

SKYLINE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICE DISTRICT
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING
July 18, 2023

A public meeting of the Directors of the Skyline Improvement and Service District was held on July 18, 2023, in person and via Zoom.

Bob Norton, Kurt Harland and Latham Jenkins (via Zoom) constituting a quorum were present.

Attending in person were Michael Minter, Tom and Kathy Sweat, and Fred Hibberd.

Attending via Zoom were Warren Machol, Jamie Streater, Worthy Johnson, Jim Hunt, and Corbin McNeill.

1. **Call Budget Meeting to Order:**

Kurt Harland called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Action: Public comment will be limited to two minutes per participant. Emailed public comments received prior to the meeting will be attached in the minutes.

Board Action:

Kurt Harland made a motion to close the Budget Hearing. Bob Norton seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0. The Budget Hearing adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

2. **Public Comment:**

Michael Minter - When we applied for the loan, we noted that we charged for water based upon a minimum charge for every homeowner and then so much per 1,000 gallons. I've seen the \$2.60, but I haven't seen anything about the minimum charge for every homeowner. We've always had our minimum charge. It was included in the application for the water meters. When Carl Brown did his analysis of rates for Skyline, he likewise had a minimum charge, but that minimum charge was a function of the line size and then he recommended charging \$2.60 per 1,000 gallons, which the budget right now is based on the \$2.60 per 1,000.

My question is what's happened to the fixed charge? Back in February when we had the town hall meeting, John Willott and Worthy Johnson were asking questions about people who irrigate being charged a lot more for water, and Kurt in response to that question said that people who irrigate are not paying for everything. 50% is funded by the base rate, so it's not truly funded by users. It's funded 50% by every household, the other 50% is by use. That's in the minutes from February.

Board Response:

Kurt Harland - That was an average, 50%. There is a fixed charge. We call it a readiness to serve fee, not a minimum.

Bob Norton - It's a base charge and it's per lot. So, every lot, even the vacant lots, are paying for some of the water system improvements and maintaining the water system. Even though they're not using any water, they're paying a readiness to serve charge. But everybody pays the same base rate and then \$2.60 cents per 1,000 gallons for what they use. Some communities do the base rate based on the meter size. So, if you have a three-quarter inch meter, you pay one fee and if you have a one-inch meter, you pay one and a half times that and if you got a two-inch meter, you pay about four times just because it's based on how much water the capacity of the meter is. They call it a demand charge. Skyline's decided it will use a fixed rate per lot. The fixed rate this year will be \$1,080 and that includes all the base. The only part of that that the vacant lots aren't paying is for the meter loan repayment because they don't have a meter.

Public Comment:

Michael Minter - What kind of increase is that from last year's rates?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - The 2023 fiscal year had a base charge of \$1,017. So, \$1,017 to \$1,080, so it's not a huge increase. Right now, we're proposing that we keep the user fee at \$2.60 per 1,000, and that works out to is 67% is fixed and 32% is user revenue.

Public Comment:

Michael Minter - So that minimum base rate should be generating \$88,000. We have 88 lots. I'm just trying to figure out where the \$88,000 is in the budget.

Board Response:

Bob Norton – The \$88,000 is made up of the loan repayments of \$7,250 and \$11,750. The \$17,000 water maintenance assessment and \$50,915 water overhead. That all adds up to \$86,915.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - I'm looking at the preliminary budget as posted. I only see an overhead and water maintenance assessment, which total approximately \$800. Where's the \$1,080?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - The \$1,080 is the charge per lot. If you go down to the bottom you'll see the water charges per lot, \$188.89 for the water maintenance assessment, \$676.63 for the water overhead and \$84.30 for water meter loan and \$130.56 for the well #4 loan.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - I think where the problem comes is for those who are paying for infrastructure into the future and they have nothing to do with the current operations of the system, nor do the reserves that are for future infrastructure improvements. I think you need to separate what is for infrastructure in your analysis and what is for future infrastructure from the costs as they're being allocated. It's not appropriate to mix the two together. We could just assess everyone for the charge for the meters this year and not have a future charge. So, to say that's a fixed charge, it's just a deferred infrastructure charge.

Board Response:

Bob Norton - That's the way we decided to do it was to borrow the money and pay for it over 20 years. You're right. It is deferring the cost but it's making the future property owners, whether it's you or me or some new buyer, pay for the meters.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - Would you agree that what I believe was written in the water study is how the costs are split to operate our system currently. This isn't to operate our system currently; this is to pay for infrastructure. Nor are the reserves that are being built up on, by the current water users have anything to do with current operations and how they're split. That is to pay for future infrastructure.

Board Response:

Bob Norton - In the budget, we do have \$25,400 projected to the reserve account for future water system improvements. The other items that I just spoke about are loan repayments. So, you're right, there is some in this budget that is for the future, and there's some of the courses for today's expenses.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - But then the splitting and the ratios are not correct for what is the split between fixed and variable for current operations.

Board Response:

Bob Norton - When I gave that ratio, I was saying the amount that's fixed per lot and the amount that comes in via the meter, which I call variable because every lot has a different amount of water use. Some people use 25,000 a year and some people use 900,000 a year. So, the people that use 900,000 pay more than the people that use 25,000.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - They're only paying more because you set the \$2.60 rate to create a \$25,000 reserve.

Michael Minter - Warren, don't you agree that we should build up a reserve, such that when we apply for the loans from the state, we've undertaken to build up our reserves? That seems to make sense to me, rather than showing that we haven't built up reserves knowing that we were going to have to spend \$5-\$7 million to upgrade the system.

Warren Machol - Mike, I think we both agree that there should be substantially higher amounts put into reserves, given what Bob has said that 25% of our future improvements need to be available in cash. If you take that amount and divide it by 90 lots, that's the amount that each lot should be responsible for to build up those reserves. So yes, I agree with you. It's the process that they aren't assessing each individual lot and only assessing water users to build reserves. That's the problem that we're discussing. I agree with you that we need more reserves.

Worthy Johnson - Question regarding your approach to having lot owners in the next 20 years pay for services that have been supplied by the ISD for the last 40 years. Is that the way you would define having a fiduciary responsibility, the Skyline Ranch ISD?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - I don't interpret it the same way you do. I see that the current users are paying for the existing system. The operations plus setting aside \$25,000 for future improvements. Then there are a couple of loans, one that's only a five-year loan, the other is a 20-year loan, and of course, every property owner is paying that and that will be, if it takes 20 years, that's another 19 years or 18 years to pay for them. But you're right, those improvements are being paid for by future owners. The only thing we're really setting aside for future expansion is the \$25,000 to go into the water reserve.

Public Comment:

Worthy Johnson - What you're looking at is to try and have the ISD accumulate 25% of a 100% future expense and the other 75% coming from grants and loans. In looking at that format, if the distribution portion of this replacement is over \$5 million and let's keep the math simple and just say 25% of that is \$1 million and the \$1 million is going to be used in let's just simply say 10 years. So, you have 10 years, \$1 million, so you're basically down to \$100,000 a year you must accumulate. Let's just say the number of lots is 100 instead of 91, you need to have \$1,000 a year of incremental assessment to get to your 25%, and that doesn't show up any place here. If anything, it's going down not up.

So, I'm leaving that with you because some of these statements that have been made, you didn't answer the question about a fiduciary. There are a lot of things that are unfiduciary that the board has been doing over the last number of years. Kurt has been on the board the longest, I believe. Bob, you may be on and off, I don't know, but I believe Kurt's been on there for 11 years. I do know that Kurt, in the August 2021 meeting at the 4H Club,

interjected and said that included in the water meter was also the backflow preventer. Then he signed a document, the SLIB loan, that excluded that, and the lot owners were not told anything about that until well after the fact. So, I think that the lack of transparency is something that is catamount that the board should perhaps excel in working on in the future.

Board Response:

Kurt Harland - The only thing I would disagree with is the backflow preventer. I think I said we needed them because that's a requirement of the district policy. I'm not sure if I mentioned in that meeting who was paying for it or who would be responsible for it. I think it's been taken out of context. I haven't been able to review that because I think the recording is gone, but my intent was that every home needed a backflow preventer. I don't think I stated that that would be included in the purchase of the loan. I think I said those could be put in at that time, so I'm not sure where all that comes from.

But I do understand that you want transparency and I personally think we've been very transparent. No one's trying to sneak anything in or pull anything over anyone's eyes or do anything nefarious. I think that we truly believe we're operating in the best interest of our entire community and I'm frankly tired of all these statements about the lack of transparency. I think there may be some misunderstandings or some miscommunication, but no one's trying to do anything behind anyone's back, so I resent those statements.

Bob Norton - The actual cost was estimated for 2030 was \$4,374,000. Of that, about 53% is asphalt repair, and so we have the street reserves for asphalt. When I say 25% of the water system replacement, which is estimated to be \$1,600,000, we need to have 25% of that. I think it is being fiduciary, it's being responsible. Now when we go borrow the money, we can borrow money for the asphalt repair too, which has a 20-year life. Certainly, we're borrowing for the water lines which have 70-year life.

I think we're doing very good, without overcharging the current homeowners or the future homeowners. I think we're building the reserves appropriately. For the purposes of asphalt, I did not plan that to be 25% because loans and grants aren't available for overlays and maintenance of the roads, so I figured that at 100%. Latham, when you call the financial committee meeting together, we can go over these assumptions in detail.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - I want to go back to the budget, and I did find the one that's posted on the website for 6/30/23 and I noted that some of the numbers were different. Bob, do you want to tell everybody what changed from what we had seen previously?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - It is different, and the primary difference is one meter reading that came in on June 30th that affected the revenues coming from user fees. So, I had to make that adjustment. So, the water system user fees are \$45,660. In the expenses, I changed the amount that was going to reserves so that it balanced.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - Because you charged people who used water less, there's less reserves, which is part of the problem we've been having. I found a few other changes. It appears the water overhead assessment went up to \$60,900 from \$46,000.

Board Response:

Bob Norton - The overhead assessment is \$60,000.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - I have the budget that was distributed for the last two board meetings, the last one dated

5/23/23, and it has different numbers than the one you've got posted. So, I don't know all of them that have changed.

Board Response:

Bob Norton - The one that's posted dated June 30, 2023, is what we are discussing and proposing, and I agree that over a period of time there were some changes. One change that happened is we decided that we need to put in \$10,000 for a financial audit from an independent auditor. We also increased the legal/professional fees, so there were some increases in expenses which caused an increase in that water maintenance or water overhead expense.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - You basically increased some revenue and increased some expenses and decreased reserves, and has anybody besides board members seen these numbers? Did they go to the finance committee or anybody else?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - I don't know if the finance committee has met. But they were all posted, the earlier version which was dated 6/28 was on for three weeks.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - The one that's posted on the website was posted five days ago and so that's why I'm trying to figure out the pieces. But I'm going to work from the one that I have from 5/23/23. You reduced the chip seal assessment and the road overhead assessment. I've asked numerous times for the analysis, and I've also asked for the balance of each of those reserves in writing. They've never been provided to the community members. I think it's important too, if we're going to decrease assessments by respectively 53% and 12%, that there should be some analysis behind that math, not just, "I think," and I wonder if you are willing to share that with members.

