

**Sierra Los Pinos Property Owners' Association**  
**Board of Directors Meeting**  
**March 8, 2022**

The meeting was called to order by the President Paul Lisko with the following members present: Keith Rigney, Cindy Hines, Ann Cooke, John Hines, David Stuedell, Paul Rightley, Josh Toennis and Kristi Cross. Jeremy Oepping was excused.

Guests: Sandra Partridge, Alexander Wold, Carolyn Corn, Harold Corn, Mary Moore, Sarah Matthews, Sue Watts, Kurt and Cindy Standley, Scott DeWitt, Suzanne Star, Barbara Van Ruyckevelt, Richard Thompson, and Eric Verret.

**Approval of Agenda:** David Stuedell made a motion to approve the agenda; seconded by Paul Rightley, motion carried.

**Approval of Minutes:** Cindy Hines moved to approve the minutes of the February 8, 2022 meeting; seconded by David Stuedell; motion carried.

Paul Rightley moved to approve the minutes of the November 6, 2021 Special Meeting on Water; seconded by Keith Rigney; motion carried.

**OFFICER REPORTS:**

**PRESIDENT:**

Paul Lisko reported:

There was a meeting on the co-mingle project that was conducted at the Sierra Los Pinos firehouse on February 16. Two bidders showed up for the meeting.

He had signed the annual corporate report for the New Mexico Secretary of State only after Kristi was listed as the secretary. HOAMCO was not including her on the list of officers. So that was done on February 16<sup>th</sup>.

A memo was sent out on the co-mingle project and recruitment for the water management team. It was sent by listserv on February 20<sup>th</sup>.

On March 2<sup>nd</sup>, attended bid opening with contractors and NV5 for the co-mingle project.

Now, we're going to get into a discussion on the co-mingle project a little bit later in the agenda, but I wanted to let you know that of the two bidders for this project, J&E, which was out of Albuquerque, bid just under \$71,000. The other bidder was David Salazar, and he is located in San Ysidro; his bid was just under \$44,000.

**VICE PRESIDENT:**

Keith Rigney reported:

He had two things on agenda; one, Ron Brown has contacted the Board to revise our road maintenance agreement. It's not revised for content, it is revised for a new buyer. As we all know, Lot 3 was bought about four months ago for LANet. There are still five more lots to sell. I believe there is a potential buyer for these five lots. This entire road maintenance agreement will be altered to show these next five lots and the new buyer's name. He asked that we get notarized and mail. I have not had time with my newborn to get notarized and/or mailed. Paul stated that he would take this over. We'll get that done when we can.

The other agenda is for me to announce anything that I've posted on behalf of the Board on our Facebook page. I have not made any posts in the recent times. I tried to make a post, but it never got posted.

If you have any questions, let me know; send me an email. Thank you.

**SECRETARY:**

Kristi Cross reported:

The Otter.ai transcription service that we thought about using to help transcribe these minutes was absolutely horrible. I think at this point Keith's newborn could have done a better job than what the Otter.ai did, so we've decided not to go ahead with that service.

In regard to revisions on the welcome packet, I need to get with Cindy to go over a couple of things that were supposed to be provided.

I have not had a chance to work on the current contact list for the service providers due to work and being sick for a couple of weeks here.

Paul Lisko: A couple of other people entered the meeting; Marsha Gaillour and Sumner Dean. Also Amber Gaston.

## **TREASURER:**

Paul read the treasurer's report from Jeremy Oepping, dated March 8, 2022:

- The balance in accounts as of February 28, 2022 is as follows:
  - Operating Account: \$188,398.73
  - Reserve Account: \$129,397.56
- As of February 28th, we have 34 delinquent accounts totaling \$36,938.44. This is an decrease of \$12,063.59 from last month. Annual assessments were officially due at the end of January. A reminder, late fees and interest do not start until April 1<sup>st</sup>, but are retro back to January 31<sup>st</sup>.
- The February amount of \$666.67 was transferred to Reserves during the month.
- There was one change in property ownership in February. We welcome:
  - Los Alamos Commnet, Inc. on High Road.

That concludes the treasurer's report. Any questions you may have, please hold them for Jeremy when he's here next month.

Paul Lisko: Now we're going to get into what I think most everybody is showing up here for, and that's the discussion on the co-mingle project, to talk about the bids received, the administrative costs and other factual information.

So, to give you a little bit of background on this before we get underway with discussion, the SLPPOA Board had looked to hire an engineering firm to help us with water issues; specifically those water issues that we addressed, and this was based upon input from our current water operator,

John Hines, and our past water manager, Harold Corn. The three areas that were identified for an engineering firm to take a look at: trying to go to a water billing system, and the Board decided to put that on hold, and there was also something that didn't have to do with water, it had to do with setting up drainages on the road, which the Board placed on hold.

There were two engineering firms that submitted proposals in March, April and May. We made a comparison between all three of those, and the Board selected NV5 as the engineering firm that we wanted to go with. The two tasks the Board identified for NV5 to take on were systematic line replacement as we progressed. Initially what the Board decided to go with was the co-mingle project between System 2 and System 1.

Now, as many of you may know, there is currently a co-mingle that's set up from System 1 to feed System 2 in the event of an emergency, and it's been used at least three times in recent memory. The most extensive use of that occurred between November 19<sup>th</sup> and December 3<sup>rd</sup> of 2021. We had to keep monitoring the tank levels and all the rest of it because there was an electrical outage on the panel at the Forest Road 10 well, sometimes referred to as the Meadow Well. It's believed it occurred due to a lightning strike and it took awhile to get an electrician up here to fix that.

The whole idea of this co-mingle project was to go ahead and have it available to provide water from System 2 to System 1. You've probably heard some talk about well, the co-mingle that's presently there can be used to go ahead and move water from System 2 to System 1. If you've read what Harold Corn wrote about that, the meter was running backwards, which I'm pretty sure a meter shouldn't do, and it's actually not set up to run that way. The way Harold put it when we were talking about this, was that he got lucky. So, to me, if we're going to go ahead and start doing major improvements on System 1, then we need to have this co-mingle project in place.

The other thing that people were really up in arms about was based on the engineer's preliminary estimate. The engineer estimate this project would cost just under \$89,000. So there were a number of people who latched onto that and stated we're going to be breaking the bank, losing all the money from the reserve account. To be honest with you, if the bid had come in as \$89,000 or more, I wouldn't be in favor of it, but it came in at a reasonable just under \$44,000. My perspective is we should move forward with this. Keep in mind, this is a Board decision. I sent all the members

who signed up before 4:30 the minutes of the Annual Meeting that were pertinent to the co-mingle project. So, when this vote comes down today, it's going to be open for discussion with all the members, but the vote is based upon the Board taking action. So, again, I think it's a good thing to do, I think the price is reasonable; I don't think it's going to get any cheaper than it already is. The other thing is we're going to be supporting a local business, which I think is a good thing, and we would also have a dependable contractor coming to work for us, who we may be able to get for other projects down the road, for other improvements.

With that being said, I'm going to open the floor for discussion.

Paul Rightley: Paul, can I ask a question?

Paul Lisko: Paul Rightley, go ahead; yes.

Paul Rightley: I would like for all the people who speak to tell me whether they are on System 1 or System 2, because I am on System 1, and there has been a backup for System 2 from System 1 for some time, and so, you know, unfortunately if we talk about majorities, then two-thirds of the people in Sierra Los Pinos are on System 2, and only one-third of us are on System 1.

So I'm not trying to say that this is a foregone conclusion, but moving water from System 2 to System 1 would definitely help my property value, let me say, and otherwise I'd like to hear what people have to say.

Cindy Hines: Actually, I have to disagree with Paul Rightley. There are something like 90 homes on System 1 and only about 50 on System 2. So it's not a two-thirds/one-third thing.

