

Month of April and May Minutes for Construction and Plan Review

We received plans from Harris & Smariga as preliminary drawings, to be able to bid the project for budgeting construction costs. The bids would help determine realistic budget numbers for selling bonds and the need for continued special tax assessment. Harris & Smariga were given a deadline of March 15 to allow for time to disburse to contractors and get bids in. Special tax assessments need to be identified to the county in May.

Harris & Smariga completed drawings by March 18. Plans were immediately sent out to several contractors for proposals. The construction budget needs to be established before next special tax assessment to confirm project's viability.

Construction bids from several contractors came in, with preliminary numbers below previously budgeted. Initial construction costs support proposed budget. Additional items still needed are pump station costs, bond, related administrative for issuing costs, permitting, fees, FRO and miscellaneous engineering.

Plans show significant road grading affecting property owner's front yards due to the steep topography, and the installation of check dams along road sides, for Storm Water Management Devices.

April 22 Meeting to Discuss SWM Devices, Check Dams, Road Grading and FRO

In attendance were MJ Minton, Frank Dertzbaugh, John Peters, Doug Chapin, and Jim DiMeglio.

The check dams were discussed as a new SWM device not seen before. There were many of them. Concerns were discussed about the amount of dams, the aesthetics, driveways, maintenance and if there were any alternatives. Due to the check dams, there is significant road grading affecting some property owners because of the slopes. For some, building footprints may be affected. Discussions addressed Parcel B and whether or not water could be channeled there. Also if a SWM pond could be used on one of the lots, to eliminate some of the check dams and grading. We brought up whether or not land could be used by Lake Merle for a littler pond but it appeared to steep. We looked at the 22 acres by the tee pee lots but they were individually owned. Land Stewards owns 80 of them but they are controlled by M&T Bank now, due to bankruptcy. The area site was carefully reviewed for any options.

We set a meeting to discuss these options with Clay Edwards, general manager of the LLA HOA.

The board voted to hire PDS, Jim DiMeglio to help with the preconstruction, plan review and submittal phase necessary for bond sale.

May 5, 2009 9:30 AM LLA HOA Office with Clay Edwards

In attendance; Clay Edwards, MJ Minton, Frank Dertzbaugh, John Peters, Doug Chapin, Jim DiMeglio

The purpose of the meeting was to address the shared concerns of the SWM check dams shown on the drawings. Clay was hoping to see something like in Aspen. The development across the street had used a step down type of storm water management that the property owners could maintain by mowing.

Concerns were shared by all for the amount of check dams throughout Aspen North, creating possible interference with parking, driveways, and aesthetics. Clay was concerned about LLA's role in maintaining these devices since the roads would be turned over to the LLA. He said as proposed, a maintenance agreement may need to be in place with the property owners paying a clean up fee in their HOA dues.

Asking the engineers for clarification as to why these were being used, Merchant McDonald from HAS responded on 4/14/09

"The County has changed what it wants to see used check dams for water quality treatment in the ditches since Aspen 1 was built. We used to be able to use landscape timbers, but now the check dams need to be stone, concrete or some other more durable material. We used a stone filled wire basket called a "gabion". This will contain the stone, keep it shape and function better than just loose dumped stone."

And on 4/16/09

"The check dam system was used because of the steep slopes on some of the roads. We used a "dry swale" without check dams where we could, but it is limited to a 4% longitudinal slope which can only be achieved where the roads parallel the contours. When the roads (ditches) run up or down against the contours, the slopes are too steep to meet the design requirements for water quality without the check dams. When we met with Betsy we talked about some possible on lot facilities for water quality, but once we got into the computations for storage volumes required, there is not enough room or the slopes are too steep on the lots to provide any significant volume contribution to the water quality requirement. Also, there is no place to put a centralized water quality facility. The terrain is too steep."
And on 4/23/09

"Only because the road slopes in Aspen North are steeper (9% - 10.5% compared to 6% - 8%). The steeper slopes make it harder to get a long enough run of terraced ditch at 4% to be considered for water quality treatment. Also, the 4% flat runs need to be about 35-40 feet long before Betsy will consider them for meeting the criteria. In Aspen we were able to use the ditches as filtering devices, while in Aspen North, they are used as storage devices."

Clay suggested possible curb and gutter on single sides of the street as used in Coldstream. A storm water management pond would be needed, but it would reduce some of the grading off the property fronts, and eliminates some of the check dams. This could add significant costs to the project.