Board Response:

Bob Norton - Every month we share the reserve amounts. I can tell you where the reserve amount is today and where I've got it projected. As far as the asphalt overlay and the asphalt chip seal costs, I took the 2023 estimated cost and divided that by the life. So, the asphalt has a life overlay of 30 years. There's 19 years left, so that was how that was arrived at. The chip seal has a life of seven years, and I took the costs at 2023 dollars and divided that by seven and that's the amount per year that should go to the reserves. The estimates for asphalt and chip seal are estimates because we don't have bids for what it's going to be in 30 years, but they're very reasonable estimates.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - Bob, you've made two comments. First, you said on the website we can see what the reserves are for those respective accounts, and you can't. That's why I've been asking for several months for those numbers. Two, I've asked for the analysis on how that's done because when you say that there's 19 years remaining to the overlay. But our plan is in 2030 to replace our water lines. We're going to need to re-overlay all our roads much sooner than 19 years, which means we would be substantially under reserved.

I believe part of the problem with only you having the assumptions and never sharing the analysis with anybody is that these kinds of flaws creep into the system. If we're going to in seven years replace our water lines, we're going to have to redo our roads at that point. There are so many crossings that are going to have to be done, so many other pieces. I think the idea of cutting these and not providing the analysis to members who ask for them, I think is not transparent.

The same thing has happened when you come down to the water maintenance assessment. You've cut it by 39% and you cut that 39% in the face of still overcharging people for their water usage, which you raised last year 59%, and these kinds of random choices are problematic. I asked for the detailed listing of every member's assessment as I've used in previous years, which shows clearly that all three board members are in the bottom 20% of water users. So, by cutting fixed charges, it benefits them. To increase the water user charges just shifts fixed costs to variable water charges.

There are other parts here that I believe also need some discussion. In the analysis from 5/23, you have the clerical contract to be 80/20 road to water. However, we're going to run an election this year. How does water get to pay for 80% of the election expenses? Same thing when we come down to legal and professional fees. You've allocated 80/20 to water. All the charges that we had last year for the botched election, you just jammed on water users. Again, I don't think these are transparent and I don't think they're done with focus. The reason that we called probably the most well attended meeting we've ever had in Skyline public meeting, was to get more people involved in this process and the idea that you've created a budget without bringing it to any of the members who are on committees which essentially have been neutered.

Board Comment:

Kurt Harland - Moving forward, let's keep public comment to two minutes per issue.

Bob Norton - I don't know if anybody else had any questions regarding some of the budget items. I'm not opposed to looking at that 80/20 split. That's something that's been there for quite a few years, and it primarily is because the water system takes more management. The billing, the calculation of the water rates, and all that is more complicated and time-consuming than the road. I agree, there's some costs like legal fees and elections, but those are minor. It takes more to administer the water system than it does the roads. But it could be a different split.

Public Comment:

Fred Hibberd - On the water lines themselves, I guess what the board has decided that they have been in the ground long enough and they could fail. Is that true?

Board Response:

Bob Norton – Yes

Kurt Harland - Well, that's part of the reason. Part of it is we need to upsize for fire suppression and higher levels of distribution.

Public Comment:

Fred Hibberd - So separate from the fire suppression, could the water lines, in some cases, last longer?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - They could. The water lines in the first filing were installed in 1964. They're AC, asbestos cement, pipe. Which was very popular at that time. But they aren't made anymore, for good reason. We haven't had a lot of problems. We've had a break or two in these pipes. A majority of the leaks in that section have been on the service lines going across to the houses. On the upper section where we live, those were built in 1972 or 1973, and they're all thin wall PVC, what I call the irrigation pipe. They don't meet today's standards or even the standard in 1976. So, both are what I would call substandard materials. New materials should last 70 plus years. We are figuring if we get 60 out of the current lines, we're doing well.

Public Comment:

Fred Hibberd - So even though it's thin wall that still works, but you're saying that it doesn't work for fire suppression?

Board Response:

Kurt Harland - The sizes don't allow.

Bob Norton - So the main line going down West Ridge is a six-inch, Meadowlark's are four-inch. Most of the AC lines in the first filing are four-inch. There's one six-inch main feed to it, but the DEQ standard minimum now is six-inch. Ultimately, they need to be replaced. Whether we go to fire protection, that's another decision we'll have to make. But it makes sense when we replace them and put in larger lines.

Public Comment:

Fred Hibberd - So the bill is roughly \$5 million to do all this? So, have you looked at being able to fix the ones that really need to be fixed, the concrete lines, and spread the debt out so that you could pick up more use. It's nice to say that mid-lines would be worth, a good one would last 70 years. But they still have to be paid for now. So, you wouldn't amortize it over 70 years other than it lasts.

Board Response:

Bob Norton – Yes, regarding the estimated cost and line repairs. We can amortize. The standard rate with the State Land Investment Board loan is 20 years. Although in other communities I have been able to say we've got an infrastructure that's 70 years and they've extended that loan to 30 years, so 2.5% for 30 years. I think that's something that we need to look at very carefully and extend it, and if we can extend some of the lines out, that would be ideal.

Public Comment:

Fred Hibberd - What is the per lot investment in the \$5 million?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - I have that number, but I don't have it right in front of me. I came prepared for this budget, so I'd be happy to show you that.

Public Comment:

Michael Minter - It's useful to point out that we're hopeful that the state will forgive a portion of that loan, up to 25%.

Board Response:

Bob Norton - That's been a standard procedure. Of course, we don't know what will happen in 2030. But right now, we're hoping that is the case.

Public Comment:

Fred Hibberd - Do you know how much per year; per lot it would be?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - I have calculated that number. I don't have it on the top of my head, and I didn't bring it with me. I'd like to finish the budget hearing first and then we can get into that infrastructure questions.

Public Comment:

Worthy Johnson - Back when Jim Lewis started off, he had the split between the roads and the water initially, around 50/50, so it's moved from that to 80/20. Secondly, just for background, the movement of the water cost from \$1.70 to \$2.60 per 1,000 gallons was a sizeable increase, let's call it 53%. There was, between Latham, Kurt

and Jim, no reasonable answer as to any cost of supplying 1,000 gallons having gone up to support that move. The third thing is, just for Kurt's edification, if we were to go to the minutes of the August 2021 meeting, Kurt, the woman from Nelson Engineering did the minutes of that meeting and they may be posted on the website. I don't know exactly, but that will give you your answer to what you said.

3. **Call to Order Regular Board Meeting:**

Kurt Harland called the regular monthly meeting to order at 4:45 p.m.

4. **Review and Approve Board Minutes of June 14, 2023:**

Action: Bob Norton made a motion to approve the Board Minutes of June 14, 2023, as presented. Latham Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

Public Comment:

Warren Machol - I only have one procedural item. Under last month's minutes, the public comment, I mentioned that they had inadvertently not listed the operating account. Below that, it says in the agenda, no changes were made, although the changes were accepted and the amendment was taken, and it appears when I look at the minutes, they were updated. So, this is incorrect to say no changes were noted. On point number two under the minutes where there's review, public comment and then changes to the agenda action, no changes were noted. You made changes to the May 23rd minutes, and they're updated, and that was what I had pointed out above in the public comment. You might want to go back and listen to the recording, but Bob agreed it was supposed to be in there and made the amendment as noted and that's what was done. I also noted that throughout this set of minutes, unlike the last couple, several sections have been changed from the actual words people said and modified, but they're kind of close in most instances. They just aren't as good as the previous ones.

5. **Changes to the Agenda:**

Action: Bob Norton requested the addition of Curb Stop Repairs.

6. **Adoption of the Agenda:**

Action: Kurt Harland made a motion to accept the addition of the Curb Stop Repairs to the agenda. Bob Norton seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

No Public Comment.

7. **Public Comment on items not appearing on the agenda:**

Worthy Johnson - You have number 15 and 16, "to approve water service policies and general guidelines regarding water." You're going to approve them now, put them on the website and then is it a week or two in advance for going forward that we're then going to have a public meeting and discuss it? I just find that to be kind of backwards. I would think that you would want to have input from lot owners regarding any changes that were important to both the board as well as to all the lot owners before you approved it. You may make some changes to it.

Warren Machol - Thank you Worthy for bringing that note up. It goes back to the last meeting where you approved, and I wanted to bring to everyone's attention. You noticed at the meeting that you were going to provide notice effective at the meeting date, even though you've never at that time provided the amendments to the water regulations and started a clock when no one had ever seen the document firsthand. The idea of approving water service policies and general guidelines and adopting an advertised budget that just was shown to everyone five days ago goes back to the idea of transparency to members of the community. Worthy's point about the agenda being drafted with the idea that the board is going to approve something without its distribution is the problem of lack of transparency and lack of communication.

I was speaking about what was not on the agenda, which was the notice that was provided the day after the meeting of the changes that are going to be forced upon us for our water regulations without a vote, just notice they were going to happen by dictatorial edicts, and that this is similar in its nature and process.

Board Response:

Kurt Harland - I'm not sure what you're talking about voting. The board votes on policy, so it's not an open vote.

Bob Norton - There's a meeting July 31st to discuss the change in regulations, and so it's not on this agenda. I guess we could place it on here and talk about it now and talk about it on July 31st again, but it's been advertised since June for written comment, and today we've received one written comment, which didn't provide any suggestions. We have until July 31st to receive comment.

8. **Correspondence received by the District office:**

Worthy Johnson – June 15, 2023

Lisa Samford – June 16, 2023

Bill Racow – June 16, 2023

Angela McGrath – June 16, 2023

John Willott – June 16, 2023

Carol McCain – June 16, 2023

Worth Johnson – June 16, 2023

Mary Lohuis – June 17, 2023

Michael Minter – June 20, 2023

Michael Minter – June 20, 2023

Warren Machol – June 21, 2023

Maria Johnson – June 26, 2023

Ellen Milne – June 26, 2023

John Willott – June 27, 2023

Derek Goodson – June 27, 2023

Lesley Beckworth – June 27, 2023

Pennie McDaniel – June 28, 2023

Emery Hemmings – June 28, 2023

Tom Yannios – June 29, 2023

Peter Freyman – June 30, 2023

Kyu Han – July 3, 2023

Warren Machol – July 10, 2023

Bruno Manno – July 12, 2023

Warren Machol – July 13, 2023

Michael Minter – July 13, 2023

Michael Wehrle – July 14, 2023

Warren Machol – July 14, 2023

Emily Hanner – July 14, 2023

Perk Perkins – July 16, 2023

9. **Review 12-month June actuals vs. full year FY 2022-2023 Budget:**

Board Comment:

Bob Norton - This is through June 30th. In the revenue side we're showing a little more revenue than we budgeted. I think the reason for that is we had some people last fiscal year that didn't pay their taxes on time, so they didn't pay until July or August. So, it showed up this fiscal year. The other big one on the income side is we

made a lot more interest, because we transferred some funds to the Wyoming Government Investment Fund. Overall, the total income was slightly less. The other income, which includes loans and grants are paid when the work is done. We budgeted, for the well #4 project, \$176,000, but because of weather and other things, we only spent \$20,000 this year so that all carries forward to next year.