Paul Lisko: You're right; that's correct.

Paul Rightley: That's the opposite of what I've been learning, but if it's true, I get it.

Kristi Cross: I would request that before everyone speaks, please clearly identify yourself to make my life easier when transcribing the minutes and please don't talk over one another, because that makes it very hard as well. Thank you.

Paul Lisko: Thank you, that reminded me that we need to be courteous with one another. Who would like to speak? Does anybody have anything to say?

Suzanne Star: Yes, I have something to say. I'll take the lead on this. I appreciate the fact that you went out and got these bids, and that the bids came in a little lower than the engineering report; however, I can only go ahead and advise one thing, and I've been harping on this for the last four or five months. Our leaks should come first. Any money that we spend right now should go to leaks on System 1. Paul Rightley is talking about the fact that it's nice to move water around. We should be fixing our leaks so we do not have to rely upon moving water around so regularly. So I would like to put my thoughts in, that the leaks should be fixed first. Thank you.

Paul Rightley: Suzanne, are you on System 1 or System 2?

Suzanne Star: The one that's leaking; I'm on System 1. It's now leaking at the rate of 59 percent. System 1 needs help.

Paul Lisko: And I want to address that, because one of the things we talked about, and I got support from our water operator, John Hines, on this, and Harold Corn was for it until he was against it. The whole reason we went out to do this co-mingle project in the first place was that was kind of deemed the failsafe as we started doing major repairs on System 1. If something failed, we would still be able to move water there. The other comment that I have, and I mentioned this before, when this program started of doing line replacement, it started about ten years ago. The first three years of that replacement was substantial. The leak rate in System 1 went from 70 percent to about 50 percent. The next four years after that, the leak rate maintained, plus or minus, 50 percent. And so nothing changed.

I don't know if you saw the email that Jonathan Morris sent out, but I thought it was very comprehensive. If we're replacing line and it costs 80 to 100 thousand dollars to replace those four-inch lines, but we weren't gaining anything, we were still having a 50 percent leak rate, like we do now, then what are we doing, what are we doing that's actually fixing things. In my mind, it's not happening. So the other thing to keep in mind, too, is one of the things that we need to do, which was recommended by NV5, and which is also recommended by any number of water associations throughout the US, the move is on right now to go from four-inch line to six-

inch line. I'm not sure how to effect that, but I would say if we're going to start replacing line, we should start replacing with six-inch line.

David Stuedell: Paul, I commend you on the six-inch line concept, but I think that you have to be really careful about how you mix any kind of diameters. That's twice the capacity. So, that would have to be engineered.

As far as the co-mingle of the systems, basically I'm for it, but because of the community's concern, like what Suzanne said, I think we should do a special assessment to execute that project, and that way we get a vote from the community and we don't deplete our funds. \$40,000 would not be a very significant cost for 155 people; \$322 a person approximately. So I wouldn't mind paying that. I think it's a good project, and I do commend you for going ahead. I think getting a contractor who is familiar with our system to do the work is a big bonus. That's all I have to say.

Paul Lisko: What I would say to that is everybody up in arms about the cost of \$89,000 and the contractor came in for less than half of that, and I don't think that we're going to get a better deal than that. Here's the thing also, David. Everybody that said about the co-mingle, it's like, well, they're not against it, but they want to see us moving toward fixing leaks first. So if you're not against it – and I understand what you're saying about an assessment – but right now we have a bid on the table and this contractor is waiting to hear from us as to whether or not we want to move forward with this. What I'm saying is, if that cost had been \$89,000, yeah, I agree, I would have been against that as well, because that would have totally depleted our reserve funds. But as it is right now, it's going to reduce it by about a third, because it's like \$129,000 in the reserve account, and this contract costs \$44,000. I still think we should go forward with it. That's my two cents' worth.

Sumner Dean: I wanted to enter into a little bit of a dialogue with you, as opposed to expressing my opinions. Was I hearing you correctly a moment ago, where you said that we have replaced lines, but we still are sitting at a 50 percent leak rate, and so what's the use, we didn't accomplish anything. Is that what I heard you say?

Paul Lisko: I didn't say what's the use, and I didn't say we didn't accomplish anything. What I said was that the line replacement started ten years ago, and the first three years of that initiative was effective. The leak rate went from 70 percent to 50 percent. And then the next four years, with

1,000 feet of line being replaced, the leak rate stayed static at 50 percent. That's what I said.

Sumner Dean: So plain logic says that the second time period of fixing, so to speak, was not fixing leaks, it was doing something else, or that means that leaks had sprung up elsewhere while others were fixed. So my question is, how do you know whether or not you're actually addressing a section of the main line that is leaking?

Paul Lisko: We don't know that.

Sumner Dean: You should know that. That's one of the main reasons why we have –

Paul Lisko: Let me finish.

Sumner Dean: -- put...in the first place to be able to know that.

Paul Lisko: Please don't interrupt me.

Sumner Dean: You're talking over me.

Paul Lisko: That's one of the things that we need to do is go ahead and continue replacing lines. That was already suggested.

Sumner Dean: And the lines that were suggested to be replaced, is there measured evidence that they are leaking, that those places are leaking?

Paul Lisko: Well, that's what would have to be assessed in order to effectively replace those lines. I think in the email I got from Harold Corn –

Sumner Dean: What do you mean –

Paul Lisko: Just a minute. I think that the email I got from Harold Corn indicated that there was some process to go ahead and kind of figure out where those leaks are.

Sumner Dean: So you're telling me there are sections that are suggested to be replaced, but there's not a measurement as to how much leakage, if any, in those segments. Is that correct?

Paul Lisko: Yeah, that's not been established yet; that is correct.



Sumner Dean: Who would go forward fixing something when you don't even know if it's leaking in the first place? So, my reaction to what you –

Paul Lisko: That's what I just told you was that – let me see if I can find that email from Harold.

Sumner Dean: So there are suggested places to fix, and they still need to be evaluated as to whether or not those sections are leaking or not; is that what I'm hearing you say?

Paul Lisko: That is correct. Harold, can you jump in here, because you gave an idea about how that's done. You can more knowledgeably answer Sumner's questions than I can. Go ahead, please jump in here.

Harold Corn: Hi, Harold here. System 1, I'll just address the topic that Sumner is asking about. In the document I sent to the Board, I added a section called "Finding the Leaks," and a technique was developed here at Sierra Los Pinos which included an acoustic flow meter installed at the storage tanks of System 1 to monitor the leak rate. The early label we used for this kind of testing, we called it a meter loop. In fact, we had a meter loop outside the main line. We would divert the water so we could measure it. That was the first attempt on a two-inch meter. Eventually, Mark Stanley ordered and we installed an acoustic clamp-on flow meter at the tank site. So, if we were looking at it right now, we would probably see that seven or eight gallons a minute flowing through when no one was using water. So that's the way you do it. And then you begin to – isolation begins at the far end of System 1 and progresses slowly, section by section, to the opposite end, recording the leak rate for each section. We have had two successful runs on this – maybe three – that have been documented, and we based the line replacement sections on the worst. We started with the worst, in other words, the highest leak rate for that section, and we can do this again.

So currently there are no sections identified to be replaced. Those measurements need to be retaken and also verify the lines that were replaced, and that would all be slowly, methodically, figured out.

Paul Lisko: Thank you for that explanation, Harold. Sumner, did that address your inquiry?

Sumner Dean: Yes. I was going off of what I thought you were alluding to, that sections had been replaced, but we had not made any advancements in the leak rates. That's what it sounded like.

