



## Official Minutes

**Town Council Special Meeting | 5:30 PM**

**Tuesday, December 30, 2025**

**Town Hall / Council Chambers - 302 Pine St Minturn, CO**

---

The agenda is subject to change, including the addition of items 24 hours in advance or the deletion of items at any time. The order of agenda items listed are approximate.

This agenda and meetings can be viewed at [www.minturn.org](http://www.minturn.org).

### **Meeting Access Information and Public Participation:**

This will be an in-person meeting with access for the public to attend in person or via the Zoom link included. Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88307619286>

**Zoom Call-In Information:** 1 651 372 8299 or 1 301 715 8592 **Webinar ID:** 883 0761 9286

**Please note:** All virtual participants are muted. In order to be called upon an unmuted, you will need to use the “raise hand” feature in the Zoom platform. When it’s your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute your line and you will have five minutes for public comment.

**Public Comments:** If you are unable to attend, public comments regarding any items on the agenda can be submitted to Jay Brunvand, Town Clerk, prior to the meeting and will be included as part of the record.

### **1. Call to Order**

Mayor Earle Bidez called the meeting to order at 5:32pm.

### **2. Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance**

Council present: Mayor Earle Bidez, and Town Council Members Eric Gotthelf, Gusty Kanakis, Lynn Feiger, Brian Rodine, Tom Priest, and Kate Schifani.

Staff Members Present: Town Manager Rob Gutierrez, Deputy Clerk Cindy Krieg (Zoom).

### **3. Approval of Consent Agenda**

Consent agenda items are routine Town business, items that have received clear direction previously from the council, final land-use file documents after the public hearing has been closed, or which do not require council deliberation.

**A. 12-17-2025 Minutes**

Motion by Gusty K., second by Kate S., to approve the Consent Agenda of December 30, 2025 as Presented. Motion passed 7-0.

**4. Approval of Regular Agenda**

Opportunity for amendment or deletions to the agenda.

Mayor Earle B. noted one update to the agenda. Resolution No. 53 – Series 2025 was added and publicly posted on Monday, December 29<sup>th</sup>. This will be item 10B on the agenda.

Motion by Eric G., second by Gusty K., to approve the Regular Agenda of December 30, 2025 as amended. Motion passed 7-0.

**5. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

**6. Public Comment**

Citizens are invited to comment on any item on the Consent Agenda, or not on the regular Agenda subject to a public hearing. Please limit your comments to five minutes per person unless arrangements have been made for a presentation with the Town Clerk. Those who are speaking are requested to state their name and address for the record.

**7. Council and Committee Reports**

N/A

**8. Staff Reports**

**9. Special Presentations**

Presentations are limited to 5 minutes. Invited presentations are limited to 10 minutes if prior arrangements are made with the Town Clerk.

No Special Presentations.

**10. Business Items**

Items and/or Public Hearings listed under Business Items may be old or new and may require review or action by the Council.

**A. Public Hearing for Minturn Water Treatment Plant Project Needs Assessment**

Rob G. introduced Jarod Limke, Design Engineer with HDR Engineering, Paul Young with Swiftwater Solutions, and Troy Bernberg with Northland Public Finance.

Rob G. also noted that the special meeting public hearing is required prior to applying for SRF financing.

Mr. Limke recapped where things currently stand with regard to the Town's water treatment facilities.

The Minturn water treatment plant was originally constructed in the 1960s and has been serving the town ever since. In recent years, the Town has been made aware of

deficiencies with the currently water treatment facility by CDPHE (CO Dept of Public Health and Environment). They are the drinking water regulatory authority in Colorado.

One of the major significant deficiencies at the existing water plant were the outdoor filters. Several years ago those filters were both deemed non-suitable for treatment, which greatly reduced the quality and capacity of treatment at the water plant. And so right now, the current water plant only has available to it the one covered filter number 3, which is 40 foot by 80 foot sand filter, and a cartridge filter that is rated for very low flow rates, and only to be used in a state of an emergency. In addition to those two filters at the water plant, there are two groundwater wells that provide water to the system. This limited capacity leaves the town in a state of vulnerability from a resiliency standpoint and compromises the town's ability to provide high-quality water long-term and into the future. Those factors coupled with the age of all of the infrastructure at the existing water treatment plant. It's near the end of its useful life. Part of the work we've completed to date was evaluating that existing infrastructure. There two outdoor filters, no longer viable for treatment, and one indoor filter. There are also struggles with treating the water out of Cross Creek during seasonal. Spikes that the creek experiences, mostly during the spring when biological activity is at its highest. The groundwater wells are both limited in what type of and the quantity of flow that they can produce.

There's also a new storage tank up on the hill, so that was constructed 2021-2022-ish timeframe.