In the expense side, most everything is in budget. Utilities are 2% overbudgeted. We've tried to adjust for that and down in the capital improvements, they're quite a bit lower than what happened, mainly because of weather and administrative issues. But overall, the budgets were good. We spent less money than we brought in and so we're going to have a net income in the road of \$81,946.44, and for the water it was \$67,312.65. What we've been doing is whenever we have an increase in the net income is we place that into the reserves. This isn't final. It's the end of the fiscal year, but there will be some adjustments once we get some final bills.

10. Review June 30, 2023, Treasury Report:

Board Comment:

Bob Norton - Over there in the red are the bills that will come up next that need to be paid. This shows all of the accounts. I'll give you a summary.

Water reserve - \$121,568.87

 First Interstate Bank - \$14,139

 Wyoming Government Investment Fund - \$107,429

Operating account - \$205,351

 First Interstate Bank - \$49,560 (\$4,500 worth of checks or bills that we need to pay)

 Wyoming Government Investment Fund - \$155,790.

Road Reserve - \$435,336

 First Interstate Bank - \$54,688

 Wyoming Government Investment Fund - \$380,647

The net that we have right now is \$757,749 and that includes the \$4,500 deduction for checks included in the next item on the agenda.

11. Approve payment of invoices:

Action: Kurt Harland made a motion to approve the payment of invoices. Bob Norton seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

| Skyline Improvement & Service District | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------|------------------|
| Date | Vendor | Ref. No | Description | Due Date | Total |
| 7/11/2023 | Lower Valley Energy | | Acct 294586001 - 003 | 7/10/2023 | \$276.56 |
| 7/1/2023 | Mountain Property Management | | Monthly Management | 7/1/2023 | \$3000.00 |
| 7/11/2023 | Teton County Health Department | 23-2909 | water test 6/5/23 | 7/11/2023 | \$20.00 |
| 7/11/2023 | Clearwater Operations & Services | 1667 | monthly service, 811 locates, exercise gate valves | 7/11/2023 | \$1572.50 |
| 7/11/2023 | Teton Media Works Inc | 354910 | budget hearing notice | 7/11/2023 | \$110.00 |
| Total for Skyline Improvement & Service District | | | | | \$4979.06 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Grand Total - both Pages | | \$6,658.56 | | | |

| Skyline Improvement & Service District - Well #4 Grant invoices | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Date | Vendor | Ref. No | Description | Due Date | Total |
| /11/2023 | Nelson Engineering | 61736 | well engineering work | 7/11/2023 | \$1679.50 |
| Total for Skyline Improvement & Service District - Well #4 Grant invoices | | | | | \$1679.50 |
| Total for Skyline Improvement & Service District-to be transferred from road reserve as part of intra-company loan | | | | | \$419.88 |
| Total for WWDC - awaiting their disbursement | | | | | \$1259.62 |
| Total Due | | | | | \$1679.50 |
| Skyline Improvement & Service District - Meter Loan invoices | | | | | |
| Total for Skyline Improvement & Service District - Meter Loan invoices | | | | | \$0.00 |

No Public Comment

12. Approve adoption of advertised FY 2023-2024 District budget and post to the ISD website:

Action: Bob Norton made a motion to approve FY 2023-2024 District budget and post to the ISD website. Kurt Harland seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

No Public Comment

13. Approve the FY 2023-2024 Water Service Policies and post to the ISD website:

14. Approve the FY 2023-2024 General Guidelines regarding Water and post to the ISD website:

Board Comment:

Bob Norton - I agree with some of the earlier comments. We're not quite ready to adopt them. In most cases, it's straightforward. Once you adopt the budget, all we do is change the dollar amounts in the water policy saying how much the assessments will be, and that was done with the budget. In this case, because we're putting in the new water meters and we do need to make a change after we make the policy change, if we do that the individuals don't have to read their own meters anymore, that will be read automatically by our operator. So, I think it's not appropriate to make the changes in the policy until after that July 31st meeting, so maybe at the August meeting. And the same thing with the general guidelines. The primary point there is the guidelines say everybody must read their own meters. When we get the automatic reading system, we don't have to do that. So, we can make those changes in August.

Public Comment:

Michael Minter - Bob, I think you said the plumber was going to have an estimate of the cost of work inside everyone's homes, that you might be able to distribute to the community?

Board Response:

Bob Norton - I don't have that yet, but he did tell me he would get me a price for backflow preventer. But I don't have that in hand yet. But we'll have that before we get going. He's not going to start in August until after we've had our meeting. But I'll get that before. I do know he told me their rate is \$150 an hour for a plumber. I asked, "Is that plumber plus helper?" He said it's \$150 an hour for the plumber and all their tools. But I'll get that better defined.

15. Board director position election date – Tuesday, November 7, 2023:

- a. **July 19th publish Notice of Election in newspaper for Nominations with submission deadline of August 29, 2023, and**

Action: Bob Norton made a motion to advertise the election. Latham Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

No Public Comment

b. July 19th email homeowners Notice of Election

Action: Bob Norton made a motion to advertise the election. Latham Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

No Public Comment

16. **Vote to approve spraying for noxious weeds and road edge mowing:**

Action: Kurt Harland made a motion to hire Frontier Landscaping to spray for noxious weeds and have the road edge mowed. Latham Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

Board Comment:

Kurt Harland - I talked to Mike. It was \$2,000 last year, which I think is very reasonable. I think we hire him to do it this year and he needs to get on it sooner than later to get the noxious weeds and knock him down before they go to seed. He thought it would be easier this year because they've knocked them down significantly from last year. It's not to exceed, but that's probably going to be close to where it was.

Public Comment:

Fred Hibberd - Would it be a good idea to get on the weeds sooner? That would be particularly with the milkweed. Before that, summer blossoms are out, so that'd have to be done next spring.

Board Response:

Kurt Harland - He's ready to go. He is waiting for this meeting. It is a time and material contract, not a fixed rate bid.

Public Comment:

Worthy Johnson - There's been a lot of work on Meadowlark as of late, which unfortunately Mike Minter can attest to. You just may want to rebid that contract because there's not much on Meadowlark that he's going to be doing a lot of work on and I'm not sure about the other areas. But you may want to just drive around and think about it.

Curb Stop Repair:

Action: Bob Norton made a motion to authorize Clearwater Operations to get the curb stops noted in their report operable. Kurt Harland seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0.

Board Comment:

Bob Norton – The water operator told me that we have four that are damaged that need to be repaired and three that they can't get the valve key on. So, there are seven in total. The water operator has an excavator. It's \$300 a day, plus a \$200 mobilization fee, then \$100 per hour for the operator and \$85 per hour for a laborer/helper.

Kurt Harland – Curb stops meaning the shutoff between the public water line and the property's service line. That's cheap.

Bob Norton – I did get an estimate, between \$4,000 to \$5,000. For some reason, they put a three-quarter inch pipe inside the riser. There's no way you can get a valve key inside there. A couple others were bent. One is in a driveway, and it was paved over so you can't get to it. They might raise it up a little bit. One of them is bent. That will probably need to be dug all the way out. Mike Minter's is going to have to be dug all the way out. The three that they can't get the valve key on might just be dirt and mud that they can work out. But nonetheless, curb stops don't do us any good if we can't turn them off.

Public Comment:

Tom Sweat – Would a homeowner know they were one of those seven?

Board Response:

Bob Norton – we'll be letting people know before we start digging in their yard once we authorize the services.

17. Well #4 and Water Meter Update:

Board Comment:

Bob Norton – The well is drilled/developed. The surface seal was put in. They are going to set the pump. We were hoping for the next couple of days to do the development pumping and final pump tests. Most of that'll probably occur next week. While they're doing that, we'll do all the water quality sampling. It is 90 feet deep with the well screen. We brought the well screen from 60 to 75, so there's 15-foot of well screen. The surface seal ended up being a 35-foot bentonite surface seal. The well driller is just getting set up for the pump test now.

There are some deviations from what we hoped. As far as the depth, the screen went well. The surface seal, they lost the bentonite when they first put it down. Because they developed the well so well, the bentonite went down and they had to redevelop to get the bentonite back out of the well and they had to redo it. They used standard procedures. but, they probably should have done a couple of things a little bit different. We haven't received a bill yet, which affects our budget because I thought some of it would be paid in June. Now it's in next fiscal year. But capital projects have their own fixed budget. So, they roll over from one year to the next.


As far as the meter project, as I mentioned, that's ready to roll once we have our July 31st meeting. The contractors are hired and ready. To my knowledge, he hasn't ordered any meters yet, but he probably will be doing that here in the next week or two.

18. Adjournment:

Action: The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Approved

Approved


Kurt (Sep 27, 2023 08:16 MDT)


Latham (Sep 27, 2023 08:52 MDT)

Kurt Harland
Chairman

Latham Jenkins
Secretary

Correspondence Received:

From: Worthy Johnson <wjohnson@lawrencecapitalmgt.com>

Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2023 10:16 AM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>; Leah Duke <leah@mpmjh.com>

Cc: Skyline Ranch Improvement & Service District <info@skylineranchisd.com>; mariajjohnson53@gmail.com

Subject: \$84.30 SLIB METER LOAN REPAYMENT ASSESSMENT

Importance: High

Team SRISD.....Attached is receipt for 2nd half taxes. Please reimburse us for \$42.15 ASAP.

Also, Leah and Bob, I demand not to see this on MPM's Tax Assessments & 2023-2024 FY

Kindly confirm receipt. Thank you,



p.s. Please note immediate address change (permanent) to:

500 Meadowlark Rd., Jackson, WY 83001

\$42¹⁵

Payment Receipt

Teton County Treasurer's Office

P.O. Box 585
200 South Willow Street Ste 115
Jackson, WY 83001
Phone: 307-733-4770
Fax: 307-732-8544
propertytax@tetoncountywy.gov

Bill To:

Worthington Johnson Jr
500 Meadowlark Rd

Jackson, WY 83001
wjohnson@lawrencecapitalmgt.com

| Parcel | Description | Owner | Tax | Interest | Fee | Amount | Paid |
|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------|---------|----------|------|---------|------------|
| 01-000427 | 2022 Second Half | JOHNSON WORTHINGTON JR. & MARIA | 7905.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7905.75 | 05-10-2023 |

Single Payment

Transaction Date: 05/10/2023 4:42 PM Pacific Time

Pay Method:  *****0018

Approval #: 66483618

Trace Number: 40787efe-89e7-4b02-a85b-d18aa56205f3

Amount: \$7,907.75

Payment Amount: \$7,905.75

Service Fee: \$2.00

Total: \$7,907.75

Thank you for your payment.