I would like to voice my opinion, which is to agree 100 percent with Suzanne that all money should be directed toward reducing the leaks, even if it means raising some, but to keep going down the path of improving or replacing sections, and to not fall for this other current project, which is to give us maybe some confidence or comfort that, oh, we've got a way to plug things for a while.

Paul Lisko: Sumner, thank you for your opinion. Anybody else?

Jonathan Morris: This is Jonathan Morris. Would it be okay if I chime in?

Paul Lisko: Yes, please Jonathan; go ahead.

Jonathan Morris: I actually read the email from Harold, and it was really interesting to kind of see the creative solutions that they have – I'll say "they," because I've only been here for four years – come up with in the past to keep a water system going for as long as it has. And quite successfully, I would say, despite the leaks. But kind of adding the two plus two, the two being Harold's technique, with what you said Paul about actually in the later years of presumably using this technique, it wasn't all that successful, in that we didn't see any significant leak reduction, albeit a possibility could be that we just sprung new leaks after replacing sections of pipe that were, in fact, bad, but because it was a zero-something gain, you know, we might have fixed 10 percent, but caused 10 percent by creating pressure elsewhere, you know.

So I guess I would just like to suggest tempering expectations that this process – and Harold forgive me, and correct me if I'm wrong on this – this process is, while educated guessing if you will, there's still a lot of guesswork and hope work and it may not be as easy as one, two, three, we found the leaks, we're going to throw 50, 60, 70,000 out, fix it, boom, done. There may be a little bit of expectation management on this, actually trying to find and fix these leaks. It sounds like it's a lot harder than maybe just isolating and listening to this sonic device and looking at the leak rates.

Paul Lisko: Thank you, Jonathan; thank you for those comments. Do you have an opinion, one way or another, about the co-mingle?

Jonathan Morris: So I joined a little bit late, so I didn't hear a lot of the early-on stuff, and here's what I'll say. I also understand that there is a really cool, also very creative, way to currently, with the system that is set up, go ahead and pump water from System 2 to System 1. I don't know how sustainable that is in the long term, if it addresses all the houses, if requires a level of expertise and volunteer assistance that may or may not be there today, even if it was there years ago when it was tried successfully. So I lean more towards this co-mingle project being a very high value. Quite frankly, us being on System 2, I feel it's a little bit disingenuous for me, or anybody else, frankly, on System 2 to vote no to this, or to have a "no" opinion on this, because we're not the ones affected.

Now, if there is a collective opinion among those that live on System 1 that they do not want this, they're willing to risk not having a solid co-mingle option to back-feed them should their wells and their pumps and their electrical systems and all of that, that could fail, failed. If the System 1 folks are like, yeah, no, we don't care, let's just throw the money at the leaks and don't give us this back-up solution from System 2, then I guess I would tend to go with them. I'm kind of on the fence 60/40 leaning towards doing the co-mingle, because I know it has helped us on System 2. I remember not too long ago, Harold and everybody was out of town, there was this massive leak on System 2, and was it not for System 1, we would have been out of water for longer. As it was, we were without water for ten days, and it would have been longer had we not had that System 1 feed option. So, it's a really nice thing to have, and I think it's worth a lot of money and some prioritization. So I'm for it in that sense, but if everybody on System 1 chimes in and they don't care about it, they'll all take the risk, then who are we to argue with them. That's my take on it.

Paul Rightley: Well, I will make a statement that if everyone on System 1 is for it, that means that two-thirds, or a substantial majority of the people in the community will most likely be for it.

Jonathan Morris: That's fine. I'm just saying there may be a lot of loud voices from those of us on System 2, and I wouldn't put a whole lot of stock, as a Board, in what those of us on System 2 feel is the right way to go, because it's not our families being affected, it's the families in System 1. So, as a Board, I know it's a Board vote, not a popular vote. I would advise you to listen more to System 1 folks. That's all.

Paul Lisko: The other thing I want to mention about that, there's talk about co-mingle currently. That thing was put in probably 25 years ago when the System 2 water system was established. So the whole idea of – Harold mentioned doing it one time and getting lucky with it. I don't think that we can just depend on luck to have that happen again, especially since, you know, it wasn't set up to run that way, to run water from System 2 to System 2 and, like I say, that co-mingle is currently, probably 25 years old. So it might get to the point where it's getting past its prime, if you will.

John Hines, I want to defer to you on this, because I think you have a pretty good handle on why that's a one-directional valve. It's not bi-directional. Harold, like he said, just got lucky with it that time. So, John, can you weigh in on this, please.

John Hines: Basically, what has to happen is, the way System 2 is set up with the booster pump, there's check valves, and so those check valves don't allow the water to run the other direction, so we don't drain our tanks up on top of Los Griegos. When Harold told me that, he did explain to me how that he did get that to do that once, but it's basically opening a valve just a little bit and making it so the pressure is equalized out from System 2 to System 1 water tanks. So water will actually go backwards through the pipe instead of forward. So it take a little finesse and turning a valve a quarter of a turn, and then measuring it to see if that's where you need it, and then going another quarter of a turn, but it is possible to do it, obviously. It's been done.

But when it's an emergency situation and people are out of water, and I tend to favor towards the customer, one of the things that personally I like the co-mingle project is because when we have replaced line and we'll be talking about the issue of water leaks later on, but when we have one, if we can turn a valve instantly and get water back, and isolate a piece of line, we might only have two or three or five customers out of water versus having a hundred customers out of water until we can figure out how we can turn that valve a quarter of a turn and stuff.

So, to me, it's a matter of efficiency and about reliability and having as few as possible customers being out of water. That being said, if people don't mind being out of water for three, five, however many days it takes to fix it, then the co-mingle would fall down on my priorities. But like I said, for me it's a customer-based preference for me. I take it personally when we have customers out of water. I just feel like I'm not doing my job. So, I kind of

like it when people have water all the time when they ask for it, and we'll talk about that later on. That's my two cents' worth.

Paul Lisko: The other thing I saw mentioned was some concern that the folks who were up on the hill, just below those System 2 tanks, that they would be adversely affected, and this has to do with Farquhars and Nathalie Martin, who is present here. But the way that it's set up is that with this co-mingle project, they would not be without water. What would happen is that part of the project is to install a gate valve that would allow water from the tanks to continue to feed those two residences until whatever the problem was, that we had to employ the co-mingle, was fixed, and it was estimated that those two residences, if all three of those 10,000 gallon tanks were at 80 percent, that would probably be enough to last for 30 days. So the issue about those folks being without water, they wouldn't be without water. I just thought about that when John was talking about customer service.

Mary Moore: Paul, this is Mary Moore, can I speak?

Paul Lisko: Go ahead, Mary.

Mary Moore: I'm wondering if the Board would give a commitment to us that you're really going to prioritize the leak detection that Harold described? Where have you shown us, or where have you put together a schedule or a group of people that we can feel that you're going to go through and actually do this leak detection? We just hear so much about the co-mingle project. I think it has merit, but my view is the leak detection issue is much more urgent, and where is it that you guys are starting to work on this? Again, I know the last piece of pipe, or the last section of pipes that was redone after leak detection investigations was in 2019. So here we are three years later, and I know Covid has intervened, but are we going to get back to leak detection? Where is the commitment to that?

Paul Lisko: The brief answer is yes, we're going to get back to leak detection. As it is right now, we can go ahead and follow the process that Harold was describing earlier. Here's the thing, though, we need to have volunteers to do that. Right now, trying to find volunteers in this community is like pulling teeth. I have to admit that when we had that major break on that line in Aspen Grove, you know, I was standing next to Harold, and we were looking down the road, and about a half dozen people that were there, it did both of our hearts good to realize, hey, there were some volunteers that were doing this. That was in an emergency. When we're

talking about actually going out and getting this done, it's going to have to be coordinated. The other thing to keep in mind, like Dave Stuedell had mentioned, I'm not sure how we go about engineering it, but if we're talking about line replacement, we want to start going with six-inch line, instead of four-inch line, and I'm not exactly sure how that goes. We're going to have to get some input from somebody who is a pay grade above what I'm doing. But yes, the short answer is yes, we do want to start replacing those lines. Again, the co-mingle project, as was mentioned here, we want to go ahead and make sure that we have it in place so that if there's a failure in System 1, we can deal with it.