When we went to evaluate these existing facilities at the plant, one of the things we wanted to consider was what can be reused for cost efficiency.

We proposed taking advantage of the existing Filter 3 and turning that into a processing facility for the backwash waste. We want to reuse the existing clear well to store and neutralize clean-in-place waste. And then convert the existing storage tank up on the hill, and this is work that's already been completed. Converting that existing storage tank into the plant's new clear well.

So overall good use of existing infrastructure that we could still extract some life out of that, albeit in a different capacity and level of service.

Filter 3 and the existing clear well building, those will no longer be involved directly in the production of drinking water. They will be involved in managing waste residual streams that come out of the drinking water production process.

Another thing that comprises work completed to date is process alternatives analysis. The number of treatment processes available in the drinking water market are many. But generally a handful cover probably 90% of all processes in the world. We'll focus on Colorado and Minturn specifically.

What we looked at in this process alternatives analysis, which is part of the project needs assessment, was we evaluated 3 primary alternatives. The first one being to rehabilitate the existing slow sand filtration process. This is very close to a do-nothing alternative, and just let it run its course. While this is close to a do-nothing, it involved the rehabilitation of slow sand filters to bring them into the current state of. permissible capacity. The big component there, uh, that helped rule out this alternative as viable was that slow sand filtration is a bit of an antiquated process. And in order to permit a new slow sand filtration process, we would have to contain the new filters in an enclosed area, this would involve a brand new foundation, brand new concrete basins with engineered underdrains, and then the enclosing part, we need to put a building around all of that. And as soon as you start

talking about foundations and superstructure, the cost is quite high. To spend that much money and not get the value of a high-quality and 21st century best available technology for your drinking water process, it's not worth it.

When we evaluated these alternatives we did it collaboratively with Town of Minturn, with the Water Task Force on Council. The Town used a criteria scoring method for each alternative considered when evaluating.

The next alternative we evaluated was to replace all of the treatment facilities at the existing water treatment plant with a conventional water treatment process. A conventional water treatment process is just that. It is a flocculation, settling, and multimedia filtration process. It is commonly used and it scales exceptionally well. It works great for extremely high flow rates. This is the type of process that you would see at Denver water facilities, for example. For Minturn, we don't have that type of flow. The new water plant's being designed with a firm capacity of 0.3 million gallons per day, up to 0.6 million gallons per day. At those flow rates, we're not talking about cast-in-place concrete structures and basins. We're talking about pre-engineered, packaged facilities. In the alternatives analysis, what we found was going through that is it's a lot more operator intensive. And not as remotely operable. The conventional process scored decently high, but missed the mark on a couple of criteria. And the cost of that alternative was higher than expected due to maintenance / operational costs.

The third alternative, which is the membrane facility, is what we ultimately arrived at. Membrane filtration is considered the best available technology and membranes are exceptionally common in Colorado. Our cold, low-alkalinity water responds very well to membrane treatment.

An ultrafiltration membrane pore provides an absolute filtration barrier for bacteria. That is highly conducive for us, because we have two groundwater wells that are supplying water to the town of Minturn. Groundwater is classified as generally being free of bacteriological contamination. And if you use a membrane to treat your water, the water that comes out the backside of that membrane is free of bacteriological contamination, and so you can mix those two water sources, which we intend to do. And apply the same exact disinfection strategy. This weighed into our alternatives analysis. With the conventional process, you do not have an absolute bacteriological barrier.

That combined with the cost being at or just below the anticipated cost for the conventional treatment process is how we as a team arrived at a membrane treatment facility. In lieu of rehabilitating the slow sand filters or a conventional process in a building.

Mr. Limke displayed a map of the proposed new facility, and discussed what the notations on the map mean. This information will be shared on the Town website as well.

The discussion then moved into funding options.

Rob G. recapped the numbers that Mr. Bernberg had presented at the last meeting.

Earle B. asked about costs of using domestic products (steel, for example) vs. non-domestic, and what those cost impacts might be.

Mr. Bernberg noted that there could be an approximately 8% increase in cost (but this could range anywhere from 6 – 12%), if we go with SRF financing and have to use domestically sourced materials.

Lynn F. inquired about the timing of rates declining (in the presented chart). Is this due to more users coming on, or other reasons?

Mr. Bernberg noted that it is due to a few things, including amortized principal, additional users due to more development, cash from sale of an asset, etc.

Gusty K. asked about the different financing options. If we go with SRF, we would start paying on our debt in November. If we go with private financing and the plant isn't done until 2027, do we just pay on the money that we've actually borrowed, or do we pay on the whole amount?

Mr. Bernberg noted that he will be looking into a draw feature. SRF does not offer this option, but some private financiers may. It's not certain if this would be offered, but it will be looked into.