From: Lisa Samford <lisa@jacksonwild.org>

Sent: Friday, June 16, 2023 9:57 AM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Subject: Re: Skyline - Notice of Intent to Amend Regulations of Water Use

I'm not sure why this is being distributed "at request" vs simply making it available to all via link or attachment, but we would request a copy of the proposed amended regulations.

From: Bill Racow <billracow@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, June 16, 2023 10:02 AM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Subject: Re: Skyline - Notice of Intent to Amend Regulations of Water Use

Hello, will these be posted online?

Bill

From: Angela McGrath <angelamcgrath.wy@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, June 16, 2023 10:55 AM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Subject: Re: Skyline - Notice of Intent to Amend Regulations of Water Use

Hi Wendy,

I would like to request a copy of the proposed amended regulations.

Angela

415 328 3107

From: "jwillott@aol.com" <jwillott@aol.com>

Date: Friday, June 16, 2023 at 12:47 PM

To: Kurt Harland <thekurtharland@gmail.com>, Latham Jenkins <latham@livewaterproperties.com>, Bob Norton <bobnorton51@gmail.com>

Cc: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Subject: Re: Skyline - Notice of Intent to Amend Regulations of Water Use

How are home owners going to comment on a proposed amendment when the proposal and a redline is not attached. SO you expect every home owner to spend their weekend searching the website to see if it has been posted. This is very poor communication!
JOHN

From: "carol_mccain@yahoo.com" <carol_mccain@yahoo.com>

Reply-To: "carol_mccain@yahoo.com" <carol_mccain@yahoo.com>

Date: Friday, June 16, 2023 at 4:32 PM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Subject: Re: Skyline - Notice of Intent to Amend Regulations of Water Use

Dear Wendy,

Please send me a printed copy of the "Proposed Amended Regulations of Water Use" for Skyline Ranch.

Also, I would like a printed copy of the minutes from the Skyline Board meeting held on Wednesday, June 14th

Thank you.

Carol McCain
P. O. Box 1952
Jackson, WY 83001-1952
My phone number is: (307) 733-4996

From: Worthy Johnson <wjohnson@lawrencecapitalmgt.com>
Date: Friday, June 16, 2023 at 3:00 PM
To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>
Cc: Maria Johnson <mariajohnson53@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed Copy of Amended Regulations of Water Use

Wendy.....Kindly email me a copy of the above.

Have a GREAT weekend....

Thank you,



From: Mary Lohuis <marylohuis@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 17, 2023 9:54 AM
To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>
Subject: Skyline Water Use

Hi Wendy, would you please send me a copy of the Amended Water Use Regulations? Can they be emailed or should I pick up a copy??

Thanks so much, Mary Lohuis

One touch of nature makes the whole world kin.

- William Shakespeare

From: michael minter <trewil@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 9:11 AM
To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>
Subject: Skyline June Draft Minutes

Wendy, the draft minutes are not accessible. Message is "bad request". Thank you, Mike Minter

From: michael minter <trewil@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2023 1:14 PM
To: Kurt Harland <thekurtharland@gmail.com>; Bobnorton51@gmail.com; latham@liveproperties.com; Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>
Subject: Skyline Water Rates

At the February meeting, there was a discussion of water rates and what every homeowner pays.

John Willott - For reference purposes, when that second well was drilled in 2005, there was a \$500 assessment on every house in Skyline, for four or five years. So that precedent has already been set by the board. Now somehow, we've got to the point where only people who use water pay for everything. Bob Norton - That is correct on the 2005 assessment. **Kurt Harland - They're not paying for everything. 50% is funded by the base rate. So, it's not truly funded by users. It is funded 50% by every household. The other 50% is by use.**

What is the base rate to be charged every homeowner for the next fiscal year? The application for the water meter loan included a base rate and usage charge for the prior budget year.

Thank you, Mike Minter

From: Warren Machol <wlm.assoc@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 11:09 AM
To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>; Kelsey Zelazoski <kelsey@mpmjh.com>
Subject: Recorded zoom of the June meeting

Wendy,
Could you help me with the link provided on the website to access the Zoom recording of this month's Board meeting?

The error message this month is different and provides the following statement when clicked:

400 Bad Request

cloudflare

Please email the link and password to access to me directly.

Thank you for your assistance

Warren

WLM Associates
500 NW Ridge Rd
Jackson WY 83001

307 734 1920 (o)

917 455 7470 (c)

From: Maria Johnson <mariajohnson53@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2023 12:08 PM
To: Carly Schupman <office@skylineranchisd.com>
Subject: LVE

Can someone please tell us what is going on with LVE on Meadowlark? There have been new markings on the road about "boring" in certain areas on the road....

Lower Meadowlark is pretty much blocked below our house...

--

Maria J. Johnson

307.203.2600 WY

941.964.7526 FL

From: Ellen Milne <edierberg@me.com>

Sent: Monday, June 26, 2023 8:31 PM

To: office@skylineranchisd.com

Cc: mjm17h@gmail.com

Subject: 6/28 mosquito spray

Please inform the residents of Skyline that there will be a helicopter spraying some of our Seven Saddles Ranch property, including the fields below Skyline, for mosquitos on June 28th.

Thanks!

Ellen

Seven Saddles Ranch

3500 W Hwy 22

From: john willott <jawillott@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 1:10 PM

To: Kurt J. Harland <thekurtharland@gmail.com>; Latham Jenkins <latham@circ.biz>; bobnorton51@gmail.com; Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Cc: john willott <jawillott@gmail.com>; Worthy Johnson <wjohnson@lawrencecapitalmgt.com>; Maria Johnson <Mariajohnson53@gmail.com>; Corbin McNeill <camcneilljr@gmail.com>; Warren Machol <wlm.assoc@gmail.com>

Subject: Proposed changes to Skyline Ranch ISD water system regulations

Dear Skyline ISD members,

We all recently received an email from Wendy Meyring at Mountain Property Management saying to contact her on behalf of the ISD Board regarding where to acquire a copy of the changes to the Skyline Ranch ISD water system regulations. Attached is the proposed new section of the water regulations with **red lines** showing the specific proposed language. It is important that all members read these new proposed regulations, as they may impose immediate and future yet undefined costs and obligations on all or many of us.

The proposed water regulations would allow the ISD to own water meters in members' homes, enter homes on 24-hour notice, and possibly impose additional costs if they enter your property. Members would probably be required to indemnify the ISD for work done by ISD-hired contractors in their homes, including damages or leaks possibly caused by the contractor or the ISD-owned meters.

The board has not been transparent and appears to be continuing on this path. To offset this lack of public process, we will endeavor to create a robust and transparent public record through informational correspondences sent to all over the next month.

We trust you will read and raise questions about these changes (along with the new Treasurer's changes to the Water meter project that were not reviewed with the two newly formed Finance and Infrastructure Committees and have not been explicitly disclosed to all ISD homeowners) that will adversely affect the safety of our water system.

All the best for a dry and cool summer season. Please take these changes and correspondences very **seriously!**

Sincerely,
Concerned Skyline ISD Members

John Willott
Worthy & Maria Johnson
Warren Machol
Corbin McNeill

ARTICLE V - REDLINE WATER METERS AND BACKFLOW PREVENTERS

5.1 Meters and Irrigation Backflow Preventers Required. All water delivered to the Premises of a User shall be metered, and such meter all Premises connected to the District water system shall be purchased and required have a radio-read capable water meter installed by User at User's sole cost and expense. In the case December 31, 2023. If water is delivered to the Premises of a User by more than one water service line, each water service line shall be separately metered. All irrigation systems shall have a separate backflow preventer to protect the water supply. The purposepurposes of the water meter and backflow preventer isare to: (1) set User fees to reflectmeasure and record actual water use for billing and other purposes; and (2) prevent contamination of the water supply. Water meters, water meter yokes, and water meter accessories shall conform to the most current American Water Works Association (AWWA) standards, the International Building and Plumbing CodesCode (IPC) and/or other applicable rules and regulations of the District and the State of Wyoming. The District may determine that certain building or water use applications require a certified hazard classification in order to determine the need for, and the type of, backflow preventer and required testing and inspection intervals. Users shall reimburse the District for costs to perform any required certified hazard classification. Users may be required by the District to install non-irrigation related backflow preventers to prevent potential contamination of the District water supply, which shall be installed at the User's sole cost and expense. If a User desires or is required to replace or add a meter, such User must purchase a District-approved meter, and such meter shall be installed, and any backflow preventer, shall be installed in accordance with the then-current international plumbing codesIPC.

5.2

5.2 Ownership of Meters and Backflow Preventers, and Related Equipment. WaterAll water meters and radio-read units supplied to Users by the District shall be owned by the District. All other related equipment installed in the Premises of a User including but not limited to water meters not supplied to Users by the District, water meter yokes, backflow preventers, and expansion tanks and other related equipment shall be owned by the User unless required by law to shall be owned by the District or other entityUser.

5.3

5.3 Location and Installation. Except as otherwise provided herein, all water meters installed upon any Premises served by the District shall be located on the User-side of the curb stop and installed inside the

boundary line of the Premises and either in the basement, crawlspace, utility room, or other accessible frost-proof area of a the User's building on the Premises. A representative from the District may recommend the location and method of installing such meters, backflow preventers and expansion tanks, and the District shall not be responsible or liable for damages resulting from the location and installation of such devices within a frost-proof meter vault. The User agrees to protect and hold the District harmless from any and all claims for such damage as a result of water meter installation if the installation of the water meter is performed by the District and done in a commercially reasonable and workman-like manner.

5.4

5.4 Maintenance and Repairs. The District shall perform normal maintenance of District-owned water meters and radio-read units including water meter battery replacement. The User shall perform normal maintenance of meters non-District owned water meters, water meter

yokes, backflow preventers, expansion tanks and other related equipment to ensure proper performance. Any cost of repair, testing, or replacement of any water meter, water meter yoke, backflow preventer, expansion tank or other related equipment shall be borne by, and charged to, the User unless performed on a District-owned water meter or as part of a District-wide repair or replacement program.

5.5

5.5 User to repair, relocate, etc., pipes and fixtures where necessary for meter operation. User, at his/her own expense and in a manner satisfactory to the District, is required to maintain, repair, replace, reconstruct, or relocate the water lines and plumbing fixtures so that all water furnished to and used within the boundaries of the Premises, including for irrigation purposes, passes through and is measured and recorded by a water meter.

