

Dry Gulch Project Listening Log

9/09/08

ISSUE ONE: CREDIBILITY OF ORGANIZATION		
DATE	SOURCE	INPUT
6/18/2008	Bill Hudson, Pagosa Daily Post series	Water District Revelations series: concerns about transparency regarding use of exec session and audio recording of meetings
7/10/2008	James Robinson, Pagosa Sun article	PAWSD forged ahead with reservoir plans despite voter rejection of ballot issue to fund in 2004. PAWSD and SJWCD have had mixed results of voter approval to fund improvements; Board's propensity for executive session gives rise to questions of transparency and legitimacy, especially questions regarding personal gain from deal.
7/16/2008	Bill Hudson, Pagosa Daily Post series	Lots of Water, Lots of Debt series: concerns about Fred Schmidt's credibility as discussed at 7/15/08 BoCC meeting; discrepancy between message that the size of reservoir hasn't yet been determined and the fact that fees, land purchases and engineering contracts are predicated upon 35,000 AF size.
7/22/2008	T.H.	We should take off our boxing gloves in the spirit of community unity - can we move beyond offense and defense and all get to a place where we can all work together as a community.
7/24/2008	Karl Isberg - Pagosa Sun editorial	A disconnect exists regarding the proposed reservoir project: there is a persistent practice of hiding information and abuse of executive session. Gave examples of obtuse ballot language in 2004, procurement of site involved one executive session after another, etc. Advised to put out the facts (to the public) and do business outside of executive session. Says it will be a long time before PAWSD rebuilds credibility and public confidence.
7/29/2008	Glenn Walsh	If voters had known that a month after they voted down the reservoir, PAWSD would be seeking water rights and doing engineering work for a 35,000 AF reservoir, it would have been more like 98% against. Fred Schmidt is a fraudulent businessman. We'd have more confidence in this project if Bob Huff by himself was handling the real estate transactions.
7/29/2008	J.R. Ford	Stop telling CWCB and other state funding agencies that the community supports the project.
8/2/2008	J.J., P.O. (two letters)	Fred Schmidt has questionable history in land dealings, including conviction for fraud; District has lost credibility; District is not acting in the best interest of Archuleta County citizens
8/11/2008	Bill Hudson, Pagosa Daily Post editorial	PAWSD brochure is just political spin - more convenient than listening to the public.
8/15/2008	Jerry Dreisens	PAWSD recklessly spending, even if recalled all of [PAWSD Board members] who would want to inherit the mountain of debt?

Dry Gulch Project Listening Log

9/09/08

ISSUE TWO: LEGITIMACY OF PROJECT		
DATE	SOURCE	INPUT
6/18/2008	Bill Hudson, Pagosa Daily Post series	Water District Revelations series: questions EU projections.
6/19/2008	Karl Isberg - Pagosa Sun editorial	Voters never approved the project through a vote.
7/10/2008	J., realtor	We don't need a reservoir that large (35,000 AF).
7/10/2008	James Robinson, Pagosa Sun article	Question growth projections upon which reservoir size/need and WRF is predicated.
7/15/2008	Greg Shulte / BoCC	BoCC memo of non-support and no confidence for CWCB loan for an amount over the cost to build a 12,500 AF reservoir. Concerns about Fred Schmidt's position with the PAWSD and SJWCD Boards.
7/16/2008	Mark Weiler	Take 35,000 AF off the table - stop talking about it.
7/17/2008	James Robinson, Pagosa Sun article	coverage of BoCC 7/15/08 meeting where the Board of Commissioners directed Administrator Greg Schulte to deliver a memo to the PAWSD BOD that evening expressing no confidence and no support for a 35,000 AF reservoir. Concerns that Fred Schmidt has been spearheading the Dry Gulch project.
7/29/2008	Judy Esterly, property owner	The [2004] PAWSD [sic] election was voted down because it was as vague as this project is.
7/29/2008	J.R. Ford	PAWSD should sit on their plan until they have real numbers - any legitimate Special District would find out what they really need before they buy the land. Stop changing your plan every year. Finds fault in the argument that need to build it to max design life/size. Encouraged the BoCC to not support the reservoir project.
8/2/2008	J.J., P.O. (two letters)	Size and need are debatable; District has ignored public requests for fee changes and a realistic review of demographics and water needs
8/15/2008	Jerry Dreisens	No public support for project
8/13/2008	Mr. and Mrs. P.D. (PO): comments on returned brochure	Growth estimates exaggerated

Dry Gulch Project Listening Log

9/09/08

8/18/2008	Glenn Walsh, Pagosa Daily Post article "Massa's Gone Away"	Through the Water Conservation Plan, PAWSD Board essentially admitted that 35,000 AF and future growth in water demand will need to be revisited Walsh questions Harris growth predictions and states through the WC plan, PAWSD is adopting the SDO population estimates.

