation.

Keenan Rice from Municap said bonds were now being priced at around 6.25 – 5.75%. Our CDA had budgeted 7%. If the interest rates do go back up on the bonds we can go back in front of the commissioners or issue them at a discount, which would mean we would get less money.

Pump Station: Barry Ebersole with McCrone submitted a final proposal for the pump station. These numbers were comparable to the other proposal. ECPC felt McCrone had the most experience and qualifications for the pump station and voted to award the proposal to them.

SWM Concept plan: On November 23 the ECPC board met to review the concept plan that was 15% complete. Notes of that meeting are included in these minutes.

11-23-10 Meeting to Discuss Concept Plan SWM 15% from Paul Sill

In Attendance: MJ Minton, Frank Dertzbaugh, John Peters, Jim Dimeglio

The purpose of the meeting was to review the first initial treatments for the SWM concept plan from Paul Sill. Overall it appears Paul has put care and thought into the challenging design issues we face. The following points from Paul were reviewed by the ECPC board as well as additional comments:

- 1) Swale at the top of Arapahoe (east side) exits the road and flows between lots #39 and #40. Concern was raised about flow on to #57. Paul said a specimen tree might be there as shown

on the plans. The board does not think there really is a specimen tree as the note shows the "fence remains" through the tree. The tree should be ignored in the designing. All flows should be maintained on the allowable LLA easements of 10' on fronts, and 6' on sides and back.

- 2) Swale along East Shavano (east side) exits the road and flows between lots #69 and #70. That would be ok as long as flows remained within allowable LLA easements.
- 3) Extra storm drain along Arapahoe to divert water from the dry swale behind Pax and L'abril. That would be ok. Board would like to know what is a dry swale and what will it look like.
- 4) Storm drain on West Shavano Road between lots #74 and #75 because of low point. That is an underground storm drain and will be ok as long as it sits within the allowable side easements (12' total)
- 5) Entrance culvert at West Shavano utilizing a manhole to get around the PE pedestal. Pedestal is a vault and likely bigger than Paul realizes. The board thinks he should field site the vault before a determination is made as it could be big. We like that the storm drain is being moved rather than the vault. We need to find out what Paul will charge to locate the vault and any other corner markers needed to make a determination on how to design the storm drain around it. Please have Paul give a price for this.
- 6) Utilize more of parcel B between East and West Shavano Road for a dry swale by grading behind lots #103 to #107. The board again would like to know what would be planned for a dry swale. Will water sit on it? It could affect the backyards of those lots if there is standing water or during a rain storm. Some of the grading goes beyond the 6' easement and onto the BRL. The board would like to use only parcel b keeping everything within that. We need to have designs that avoid getting easements from property owners. In this case we would not want to utilize the LLA 6' easement either since it would affect a property owner's use of their backyard, for example if they had a garden. We also like the idea of NOT using check dams. The Coastal Outfall may be an option with big rocks as check dams, if it can stay within the parcel b width.
- 7) Additional concern came up regarding the bioretention area. Is it filled with water? It is likely due to the location of driveways on lots #69 and #68 and with the curve in the road that people may drive into it. Also we wonder if fire safety would approve the bioretention design as a firetruck may not be able to get around it and the curve it sits on. Can the bioretention be moved to the inside corner on lot #102? Maybe making it longer and narrower so a fire truck will be able to get through?
- 8) Is the SWM legend applicable? It is striked out.

- 9) Regarding FRO, the whole LLA area is considered on site and we will not be doing any offsite banking. All of our acreage will come from on site acres as allowed by Mike Wilkens regarding FRO.

- 10) Storm drain outfalls on Land Stewards property between lots #88 and #89. We do not want to outfall on their property. Can the storm drain instead go straight down Arapahoe by lot #83 and eliminate the extra piping? If not, can it be put between #86 and #87 or #84 and #85 and go between #15 and #16 to parcel B?

- 11) There is nothing shown for Arapahoe Road between lots #25 – 34. What will it be? Asphalt, pervious concrete, dry swale? Is there any treatment for this area?

- 12) The entrance at Shavano has a little bit of pervious concrete. The board would like to eliminate this. Because it is so small it will look “piecemeal” at the entrance, and asphalt will be a better product for the wear and tear of the entrance. Since it has little impact on the calculations we would like to remove it so the entrance has more durability, looks better, and minimizes the piecemeal and transition of asphalt and pervious concrete.