5.6

5.6 Inspections. Water meters, backflow preventers, and expansion tanks and other related equipment are subject to inspection by the District. The District may assess a reasonable charge for each any such inspection of a meter and/or backflow preventer.

5.7

5.7 Periodic reading and record of water consumption – Failure of District to obtain meter readings shall not affect payment obligations of User.

The District requires

a. Until a radio-read capable water meter is installed in the Premises of a User, each User to shall read his/ or her own meter, and report such reading to the District at such intervals as determined by the District. Once a radio-read capable water meter is installed in a Premises of a User, the District will periodically read the meter using the installed radio-read system, or manually, at such intervals as determined by the District. The District shall keep a proper record of the water consumption by each User. However, failure of the District to obtain meter readings shall not be deemed to be a waiver upon the part of the District of any obligations of payment upon the part of the User.

1. The District requires each User to provide one close-up photo of the meter as currently installed, which clearly shows the make/model of the meter and the meter reading.
2. If a meter is difficult to access, meters with remote readouts are available at the User's expense, including installation.

b.

the District for any reason, the water billing for that period may be based upon an estimate by the District and the billing shall be adjusted at the time of the next meter reading and will may include non-refundable administrative fees plus meter-not-read fees as outlined in the District's rate schedule.

5.8 5.8 Right of entry for purposes of installation, reading, inspecting, testing, etc.- – Failure to allow entry. At any time during reasonable working hours and upon at least twenty- four (24) hours advanced notice, representatives, agents, and/or contractors of the District shall have the right to enter upon and return from the any User Premises upon which a water meter and/or backflow preventer is located or required for the purpose of installing, reading, inspecting, testing, or adjusting maintaining such meter or backflow preventer. In the event such entry for purposes of installation of a water meter is refused, or in the event a User desires to install his or her own water meter, such owner or occupant does not contact the User shall be allowed to install a District and

if for any reason a meter is not read and/or reported at the interval determined by

arrange to allow agents of the-supplied or District to enter upon and return from such Premises within ten (10) days after written request to make such -approved water meter in a location specified in paragraph 5.3 above. In the event such entry is refused for purposes of reading, inspecting, testing, or maintaining a water meter, the District shall have the right to shut off the water water to such Premises after providing ten (10) days written notice to such Premises without further notice to the User.

5.9 5.9 Defacing, tampering with, injuring, etc. – Estimated charges for months when meter fails to register correctly.

a. It is unlawful for any person to deface, injure, loosen, take apart, or otherwise tamper with any water meter, to adjust or to attempt to adjust the same to reduce the reading thereof, to divert water around such meter, or to attempt in any other manner whatsoever to interfere with the correct reading by such meter of the total amount of water furnished to the Premises where such meter is installed.

b. If, in the opinion of the Board, any meter has been tampered with, the quantity of water delivered during the month such meter failed to register correctly by reason of such tampering, or for which no reading was obtained, shall be determined by the District by using an average of the previous three (3) years water usage for the same period to determine normal billing, or, if such records are not available, by a good faith estimate of the District, which shall be charged to the User. The District may also impose a penalty charge not to exceed \$50005,000.00 against any User for tampering with a water meter. Upon repetition of such offense, the District may, at its option, stop the delivery of water to the Premises of the User.

From: Derek Goodson <dgoodson@springcreekranch.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 1:43 PM

To: thekurtharland@gmail.com; latham@circ.biz; Bob Norton <bobnorton51@gmail.com>; Wendy Meyring

<wendy@mpmjh.com>

Subject: FW: Proposed changes to Skyline Ranch ISD water system regulations

Not sure whether this is your redline or that of the guys with the tin foil hats. Can you please send to me the current and proposed changes.

Derek

From: Lesley Beckworth <lbeckworth@tcweed.org>

Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 3:43 PM

To: info@skylineranchisd.com; office@skylineranchisd.com

Cc: kurt@bhhsjacksonhole.com

Subject: Mosquito Management in Skyline Ranch - Information from TCWP

Hello Skyline Ranch Board,

Please see the attached letter from TCWP about mosquito management in Skyline Ranch ISD and accompanying Mosquito Management flyer.

I am happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Regards,

Lesley Beckworth

Landowner Program Coordinator

Teton County Weed & Pest District

Phone: 307-733-8419 **Mobile:** 307-413-4260

7575 S Highway 89, Jackson, WY 83001

Web: tcweed.org

Email: lbeckworth@tcweed.org

June 14, 2023

Dear Skyline Ranch Homeowners Association:

Each year, the Teton County Weed and Pest Control District (the “District”) conducts surveillance and virus testing of adult mosquitoes and mosquito habitat inspections throughout Teton County, Wyoming. The District’s work is intended to mitigate the public health risks associated with mosquitoes and West Nile Virus. Despite the limited scope of the District’s services, the District receives many calls each year from homeowners within your subdivision requesting mosquito spraying on their individual properties and for special events. The District also receives calls from individual owners objecting to the work that the District must do to protect public health. The volume of inquiries received each summer reduces the District’s efficiency and ability to implement its mission.

In an effort to streamline District operations and clarify what services the District can and cannot provide, we have prepared the enclosed pamphlet. We would be very appreciative if you could disseminate the pamphlet to your homeowners. We would be happy to meet with the Board to discuss further, or to answer any questions or concerns you or your homeowners may have.

Thank you,

Erika Edmiston

From: Pennie McDaniel <pmcdaniel@lglp.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2023 1:52 PM
To: Skyline Ranch <office@skylineranchisd.com>
Subject: FY 24 Declaration of Coverage

Here's a copy of your entity's Declaration of Coverage Document for FY 24. Thanks for your membership and please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks

From: Emery Hemmings <emeryhemmings@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2023 6:25 PM
To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>
Subject: Re: Skyline - Replacing Water Meters

Thank you. Does this mean we will not have to send in meter readings every 6 months?

From: Tom Yannios <tyannios@nycap.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 29, 2023 5:01 PM
To: 'john willott' <jawillott@gmail.com>
Cc: 'Kurt J. Harland' <thekurtharland@gmail.com>; 'Latham Jenkins' <latham@circ.biz>; 'bobnorton51@gmail.com' <bobnorton51@gmail.com>; Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>; 'Worthy Johnson' <wjohnson@lawrencecapitalmgt.com>; 'Maria Johnson' <Mariajjohnson53@gmail.com>; 'Corbin McNeill' <camcneilljr@gmail.com>; 'Warren Machol' <wlm.assoc@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed changes to Skyline Ranch ISD water system regulations

Dear Residents,

I agree that there are serious problems with the proposed and imperious water system regulations . We need to meet about this!

T Yannios.

From: Pete Freymann <pete@hawkeyejh.com>
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2023 7:58 AM
To: office@skylineranchISD.com
Cc: Margit Wennmachers <margit.wennmachers@gmail.com>
Subject: Fw: Water Meter

Hi Wendy,

I've spoken with Steve Davidson of Anytime Plumbing for the replacement of the water meter at Margit Wennmacher's home and I would request that you add my phone number as the contact to coordinate access for the project. In addition, would you please add my contact information for access to the Milne property at 700 NW Ridge Road. We will schedule both of these accounts on the same day.

Many thanks,

Pete Freymann
307-690-9600

From: Kyu Han <kyuhan2018@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 3, 2023 10:43 AM
To: office@skylineranchisd.com
Subject: ISD tax

Hi,

I am a member of an ISD, and we're currently reviewing our tax structure. I'd appreciate it if you could let me know:

- If taxes in your ISD are charged per lot or according to assessed property value
- How empty lots w/no structure are treated

Thanks,
Kyu

From: Warren Machol <wlm.assoc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2023 4:18 PM
To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>
Cc: Latham Jenkins <latham@livewaterproperties.com>; Bob Norton <bobnorton51@gmail.com>; Kurt Harland <thekurtharland@gmail.com>
Subject: Information for July board meeting & public Budget meeting

Wendy,

The upcoming July Board meeting for Skyline ISD is set to take place a week from today.

It is currently unclear when the meeting Agendas (Regular and Budget) for the July 18th session and the minutes from the previous June Skyline Board meeting with correspondence will be available to members for review. Appears Board members have already received copies of these documents why delay distribution?

We, as members, also re-request the following budget details to determine if the proposed budget is accurate and sufficient for the required and proposed ISD infrastructure projects.

Revenue:

- The amount of water to be billed for and the previous year's adjustments by members and lot.
 - Could you provide the requested information as had been done in the previous year in Excel or readable format?
 - ### Please take a look at the attached analysis for historical formatting.

Analysis of road Overlay and Chip seal Assessments decreased by 12% and 53%, respectively.

Provide current Reserves funds Balance for both the overlay and Chip Seal

- Provide the current projected cost for each road project

- Provide the expected year to complete each project
- Provide assumptions for inflation, Oil, and additional repair work associated with water line replacement.

Analysis of a decrease in Water Maintenance Assessment of 39% and concurrently no reduction in Water usage fees. (last year, +6% maintenance and +59% water usage fees, respectively)

- Board analysis of the current water reserve sufficiency to meet projected and required projects.
 - Why are we currently borrowing from road reserves for water projects? (see well #4 road reserve road payment)
 - Where is the analysis to decrease per lot assessments when Water reserves are insufficient?
- Board analysis of the allocation of all water reserve costs.
 - Water Reserves in the proposed budget are 100% assigned to current water users (\$30,908).
 - Please define the allocation methodology.
 - Do water reserves benefit all lots and members, present and future? or only current water users?
 - I've attached the 7-year analysis of Variable water excess charges.

Please expedite distribution, as time is of the essence, with a week to go before both meetings.