Here's the thing I want you to keep in mind with all of this. The last time, and Jonathan mentioned this, it was more than ten days when they had to take water from System 1 through the existing co-mingle to System 2. That process went on from November 19<sup>th</sup> through December 3<sup>rd</sup> of 2021. So, I mean, that's greater than ten days, that's like two weeks that went through. So, here's what I want you to think about. There's already enough stress on System 1. We all agree there is a sufficient amount of leaks there. So with this stressed system, now we're pulling more water out of it to go to System 2. I have a real issue with that. But, okay, that's what that co-mingle was set up for. So we have to keep in mind that this new co-mingle is going to help us out in the long run, maybe not today, maybe not tomorrow, but it's eventually going to be worth its while to have it there, plus the fact that if we start moving to six-inch line, one of the things that's going to be great on that particular section of line is we're going to have a fire hydrant there. If we start placing these hydrants throughout the subdivision, then that's going to be better for us all the way around.

Nathalie, go ahead.

Nathalie Martin: Nice to meet all of you. I just want to say I really want to thank the volunteers. I realize that this is not exactly – you know, this is kind of thankless work, first of all, and I trust the community to do what has to be done. I was interested in what Harold had to say, I missed part of it. I don't know the rest of you, but I really appreciate the clarification, Paul, on what would affect me and my neighbors, the Farquhars, and my husband and I, and I just want to say thank you, thank you, for doing this. I trust you guys to work it out, and thanks for listening.

Paul Lisko: Scott DeWitt, I see you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Scott DeWitt: What's the risk of this co-mingle project further damaging System 1?

Paul Lisko: I'm not sure what you're asking, but the risk is going to be low, because the whole point of doing this is to support System 1 with water in the event that there is a failure.

Scott DeWitt: Well, if System 1 is leaking and from some of leakage rates I've heard, it's increasing, is the added pressure and volume from System 2, is that going to place System 1 at risk for more leaks? It sounds like the piping in System 1 is either old or damaged or something. Knowing what I know about hydraulics, when you have a damaged pipe and you put more pressure and flow through it, it's not good.

Paul Lisko: Okay. What has to be realized here is that the whole point in this co-mingle project is if System 1 is without water. So, the only way that it can get water is to move it from System 2, which is what this co-mingle project will provide.

Scott DeWitt: Oh, okay. Just for the record, it sounds like it's needed as a redundancy in backup. I'm not sure if the timing is correct. I'm more on the fence that I would rather see leaks and repairs on System 1. If it's an either/or, I would rather see, you know, the leaks addressed. Of course, I have concern that further water from System 1 may further damage – or excuse me, water from System 2 may damage System 1. That's all I have.

Paul Lisko: Just to make it as simple as I can for you, this co-mingle that we're talking about is one of the first steps that we're taking in the overall repair of System 1. We need to have something in place in case something starts to fail, we can have this backup.

Harold Corn: I had a little more to say. I was just trying to clarify for Sumner on the last interjection. So I'm kind of a 60/40 against the new co-mingle for the following reasons, and I did not know the cost until tonight, but it was just too expensive and would deplete a large portion of our reserve funds, was one of my reasons. I was concerned about the two households at the top of System 1, Nathalie and the Farquhars. Then my last point was the older co-mingle connection, and I sent this to the Board, can do about 95 percent of what the new co-mingle system claims, System 2 to System 1, which is more difficult.

By the way, Paul, the old meters are – it doesn't hurt them to go backwards. Many meters, if they're designed to go forwards and backwards, that's okay. For example, our home service meters on each service line, they are a ratchet type and they cannot go backwards. We don't want them going backwards, that's how you pollute the main system. So, we have a double-check valve in the meter can system. What I was trying to tell when the meter went backwards was the fact that it was going the correct direction for 2 to 1. The meter was set up to go from 1 to 2, is the reason it would go forwards, but it's the same meter, on the same line, and it will go backwards. It's not a problem, not a problem, and we could also measure that. So, as I was saying several years ago, we did this. I had Joshua Roybal check me out as we did this, in order to try to send water from System 2 to System 1. This hadn't been done before, was concerned about it, and the luck was picking the correct valve in the booster station. So it's basically I sat down and created a half dozen steps for this procedure. I would like the opportunity, and have witnesses, with John and anyone else, to try this procedure, actually before you guys make a decision. That would be my suggestion. But by the way, I like David Stuedell's idea about a special assessment. I hadn't heard that proposed before. So I kind of like that. But I am for finding the leaks more at this time because I think we can be covered, if given the chance, with the old system.

Don't get me wrong, I have supported the Board to move forward with the engineering, and the estimated cost – go ahead.

Paul Lisko: One of the things I wanted to ask you about is the reason why, one of the big reasons why we went with this co-mingle project is because both you and John Hines, our current water operator, were in favor of it. So, as I understand it, you became not in favor of it based on the cost and based on whether or not those two houses at the top of the hill would get water. Well, the cost is half of what the engineering estimate is, and I personally think that talking to you before, it seems like you think the co-mingle is a good idea, but maybe not at this time. Well, what I want to put forward is, I don't think we're going to get a better deal than what we've already got, and we've already gone this far, and actually have a bidder who is willing to contract out to get this done, so I think we should go ahead and take advantage of that. The other thing is, the whole idea about Nathalie Martin and the Farquhars not getting water, that's a moot point, because the way it's set up is there will be a gate valve to allow them to do that if the co-mingle between 2 and 1 takes place.



Harold, did you have anything else to add to that?

Harold Corn: I've never been against the redundancy of the co-mingle idea as you can tell. As a matter of fact, I was heavily involved in the first co-mingle to get that connection between the two systems. I was involved. I certainly believe in that and, therefore, that carried over to the idea of a new system. What disappointed me was the homeowners that were left out, and then I got to thinking about the priorities. The priorities just seemed to be -- finding the leaks seems to just beg for attention and repair.

Paul Lisko: Thank you. Go ahead, Sumner, you're up.

Sumner Dean: Thank you. So I 100 percent agree with the last phase statement of Harold's; that is so true. There are several of us, who have spoken, who say it's a matter of priority. Finding and fixing leaks should be number one; and, until they get down to a reasonable, manageable amount, on the order of 10 percent or whatever, then we can look at other things.

So, here's my question to you, Paul. And, Paul, no disrespect intended whatsoever, please leave out conjecture or opinion or sales pitch, please tell me what the cost benefit analysis is of this co-mingle project that you want to do is?

Paul Lisko: Well, it's a good price and I don't think we're going to get a better priced; it's not going to get any cheaper to get that done, and eventually the system needs to have it. We are supporting a local business to put in this co-mingle connection, and it's nice to have a dependable contractor that is willing to come up to our area, because as everybody knows, getting a good contractor to do work for us is somewhat difficult, depending on where we are. So I would have to say that those are benefit, and the cost of \$44,000 is reasonable to get this system on-line, and we need it anyway.

Sumner Dean: So what you just said was in the category of conjecture and opinion and argument. Not that it's a fight, but an argument, trying to put forth your rationale, your reasoning. That's not what I was asking. I was asking for the cost benefit analysis of doing the co-mingle project, wherein you bring in actual numbers and you analyze doing the project in an analytical manner. That's what I'm asking for, and I guess it might not have been done. Am I right or not?