Gusty K. brought up something in the PNA report that states that the Town struggles to meet regulatory requirements. He felt this makes it sound like we're not doing what we're supposed to do and that we have quality issues.

Mr. Limke responded that the PNA report is structured to present need, and although the Town does a great job currently of providing quality water, we do need to demonstrate need and the limitations that our current infrastructure is contending with.

Mr. Limke also addressed the types of things that are being addressed in the environmental assessment (which also includes biological, historical and cultural resource impacts).

Public Hearing Opened:

Amanda Mire, 414 Eagle River St.

Ms. Mire inquired if there are incremental checks on the construction / progress? If the PDA is involved (SRF financing)?

Rob G. noted that the agencies don't inspect, but we do have strict reporting requirements to ensure we're complying with the terms. The Town would likely have to hire someone to assist with the reporting.

Ms. Mire also asked if the agency involvements could slow the project down.

Rob G. noted that it could. We wouldn't know about the SRF funding until April / May. We could likely start faster if we go with private funding. But it's hard to quantify.

Mr. Bernberg also spoke to the cost of materials gap between the two options.

Mr. Young also noted that delays are not necessarily on inspections, they are more related to administration and compliance (materials equipment sourcing, etc). Lead times can certainly cause delays.

Inspections – there aren't really any construction inspections that the state requires, it's really just administrative. The state will do a final inspection however, with CDPHE, to ensure that the final plans and specs adhered to the original plans.

Ms. Mire also asked about rate increases – is the Town taking into account potential delays with funding from agency funding (vs. private)? Or are the increased projected rates based on either?

Rob G. noted that year 1 is the primary difference. The amortized principal has the most impact the soonest. The PDA does require us to start paying sooner vs. private. (2026 vs. 2027).

Terry Armistead, 1632 Main St.

Regarding the monthly impact – clarifying that the #s presented in the chart are on top of what's currently being paid? Rob G. confirmed that to be correct.

Ms. Armistead also asked about the length of the debt service.

Rob G. noted that it's likely to be 20 years.

Public Hearing Closed.

Mr. Young noted that at the end of the comment period, the state will issue a FONSI (Finding of No Significant Impact) once the environmental assessment is complete.

**B. Resolution No. 53 – Series 2025, A Resolution Accepting a Project Needs Assessment for Water Treatment Facilities**

Motion by Kate S., second by Lynn F., to approve Resolution No. 53 – Series 2025, a Resolution Accepting the Project Needs Assessment for Water Treatment Facilities, as presented. Motion passed 7-0.

## **11. Discussion / Direction Items**

**A. Continued Discussion with Municipal Advisor regarding WTP Financing**

Troy Bernberg addressed the council.

Will begin exploring the direct lending option in January, so we can hopefully make a final decision earlier (possibly February). He will be soliciting 12 – 13 banks. That solicitation does not commit us to anything.

We will continue to explore the PDA (SRF) loan option. We can apply without committing. Same with the traditional lender solicitation (does not commit us to anything).

It will be important to decide what approach we want to take sooner than later, because when we go out to bid contractors will bid based on the type of financing and associated requirements / impacts. We also continue to have associated costs with the preparation for SRF funding.

Rob G. noted that the costs of administering SRF are very high. The cost of reporting could be 4 – 8% of the construction cost. This is a significant burden.

Tom P. asked whether the Council should just make a decision so we're not spending money on an approach that we aren't going to end up taking. He suggested moving up the decision timeline as much as possible.

Rob G. responded that we are currently working on Bond counsel so that we can wrap this up as soon as possible.

Mr. Bernberg is hoping to get something out next week, which would mean responses hopefully by the end of January.

We should have options to consider by the first meeting in February (private financing), but we won't know about SRF yet at that point. That could take 2 – 3 months (We submit on January 5<sup>th</sup>).

Mr. Bernberg noted that we can bid the project out as non-SRF once we get responses back on private financing options. If that route looks more attractive, then the Town can move forward with that approach.

Gusty K. noted that we want be mindful of the timeline, so it makes sense to bid the project out as non-SRF and then if we need to change it later, we can (knowing that would cause a delay).

Gusty K. inquired about debt forgiveness programs.

Rob G. responded that we are not eligible, but we are looking into a grant (they have a meeting coming up with CDPHE to look into this).

Gusty K. also asked about congressional spending and whether we may be eligible to apply for additional funds.

Rob G. noted that the timeline may not line up, but we can look into it.

Gusty K. noted that based on his conversation with Representative Neguse that this could possibly be an option for future years (into the project), probably not year 1.

## 12. Future Agenda Items

### A. Future Meeting Topics

## 13. Adjourn

Motion by several council members, second by Tom P., to adjourn the meeting at 6:58pm.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Earle Bidez, Mayor

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jay Brunvand, Town Clerk