All the best

Warren

WLM Associates

500 NW Ridge Rd

Jackson WY 83001

307 734 1920 (o)

917 455 7470 (c)

Prepared by Warren Machol 6/13/2023

TOTAL Cumulative excess charged for water \$138,191

10:14 PM
10/14/21
Accrual Basis

**Skyline Improvement and Service District
Five-Year Water Usage Fee Revenue
July 2017 through June 2022**

| | Jul '17 - Jun '18 | Jul '18 - Jun '19 | Jul '19 - Jun '20 | Jul '20 - Jun '21 | Jul '21 - Jun '22 | TOTAL |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ordinary Income/Expense | | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | | |
| 5125 Water System Usage Fees | 14,749.71 | 25,306.36 | 32,629.64 | 21,207.04 | 43,560.26 | 137,453.01 |
| Total Income | 14,749.71 | 25,306.36 | 32,629.64 | 21,207.04 | 43,560.26 | 137,453.01 |
| Gross Profit | 14,749.71 | 25,306.36 | 32,629.64 | 21,207.04 | 43,560.26 | 137,453.01 |
| Net Ordinary Income | 14,749.71 | 25,306.36 | 32,629.64 | 21,207.04 | 43,560.26 | 137,453.01 |
| Net Income | 14,749.71 | 25,306.36 | 32,629.64 | 21,207.04 | 43,560.26 | 137,453.01 |

10:43 PM
10/14/21
Accrual Basis

**Skyline Improvement and Service District
Five-Year Water Repairs and Maintenance Expense
July 2017 through June 2022**

| | Jul '17 - Jun '18 | Jul '18 - Jun '19 | Jul '19 - Jun '20 | Jul '20 - Jun '21 | Jul '21 - Jun '22 | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Ordinary Income/Expense | | | | | | |
| Expense | | | | | | |
| 6133 Repair and Maintenance Expense | 0.00 | 3,616.87 | 21,666.66 | 20,598.17 | 3,106.74 | 48,998.46 |
| Total Expense | 0.00 | 3,616.87 | 21,666.66 | 20,598.17 | 3,106.74 | 48,998.46 |
| Net Ordinary Income | 0.00 | -3,616.87 | -21,666.66 | -20,598.17 | -3,106.74 | -48,998.46 |
| Net Income | 0.00 | -3,616.87 | -21,666.66 | -20,598.17 | -3,106.74 | -48,998.46 |
| Utilities @ +/- | \$4,200 | \$4,200 | \$4,200 | \$4,200 | \$4,200 | \$21,000 |

Excess collected and charged over costs from 2018 - 2022 \$67,465

| | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------|
| June 22 - June 23 | 11 Of 12 months actual | Proposed |
| \$ 56,426.00 @ 2.6/1000 | | June 23 - June 24 |
| \$ 1,571.00 @ 1.9/1000 | | \$ 51,168 @ 2.6/1000 |
| \$ 57,997.00 | | \$ 51,168 |
| \$ 14,190 Repair and Maintenance *** | | \$ 15,600 |
| Note: \$8500 is legal bills for election | | |
| \$ 4,449 | | \$ 4,200 |
| \$ 39,358 | | \$ 31,368 |

Data from Sky line office -- Annual water usage 2021-2022

Calculation of Annual Water Usage Fees

| Submitted to Teton County | | Actual Gallons Used FY 2020-21 | Usage Fees FY 2020-21 | Gallons Under/ (Over) Billed | (Over)/Under FY 2020-2021 Rate | Water System User Fees | Amount charged | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Notes | Lot # | Homeowner | | | | | Number of Members | Members | Quartile Max Payment | Average Payment | Tax collected | Percentage of of tax collected |
| | 3 | Warriniak | 44,946 | 76.41 | (48,792) | (68.31) | 8.10 | 1 | | | | |
| | 26 | Waggoner Family Trust | 8,200 | 14.08 | - | - | 14.08 | 2 | | | | |
| | 34 | Yannios/Rubinson | 26,060 | 44.30 | 546 | 0.76 | 45.07 | 1 | | | | |
| | 29 | Lohuis | 26,433 | 44.94 | 3,287 | 4.60 | 49.54 | 4 | | | | |
| Just occupied home | 3-25 | Keith Johnson | 32,282 | 54.88 | 32,282 | | 54.88 | 5 | | | | |
| | 2-3 | Stockhouse | 19,768 | 33.61 | 19,768 | 27.68 | 61.28 | 6 | | | | |
| | 24 | Ulrich | 34,119 | 58.00 | 2,718 | 3.81 | 61.81 | 7 | | | | |
| | 3-32 | Dong/Johansen | 37,760 | 64.19 | 3,834 | 5.37 | 69.56 | 8 | | | | |
| | 3-23 | Norton | 43,250 | 73.53 | - | - | 73.53 | 9 | | | | |
| | 36 | Byron | 38,822 | 66.00 | 5,882 | 8.23 | 74.23 | 10 | | | | |
| | 4-4 | Skyline Ranch, LLC | 50,000 | 85.00 | - | - | 85.00 | 11 | | | | |
| | 9 | Jenkins | 76,589 | 130.20 | (8,411) | (11.78) | 118.43 | 12 | | | | |
| | 3-35 | Lewis | 48,685 | 82.76 | 26,855 | 37.60 | 120.36 | 13 | | | 43,847 | |
| | 25 | Rogers | 49,710 | 84.51 | 27,125 | 37.97 | 122.48 | 14 | | | | |
| | 21 | Teal Skyline Property | 148,120 | 251.80 | (85,930) | (120.30) | 131.50 | 15 | | | | |
| | 2-4 | Van Gendren | 57,466 | 97.69 | 26,511 | 37.12 | 134.81 | 16 | | | | |
| | 3-24 | Barret Wine Room | 54,120 | 92.00 | 41,660 | 58.32 | 150.33 | 17 | | | | |
| | 19 | Meehan | 74,339 | 126.38 | 32,390 | 45.35 | 171.72 | 18 | | | | |
| | 4-1 | Krisk | 132,961 | 226.03 | (38,726) | (54.23) | 171.82 | 19 | | | | |
| | 30 | Stevens | 92,553 | 157.34 | 14,683 | 20.56 | 177.90 | 20 | | | | |
| | 5 | Harland | 83,717 | 142.32 | 28,984 | 40.58 | 182.90 | 21 | | | | |
| | 3-11 | Racow | 88,770 | 150.91 | 30,885 | 43.24 | 194.15 | 22 | | | | |
| | 3-31 | Jacobson | 123,765 | 210.40 | 10,566 | 14.79 | 225.19 | 23 | | | | |
| | 3-16 | Long | 85,400 | 145.18 | 60,388 | 84.54 | 229.72 | 24 | | | | |
| | 37 | Feagin | 167,720 | 285.12 | (14,703) | (20.58) | 264.54 | 25 | | | | |
| | 3-1 | Fleck | 289,271 | 491.76 | (160,839) | (225.17) | 266.59 | 26 | | | | |
| | 3-22 | Timberline Hibberd (hse) | 135,553 | 230.44 | 38,132 | 53.38 | 283.82 | 27 | | | | |
| | 8 | Oksanen | 150,549 | 255.93 | 27,975 | 39.17 | 295.10 | 28 | | | | |
| | 35 | Villaume | 104,860 | 178.26 | 86,285 | 120.80 | 299.06 | 29 | | | | |
| | 2-78 | Bondler | 152,844 | 276.84 | 21,385 | 29.94 | 306.77 | 30 | | | | |
| | 3-25 | Minter | 227,650 | 387.01 | (56,607) | (79.25) | 307.76 | 31 | | | | |
| | 2-8 | Houfek House & Irrig | 157,680 | 268.06 | 41,660 | 58.32 | 326.38 | 32 | | | | |
| | 18 | Wehrle | 158,337 | 269.17 | 41,860 | 58.60 | 327.78 | 33 | | | | |
| | 23 | McCain | 147,754 | 251.18 | 57,605 | 80.65 | 331.83 | 34 | | | | |
| | 10 | Karns | 150,511 | 255.87 | 67,951 | 95.13 | 351.00 | 35 | | | | |
| | 38 | Goldstein | 190,749 | 324.27 | 30,168 | 42.24 | 366.51 | 36 | | | | |
| | 3-7 | Glick ARU | 190,588 | 324.00 | 32,172 | 45.04 | 369.04 | 37 | | | | |
| | 3-28 | Staeher | 208,715 | 354.82 | 24,463 | 34.25 | 389.06 | 38 | | | | |
| | 3-24 | Barret Irrigation | 200,000 | 340.00 | 45,654 | 63.92 | 403.92 | 39 | | | | |
| | 4-5 | Lentz | 248,420 | 422.31 | - | - | 422.31 | 40 | | | | |
| | 3-27 | Anderson | 150,414 | 255.70 | 120,171 | 168.24 | 423.94 | 41 | | | | |
| | 2-9 | Gillett | 244,393 | 415.47 | 7,725 | 10.82 | 426.28 | 42 | | | | |
| | 7 | Besette | 234,291 | 398.29 | 20,756 | 29.06 | 427.35 | 43 | | | | |
| | 12 | Swinsky | 474,787 | 807.14 | (244,231) | (341.92) | 465.21 | 44 | | | | |
| | 3-6 | Parkins | 211,847 | 360.14 | 93,450 | 130.83 | 490.97 | 45 | | | | |
| | 43 | Hemming | 212,513 | 361.27 | 99,212 | 138.90 | 500.17 | 46 | | | | |
| | 31 | McCoy | 275,017 | 467.53 | 26,055 | 36.48 | 504.01 | 47 | | | | |
| | 6 | Manno | 391,919 | 666.26 | (115,551) | (161.77) | 504.49 | 48 | | | | |
| | 42 | Goodsen | 285,156 | 484.77 | 26,838 | 37.57 | 522.34 | 49 | | | | |
| | 2 | Garson | 309,260 | 525.74 | 5,593 | 7.83 | 533.57 | 50 | | | | |
| | 3-33 | Schwartz | 278,036 | 472.66 | 44,766 | 62.67 | 535.33 | 51 | | | | |
| | 2-10 | Fairbanks | 293,474 | 498.91 | 39,350 | 55.09 | 554.00 | 52 | | | | |
| | 3-19 | Gottschalk | 383,724 | 652.33 | (43,267) | (60.57) | 591.76 | 53 | | | | |
| | 3-14 | Davis | 336,612 | 572.24 | 16,842 | 23.58 | 595.82 | 54 | | | | |
| | 3-7 | Glick House | 272,875 | 463.89 | 100,148 | 140.21 | 604.09 | 55 | | | | |
| | 3-21 | Askew | 307,984 | 523.57 | 60,377 | 84.53 | 608.10 | 56 | | | | |
| | 14 | Cutler | 329,717 | 560.52 | 56,434 | 79.01 | 639.53 | 57 | | | | |
| | 3-9 | Willott House & Irrig | 336,226 | 571.58 | 80,883 | 113.24 | 684.82 | 58 | | | | |
| | 4 | Kilman | 265,247 | 450.92 | 200,745 | 281.04 | 731.96 | 59 | | | | |
| | 3-4 | McNeil | 341,223 | 580.08 | 110,031 | 154.04 | 734.12 | 60 | | | | |
| | 17 | Long | 243,763 | 414.40 | 236,983 | 331.78 | 746.17 | 61 | | | | |
| | 1 | Ridgeway | 395,071 | 671.62 | 101,687 | 142.36 | 813.98 | 62 | | | | |
| | 15/16 | Sweet | 378,655 | 643.71 | 132,934 | 186.11 | 829.82 | 63 | | | | |
| | 3-3 | McGrath | 336,093 | 571.36 | 196,111 | 274.56 | 845.91 | 64 | | | | |
| | 11 | Manson | 417,143 | 709.14 | 114,707 | 160.59 | 869.73 | 65 | | | | |
| | 2-6 | WYHUS | 405,203 | 688.85 | 133,693 | 187.17 | 876.02 | 66 | | | | |
| | 39 | Vance | 457,890 | 778.41 | 101,032 | 141.44 | 919.86 | 67 | | | | |
| | 40 | Parker | 516,959 | 878.83 | 35,265 | 49.37 | 928.20 | 68 | | | | |
| | 4-2 | Frankel | 407,269 | 692.36 | 182,949 | 256.13 | 948.49 | 69 | | | | |
| | 20 | Knoke | 442,119 | 751.60 | 185,758 | 260.06 | 1,011.66 | 70 | | | | |
| | 3-2 | Linton | 485,334 | 825.07 | 167,246 | 234.14 | 1,059.21 | 71 | | | | |
| | 22 | Matthews | 554,891 | 943.31 | 129,891 | 181.85 | 1,125.16 | 72 | | | | |
| | 3-18 | Cosala | 614,452 | 1,044.57 | 94,858 | 132.80 | 1,177.37 | 73 | | | | |
| | 13 | McCarvey/wood | 542,786 | 922.74 | 192,027 | 268.84 | 1,191.57 | 74 | | | | |
| | 3-20 | Machol (hse) | 637,912 | 1,084.45 | 160,845 | 225.18 | 1,309.63 | 75 | | | | |
| | 3-12 | Chapman | 608,502 | 1,034.45 | 286,454 | 401.04 | 1,435.49 | 76 | | | | |
| | 3-17 | Hunt | 738,409 | 1,255.30 | 175,853 | 246.19 | 1,501.49 | 77 | | | | |
| | 33 | Stars Horizon, LLC | 900,000 | 1,530.00 | - | - | 1,530.00 | 78 | | | | |
| | 2-1 | Polar Express House | 1,147,303 | 1,950.42 | 338,905 | 474.47 | 2,424.88 | 79 | | | | |
| | 28 | Thulin | 797,642 | 1,355.99 | 772,855 | 1,082.00 | 2,437.99 | 80 | | | | |
| | | Total usage and taxes | 21,331,227 | \$36,263.09 | 4,916,046 | \$6,837.31 | \$43,100.35 | | | | | |