Paul Lisko: I can't provide you with that. I can't provide you with what you're asking.

Sumner Dean: So then it has not been done. Therefore, I submit that you guys shouldn't even consider going forward on this unless you have both done it and presented it to one and all. So thank you for letting me speak.

Jonathan Morris: I was just going to throw out a few comments, because I have to drop off-line. I will say, as far as cost benefit analysis, the cost is \$44,000; benefit is System 1 families don't go without water for any long period of time. I mean, I'm all for doing Harold's plan of getting a bunch of us together and rehearsing the steps and testing it. In fact, I would shut off water to System 2 and then test it and see if it really works, and go through that. I will participate and help. If you guys vote for it, I will volunteer time and tractor to go help try to find leaks, or at least dig them up when you find them. If you vote against it, and you want to try to co-mingle with volunteer labor, I'll help with that too, and hopefully other people will join me on that. So I, too, appreciate what you guys are doing. But again, cost \$44,000; benefit families have water. I know our well systems can support the leaks, even though that sounds ugly to say, but if our wells fail, tanks fail, electrical fails, whatever, then God-forbid Harold or John Hines, that the one or two experts are out of town, to do this super fancy maneuver that they can do with the current system. The new co-mingle, I understand, will be a relatively simple process that a bunch of us laypeople could learn and operate. So that's the benefit, is the guarantee of water. You guys will have to decide what's beneficial. Again, my opinion was listen to the System 1 people; ignore us on System 2 as far as the prioritization of that. But whatever you need, hit me up and I will do the best I can to volunteer time and effort to help dig that, and I'll ask as many people as I know, and maybe we can all find and fix a few leaks, regardless of whatever direction you guys go. So thank you again for leading the charge on this effort.

Paul Rightley: Thank you, Jonathan.

Paul Lisko: Thank you, Jonathan, for that simple cost benefit analysis. It's appreciated. Eric, I see you have your hand up, go ahead.

Eric Verret: I'm just trying to make sure I'm understanding. So, Paul, my understanding, from what you guys are saying, is that by putting this in, it will create an opportunity for us to fix Area 1's water system with a backup.

And what I mean by that is, after that system is in, we can work on System 1 more effectively. Is that understanding correct?

Paul Lisko: That is correct.

Eric Verret: The other comment I had is, in System 1, the leak percentage of 50 percent or better, is a lot of that on private property, on individual's homes, the lines running from the street to the house?

Paul Lisko: That's a good question, and that cannot be knowledgeably answered. I mean, we can make conjecture about that, but there's no definitive answer on that. You could say that – well, I mean, I can tell you for this major leak that we had on Aspen Grove, that was from the two-inch connection that went to a house. That's where the issue was, from the four-inch line to the two-inch connection. The system is over 40 years old, so it could be – again, this is just conjecture, there's no factual analysis here. It could just be where the connections between one 20-foot stick of pipe goes to another 20-foot stick of pipe, but we don't know that until we start digging them up and replacing them.

Eric Verret: I understand. I had a leak on my place here that I wasn't aware of, and it was brought to my attention. I was able to fix it. I just didn't know if that was something that we had the ability to do – as you guys are an entity, I didn't know if we had the ability to go on private property and actually fix a leak.

Paul Lisko: Like I say, if it's on private property, then the homeowner is basically responsible for that. I think the way it's set up is that the water association is responsible from the main line to the meter, and then from the meter to the house, the property owner is responsible.

Eric Verret: I understand. Thank you for that clarification, Paul, I appreciate that. Like a couple of other people have said, I'm in System 2, and my opinion shouldn't matter as much as the folks in System 1. I'm definitely for it, but I think those other folks are – it's their decision.

Barbara Van Ruyckevelt: I think this whole conversation has gotten bogged down in just leaks. The whole purpose of our system is to try and replace it, because it's so old, the pipes are going crack, the glue is going to come undone, all that. So not just the leaks you're talking about, but you're talking about the piping. That's one of the main reasons we should be doing it. And that's probably to Sumner's question, when we replace

some pipes, when it was done and there was no leak reduction, is because probably the pipes needed to be replaced. And on Sumner's cost analysis, you have to finance in any cost overruns that we're going to have. Frankly, on the question Scott had, on the pressure, I don't think that was answered at all. System 2 to System 1 could be a definite problem and, frankly, being on System 2, it's like your roof, you just don't want holes punched in it. I think you're asking for trouble. What happens when you go into System 2, and this company – I'll give you an example. I had an electrician give me a real low bid on something I had done, and then all of a sudden, when he got into it, he realized he had to do this, so your cost benefit analysis is not as easy as Morris gave it out. It should be really considered in advance. You can count on it's not going to be \$44,000, period; it's going to be more.

Paul Lisko: It can't be more, because that's what the contract is.

Barbara Van Ruyckevelt: Not if they start punching holes in System 2, or whatever, to do this and something happens. That's going to be cost overruns.

Paul Lisko: That's on them. It's not going to cost us.

Barbara Van Ruyckevelt: Okay. But the whole thing on just fixing the leaks is not the whole purpose of replacing the pipes, because our pipes are old. I like the thought of Dave's that since there is so much opposition to just this one thing that you're trying to do, to go ahead and do it by the Board would be quite aggressive and not giving the community the chance to vote on this. It should be left up to the members.

Paul Lisko: The community has had input available to them since the annual meeting, and we've been transparent about everything we've done.

Barbara Van Ruyckevelt: No, you haven't.

Paul Lisko: This whole thing of having the community vote on it, it's beyond that. At this point, it's to the Board.

Cindy Hines: I just want to say that this is a responsibility of the Board. The Board was elected by the members of this community to make decisions for the community. You can't function as an entity when you put every decision out for a vote of the entire community. It just doesn't work. That's all I have to say.

Paul Lisko: Sue Watts, go ahead.

Sue Watts: What I'm wondering here, listening to all of this, is are these two things mutually exclusive? You know, we pay the \$45,000 for that, but then does that exclude the possibility of looking for leaks, or will that continuing to look for leaks happen regardless of how we vote on the co-mingle?

Paul Lisko: Yes.

Sue Watts: I'm sorry; yes, meaning?

Paul Lisko: Meaning to answer your question: yes, we will continue looking for the leaks no matter how the vote comes down on the co-mingle.

Marsha Gaillour: So, Paul, is there a plan for replenishing the reserves, I mean, in terms of increasing the amount that goes into reserves every month?

Paul Lisko: As I recall, our treasurer is looking at that right now, to actually start increasing those amounts to put into the reserve account. As it currently stands, we put in \$666.67 every month, which I think works out to \$8,000 a years. So I know Jeremy had mentioned that he's looking into finding a way to actually increase the amount that actually goes into the reserves.

Marsha Gaillour: Okay. And as far as the leak repairs, are those done by the community members or are you hiring someone to do the repairs?

Paul Lisko: Well, that's a very good question. That's one of the things that we're trying to figure out, because as it stands right now, we've had very little support from anybody wanting to volunteer in this community to do stuff like this. Don't get me wrong, when we had that emergency on the leak on Aspen Grove, there were eight of us that showed up and really worked to get that thing fixed. But in terms of getting a group out there to do what Harold was saying about doing this sonar testing and trying to track down where we're going to have this, and have a volunteer to put in a tractor to dig up line, I'm not sure that that is going to be feasible. And so, one of the things that we may have to do – I mean, I'm not saying that we can't do that. I would certainly love to be able to have this work to be done by volunteers. But I'm also realistic in looking at what has happened in the past, and people weren't showing up to volunteer for this stuff. But if they do show up, and we can find volunteer labor to get this done, that's perfect.

If not, then we'll have to go with a company that's willing to do leak detection and line replacement.

Marsha Gaillour: And so, do you know what the cost of that is?

