

Approved
May 8, 2025
as written



PINE MEADOW MUTUAL WATER COMPANY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

THURSDAY, April 10, 2025
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH

Board Members in Attendance: Eric Cylvick, Steve Anderson, Scott Smith, Shaun Baker.

Excused: George Sears.

Ex-Officio: Brody Blonquist

Mr. Cylvick called the meeting of the Pine Meadow Mutual Water Company to order at 6:30 P.M.

Minutes

MOTION: Eric Cylvick moved to approve the regular Minutes of January 9, 2025, as written.

Second: Steve Anderson seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Financial Overview

MOTION: Steve Anderson reviewed the **Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual** report dated April 9, 2025. After a brief discussion, he motioned for its approval.

Second: Eric Cylvick seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Unpaid

Bills

Brody Blonquist reviewed outstanding usual and customary invoices, including:

- **Badger Meter:** (monthly fee for the meters)
- **KGC Associates, Inc.:** (Carol's monthly invoice)
- **Pine Meadow Mutual Water Co:** (two transfers, one to the capital account, one to the water purchase account)
- **Summit County Health** (two water samples)
- **Utah State Division of Finance:** (two DDW loan payments)

MOTION: Eric Cylvick moved to approve to pay the bills of \$35,697.39 as presented.

Second: Shaun Baker seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

FM-D-109, Water Hookup Fee and Double Payment

Steve Good, 2364 S FOREST MDW RD, recounted the timeline of his property development. He and his wife purchased their lot and closed in 2020. In April 2021, they paid \$11,000+ in advance for water hookup and parts, anticipating the construction of their home. By the end of 2021, they had received HOA approval and were aiming for a 2022 build. However, their initial builder ceased communication, causing delays. Steve mentioned approaching Shaun Baker and eventually reaching out to the board upon Trevor's advice.

In Fall 2023, Steve Good had a permanent water connection installed. The contractor acquired the necessary parts, which Steve paid for again, despite having already paid for them in 2021. This discrepancy led to the request for reimbursement. He noted that \$500 still listed on the assessment pertained to the water meter and endpoint.

Brody clarified that the policy had changed: previously, homeowners paid upfront for parts, but due to rising costs and potential financial losses, and delays in construction, the Water Company shifted to requiring homeowners to directly procure parts. Brody explained that parts purchased years earlier often increased significantly in price by the time of installation, leading to losses for Pine Meadow Water (PMW).

Mr. Good confirmed that he is requesting a refund of approximately \$1,400 for parts that he was charged for twice. Brody acknowledged that PMW never bought the parts in 2021 despite charging \$1,920 for them. Brody added that the \$500 assessment was still valid, as it covered the meter and endpoint, which homeowners could no longer purchase independently.

Mr. Smith raised concern about setting a precedent, citing similar prior cases where refunds were denied. Brody emphasized that each case was different, often depending on the year the original payment was made. Steve Good reiterated that this was a courtesy request due to changes in PMW policy and expressed appreciation for the water service received.

Mr. Cylvick acknowledged that Steve Good had effectively paid twice—once in 2021 for parts never received and again in 2023 via his contractor. Mr. Good estimated the second payment at “a little more than \$2,000.”

Mr. Cylvick clarified that Steve Good was seeking a refund of \$1,920.56 minus the valid \$500 for the meter, resulting in \$1,420.56. The board agreed that this amount represented a fair refund for parts and services not rendered.

MOTION: Eric Cylvick made a motion to refund \$1,420.56 to Steve Good.

Shaun Baker seconded the motion.

VOTE: Unanimous approval.

Brody informed Mr. Good that he could either accept a direct refund or apply the amount as a credit toward future water bills. Steve indicated he had already paid in full and would coordinate with Carol for the refund.

Steve expressed appreciation for the board's time and consideration.

Shaun Baker left the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Manager's Report

Mountain Regional Update: Water Usage and Metering Discussion

Brody began the manager's report by stating that since January 1st, there had been a credit of 87,000 gallons of water from Mountain Regional Water. Mr. Cylvick confirmed the amount and asked if it pertained to the upper lots. Mr. Anderson questioned the accuracy of the measurement, noting that there was no physical meter installed on site. Brody explained that while there wasn't a direct meter on the upper lots, the data came from the PMW computer system that tracked the water input into the Stage Coach tank, which was monitored at the pump house.

Mr. Cylvick and Brody clarified the location of the meter and explained that the only meter used for tracking was on the water input line at the Stage Coach tank. Brody stated the system was gravity-fed, and they obtained additional meter readings from the 12 homes connected downstream.

Mr. Anderson expressed concern about the lack of direct monitoring between the tank and those 12 connections. Brody acknowledged the presence of fire hydrants on the line and noted the inaccuracy of the current meter at low flow, such as 5 gallons per minute or less.

Brody highlighted the limitations of the current setup, indicating that low-flow usage, such as from leaks or minor residential usage, would not be picked up by the existing meter. Mr. Anderson suggested installing a dedicated meter closer to the water flow point, as the distance from the current meter caused concern over unmeasured usage. Mr. Cylvick agreed, noting the importance of calculating accurate usage due to the cost impact.

Brody and Mr. Cylvick reviewed meter data. For January, February, and March, the 12 Stage Coach customers used approximately 12,865, 8,960, and 9,638 gallons respectively. This

totaled about 31,463 gallons over three months. With 87,000 gallons credited, the board questioned where the remaining 55,000 gallons had gone.

Brody recommended that during the upcoming renegotiation of the agreement with Mountain Regional Water, PMW insists on a clear schematic of their system. This would include detailed explanations of the flow mechanics, why 2,000 gallons get delivered unexpectedly when Mountain Regional activates their pumps, and clarification on whether Pine Meadow is responsible for filling the shared tank.

Mr. Cylvick supported this direction, suggesting that if PMW provides more water than accounted for, then Mountain Regional should bear part of the cost to install a new metering vault. He highlighted the importance of obtaining accurate data and receiving appropriate compensation.

Mr. Cylvick adjourned the Pine Meadow Mutual Water Company meeting at 7:20 PM.

Approved by

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'P' followed by a series of loops and a final vertical stroke.

Date

5/8/25