21,555,260

Second meters on properties

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------------|
| Second meter --Not a separate | 3-16 | Long irrigation | 14,200 | 24.14 | (12,980) | (18.17) | 5.97 | 1 | | |
| Second meter --Not a separate | 3-20 | Machol (Barn) | 2,440 | 4.15 | 2,191 | 3.07 | 7.22 | 2 | | |
| Second meter --Not a separate | 3-5 | Byrne-meter 2 | 6,518 | 11.08 | 86 | 0.12 | 11.20 | 3 | | |
| Second meter --Not a separate | 3-22 | Timberline Hibbert (gst) | 13,845 | 23.54 | 2,164 | 3.03 | 26.57 | 4 | | |
| Second meter --Not a separate | 2-3 Irrigation | Stockhouse Irrigation | 90,500 | 153.85 | 79,068 | 110.70 | 264.55 | 5 | | |
| Underdeveloped - Barn | 2-2 | Polar Express Barn | 9,135 | 15.53 | (9,027) | (12.64) | 2.89 | 6 | | |
| Is this a home? | 2-7A Irrigation | Bunnett irrigation | 87,400 | 148.58 | - | - | 148.58 | 7 | | |
| | | | 224,038 | \$ | 380.87 | 61,502 | \$ | 86.11 | \$ | 466.98 |

Non-water using members - Vacant land or homes under construction

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|------|--------------------------|--------|--------|----------|----------|--------|----|
| Home under construction | 3-8 | Hughes-MGH Marital Trust | 63,090 | 107.25 | (79,534) | (111.35) | (4.09) | 1 |
| No Water Lot | 3-5 | Byrne lot | 88 | 0.15 | (2,238) | (3.13) | (2.98) | 2 |
| No Water Lot | 2-5 | Nlonde - Land only | 0 | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| ?? Whats this? | 2-7A | Bunnett | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| New Construction | 3-10 | Koski | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| No Water Lot | 3-13 | Byrne - Land only | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| ?? Whats this? | 3-15 | HFF | - | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| No Water Lot | 3-29 | McCann - Land only | 0 | - | - | - | - | 8 |
| New Construction | 3-30 | Ambler/Johnson | - | - | - | - | - | 9 |
| New Construction | 33 | Miccoja Ranch | - | - | - | - | - | 10 |
| Land no irrigation | 4-3 | Skyline Ranch, LLC | - | - | - | - | - | 11 |
| Land w/irrigation | 27 | Waggoner Family Trust | - | - | - | - | - | 12 |

From: Bruno Manno <bvm53cor@gmail.com>

Date: Tuesday, July 11, 2023 at 9:19 AM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Subject: Re: Skyline - Replacing Water Meters

Hi, I emailed plumbing anytime to try to arrange a date for meters to be done when I'm out there which is first half of august. I have not heard anything back from them!

Do you have any input with them so this doesn't turn into a problem!

Regards

Bruno Manno

From: Warren Machol <wlm.assoc@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2023 8:44 AM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Cc: Latham Jenkins <latham@livewaterproperties.com>; Bob Norton <bobnorton51@gmail.com>; Kurt Harland <thekurtharland@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Information for July board meeting & public Budget meeting

Wendy,

Today is Thursday, July 13th, three business days before the upcoming Regular Board and Special Budget meeting. I am still waiting to receive confirmation of my information request; please confirm you have received the request for information.

Also, will the requested 23-24 budget information be available to the Skyline membership before the meeting date? While budgets are significant, the details are essential in determining the accuracy and sufficiency of the numbers.

Lastly, I found the agenda for the Regular Board meeting posted on the website, but I have yet to locate the agenda for the Budget meeting. Also, please note that the June minutes link is broken, and I received the error message below when attempting to access the Draft June ISD Board minutes.

400 Bad Request

cloudflare

Kindly inform me when the link has been fixed and the minutes are accessible to all members, not just the ISD board members and your team.

I'm looking forward to speaking with you.

All the best

Warren

WLM Associates

500 NW Ridge Rd
Jackson WY 83001
307 734 1920 (o)
917 455 7470 (c)

From: michael minter <trewil@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2023 11:43 AM

To: Kurt Harland <thekurtharland@gmail.com>; Bobnorton51@gmail.com; latham@liveproperties.com; Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Subject: Re: Skyline Water Rates

I wrote you three weeks ago inquiring about the fixed rate portion of water charges for the upcoming year, which would have an impact upon the budget to be discussed next Tuesday. Please add this to the agenda for Tuesday's meeting. I again refer you to Kurt's comment re: fixed charges at the February town hall meeting.

I have included Carl Brown's suggested minimum(fixed charge) charge for each meter size as well as the \$2.60 unit charge per 1000 gallons from his December 2022 rate study.

I had also requested several weeks ago that a copy of the water meter loan agreement with the SLIB be added to the SRISD website.

Thank you, Mike Minter

Jim Lewis jamesl5546@gmail.com Dec 11, 2021, 10:54 AM (2 days ago) to Skyline

As an alternative to a tiered conservation rate structure what would be a flat rate or unitary block rate per thousand gallons which would generate equivalent pro-forma water usage revenue? Jim Lewis

Answer: See Table A that follows. This is the same table as appears in the final rate analysis report, except I eliminated the conservation rate tiers from this model and then solved for the same reserves target. Thus, the unit charge was the only thing that changed.

Table A: System Development Fees; Minimum and Unit Charges With No Usage Allowance Calculated by the Skyline I&SD, Jackson, WY, Water Rates Model 2021-1D, No Conservation

In addition to the minimum charges below:

Each customer and ARU would be charged a meter loan repayment assessment of \$170 in Fiscal Year 2022-23. That would drop to \$85 in Fiscal Year 2023-24 and thereafter.

Each landowner and ARU would be charged a meter loan assessment of \$220 in each of Fiscal Years 2022, 2023 and 2024.

| Water Meter Size in Inches | Meter Type | Fee per New Tap for Peak Costs | Annual Minimum Charge for Each Meter Size | Unit Charge per 1,000 Gallons For Following Ranges of Gallons Used Semi-annually: | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | 0 to 99,999 | 100,000 to 199,000 | 200,000 or More |
| 0.625 | Displacement | \$6,416 | \$519.70 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 0.750 | Displacement | \$6,416 | \$519.70 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 1.000 | Displacement | \$14,435 | \$562.99 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 1.500 | Displacement | \$25,983 | \$625.33 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 2.000 | Displacement | \$37,416 | \$687.04 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 2.500 | Displacement | \$52,616 | \$769.09 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 3.000 | Singlet | \$60,614 | \$812.26 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 3.000 | Compound, Class I | \$60,614 | \$812.26 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 3.000 | Turbine, Class I | \$59,667 | \$807.15 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 4.000 | Singlet | \$76,714 | \$899.18 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 4.000 | Compound, Class I | \$76,714 | \$899.18 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |
| 4.000 | Turbine, Class I | \$85,613 | \$947.21 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 | \$2.60 |

From: MICHAEL WEHRLE <mwehrle@aol.com>

Date: Friday, July 14, 2023 at 8:41 AM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Cc: Jeana Trout <jeana.trout@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Skyline - Replacing Water Meters

Wendy,

I have done a quick review of the documentation that accompanies the new water meters for the homeowners at Skyline Ranch.

While I respect your decision to change out the water delivery monitoring system and make the upgrade, the changes in the documentation, and the invasion of property rights/privacy for the homeowners that you are proposing along with the water meter upgrade, are outrageous, and almost certainly would fail any legal scrutiny.

I strongly suggest the removal of all the items that represent a gross invasion of privacy for the homeowners, and a blight on their property rights. There are only 4 to 6 of these items, and they seem like they would be relatively simple to remove.

I suggest a legal approach with a tone that suggests you will work with the homeowners in Skyline Ranch, replacing the one that suggests that the ISD will force themselves on the homeowners property rights at any time that they choose.

I respect what you were trying to accomplish. However, please reconsider the draconian approach that your legal documents suggest. There is no reason for that.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Wehrle
3150 West Teal Rd

From: Warren Machol <wlm.assoc@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 14, 2023 3:21 PM

To: Wendy Meyring <wendy@mpmjh.com>

Cc: Latham Jenkins <latham@livewaterproperties.com>; Bob Norton <bobnorton51@gmail.com>; Kurt Harland <thekurtharland@gmail.com>; John Willott <jwillott@aol.com>; Maria Johnson <mariajjohnson53@gmail.com>; Worthy Johnson <wjohnson@lawrencecapitalmgt.com>; Corbin McNeill <camcneilljr@gmail.com>; Jamie Streator <jstreator58@gmail.com>; michael minter <trewil@hotmail.com>

Subject: Re: Information for July board meeting & public Budget meeting

Wendy,

Thank you for updating the links for the minutes of the June meeting and related documents for the July 18 Board meeting on the web site. I can report the links are now all working and accessible.