Paul Lisko: I do not.

Marsha Gaillour: I just know that I'm on a different Board in Albuquerque, and every time we have a leak, it might just be a matter of maybe 20 feet, it's generally like \$2500 to \$5000 per leak. So our costs are always about repairing leaks. So that was just my question, in terms of budgeting for leaks, and also replenishing the funds, how does that play into your plans or the Board's plans?

Paul Lisko: Well, as I mentioned before, if we move forward with this project, it's going to deplete the reserves by about a third. And again, the engineer's estimate was going to be 89,000 and we're at half that.

Marsha Gaillour: And part two of what they were doing, my understanding at least from attending meetings before, would they also be involved in the second phase, which is the leaks and putting in new piping; is that correct?

Paul Lisko: Yes. That's one of the things that we considered about having them do. Eventually, what we want to do is go to six-inch line. So in order for that to happen, we have to get an engineer involved to figure out how we're going to make that transition piece-by-piece, going from a four-inch line to a six-inch line. Yes. So, if not NV5, it will have to be some other engineering group that's involved, in terms of us figuring how to proceed effectively with that line replacement, whether it's piecemeal or a massive undertaking, a big line replacement.

Cindy Hines: Based on Marsha's questions, and also based on Sue's question in the chat, I just wanted to kind of clarify that when we hired NV5, we talked to them about doing this in two phases. Am I correct, it was phase one was the co-mingle project and then phase two was moving then into line replacement, leak detection and line replacement. So it really is all kind of part of the same thing, but NV5, being engineers, and us understanding what they were telling us, they felt that the co-mingle project should be step one, because it will aid in doing step two. I just thought I would throw that out there, because it seems like people are kind of having questions. It's not one or the other, it's all part of the same project.

Paul Lisko: That's a very good point; thanks for clarifying that.

Barbara Van Ruyckevelt: The problem is, with the two projects, the Board has not done their homework. They have not done any cost benefit analysis with the two projects that need to be done. The most urgent is replace pipes and fix leaks. The co-mingle, it's fine, it can follow, but I don't see where it's an emergency and where it's urgent to fix it.

Paul Lisko: Thank you for your opinion. Go ahead, Suzanne.

Suzanne Star: Thank you. I just wanted to capitalize on what Marsha was asking, is that you did quite an extensive amount of work on the co-mingle, quite an amount of money put into it, but we saw nothing on the line replacement. Cindy indicated this was, you know, step two of the project. My question is, is did you ever investigate what the line replacement and what that second project or that second task would cost. Could we afford it after we do the co-mingle and spend \$44,000, what are we looking at here? I mean, we might be able to do a little bit more with the line replacement, but if we put our resources towards the co-mingle first, and we leave the line replacement for second, or leak detection for second, what are we looking at? Was there any type of information coming from NV5 of what it might cost? What are we looking at?

Paul Lisko: Yes. You have that information, because that was – I don't have it right here to share it with you, but if you remember right, when NV5 sent us those four tasks, remember? Remember that? And they had the picture of the people that were replacing lines and all that stuff, and the Board decided to go with two of the tasks. One of them that was recommended, not only by NV5, but by our water operator, John Hines, and our previous water manager, Harold Corn, was to go with the co-mingle project. And if I remember right, and again I'm just coming off the top of my head with this, I remember that their proposal for line replacement was just under \$10,000 for engineering that. But, again, I don't have that paperwork in front of me. But you know what I'm talking about; right? It's that proposal that they sent us, I think it was in April, and it had those four projects on there. Do you remember that, Suzanne?

Suzanne Star: I remember that. It was \$9,000 that they could take a look at what it would be for the line replacement. My question was not \$9,000 so that they could give us some analysis. I'm interested in knowing what their estimate might have been for what we're looking at for line replacement, not the design analysis that we got for the co-mingle or what

we'd get for the line replacement. That's not what I'm asking. I'm asking for when NV5 came in and did a bid of around \$89,000 for the actual install of this line, I understand that part. Did we ever get anywhere close to understanding how much it would cost us to start line replacement just in System 1, six-inch lines, with hydrants and all of the valves that we need to have? And that's what I'm asking you right now. If we're looking at a couple of million dollars, we have no money for that. \$44,000, even if it only takes – wait a minute, you're overtalking me, please.

\$44,000 may be one-half of our reserves, but the other half of our reserves have got to cover us for quite some time until we can build those reserves up. How much could we do on line replacement if we need to? It took us \$20,000, I think, for 1,000 feet of line, if I remember right, when Harold replaced 4,000 feet of line. \$20,000 for 1,000 feet, it's not going to be that cheap anymore. We don't have the contractors and six-inch lines will require more expensive components. That's what I'm asking you. You went and did a lot of good research on the co-mingle, and I'm not suggesting that the co-mingle should never been done. I am suggesting it should be postponed, because I think all of the money that we've got right now, that we can afford to invest, needs to go towards not just leak detection, but if we need to replace lines, like Marsha was referring to, we need to have the money to be able to do that. If we don't have that money, it doesn't make any difference how much we've got left in the reserve, we're just going to sit there and wait until the reserve builds up or we do something different with it. I don't know what to say. I'm just saying, do we have enough money to actually proceed on after the co-mingle to do anything with line replacement?

Paul Lisko: I'm going to say yes, and I have two points that I want to raise with you on the things that you just said. First of all, \$44,000 is not going to deplete our reserves by half. It's going to reduce it by one-third. The other thing that I wanted to mention to you was that I have already talked to NV5 about finding – and, again, this is if we can't get the volunteers to do it. I've spoken with them about providing us with information on companies that would do leak detection and line replacement.

Harold Corn: I wanted to point out the co-mingle project is simply a six-inch line, 300-plus feet, and the estimate for that line would probably apply from NV5 the same for line replacement, six-inch line, just saying. Even though their estimate was high according to the bid that came in; correct?



Paul Lisko: Yeah, it was very high; it was double. Is there anyone else who has a question or comment? (No response).

I'm going to go ahead and put this for a vote before the Board, and the first thing I would like to do is go ahead and make a motion that we accept the bid from David Salazar to install the co-mingle, as outlined in the contract documents, with New Mexico gross receipts included, for the cost of \$43,965.58; and move we hire David Salazar for that amount and draft those funds out of the reserve. So I will entertain a motion at this time.

Paul Rightley: I move to spend that amount of money to co-mingle System 2 with System 1.

Paul Lisko: Okay, is there a second?

Cindy Hines: Second.

Paul Lisko: So the motion is on the floor, so I want to get the input from each of the Board members, specifically if they are a yea or nay, if they are for or against the co-mingle project. So, Keith, we'll start with you.

Keith Rigney: Against.

Paul Lisko: Kristi?

Kristi Cross: Against.

Paul Lisko: Jeremy is not here. David Stuedell?

David Stuedell: Against.

Paul Lisko: Cindy Hines?

Cindy Hines: For.

Paul Lisko: Josh Toennis?

Josh Toennis: Against.

Paul Lisko: Ann Cooke?

Ann Cooke: What's the tally at this point?

Paul Lisko: There are three against and one for.

Ann Cooke: I abstain.

Paul Lisko: Okay. Paul Rightley?

Paul Rightley: I made the motion, Paul; I am for.

Paul Lisko: And so I'm for. We would have to hear from Jeremy, and then Ann, we need you to go one way or another here. I realize you want to abstain, but it's kind of important to vote, because it's kind of splitting down the middle here.

