

Hoback Drinking Water Stakeholder Group
Meeting 3: Forming Draft Recommendations
Monday, February 10th 6-8:15pm at Hoback Fire Station
Meeting Minutes

- Introductions
 - Max Ludington (scribe), Mark Kelly, Carlin Girard, Ty Ross, Mike Shidner, Ted Van Holland, Jodie Pond, Sarah Budge, Bill Rode, Kevin Chatham, Mike Trumbower, Janet Palermo (via phone), Todd Fitzgerald (phone), Bert, Bob Abolondi, Kristen Waters, Heather Overholser, Morgan Graham
- Agenda review, follow up from last meeting
- Outline and review stakeholder process
 - Goal: develop draft recommendations that can be presented to the board of county commissioners and the public
 - Jodie Pond
 - BoCC is looking for community guidance and input on the issue
 - Would like genuine input
 - There is no standard for this, they have not previously completed a process like this
 - An issue that makes this process different from previous special district attempts is that there is not a central entity pushing this in this case, no developer, no HOA
 - Having to create this from scratch, which can be quite difficult
 - There is another challenge in that water quality problems can emerge over time, they are not fixed in space
 - Might see an issue arise on this front in the future, might have to consider possibility of the issues moving over time
- Special district cost analysis
 - General guidance and WWDC costs
 - Push until later in the meeting after recommendations
- Brainstorm recommendations
 - High level ideas
 - Status quo
 - No change scenario
 - Negatives: public health issue is not resolved
 - Pros: cost, requires no action
 - *Recommendation: (interim) any resident with water with nitrate over 10 ppm and can prove financial need will have a water treatment system paid for by the county*
 - Potential route: installing individual treatment systems on taps to reduce costs
 - Downside: requires maintenance, can be expensive over time
 - Pro: can be cheaper in short-term

- *Recommendation (interim): Mandatory septic inspections at hot spots (at no cost to owner)*
 - If you have a problem identified, 50% cost share on fixing problem
- *Recommendation: County/TCD will conduct further studies to try to understand the source of the nitrate contamination*
 - Isotope study is most likely route
- Path forward: continue formation of special district
 - Homeowners will do this if it makes sense financially (South Park to Camp Creek would be under consideration, could be any subset of that area)
 - Give reasonable cost estimate before Level 3 with a chance to opt out of the district at that time
 - If it leads to additional development in Hoback, how does that affect costs in the district?
 - Can you design it to get folks reimbursed if new people join on?
 - How does that impact development patterns in Hoback?
 - An important consideration for any solution
 - Special district from Game Creek/Old West, all the way to Deer Creek is an option, could explore willingness within that area
- Potential idea: very small special district focused only on Hoback
- Key need to move forward: get general cost information out to the public
 - Request better price assessment of what it would take
 - That is the essential next step, difficulty is how do we get the community to that point?
 - Need county backing to drive that
- We will need buy-in for the process from the community
 - Need trust that cost is an issue and solutions won't be jammed down people's throats
 - Pursue WWDC, SLIB, and SPET funding
 - Recognize that having water system can affect housing values
 - Recognize that if the cost of getting to the water source is too high after Level 2, it's not going to work
 - WWDC would like assurances that you'll move from Level 2 to Level 3, but reality is that if the costs are extraordinary, it won't be feasible
 - Is it worth coming up with the price people are willing to pay?
 - TCD/Health Dept. study showed an average of about \$50 per month
- *Recommendation: County will help fund the formation costs associated with the special district formation on the basis that county is a landowner*

with a particular interest in this (will be a member of the district) and there is a public health issue affecting the community

- Employ and outside attorney with experience representing special districts
 - This is critical
 - Can't rely on county attorney for this, need an expert in district formation
- County is supportive of the formation of this district, has an interest in the public health side of this
- Expectation is that it will be \$25,000-50,000 in upfront costs
 - Try to get some matching funds secured?
 - 50% cost share with the county is reasonable
- *Recommendation: Once formed, the special district will pursue through Level 2 study to understand the specific costs of developing the water source with the assumption that if the costs are not overly burdensome, the district will move forward with a Level 3 implementation*
- *Recommendation: County will consider SPET measure to support the costs of building out the public water system should it move forward*
- *Recommendation: Have county formally recognize and enforce the housing density regulations, recognize the potential impacts to water quality that additional density will bring to the area*
 - Don't allow more employees to be there than are supposed to occupy a residence
 - Recognize that additional development is adding to the problem
- Key Question: What district type makes the most sense?
 - Water district
 - Negative: limited to a mill levy, can lead to unfair balance where ag lands are assessed at a lower value, don't pay a fair share
 - Pro: simpler, might give community confidence that this is the route we are pursuing, not looking to do a bunch more than needed
 - As Keith pointed out at the last meeting, this can always be changed over time if we need a more complex district (ISD)
 - Water and sewer district
 - ISD
 - Pros: Has more flexibility in its assessment, can lead to a more equitable pricing in the district

- Invites
 - Bob Ablondi, maybe able to be involved in Q&A
 - All of previous presenters