

DRY GULCH LISTENING LOG CONCERN SUMMARY

A. CREDIBILITY OF ORGANIZATION

A-1: PAWSD forged ahead with reservoir plans and expenditures regardless of 2004 ballot issue rejection.

A-2: Board's propensity for Executive Session lends questions of transparency, honesty, personal gain of those involved and legitimacy.

A-3: PAWSD's financial decisions and debt obligations are questionable given the economic climate.

A-4: Fred Schmidt should not be involved in or associated with this project now and in the future.

A-5: Working together with other organizations will enhance PAWSD's credibility.

A-6: It will take PAWSD a long time to rebuild its credibility and public confidence.

A-7: PAWSD is not listening to or acting in the best interest of the public.

A-8: Disconnect between message that size of reservoir has not been determined and the message that projections and expenditures to date have been predicated on a 35,000 AF size.

A-9: PAWSD Board is misguiding State agencies by misrepresenting the level of public/community support for project.

B. LEGITIMACY OF PROJECT

B-1: Future growth estimates are questionable and the need for a 35,000 AF size is exaggerated.

B-2: Because the numbers keep changing and the plan seems vague, the project should not go forward until numbers (costs, accepted EU projections) are concrete.

B-3: Fred Schmidt's spearheading calls into question the legitimacy of this project.

B-4: The perception, aided by the BoCC resolution and 2004 vote outcome, is that there is no public support for this project, particularly at the 35,000 AF size.

C. HOW WILL WE PAY FOR THE PROJECT?

C-1: Size of debt service is unprecedented and Water Resource Fees are not coming in as projected: fear of a County-like financial train wreck resulting in emburdening property owners to carry the difference through increased service fees.

C-2: First 20% of new growth should not have to pay for whole project – cost should be spread amongst everyone.

C-3: Alternate proposals:

- Weiler/Walsh proposal to eliminate WRF and spread cost over life of project by raising service fees for everyone
- Cut WRF in half and go for a G.O. Bond to finance Snowball WTP replacement
- Reenter discussions with JR Ford and Alpine Cascade Corp. to obtain water storage rights in Hidden Valley Reservoir.

C-4: How does PAWSD intend to pay for land required for Forest Service land exchange when WRF is not currently covering debt service on existing private land loan?

D. AFFECT OF PROJECT ON THE LOCAL ECONOMY

D-1: The project costs more than this community can afford. High fees are deterring commercial development and new people from coming here, and the project will hurt current residents through higher service fees well into the future.

D-2: The Water Resource Fee, predicated on a 35,000 AF reservoir, is consuming most of the available capital in the community at the expense of other agencies' impact fee needs.

E. MISUNDERSTANDINGS THAT MAY UNDERMINE PROJECT LEGITIMACY

E-1: June rate increase due to the gap between Dry Gulch debt service and WRF collections.

E-2: 35,000 AF would supply 300,000 people

E-3: PAWSD is in violation of State Statute in its fee collection and usage.

E-4: PAWSD has the ability to guide or restrict growth and development.