Ann Cooke: I will tell you my thinking right now. I believe that it is good to have redundancy in the system, and for that I tend to lean being for this co-mingle. I also think that it will take – let me finish. It will take a special assessment to do the majority of the leak finding and replacement, in which case I really don't think that it's relevant what our reserves are. They aren't going to cover taking care of replacing the system as it stands, and it will end up being a special assessment. So, with that having been said, it also makes it more comfortable to the membership, as the system is replaced, if there is at least the possibility of being supported by the entire Association in the way its supplying water. If the membership really had wanted, I guess, to go through the uncomfortableness of fixing without this backup, I think that that would be okay. But as I said, I don't think there's going to be enough funds anyway to cover replacing it. So, with that being said, and I'm sorry for the long – but I didn't put in my two cents before, I'll vote for.

Paul Lisko: Okay, that's four in favor and four against, so I will contact Jeremy. I will try right now to get ahold of him and see.

Barbara Van Ruyckevelt: Paul, could I say something?

Paul Lisko: No, not right at this time.

Keith Rigney: Quick comment since we can't get ahold of Jeremy. I think it is only fair that before Jeremy casts his vote, he has time to either look at the minutes of this meeting, or listen to this meeting. It is not fair that an individual Board member can reach out to him to ask for a vote, because it seems since we are so split, you could get one from either side to reach out to Jeremy, and we could easily flip the vote. He needs to make his own assumption from the information presented tonight.

Paul Lisko: I think that's an excellent suggestion, Keith. I agree with you wholeheartedly on that. I will tell Jeremy we are split on it, and I'm not going to say one way or the other, and that he has the deciding vote, to listen to the cloud recording and then he can weigh in if he is for or against. We will table it for now.

Harold Corn: I wanted to make a statement, having been a part of the Board for many years. Two things: number one, if a member of the Board is not present for the meeting, I don't think he can vote. Number two, Robert's Rules, I believe the President only votes in the case of a tie.

Barbara Van Ruyckevelt: That's what I was going to say, Harold, too, when I was denied access. Thank you.

Paul Lisko: Anyway, this has been tabled for now, and we're going to move on with the rest of the meeting.

Keith Rigney: I don't know, but if that were true, we need to put this on the record. If the statements of Harold Corn is true when you look at the bylaws, that means Paul's vote is null and void, and the ruling on the table is that co-mingle is voted against on a 4 to 3 vote. Because Jeremy is not here to cast his vote, and Paul does not vote unless there is a tie, it goes 4-3. We have to have that on record.

Paul Lisko: If that's the way it's set up with Robert's Rules of Order and all the rest of it, then yeah, okay, that's 4 to 3 against. So the motion does not carry.

Kristi Cross: Paul, sorry, I'm letting you guys know that I am dropping off the call for now, but will prepare the minutes once everything is forwarded to me.

## **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

### **Water:**

John Hines reported:

It's been a busy month, to say the least. For my monthly report through the month of February, I did weekly well and pump inspections; had to reset the booster pump twice. And I'm going to bring up something that has

happened in the month of March, just because it's fresh on everybody's mind. We had a water outage at the end of Los Griegos Road, starting March 2<sup>nd</sup>, with five customers out of water. Two of the homes actually are unoccupied right now, but the other three didn't have water. What we had, basically, was a valve failure, that failed closed and sealed off getting water to them. We've been working on hand-digging it up. Finally got it out today. I've been through a lot of issues with our contractor not showing up that was going to dig it up, and so thank you to Jonathan Morris for coming and digging it up. Getting parts wrong; we don't have a trash pump, and so when I open up – take that valve out, I'm going to get about 500 feet of main water down in the hole, so I'm going to have to get a trash pump tomorrow. So, hopefully, we can get that fixed and get those three people back on water. Temporarily I have them on water just using a garden hose.

We had a major water leak that everybody knows about at 631 Aspen Grove. We had six volunteers that showed up to work on that, and a special thanks to Jonathan Morris, Paul Lisko, Harold Corn, Keith Rigney, Josh Toennis, Shawn Weary and Steve Godfrey for their help in getting that fixed. We had a major loss of water on System 2, according to the meter reading, and fortunately it did show up and so we had to work Friday night until 9:30 at night in cold water and mud and snow to get it fixed.

I attended a rate study meeting; I attended a co-mingle project onsite contractor pre-bid meeting. I attended two water management team meetings, discussed the well meters with the State Engineer's Office, met with Mountain Pacific Meter Company for a quote to calibrate our master meters. I read the meters on March 1<sup>st</sup>.

As far as the compliance report goes: System 1, had zero Coliform present; Disinfection Residual 0.18 mg/l and System 2, Zero Coliform Present; Chlorine Residual 0.13 mg/l

System 1:

- Pumped 521,000 gallons
- Used: 211,000 gallons

- Average Household Usage; 84.87 gallons per day
- Lost: 300,273 gallons; leakage rate of 59%
- Leak Flags – 9, with eight of those being repeats
- Users over 7,000 gallons – Six, and five with leak flags

#### System 2:

- Pumped 217,800 gallons
- Used: 111,950 gallons.
- Average Household Usage: 66.63 gallons
- Lost: 105,9340 gallons; leakage rate of 48% and I'm sure that's because of the leak on Aspen Grove
- Leak Flags – 5, with four being repeats
- Users over 7,000 gallons – None

We had a water committee report. The first thing we came up with was a vision statement for the Water Utility Team, is to achieve a sustainable water system management, focusing on a proactive approach, with professional guidance to the current system and issues. Our mission statement was to improve the system to meet our future obligations in supply and delivery of safe drinking water and enhance property values.

We had some bullet points that we wanted to talk about. We had four goals. One was to remove the water cost out of the annual assessment, which the Rate Study Committee is working on; pursue a preliminary engineering report to identify and prioritize tasks for upgrades; improve community relations through more proactive communications through websites, Facebook, Listserv, newsletters and the calendar, and develop a narrative on our infrastructure issues and cost to educate the members.

The water rate study plan submitted by the Water Rate Committee was submitted and –

Paul Lisko: That's going to be addressed a little bit later, John.

John Hines: Okay, I won't talk about it then. I'm going to have to go back to Albuquerque tomorrow to pick up a trash pump. The cost is going to be

close to \$500 for a gas-powered trash pump with a two-inch hose for intake and two-inch output. And while I'm in Albuquerque, I'd like to pick it up, because as we all know, we could have really used it on the Aspen Grove leak, and I'm going to really need it on this leak at the end of Los Griegos. So I would like to pick it up tomorrow so I can actually use it and get that fixed tomorrow.

Ann Cooke moved to allow John to pick up the trash pump and be reimbursed for the cost of it. Keith Rigney seconded the motion; motion carried.

Paul Lisko: I saw the invoice from Mountain Pacific Meter Tech. Has that already been paid, or what is that?

John Hines: No, that is a quote from Mountain Pacific for them to come up and recalibrate our three master meters. So I need a motion for them to come up and do the recalibration of our three well meters. That price –  
Paul Lisko: \$1,042.58.

Ann Cooke moved that the estimate be accepted and get them up to do the recalibration. Josh Toennis seconded the motion; motion carried.

Paul Lisko: And then you wanted to purchase a load of gravel?

John Hines: Right. I didn't know if you wanted to bring that up now or not. Down then on Aspen Grove, because of the mess we made with all of the mud and the water leak, I would like to request that we have a load of road base product delivered and we can backfill it, because I don't want to backfill that hole with just mud, because when it thaws, it will just be a big sink hole. I just need somebody to say go ahead.

Ann Cooke: Does Dave Stuedell have any comment?

David Stuedell: The only comment I have is would we want to just use the cinders we have, instead of gravel. That's the only comment I would have about that.

Paul Lisko: John, do you want to use cinders instead of gravel?

John Hines: I don't care. I just want something to put in the ground that doesn't sink.

Paul Lisko: Okay, I guess we'll go that route; use the cinders.