ISSUE THREE: FINANCIAL CONCERNS - HOW WILL WE PAY FOR IT?		
DATE	SOURCE	INPUT
6/18/2008	Bill Hudson, Pagosa Daily Post series	Water District Revelations series: questions about manner in which impact fee is assessed - not spreading fee out to all users but assessing only first 20,000 new customers and applying WRF to project (pipeline) that should be funded by existing users as well
6/19/2008	Karl Isberg - Pagosa Sun editorial	Financial concerns that PAWSD is headed for a train wreck like the County. Requests assurances. How does District intend to pay debt service when key revenue projections not being met?
7/10/2008	James Robinson, Pagosa Sun article	PAWSD Board has obligated District to debt that may emburden tax payers. Amount of debt is unprecedented. CIF/WRF collections, upon which payback of the debt is predicated, is coming in at a fraction of projections.
7/14/2008	Steve Van Horn, Mayor's Economic Dev Task Force, Economic Forum	Concerned about PAWSD debt service: what if economy stays down for a prolonged period of time-will service fees go up?
7/15/2008	Mark Weiler / Glenn Walsh (financing proposal: HBO model)	Presented alternative financing plan, to summarize: drop the Bernstein plan, fine tune cost projections based on 12,500 AF, create payment structure so that all beneficiaries pay, not just new growth. Model payment structure after "what works", such as HBO. Instead of upfront cost (resource fee), price the project cost out over life of project, where existing cutomers pay about \$6 more per month on their water bill and new users pay \$17 per month more.
7/15/2008	Steve Van Horn	Encourages pursuing Forest Service Special Use permit; strongly against purchasing property for FS land exchange
7/16/2008	Steve Van Horn	PAWSD should go to voters to approve a GO bond to fund the new treatment plant.
7/16/2008	Bill Hudson	PAWSD is charging the first 20% of new growth for the whole cost of the project.
7/16/2008	Bill Hudson, Pagosa Daily Post series	Lots of Water, Lots of Debt series: concerns about amount of debt service, as expressed by Steve Van Horn at Economic Forum; concerns about PAWSD fee structure and voices his support of Mark Weiler's plan.
7/29/2008	Steve Van Horn	Everything in this plan is predicated on a 35,000 AF reservoir. WRF is predicated on a 35,000 AF reservoir. It would cut WRF in half to have taxpayers approve a GO Bond to pay for the Snowball WTP replacement.

Dry Gulch Project Listening Log

9/09/08

7/29/2008	Glenn Walsh	No one is paying for this right now; have only collected \$40,000 in WRF by May. So if new growth doesn't happen we're going to pay for it. Is PAWSD going to seek another \$11 million loan to buy more land? 12,500 vs 35,000 AF has become a talking point but they are not the same in terms of cost. Why should new growth pay for the Town's water system [referring to WTP replacement]
8/1/2008	Ed Simpson - letter to the editor, Pagosa Daily Post	Why can't PAWSD and SJWCD reenter discussions with JR Ford and Alpine Cascade regarding Hidden Valley water rights? Seems more cost effective than pursuing Dry Gulch.
8/2/2008	J.J., P.O. (two letters)	fear that property owners will have to pay higher service fees to cover debt service; \$150 million is a burden to a County of our size

