

Securing Lake Rockport Estates Water Future

Uniting the Community for Sustainable Water Solutions

Water Education Meeting / January 8, 2026 / 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
Mountain Regional Water District – 5739 Paintbrush Drive, Park City, Utah

Executive Summary

Lake Rockport Estates faces an unprecedented challenge: our existing well, long believed to reliably serve our community, produces just 30 to 35 gallons per minute as noted in the Bowen Collins Phase 1 feasibility study—far below the previously assumed 90 gpm. (Study link:

<https://www.lakerockportestates.com/annexation-evaluation/>.) This shocking revelation is prompting the water committee to take swift action before we face a water crisis. With 132 households, including approximately 92 full-time and 40 part-time residents, reliant on this limited supply, the time has come to act decisively. Finding a reliable, year-round water source is critical for community safety, property value, and fire protection,.

Water Options – Note: These are non-binding estimates only based on prior purchases, discussions with contractors, LRE's 2025 Reserve Study, and feasibility studies.

- **Wanship Cottages:** As discussed in the November and December monthly board meeting, this option is no longer viable due to unknown well output, outdated or unavailable data, and uncertain pump tests and well integrity. In addition, the water committee found the well was initially drilled in 1987 for irrigation purposes only, not for drinking water.
- **Wells:** Meeting annual water demand will require drilling *at least* 2 new wells, costing about \$3,000,000. Installing extra piping to the mid-mountain pump house would add around \$1,200,000. Additional costs will include maintaining the current system, possibly adding a storage tank at the base of the mountain, replacing pumps, installing more fire hydrants and replacing current distribution lines at approximately \$5,100,000 per our current reserve study. This solution is not suitable for year-round water for all our members until fully constructed, with no guarantee of proper yields. No additional water meters would be issued until we have 270 gpm in combined well yields. In addition, in the Loughlin Well Study conducted prior to drilling Well #3, it clearly states, "We selected 53 wells, including LRE Well #1 and Well #2. Well depths range from 15 to 980 feet with most wells being less than about 600 feet. Reported yields from the wells range from 0 to 1250 gpm with most of the yield being 50 gpm or less. Only six well reported yields of 100 gpm or greater. Wells completed in the Kelvin Formation (which is where LRE is located) generally have yields that are 50 gpm or less." (See page 5 of the Loughlin Well Study.)
- **Mountain Regional Water (MRW):** MRW would be completed in two phases. Phase 1 connects a water source to our community and supplies water to our current holding tank using existing methods from June to December; water meters can also be issued. This phase is estimated to cost \$7,500,000,. Phase 2 builds a new water infrastructure meeting Utah and Summit County requirements, with costs around \$14,000,000, payable over time and requiring a monthly MRW bill.

Advantages and Disadvantages

There are advantages and disadvantages to both options. This is not an all-inclusive list, and we encourage input and feedback during our upcoming water education meeting.

OUR SHARED WATER WELL	
Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independence – Privately Owned • Environmental Friendliness • Emergency Preparedness • Upfront Costs Drilling Costs are Less Expensive • _____ • _____ • _____ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant Reduction in Output • Not Able to Issue Water Meters to ALL Members until we yield 269 gpm • Full Ownership requires a Qualified Water Operator • Costly Upkeep and Repairs • No Additional Real Estate to Drill Safely • Contamination Risk • Monthly Treatment and Testing • Unpleasant Tastes and Odors • Requires Constant Electricity • Limited Supply • Wells Can Dry Up • Drilling into an Existing Aquifer may Reduce Current Production Rate • Currently Not a Year-Round System • May require additional Water Storage Tanks • Significant Reduction in Output • Hard Water • Construction Woes
A MANAGED WATER SYSTEM	
Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to Issue Water Meters after Water Source is Implemented • Reliable Water Source • Moving Towards Year-Round Water • Year-Round Water Means Fire Hydrants are Operable at all Times • Phase 1 Study Completed • Insurance Confidence • No Water Operator or 3rd Party is Required • Public Health Requirements • Strict Standards • Disease Prevention • Improved Hygiene • Low Maintenance • Reducing Personal Costs for Treatment and Bottled Watered • Water Quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Costs are High • Monthly Bills rather than Annual Assessment/Dues • Possible Service Interruptions • Limited Control • Chemicals to Treat Water • Construction Woes • _____ • _____ • _____

Water Committee Members:

Denise Holding, Chair
 Rosemary Carroll, Co-Chair
 Skyler Kershner, Committee Member
 Paul Strader, Committee Member
 Wendee Aguilar, Committee Member
 Candy Rust, Committee Member

deniseholding@gmail.com
rpcenergy@gmail.com
skyler.kershnerlre@gmail.com
paul.strader.lre@gmail.com
wendddble@gmail.com
candacerust@gmail.com