Suzanne Star: A comment, please. Dave, I wonder when you say use the cinders, if you throw cinders on top of it, is there a line there that if the compression goes in too far, the cinders could be a problem on the line. Do you know what I mean? Is that proper bedding that we could use or would that cause a problem?

David Stuedell: You know –

Keith Rigney: The hole that is open has no pipe in the bottom of it, just for reference. The hole that was left open to fill doesn't have any pipe directly underneath it. It should be two or three feet in one direction. So this fill would not be touching pipe.

Suzanne Star: Thank you.

Paul Lisko: Do you have a question, Kurt?

Kurt Standley: First, I'd like to thank Mr. Hines for coming out and promptly fixing that leak in front of my house. I don't have a problem with cinders getting put in, but I'd rather see road base because people are now using my driveway as a route around it, and cinders are going to collapse in the mud that we have on that section of road, and it's pretty well water-fed right now. It's not dehydrated at all. It's going to create a big old dip in there and they're still going to probably use my driveway. We're talking about cinders you use to treat the road and they don't compact as well as base does.

Ann Cooke: My suggestion is Dave, would you make a motion for whatever you feel is best? I will be happy to second it.

David Stuedell: Well, they seem to use them out there by the mailboxes, and they actually seem to work really well for compacting, but I don't know, I think I'm outside my knowledge –

Kurt Standley: They use them for potholes.

David Stuedell: Let's do whatever people think is the right thing, and I guess getting some gravel – I don't know if gravel would be the answer either. I'm fine for whatever John Hines feels is the best course of action. I really can't say.

John Hines: I would like to use three-quarter-minus road base.

Kurt Standley: Thank you, Mr. Hines. If the Association would rather save money, we could probably go with reclaimed concrete out of the eco station in Los Alamos, if you guys want to save money and if that's appropriate for up here on the mountain.

David Stuedell: I will move to purchase road base to fill the hole that John is referring to. Ann Cooke seconded the motion; motion carried.

### **Roads:**

David Stuedell indicated he had nothing to report. The plowing seems to be going okay. The sander seems to be going well. I think we have to figure out what we're going to do with the old sander. I guess just park it over there by the fire station and maybe sell it at some point in the future, because now we have a good electric one. We're kind of in that in-between period before we get our roads graded in August.

### **Legal:**

Paul Rightley indicated he had nothing to report other than the two issues to take up in executive session.

### **Firewise:**

Ann Cooke indicated she had nothing to report.



Paul Lisko: I just wanted to mention about that fire preparedness workshop at the Jemez Baptist Church on Saturday April 9<sup>th</sup>.

David Stuedell: Can you explain the April 9<sup>th</sup> thing again? I'm sorry.

Paul Lisko: That's the annual fire preparedness workshop that's put on by Jemez Mountain Firewise Association and supported by the La Cueva Volunteer Fire Department and the Jemez Baptist Church. What they do is they invite people there on April the 9<sup>th</sup>, and they have a cookout, and they have a lot of speakers, like from the Forest Service and other organizations that tell you how to make sure that your place is Firewise and home-hardened and all the rest of that. It's an annual event, and this year it's taking place on April 9<sup>th</sup>.

### **Architectural:**

Josh Toennis indicated that he had no items to report.

### **Parks:**

Cindy Hines indicated there was nothing new on parks, other than once John is done with all of his water issues, he'll work on burning out that stump with the wasps in it. Hopefully, in another month or so, we might be able to start putting up some road signs. I'm having difficulty finding the unistruts, but I'm working on it.

Josh Toennis: One comment on the poles real quick is usually you don't embed the unistrut all the way into the concrete, you have a piece that sticks up about six inches and then you have shear bolts containing the post that actually holds the sign. That way, if somebody does hit it, you aren't bending the post over, you're just breaking it off.

I will work on the newsletter this month, so if anyone has anything they would like to include, please just email me; otherwise, I've got a few things in mind to put in.

The last thing is I've been looking at the website, and basically, I hate it, and I want to work on it. So I've emailed Mike Schacht, who we know really doesn't want to do it anymore and asked him for the log-in information to WordPress. I've used WordPress before, I'm familiar with the dashboard. I may not know how to do everything he does on the

website, but if he would be willing to at least tutor me in a few things, I would be happy to be the person that posts everything every month. I'd like to go through it, and there are some pages in there that are from years ago that we can eliminate. We are really behind on posting some of the water reports. So, if I can get ahold of those, we'll get those up-to-date. If you guys don't mind, I would like to take that on. Even when my term ends as a Board member, I probably would still be willing to keep up with that for you guys.

Suzanne Star: I have a question for Cindy, please. Is there a chance, if you're going to take over the website at some point, right now we don't have the financials or the minutes being regularly posted. Is there a chance that I could request having the minutes and the financials emailed to me? I'm not asking you to do it for the whole association. I'm just asking personally. If there is anybody else that would like to get them regularly until which time you get the website caught up, could that be done, because I was thinking about maybe putting it out on the Listserver (sic), you know, electronically let the minutes and the financials go out, but I think that maybe the Listserver (sic) goes to other people that you don't want it to go to, so just as a personal request, could I ask that those get sent to me until which time the website is updated by yourself?

Cindy Hines: I don't have an answer to that. I don't know if that is something we can do, but my plan is that as soon as I get the log-in information from Mike, which I hope to get in the next few days, I'm going to start working on it. I have all of that information, so I should be able to just post it on there right away.

Suzanne Star: Okay, I appreciate that. I've just been looking for it, and we haven't had anything since December, so it would be nice to be able to get caught up a little bit.

Cindy Hines: I'm hoping with me doing it, it will get done faster.

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

Paul Lisko: The next thing is action items and John Hines, you're up to talk about the progress on developing a water rebilling structure.

John Hines: Like I mentioned before, the Water Rate Study Committee met and we did a presentation of some either/ors or possible choices to the

Water Committee. They basically sent us back to work on it some more, because it wasn't satisfactory, exactly what they were looking for. So, we're going to meet again.

Paul Lisko: I wanted to say that the algorithm that Ann Cooke put together was pretty impressive, but it didn't really meet the whole idea of taking water out of the annual assessment. As a matter of fact, when I was looking at it, it kind of harkened back more to that initiative that we had a couple of years ago to try and change the bylaws and have that tiered system where if somebody was over 7,000 gallons, that they would be penalized. The whole idea, I think, for that rate structure is to make it clean. It's either a tiered system or it's a per-gallon charge, whatever it is, but there's no penalties. It's like if we figure the base rate is 7,000 gallons or whatever it is, great. If somebody uses an excessive amount, we're not going to try to penalize them, other than through the water rate billing structure. The one thing about this is, is we have 150-plus hookups in Sierra Los Pinos, and there's only like 13 people that use excessive amounts of water. So once we can get this water rate structure pulled out of the annual assessment, and figure it out, either on a per-gallon charge or on a tiered system, they're going to end up paying more anyway, without having to actually institute an actual penalty. So thank you for that. Keep up the good work, and let us know next time around.

I wanted to mention about the delivery and installation of the Intel water tanks to SLP Station 52 for fire suppression. I've given you kind of a chronology in the agenda and at the last meeting. There are minor problems with transport, like the tanks stick out 13 feet beyond the trailer, instead of the allowed 12 feet, so they're working on getting a dispensation for that. The National Guard (Colonel Carper) is willing to bring in a crane and set the tanks up for us, but first they have to be assigned the mission by Homeland Security and Emergency Management. Chief Taylor has agreed to take on the task of dealing with the Sandoval County Emergency Manager, Theresa Greeno, so he can get to know her. I have turned it over to him.

The next regular board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 12, 2022 at 1830 hours.

Josh Toennis moved to adjourn the meeting; Cindy Hines seconded, motion carried and the meeting adjourned.