

# BASECAMP TRINIDAD — WATER · ENERGY · FARM STRATEGY

v2 · Updated 2026-07-06 · Incorporates realtor intel (2026-06-29), full TRO contract read, and FEMA panel 08071C1778C. All figures illustrative.

## 1. WATER — TWO PATHS, ONE BASE CASE

The single biggest de-risk since v1. The tract is un-annexed with an existing extra-territorial DOMESTIC tap already serving it. That converts our water question from "can we get water at all" (well/haul risk) into "which of two City paths do we take" — and both are cheaper and faster than drilling.

AXIS	PATH A — EXTRATERRITORIAL COMMERCIAL TAP (BASE CASE)	PATH B — ANNEX INTO CITY
<b>Land-use regime</b>	Stays under Las Animas COUNTY — preserves R-Ranchette by-right lodging / restaurant / office. Our permitting freedom is the moat; this path keeps it.	City land-use code applies — new review layers on every structure; by-right freedom likely narrows.
<b>Process</b>	Application to City of Trinidad Water for a commercial extraterritorial tap; realtor reports this as a viable, established path here.	Annexation petition; realtor says "not difficult" adjacent to already-annexed land, but it is a City legislative process with hearings and conditions.
<b>Capacity</b>	OPEN — the deciding question. Ask Marc Vigil the max EQR/capacity available extraterritorially at this location. Buildout cap (~50 units / ~150 overnight) is set by water + septic, not land.	Potentially larger tap AND possible City SEWER — which would eliminate the engineered commercial OWTS entirely. That is the only prize big enough to justify Path B.
<b>Cost / timeline</b>	Tap fee + meter + service line. Typically far below well-drill + storage + treatment. Weeks-to-months.	Fee structure similar once annexed, but annexation itself adds months and possible exactions (ROW dedications, infrastructure conditions).
<b>Decision rule</b>	DEFAULT. Proceed unless Vigil states the extraterritorial cap cannot serve full build.	PHASE-3 OPTION. Revisit only if (a) extraterritorial capacity caps us below plan, or (b) City sewer is on the table. Adjacent-to-annexed status keeps this option open indefinitely — it costs nothing to hold.

Irrigation is separate and already solved: 2 Chilili Ditch shares (senior 1862 priority) convey at closing and currently support two hay cuttings a year on Parcel 2. Ditch water irrigates the meadow, farm plots and landscape; the City tap serves potable/commercial load only. Keep the two systems strictly separate in plumbing and in permitting narrative.

## 2. WASTEWATER — ONE KNOWN UNKNOWN, ONE ENGINEERED KNOWN

- Old tank (known unknown): a septic tank exists on site; condition and location unknown. Budget: locate (probe/records), pump + inspect, then repair-or-decommission. Carry a low-thousands contingency until inspected.

- Full build (engineered known): everything commercial in this area runs on county-approved OWTS. ~150 overnight guests + cafe/taproom requires an ENGINEERED commercial system — this is a real line item; get an OWTS engineer estimate before the offer's diligence period ends.
- Ground truth from the TRO plan (on-site observation): depth to groundwater 10-50 ft, soils sandy-to-clay. Upland leach fields on Parcel 3 are feasible; keep all fields well off the river corridor and out of the floodplain.
- Realtor foresees no perc/siting issues but cannot guarantee until inspection — treat perc tests on the Parcel 3 core as a diligence-period contingency, not a post-closing task.

### 3. FLOOD TRUTH AND INSURANCE-AWARE CAPEX TIERING

FEMA panel 08071C1778C (eff. 8/28/2019) resolves the geometry: the 100-year floodplain and floodway lie north/west along the Purgatoire — Parcel 1 only. Parcels 2 and 3, south of US-160, are Zone X (SFHA: No). The realtor's framing — "all buildable, insurable is very rough" — now has a map answer: put insured capital where insurance is cheap.

TIER	RULE
<b>Zone X — P2 + P3</b>	Permanent, financed, insured: Commons (store/cafe/taproom/work hub), bathhouse + laundry, cabins/domes, RV loop with hookups, glamping pods, residences. Normal construction financing, normal property cover, preferred-risk/optional flood.
<b>Floodplain/floodway — P1</b>	Movable, unfinanced, uninsured by design: riverside tent camp, movable river wellness, event lawn + movable stage, trails, horse turnout (movable fencing), gravel/grass event lot. Nothing here carries a premium because nothing here is insured.
<b>Conditional — homestead</b>	The one structure in/near the floodway. Reuse as HQ triggers a floodplain development permit + likely elevation/floodproofing + a real insurance quote. PRICE FIRST. Fallback is locked: unconditioned day-use shell; HQ function relocates into the Parcel 3 Commons.

### 4. TRO / RUSSIAN-OLIVE PROGRAM — SMALL, RIPARIAN, LIKELY OPTIONAL

- What it is: a COST-SHARE under the PWWMC/SPPRCD Riparian Restoration Program — not a conservation easement. No use restriction; nothing recorded against title (verify at title).
- Scope: ~3 acres of riparian treatment area on Parcel 1 (river/ditch corridor). Obligation is annual follow-up spray of re-sprouts + an annual tracking log + allowing monitoring.
- Cost: 2019 professional rate \$65-85/acre → roughly \$200-255/yr hired, less DIY. Trivial opex either way.
- Term: internal ambiguity — "project completion fall 2027" vs "five years post-project monitoring." Working figure ~2 seasons remaining; get the end date in writing from SPPRCD.
- Transferability: signed by Ed Dionisio as a NON-owner applicant with permission; the treatment obligation has no successor/assigns clause. It very likely does not bind a buyer — assumption is a choice (to keep the restoration benefit), not an inherited liability. Confirm in writing.
- Side finding for the farm plan: the plan documents Kochia at ~50% cover over ~30 ac of hay/ditch area and Scotch thistle by the house. Budget meadow weed management in Year-1 opex and ask the hay lessee what they currently run.

### 5. ENERGY FROM FLOW (CARRIED FORWARD, UNCHANGED)

The Chilili ditch drop and river adjacency keep the micro-hydro / energy-from-flow concept alive as a Phase-3 exploration, not a dependency: any kilowatt generated is branding and resilience, not baseload. Primary energy remains grid service (will-serve letter pending, tracker row 13) with solar-ready roof orientation on the Commons and bathhouse. Nothing in the new intel changes this posture.

## **6. FARM / NO-COURT UNLOCK (CARRIED FORWARD, SHARPENED)**

Parcel 2 remains the branded-farm and equestrian node: senior 1862 ditch water, existing hay operation to continue through a lease for ag-status continuity (tracker row 20), glamping pods on the meadow edge, barn + BYO-horse. The realtor independently recommended horse/wildlife use for the river tract — validation for river-side turnout with movable fencing, which stays inside the P1 "movable only" tier. Fishers Peak SP (19,200 ac, 16 mi of trails incl. horseback) and Trinidad Lake SP equestrian trails ~5 mi out anchor the BYO-horse positioning; the Tier-3 full stable stays a thin standalone — prefer the outfitter partnership.

*Conventions: plat labels authoritative (P1 27.85 river · P2 7.91 meadow · P3 17.16 upland). No listing photos in deliverables. Deck shows ownership-stake language only — no NCTR percentages.*