

**CASTLE PINES NORTH METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
WORK SESSION MINUTES  
February 16, 2026 – 5:30 p.m.**

**HELD:** Monday, February 16, 2026, at 5:30 p.m. at 7404 Yorkshire Drive, Castle Pines, CO 80108.

**ATTENDEES:** Directors Jason Blanckaert, Leah Enquist, James Mulvey, Tera Radloff, and Jana Krell were present. Also present were: Molly Janzen, Elevated Clarity; Nathan Travis, District Manager; Rene Santini, Deputy District Manager; and Paul Polito, Seter, Vander Wall & Mielke, P.C. (via Zoom).

**CONFLICTS:** None.

**QUORUM:** Present.

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** The Work Session was called to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

**INTRODUCTION OF DEPUTY DISTRICT MANAGER**

District Manager Nathan Travis introduced Rene Santini as the incoming Deputy District Manager. Mr. Travis noted that Mr. Santini has experience with CH2M Hill, Jacobs, and several smaller engineering firms. Mr. Santini resides within the District on Whitby Court and most recently worked with Respec, an engineering firm based in South Dakota with a Colorado Springs office. The Board welcomed Mr. Santini.

**FINANCE ITEMS**

**Review: Monthly Claims for Payments Made from January 14, 2026 to February 11, 2026**

Molly Janzen of Elevated Clarity reviewed the monthly payment claims totaling \$1,895,968.59, consisting of \$1,754,169.08 in checks and \$141,799.51 in electronic payments. Ms. Janzen noted that the claims report format has been streamlined: the summary page has been consolidated from two pages to one by including electronic payment detail on the main page, and the check detail report has been reformatted using an export from the financial system for clarity. A totals-by-vendor pivot table was also included. Ms. Janzen noted that the financial controls matrix overlay has been removed from the recurring claims presentation, as the financial controls policy is now well established.

Director Radloff asked how the Board would be made aware if an expenditure requiring prior approval under the financial controls policy was processed without such approval. Ms. Janzen and Mr. Travis explained that expenditures over \$50,000 require prior Board approval, and the Board would identify any discrepancies by reviewing the claims each month. Director Krell suggested adding a column to the totals-by-vendor report identifying the associated contract or project for each vendor. Director Mulvey suggested creating a lookup table that cross-references vendors to their contracts, which could be conditionally formatted to flag any payment not associated with a known contract. Ms. Janzen and Mr. Travis agreed to look into the development of such a tool.

## **LEGAL ITEMS**

### **Review January 19, 2026 Work Session Meeting Minutes**

Legal Counsel Paul Polito presented the January 19, 2026, Work Session minutes for review. The Board had no comments or requested changes.

### **Review January 26, 2026 Board Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Polito presented the January 26, 2026, Board Meeting minutes for review. The Board had no comments or requested changes.

### **Review CPNMD Service Plan Second Amendment**

Mr. Polito presented the draft Second Amendment to the District's Service Plan. He explained that the amendment is required by two intergovernmental agreements with the City of Castle Pines: the Parks IGA, which transferred parks and recreation properties, and the Stormwater IGA, which transferred stormwater facilities. The Second Amendment formally removes the District's authority to provide parks, open space, trails, stormwater services, and establishes a maximum operations mill levy cap of 7 mills. Mr. Polito noted that the November 7, 2023, City voter authorization date will be updated in the final document.

Mr. Polito explained that the amendment replaces the First Amendment from 1994 and further decreases the District's level of services. He noted that he had originally considered an amended and restated service plan but determined that a simple amendment was legally equivalent and would be significantly less costly and time-consuming. The draft petition for submission to Douglas County was also included in the packet on page 150. Mr. Polito indicated he would seek a Board resolution at the next regular meeting to authorize submission of the petition to the County.

Director Radloff asked why the amendment would be submitted to Douglas County rather than the City of Castle Pines, given that the District is wholly contained within the City. Mr. Travis and Mr. Polito explained that while the statute permits submission to the City, the existing IGA specifically requires submission to the County. Mr. Polito added that this approach is consistent with how other districts in the area, including Parker's, have their service plans approved. Director Radloff agreed it makes sense to remain consistent.

### **Review Standard Contract Form**

Mr. Polito presented a new Independent Contractor Agreement template. He explained that the agreement is designed to serve as a master services agreement for on-call and recurring vendors, incorporating protective terms for the District including TABOR compliance, governmental immunity, and independent contractor acknowledgments. The agreement includes a task order process for authorizing specific projects without renegotiating the base contract. Mr. Polito noted the agreement is flexible enough to incorporate terms from a contractor's own agreement while ensuring the District's terms control in the event of a conflict.

Mr. Polito highlighted the indemnification provision, under which the contractor indemnifies the District, with no reciprocal indemnification clause, consistent with Colorado constitutional limitations. He also discussed the repairs and claims provision in Section 4, which requires contractors to notify the District of any damage, preserve physical evidence relevant to potential claims, and maintain safety precautions. Director Mulvey asked about the practical application of the evidence preservation requirement, referencing the recent well shaft failure. Mr. Polito explained that the provision is intentionally broad and, in practice, he would expect to be contacted

immediately for guidance on any significant incident. Mr. Travis and Mr. Polito agreed to coordinate on establishing a notification protocol for such situations.