Regarding the replies provided by the ISD Board to the questions asked for the second or third time, I have included comments below in [Blue](#).

The ISD Boards' lack of transparency is troubling. The majority of the board replies are non-responsive or change of topic deception and have failed to provide the relevant facts to the questions asked.

I respectfully request the original email questions and the new question to be truthfully and directly answered and distributed before the Budget hearing so that members are accurately informed to discuss the proposed budget.

Respectfully submitted

Warren Machol
ISD Member

Warren,

Here is the answers, in red, to your earlier questions. I will check the site to see if I can figure out why the links are not working. This seems to be happening more often lately.

The upcoming July Board meeting for Skyline ISD is set to take place a week from today.

It is currently unclear when the meeting Agendas (Regular and Budget) for the July 18th session and the minutes from the previous June Skyline Board meeting with correspondence will be available to members for review. Appears Board members have already received copies of these documents why delay distribution?

The agenda and proposed budget (as advertised) should be posted on the website.

We, as members, also re-request the following budget details to determine if the proposed budget is accurate and sufficient for the required and proposed ISD infrastructure projects.

Revenue:

- The amount of water to be billed for and the previous year's adjustments by members and lot.
- The amount of water to be billed for is 19,943,283 gallons which is 96% of the produced water. At the current rate of \$2.60/1000 gallons the total billing for water is \$51,853, however the rebate (\$6873) for overcharging the previous year plus admin fees (\$680) results in a decrease of \$6,193. Therefore, the budget revenue for FY 23-24 is \$45,660.

The question was the tax and adjustments by member by lot --- not a request for the aggregate numbers (I am prepared to do my own analysis as I have done the last 5 years). Please provide the requested information (similar to previous years format in an Excel readable format) for the Variable tax assessment by lot.

- Could you provide the requested information as had been done in the previous year in Excel or readable format? My opinion is that the water use by each homeowner should be available to the homeowner but that information should not be made public unless the homeowner gives permission, a Board decision.

This is a change of subject -- The Tax assessment amount is derived from water use due to board policy to shift fixed to variable costs. The request is for the tax amount, and the adjustment, if any, is caused by the convoluted ISD water billing policy. The request for the by

lot/member variable tax amount assessed by member/lot is subject to accurate public disclosure, so please provide it without delay.

- o # # # Please take a look at the attached analysis for historical formatting.

Analysis of road Overlay and Chip seal Assessments decreased by 12% and 53%, respectively.

Provide current Reserves funds Balance for both the overlay and Chip Seal

Non - Responsive: what are the **current reserve fund balance** (s) in the OverLay and the Chip seal accounts?

- Provide the current projected cost for each road project. **As explained at the May 23rd meeting, I thought that the assessment for road overlay was very high. I calculated the FY 23-24 assessment based on the 2023 estimate cost for the road overlay divided by the expected life of the overlay at 30 years, \$20,653. The assessment should increase each year based on inflation.**

Non - Responsive Provide the current projected cost to complete each road project this year in current dollars.

Please provide the facts, not **"I thought last year's chip-seal assessment was high"**

- Similarly, I thought last year's chipseal assessment was high, as explained at the May 23rd meeting, the assessment for the road chipseal is based on the estimated 2023 chip seal cost divided by the expected life of the overlay at 7 years, \$22,762. Again, the assessment should increase each year with inflation.
- Provide the expected year to complete each project. **As discussed at the May meeting it was proposed that the chip seal occur in FY 24-25, to be bid during FY 23-24. If we continue to chip seal every 7 years, the road should last 30 years so the next overlay would be in 2042.**

2042 Appears to be a bad assumption if water line replacement is scheduled for 2030, which will require substantial road repair. Does this mean we are under reserving to repair our roads appropriately when the water lines are replaced?

- Provide assumptions for inflation, Oil, and additional repair work associated with water line replacement. **Historically long-term inflation, for road overlay, is 3.5%, shorter term inflation for chipseal would vary, this last year it was 9.5% but it was assumed to be 3.5% for previous years.**

Non - Responsive What is in the model and variables used to determine the correct reserve fund balances? How has the model been used to set the appropriate assessments? If no analysis was done, please confirm; this is just a board member's thoughts/opinion without facts or analysis.

Above, there is a reference to "your discussion" (I assume Bob Norton wrote) in the May 23 board meeting. My questions at that meeting were for the board to provide a specific analysis of Road overlay and road chip seal, not off-the-cuff thought or opinion. The analysis and assumptions have never been provided. Please provide this prior to the July 18 Budget meeting, as was originally requested in writing on April 18.

Analysis of a decrease in Water Maintenance Assessment of 39% and concurrently no reduction in Water usage fees. (last year, +6% maintenance and +59% water usage fees, respectively) **The Water Maintenance Assessment was reduced because the depreciation expense was removed, as suggested by some property owners, and an expense line, water reserve account, and item was added.**

Non - Responsive The request was for *Analysis (used) of a decrease in Water Maintenance Assessment of 39% and concurrently no reduction in Water usage fees.*

DECEPTIVE CHANGE OF SUBJECT *Depreciation is a non-cash charge with nothing to do with properly assessing members for reserves and allowances.*

If you are saying you removed non-cash depreciation expense and did not apply the appropriate per-lot charge for reserves to grow -- please confirm.

- Board analysis of the current water reserve sufficiency to meet projected and required projects.

Non - Responsive - I asked for "*Board analysis of the current water reserve sufficiency to meet projected and required projects.*"

None has been provided

- Why are we currently borrowing from road reserves for water projects? (see well #4 road reserve road payment) **The previous Board voted to borrow \$58,750 (at 2.5% for 5 years) from the road reserve to pay for Skyline's share of the Well No. 4 project.**

Non - Responsive - I did not ask how I asked why did we needed to borrow from road reserves, **Are water reserves insufficient?**

- Where is the analysis to decrease per lot assessments when Water reserves are insufficient? **If water reserves are insufficient the assessments to lots would only increase. The analysis of water reserve calculations is based on Skyline having in reserve 25% of the water system replacement cost, the remaining 75% being provided by grants and loans. Future water users will pay the loan repayment over 20 to 30 years.**

DECEPTIVE CHANGE OF SUBJECT where is the analysis of water reserves? Please provide any analysis completed.

- Board analysis of the allocation of all water reserve costs.

○ Water Reserves in the proposed budget are 100% assigned to current water users (\$30,908). **Current water users contributed to the Water Reserves with the intent to accumulate 25% of the cost of future water system replacement as described above.**

- Please define the allocation methodology.

DECEPTIVE CHANGE OF SUBJECT - question asked: "Water Reserves in the proposed budget are 100% assigned to current water users (\$30,908). Please define the allocation methodology."

PLEASE REPLY TO THE QUESTION ASKED; not a "goal to reach a 25% reserve" at some unspecified date while only assessing current water users.

○ Do water reserves benefit all lots and members, present and future? or only current water users? **Water reserves benefit all lots/property owners.**

Thank you for being clear and concise in your reply to this question:

To confirm, 100% of budgeted reserves for the year 2023-24 will be charged to current water users. The excess water charges are to be used to subsidize current low and non-water users' non-participation in building and replacing water reserves.

The Board intends to accumulate an amount equal to the 25% goal (but an unspecified amount) to borrow the remaining 75% to build infrastructure to benefit all ISD members. (a few pay for many -- the socialist way)

- I've attached the 7-year analysis of Variable water excess charges.

Last year the calculation for the amount transferred to reserves was based on net water system revenue plus depreciation. That is also how it was calculated prior to 2016. I am not familiar with how the transfer to water reserves was calculated between 2017 and 2022.

DECEPTIVE CHANGE OF SUBJECT - Thank you for sharing your knowledge of what was transferred in previous years. You concur that the excess charging for water explains the majority of current water reserves.

NEW QUESTION

Please define the Boards methodology on how the methodology as Budgeted is fair and equitable, pursuant to ISD law, for a few to pay disproportionately to increase the size and capacity of the water system when all current and future members benefit from the water system upgrades.

Please expedite distribution, as time is of the essence, with a week to go before both meetings.

All the best

Warren

From: Perk Perkins <perkinsp@orvis.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2023 8:50 PM
To: office@skylineranchISD.com
Subject: lower valley energy line flags

Hi

I see where lower valley energy has marked our drive and Meadowlark for where they intend to bury lines. Is this for the new water meters? If not, do you know what it is for?

I'd like to talk to someone there before they dig because they will be crossing our underground dog fence and I'd like to avoid breaking that line if possible. Can you advise who I should talk to about that?

Thankyou

Perk Perkins
320 N West Ridge Rd.

On Fri, Jul 14, 2023 at 2:26 PM Emily Hanner <clearwateroperations@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello all,

According to our notes, there are 4 curbstops that are inaccessible due to damaged risers, or having been paved over.

There are another 3 that the riser appears fine, but we can't get the key on to operate.

Would you like us to plan to excavate and repair these curbstops so that they are functional again?

We will have our excavator in Jackson for the next couple months, working across the highway at Bar Y, installing meter pits.

These will just be billed out at a time and material basis.

Thanks,

Emily Hanner

--

Clearwater Operations & Services

307-690-5512









Skyline Minutes 7-18-23

Final Audit Report

2023-09-27

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Created: | 2023-09-27 |
| By: | Mountain Property Management (info@mpmjh.com) |
| Status: | Signed |
| Transaction ID: | CBJCHBCAABAAX3RqcP8zgSYsxxuD6VwgKrfUGS0cUTQT |

"Skyline Minutes 7-18-23" History

-  Document created by Mountain Property Management (info@mpmjh.com)
2023-09-27 - 2:14:46 PM GMT- IP address: 207.183.166.24
-  Document emailed to Kurt (kurt@bhhsjacksonhole.com) for signature
2023-09-27 - 2:15:24 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Kurt (kurt@bhhsjacksonhole.com)
2023-09-27 - 2:15:45 PM GMT- IP address: 66.102.6.128
-  Document e-signed by Kurt (kurt@bhhsjacksonhole.com)
Signature Date: 2023-09-27 - 2:16:21 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 184.167.8.215
-  Document emailed to Latham (latham@livewaterproperties.com) for signature
2023-09-27 - 2:16:23 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Latham (latham@livewaterproperties.com)
2023-09-27 - 2:26:57 PM GMT- IP address: 104.28.50.161
-  Document e-signed by Latham (latham@livewaterproperties.com)
Signature Date: 2023-09-27 - 2:52:22 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 184.167.24.142
-  Agreement completed.
2023-09-27 - 2:52:22 PM GMT