ISSUE FOUR: FINANCIAL CONCERNS - AFFECT OF PROJECT ON THE LOCAL ECONOMY		
DATE	SOURCE	INPUT
7/10/2008	S.H., property owner	PAWSD is the #1 reason why growth has come to a stop.
7/16/2008	Commissioner Bob Moomaw	If we proceed with a 35,000 AF reservoir, cost would dramatically stress the capital available for projects needed by the community. Doesn't think we have the economic base to support 35,000 AF. We need to get together with other organizations benefitting from Impact Fees and "divvy up what the market can bear." Right now PAWSD is getting the vast majority of what the market can bear [Impact Fee Summit with all profiting agencies scheduled Aug 6 based on this position]
7/16/2008	Bill Hudson, Pagosa Daily Post series	Lots of Water, Lots of Debt series: supports Moomaw's concerns that PAWSD is taking all of their available capital in the community while other agencies need money for their projects.
7/29/2008	BoCC resolution	Concerned that cost of 35,000 AF exceeds available public capital
7/29/2008	Bob Moomaw, County Commissioner	Re: resolution: BoCC is expressing the concern of the community that the project [35,000 AF reservoir] is too large. Capital required is all the capital in the community. We don't have a number yet for what that amount is [all the capital in the community / what market will bear] but will discuss it Aug 6. We don't have the resources available to do a 35,000 AF reservoir. If PAWSD proceeds down that route, other entities will be left in a bind. There is a finite amount of money in this community to do projects - needs to be divided out.
7/29/2008	Ronnie Zaday, County Commissioner	My position sitting here is listening to the concern of citizens. PAWSD fees are taking away from all the other projects. There is a need to express to the PAWSD Board this concern. I don't feel like we're putting any limits on water rights. After reviewing documentation provided by the PAWSD Board, still feels 35,000 AF is beyond the realm of what we need to go after in this community. Using tax payers' dollars to buy land to prepare for taxpayers yet to come. All of Archuleta County taxpayers are affected because there is no money to spend on other things.
7/29/2008	Bill Hudson	We're not hearing from PAWSD and how they care about the other entities, how they care about the County and the Town. All they want is to build this huge thing.
7/29/2008	Judy Esterly, property owner	This project will indebt us and our children.
7/31/2008	James Robinson, Pagosa Sun article	coverage of 7/29/08 BoCC meeting: Moomaw has little confidence in the studies and growthprojections used as a basis for reservoir project and fears it will bankrupt the community.

Dry Gulch Project Listening Log

9/09/08

8/2/2008	J.J., P.O. (two letters)	PAWSD's onerous fee schedule has affected development
8/13/2008	Mr. and Mrs. P.D. (PO): comments on returned brochure	We can't afford this plan

ISSUE FIVE: OTHER MISUNDERSTANDINGS THAT MAY UNDERMINE PROJECT LEGITIMACY		
DATE	SOURCE	INPUT
7/17/2008	Realtor, female (did not disclose name)	Fear that PAWSD is charging more now (in CIF/WRF) for homes under 2000 sq ft than under old method
7/24/2008	R.S. - property owner	Believes rate increase is due to Dry Gulch funding needs
7/29/2008	George Esterly	Believes recent monthly fee rate increase was to offset lack of CIF/WRF revenue from slow growth.
8/2/2008	J.J., P.O. (two letters)	PAWSD circumvented 2004 vote by creating a "special enterprise district" without voter approval; PAWSD ignored decision of CO Supreme Court; using fees to replace and upgrade facilities is a violation of state statute; 35,000 AF would supply 300,000 people, a city the size of Pueblo.
8/23/2008	G. W. (P.O. - letter)	PAWSD has a great chance to guide the area to keep it pristine and not a metropolis.
OTHER / STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT		
7/15/2008	Mark Weiler / Glenn Walsh (financing proposal: HBO model)	Support 12,500 AF reservoir
7/17/2008	M.A.	PAWSD is doing the right thing - they are still in business and doing well.
7/29/2008	BoCC resolution	Support for 12,500 AF reservoir; support for acquisition of water rights
8/12/2008	David	In favor of WRF; We have to plan for the future; no water = no growth; those who disagree are being short-sighted: nobody likes to pay fees.
8/12/2008	T.S.	Will the San Juan be a tail water fishery below the reservoir?
8/12/2008	hairdresser	PAWSD is one of the few in the County who plan for the future
8/23/2008	G.W.(P.O. - letter)	Re: Our Water Our Future: planning for the future of tomorrow's water is right on. Provided suggestions on how to implement water conservation measures/programs.