

January 25, 2024

Adams County Community and Economic Development Department
Attn: Greg Barnes
4430 South Adams County Parkway
1st Floor, Suite W2000B
Brighton, CO 80601

Re: Wright Farms Metropolitan District
Response to Comments Received Regarding Service Plan Amendment

Dear Community and Economic Development Department,

This letter is provided in response to the comments provided to Adams County regarding the Wright Farms Metropolitan District's proposed service plan amendment, which, if approved, gives the District the authority to provide trash and recycling services to District residents.

Comments on the service plan amendment were received from:

1. Adams County:
 - a. Planner: Greg Barnes
 - b. Development Engineering: Matthew Emmens
 - c. Environmental Analyst: Megan Grant
 - d. Neighborhood Services: Cornelia Warnke
 - e. ROW: David Dittmer
2. Hilltop Securities
3. 27J Schools
4. City of Brighton
5. City of Thornton
6. Regional Transportation District
7. South Adams County Water & Sanitation District
8. United Power, Inc.
9. Excel Energy

Page 1 of 7

10. Residents of the Wright Farms Metropolitan District. Approximately forty responses were received from District residents both in favor of and not in favor of the proposed service plan amendment that, if approved, gives the District the authority to provide trash and recycling services to District residents.

Community comments in favor of the proposed service plan amendment focused on:

1. Reduced cost to each homeowner by eliminating the need to pay for private trash and recycling service, because these services will be covered by existing property tax revenue.
2. Reduction in trash and recycling truck traffic.
3. Improved safety due to fewer trash and recycling trucks within the community.
4. Improved service due to single trash and recycling service provider.

The community comments not in favor of the proposed service plan amendment were generally as follows:

1. Concerns over cost and whether there would be any cost savings.
2. Lack of concern over trash and recycle truck traffic.
3. Desire to maintain ability to choose their own trash and recycling service provider.

Response

1. Adams County:
 - a. Planner: Greg Barnes

Comment: Extensive outreach needs to take place before the service plan amendment is provided to the Board of County Commissioners.

Response: On January 4, 2024, the District conducted a Q & A session and presentation for its residents, addressing the service plan amendment and provision of trash and recycling services. During the presentation, the District provided details on the funding mechanism for the trash and recycling services, which is existing property tax revenues, the timeline for implementation, and actively responded to inquiries from residents regarding the service plan amendment.

Additionally, the District prepared and distributed a neighborhood survey at the end of January regarding District services, including information regarding the proposed service plan amendment. In this survey, the District requested feedback regarding the community's interest in the District providing trash and recycling services (results are pending – due Jan. 31). *See Neighborhood Survey* enclosed. The District also responded to each comment provided by District residents in response to the District's proposed service plan amendment and provision of trash and recycling services. The District continues to hold monthly public meetings, at which

the District Board would respond to any additional questions District residents might have regarding the service plan amendment.

b. Development Engineering: Matthew Emmens

Comment: No engineering concerns with this proposal.

Response: No response required.

c. Environmental Analyst: Megan Grant

Comment: No environmental comments on the plan amendment. Note provided stating that as of February 16, 2024, solid waste haulers must be licensed to operate in unincorporated Adams County.

Response: If the service plan amendment is approved, the District will require its selected provider to be licensed to operate in unincorporated Adams County.

d. Neighborhood Services: Cornelia Warnke

Comment: No comment.

Response: No response required.

e. ROW: David Dittmer

Comment: No comment.

Response: No response required.

2. Hilltop Securities

Comment: No comment because no financial plan needed.

Response: No response required.

3. 27J Schools

Comment: No objection to the service plan amendment.

Response: No response required.

4. City of Brighton

Comment: No objection to service plan amendment.

Response: No response required.

5. City of Thornton

Comment: No comment.

Response: No response required.

6. Regional Transportation District

Comment: If the service plan amendment requires work to be done on RTD facilities or property, the correct permits will need to be acquired.

Response: No work will need to be done on RTD facilities or property to provide trash and recycling service to District residents.

7. South Adams County Water & Sanitation District

Comment: No comments.

Response: No response required.

8. United Power, Inc.

Comment: No concerns or objections to the service plan amendment.

Response: No response required.

9. Excel Energy

Comment: No comment.

Response: No response required.