LLA has a 10' easement for utilities running along the back of all properties. Building restrictions are 6' in the rear, 10' in the front, and 6' on the sides. Given the grading for the SWM there would be significant cutting on some lots requiring custom home designs to meet the building footprint requirements.

In regards to repaving or patching Eaglehead after sewer installation, Clay said the requirement was to patch back to the existing pavement.

It was decided after much discussion and questions that a meeting would be called with the engineers to discuss other options.

5-11-09 Meeting with HSA to discuss SWM, Grading, Check Dams, and FRO

In Attendance; Mike Smariga, Fran Zeller, Merchant McDonald, Clay Edwards, MJ Minton, Frank Dertzbaugh, John Peters, Jim DiMeglio

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss questions raised on the grading, SWM, Check Dams, and FRO.

Mike informed us that the SWM regulations were scheduled to change on 4-10-10 which would be more environmentally sensitive, requiring things like porous pavement and less structures/SWM ponds as part of the new regulation. The design as planned is expected to meet the new regulations. There is concern about the velocity of the water because of the steepness. A bare minimum plan is needed to get in the door. It could take as long a year for approvals. If the regulation goes into effect during that time we have to start over. Submitting a plan that will meet the new regulations is important. And getting it in with time for the approval process is equally important.

We asked if we could add some curb and gutter to eliminate some of the grading and check dams. Curb and gutter would add a significant increase to our budget. Currently we had approximately \$250,000 in check dams. Curb and gutter would be higher. An area would need to be allocated for a SWM pond, and the ponds and structures were being steered away from in the new regulations

We asked if we could use the step trenches like in Aspen, with the driveways to serve as dams in lieu of the check dams. They felt these would not go through the new regulations, and we had some steeper slopes.

We discussed if we could reduce the crown and make the road a single slope, and if the road could be narrowed to eliminate grading. The answer was no, as LLA road standards were 20'.

Could Parcel B between West Shavano and East Shanvano be contoured to catch water and then channel it off? Could 2nd 6" drainage pipe be installed in the ditches to collect more water, reducing the need for gabions?

Questions came up regarding the driveways. If a driveway took the place of the check dam was there more water to calculate? What will the property owners incur? How will their individual SWM needs be dealt with. Engineers estimate approximately \$2000 for individual property owners SWM requirements. If the check dams where the driveways are shown are removed, what happens when the homeowner seeks approval for their home? Will their SWM requirements be impacted? The design takes into effect some of the property owner's storm water runoff but not the entire project. The engineers would need to review the design of the check dams and driveways, and see if they can reduce the impact to the property owners, making the driveways part of the SWM plan. Aprons are estimated at around \$2500. With the current plan, temporary grading easements will be required by all property owners for the road grading. If no approval is given then a retaining wall will take its place.

Preliminary estimates for FRO are 7 acres. Clay thinks there may be some areas in Liganore we could ask the board to allow us to put into a perpetual easement for our FRO needs. This will have to be finalized by the engineers. It still needs to be determined how the county will treat FRO easements dedicated to AN by LLA. A meeting with the county will need to be scheduled."

Grinder pumps will be needed on some of the lower lots for sewer service. Grinder pumps would be paid by individual property owner.

Contractors were showing a haul off of soils of 17000 yards while engineers were saying it was balanced. When asked about it the engineers said that we should go by the contractor's estimates as they have a more detailed program when it comes to estimating dirt. Reducing the soils haul off could save us money.

ECPC Meeting 5-13-09

In Attendance: MJ Minton, Frank Dertzbaugh, John Peters, Doug Chapin, Jim DiMeglio

The board approved April's minutes

Budget: If all taxes were collected we would have \$172,500. This year we collected \$158,000
Money remaining in escrow is \$42,918.75
We have spent to date \$114,437.67 with a portion of the engineers fee differed.

SWM Review: We want to make sure drawings and budget will work. A way to help with the buildability of the lots is to put the driveways in now, no paving, just earthwork. We set up a timeline for submitting SWM plans, bond sale and construction. Pump station may be done in a separate phase depending on county and approvals.

Sewer and Water would require a letter of credit before they issue permits. Bond council is now requiring our project to be a lot further along and permit ready. Board discussed how to finance the project to satisfy bond sale requirements yet operate in our budget of \$1500 per lot owner. We would have to get this information from Keenan