

Members Present: Currier, McDole, McKinney, Mitcham, Prewett, Smith, Winters

Public Input: Win Cary spoke of the newly formed “**Firewise Community**” program started within Spring Valley. The first meeting was held and the 2nd meeting will be held 3 November at 10:00 a.m..

Special Districts Presentation: [Jan Coppenger, Scott Harter, Will Evans]

Repairs planned for the Chalk Mountain Bridge [CMB] and the Upper Wolf Creek Bridge [UWCB] should be complete by the 19th of October. Once complete, the repairs should bring the UWCB back to usable status.

Bridge replacement projects for Upper Wolf Creek, Chalk Mountain and Lower Wolf Creek should be completed within five years. Construction should begin in 2019 on the UWCB, 2021 for the CMB and 2022 for the LWCB.

Water production remains in good shape with water paying for water. The State has run out of money to fund the Water Distribution Engineering Grant (WDEG — \$500K), which will define the final phase of the final water system upgrade. The WDEG will be submitted this Fall in hopes of being funded in early 2019. The final upgrade will require another grant that would be applied for late 2019 with work starting in 2020/21.

Those present were advised by SDA to report (call: 263-0119, 24/7) anytime they notice something that seems wrong — leaks, trucks using water from hydrants, etc. We pay to produce water, if trucks are using it without being metered, we are losing money.

There is a metered hydrant at the water plant currently that is being used for the cleanup activity. It is the only hydrant that trucks should be using.

Our **roads** are in need of major repairs. The analysis works on a scale of 0-25 = Fail; 26-50 = Poor; 51-74 = Fair and Greater than 75 = Good. Most of our roads are rated “Fail.” A first, rough estimate of the cost and time to bring our roads up to “Fair” condition indicated a cost of \$M1.2 over 10-years and perhaps generated from a property tax assessment of about \$150 per year per parcel.

Our roads are “Double Chip Seal” construction which means they are relatively inexpensive to repair because there is no asphalt or concrete base to be replaced.

Important to note, the first analysis was just that, a first analysis. The results need to be reviewed for things overlooked or incorrectly input and so on. The necessary work will likely change as the input data gets refined. For instance, if we want our main roads widened we need to input that data and the cost would go up.

Lake Recovery: [See presentation.] SDA was thanked for the presentation, and for reopening negotiations with the vendor, which may lead to a signed contract allowing

work start in 2019. As presented, we must spend up to \$60K to complete the engineering work necessary to put shovel to dirt.

Most important, the presentation provided no estimate of other costs that might arise during the project, or after the project. Maintenance, for example, includes the removal of debris from the containment pond as required. An estimate of how often this might occur and what each occurrence might cost was not given.

SDA was asked to provide estimates for these post-project costs; specifically, what will it cost to empty a full containment pond and how often might it be necessary.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted: Sandie Winters for Helen Mitcham

Discussion: [by Winters]

Without these estimates, the Advisory Board has no way to present the “cost of lake recovery” to the community. If we spend \$40-\$60K for engineering and the post-project costs exceed our ability to pay, we will have invested up to \$110K with no return.

What could the post-project costs be? We don't know, but at the end of the project we will have a hole in the ground begging for landscaping, picnic tables, shade, bridges between islands, fencing, floating dock(s), a working bathroom and so on, above the water. Then there is the planting of water plants to filter out the silt in the containment pond, and the placement of boulders where a hardening of the banks is needed, along with what ever else might be necessary. And, the periodic cleaning of the containment pond for as long as we want a lake.

The project definition, presented to the community and the Board of Supervisors, anticipated these costs and suggested that \$1.00 per cubic yard of debris removed and sold by the vendor would accumulate during the project and could help to cover these post-project costs. At that time, it was believed that around \$375,000 could be realized. Today, that amount could still be sufficient depending on how often the containment pond must be cleaned out.

If the estimates from SDA can be anticipated to be covered by tax assessment and/or water rates, we can present alternate solutions to the community.

*“Would you pay \$X.XX per month on your water bill for maintenance of the lake?”
...and/or*

“Would you pay an additional \$X.XX per month tax assessment...”

If acceptable to the community, the Advisory Board's job is to get a grant to cover as much of the costs as possible.