### **JAM Ranch Rezoning Application Response**

Mr. Polito presented the District's formal referral response to Douglas County regarding the Jam Ranch Rezoning application (File # ZR2025-015). The response was prepared collaboratively by Mr. Polito, Mr. Travis, and water attorney Austin Hamre. Mr. Polito explained that the applicant had previously sought inclusion into the District but was unable to meet the renewable water dedication requirements enacted by the District's March 2025 resolution. The applicant is now seeking to form its own single-purpose metropolitan district serving approximately 32 homes on 2.5-acre estate residential lots, relying entirely on non-renewable Denver Basin groundwater and septic systems.

The referral response raised several objections, including inconsistency with the Douglas County Comprehensive Master Plan's goals for transitioning to renewable water sources, insufficient water demand estimates given the large lot sizes, and the lack of an augmentation plan. The District also requested that the County require a recorded consumer protection disclosure in the chain of title for each lot, notifying future buyers that the property lacks a renewable water source and that the water supply is finite and diminishing.

Director Radloff asked whether Castle Pines Village Water submitted a similar response. Mr. Travis confirmed that they did and that their letter was available on OnBoard as supplementary material. Mr. Travis noted he is monitoring the planning commission schedule and will attend hearings when possible. Director Radloff emphasized the importance of the District being represented at the planning commission level. President Blanckaert asked whether the retail component had been removed from the project, and Mr. Travis confirmed it had been dropped, leaving only the 32 residential lots. Mr. Travis discussed the risk of smaller surrounding districts eventually requiring District water service and noted that the District's response was intended to establish expectations, even if the chances of blocking the rezoning are limited.

### **DISTRICT MANAGER ITEMS**

#### **Gittlein Farm Lease**

Mr. Travis presented the annual farm lease for the District's property in Weld County, leased to Timothy C. Gittlein d.b.a. Gittlein Farms. He explained that the lease covers approximately 57.8 acres and effectively pays for the District's water augmentation contracts through the Central Colorado Water Conservancy District, which total slightly over \$50,000, and provides ongoing land maintenance including weed control. Mr. Travis noted that the augmentation contracts have an estimated value of approximately \$1.5 million if sold, but that a sale would be a multi-year process to avoid depressing prices. He indicated the Board may revisit the long-term disposition of these assets in the fall.

#### **Review Draft Douglas County 2050 Water Plan**

Mr. Travis presented the draft 2050 Douglas County Water Plan prepared by Forsgren Associates for the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners. He noted that the document is still in draft form and is scheduled for public outreach and comment in the first half of 2026. Mr. Travis reported that the District is referenced 17 times in the plan, primarily reflecting information the District provided regarding water sources, use, and projected growth.

Mr. Travis observed that the plan does not appear to contain significant regulatory authority or mandates and characterized the Douglas County Water Commission as largely advisory without

legislative power. He noted one area of concern regarding differences between presumed and allotted groundwater availability in the Arapahoe Aquifer. Mr. Travis indicated he has asked the District's water attorney to review the plan for any provisions that could affect the District. Mr. Polito added that the plan may have some relevance to zoning decisions, as county zoning criteria reference the comprehensive plan, but noted that the language provides the County considerable flexibility.

Director Krell asked about the goal of the plan and what changes might be expected between the draft and final versions. Mr. Travis and the Board discussed the limited practical impact of the plan given the Water Commission's lack of regulatory authority. Director Enquist asked whether other counties have water commissions with actual legislative authority, and Mr. Travis and Mr. Polito confirmed that some do, such as designated groundwater commissions on the eastern plains, but that Douglas County's commission was not established with such powers. The Board agreed to continue monitoring the plan's progress.

### **Tank Rehabilitation Program**

Mr. Travis presented a proposal from Kennedy Jenks for engineering design services for the rehabilitation of South Tank #1 and South Tank #2, located on the Country Club of Castle Pines property. He explained that a condition assessment was performed in June 2024 and that the proposal covers the design of recommended repairs, including concrete rehabilitation, tank lining, valve vault replacement, abandonment of an 8-inch water main, and installation of backup float switches and solar power for South Tank #2. Mr. Travis noted that the District plans to use a CMGC or CMR delivery method, similar to the filter bed rehabilitation project, due to the difficulty of estimating costs for concrete rehabilitation work.

Mr. Travis noted that the proposed Serena Drive tank site has been removed from this scope and will be pursued as a separate project. He indicated that the proposal dates will be adjusted approximately 30 to 45 days later than shown in the packet. Director Krell confirmed the Kennedy Jenks engineering services portion is approximately \$430,000 on a not-to-exceed basis. Mr. Travis stated this item will be presented for Board approval at the February 23 regular meeting, and the Kennedy Jenks engineer who prepared the proposal will be available via Zoom to answer questions.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the Work Session was adjourned.