10. Residents of the Wright Farms Metropolitan District

The District carefully reviewed the following comments that were in favor and not in favor of the District's service plan amendment and provision of trash and recycling services:

Comments in Favor					
Person	Comment Summary	Person	Comment Summary	Person	Content Summary
Dhanpal Patel	In favor	Daniel Johnson	In favor Too many trucks under current model	Michael Botelho, Planning Manager	Only residential or include Glacier Peak Elementary?
Chad Pulley	In favor	James and Susan Stec	In favor Cost Savings More consistent service	Shannon Avila	In favor Cost savings
Corrine Turner-Jacob	In favor Reduced traffic Cost savingst	Kevin Sleight	In favor Too much traffic	Peggy Ripko	In favor Cost savings Reduced traffic Increased safety

Comments in Favor (continued)					
Person	Comment Summary	Person	Comment Summary	Person	Content Summary
Vitelio and Jessica Mazariego	In favor	Kevin Wood	In favor Confirm is both trash and recycle	Jeanette Hall-Pearson	In favor. Cost savings Reduced traffic and noise
Patel Family	In favor Cost savings Better health and safety Improved efficiency Better aesthetics in neighborhood Better recycling	Arden Freeman	Called and left message with Greg re frequency of pickup	Mike Dilkey	In favor Cost savings Reduced traffic
Nate and Jamie Trujillo	In favor Reduce truck traffic Increased safety (kids)	Pat McLain	In favor (call to Greg)	Tony Unrein	In favor Cost savings
Lucille Trujillo	In favor	Alina Pshichenko	In favor	Mike Bruce	In favor
Jalasa Bainter	Mailed physical letter In favor				

Comments Not in Favor					
Person	Comment Summary	Person	Comment Summary	Person	Content Summary
Lynn Schimpf	Monopoly Choice (like current provider) Concerned about cost.	Charity Reeves	Not enough outreach Not enough cost savings Prefer drop in taxes rather than District provided service Some owners bought their own trash cans	Michael Botelho, Planning Manager	Only residential or include Glacier Peak Elementary?
Sandra Lowman	Choice	Geoffrey Black	Not concerned about traffic (thinks it is overestimated) Raise mill levy	William Nero	Not in favor Concerned about lack of services "Money Grab"

Comments Not in Favor (continued)					
Person	Comment Summary	Person	Comment Summary	Person	Content Summary
Vicki Woody	Choice Cost (senior citizen discount) No concerns about traffic	Katherine Black	Choice Cost (thinks it will be more expensive)	Thomas James	Not in favor Choice
Sharon Ochsner	Choice Trash bags Cost (only use part of year)	Russ Meyer	Not in favor Cost (doesn't think there will be a savings)	Christoper Montoya	Not in favor Do not want to add District power. Duplication of Service (already provided by residents) Choice Cost (thinks will go up) Management challenges Adequate service is already provided
Jay Hill	Choice No concerns about traffic Cost (doesn't believe it would be a savings)	Arden Freeman	Called and left message with Greg re frequency of pickup	Kurt Witte	Not in favor Choice Cost (no savings)
Helen Leung	Cost (senior discount)	Vang Lee	Not in favor Choice	Stephanie Bendykowski	Cost (will go up over time) Lower service Economic impact Days per week
Rick McFarland	Cost (senior discount) No concerns about traffic Ability to opt out	David Brostrom	Not in favor Choice Outreach	Mary Wilcoxon	Mailed physical letter Not sure of cost savings Questions about implementation
Bob Murray	Choice More outreach	Pat and Margaret Uncapher	Not in favor Choice Not sure of cost savings	Paula and Linda Roper	Mailed physical letter Concerns over additional problems in the neighborhood – no concerns with trash services

Response to Community Comments: A response from the District to these comments is attached for distribution. *See Correspondence Addressing Concerns and Clarifications Regarding Wright Farms Metropolitan District's Trash and Recycling Proposal.*

Please let me know if you would like to discuss any of the comments or response in additional detail or have any questions.

Sincerely,

ERB LAW, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Glory S", written in a cursive style.

Glory Schmidt, Esq.

Cc: Jeffrey E. Erb

Enclosures (2): Neighborhood Survey, Correspondence Addressing Concerns and Clarifications Regarding Wright Farms Metropolitan District's Trash and Recycling Proposal