

Timpanogos Special Service District
Administrative Board Retreat Minutes
6400 North 5050 West Utah County, Utah

APPROVED

September 18, 2025

8:00 a.m.

Conference Room

Board Members:

Present: Sullivan Love (Chair) David Bunker Dave Norman
Joel Thompson Neal Winterton Richard Nielson
Mark Christensen Blaine Thomas *Chandler Goodwin (Vice Chair)

Electronic: Mack Straw

Excused: Brian Braithwaite Brent Rummeler

District Staff: Richard Mickelsen, District Manager Shannon Hansen, Administrative Manager
Sam Grimes, Treatment Manager David Barlow, District Engineer
Matt Ferguson, Finance Director Devin Langford, Chief Technical Director
Addison Winn, Risk Manager Danette Smith, Board Secretary
Brian Selck, Lab Director Wootton Redmond, Operations Supervisor
Megan Pope, Compliance Specialist

Others: Trevor Lindley, Brown and Caldwell Brandon Wyatt, Bowen Collins & Associates
Ryan Bench, Carollo Engineers Kasey Chesnut, Horrocks Engineers
Brad Rasmussen, Aqua Engineers Wade Stinson, Aqua Engineers
Christian Logan, Aqua Engineers Dave Epstein, Jacobs Engineering
Susan Spore, Brown and Caldwell Ryan Dooley, Brown and Caldwell
Mark Hansen, Brown and Caldwell Gary Vance, JUB Engineers
Mark Bell, Hayes Godfrey Bell PC J. Mason Kjar, Fabian VanCott
Mark Anderson, Zions Public Finance Jon Schutz, Cohne Kinghorn, PC
Darrell Child, Olympus Insurance

A. Call to Order - Sullivan Love, Board Chair 8:02 a.m.

1. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

2. Safety Report - Addison Winn

Addison said an NCCI experience modifier (E-mod) is a factor used in workers compensation premiums. It is one of the factors that employers have the most control over in keeping their insurance premiums low. An E-mod reflects an organization's claims history compared to other organizations in the same industry. An E-mod above 1 means claims are worse than compared to others and an E-mod below 1 means they are better. In 2020 the District's E-mod was 1 and for 2024-2025 it is .7, which has resulted in accumulative savings over \$42,000. Addison said she has requested an increase in safety training, equipment, and supplies. The top safety focus is District employee's safety while we have active construction zones on site. This includes training employees in working near active construction zones, providing high vis wear and equipment to mark worksite zones and hazards. The District has three safety events each year. The events are engaging and help all staff be a part of the safety culture. Another safety focus is strengthening the emergency response program plan, so employees know what to do in critical situations. After reviewing the last five years of claims data, Addison would like to improve training on strains and situational awareness. It will also be beneficial to provide short training outlines for supervisors to review quickly with their team at the beginning of the week.

1 i. Board Safety Training

2 Darrell Child, Olympus Insurance, gave a report on avoiding public officials' errors and omissions claims. Darrell
3 said over the last 20-30 years there has been an upward trend in public officials' liability claims, and greater
4 accountability held against public officials. Darrell said, as board members, you are held to higher standard of
5 accountability and there is potential that you can see more active engagement challenges and potentially claims or
6 litigation. Board members are protected through the overall insurance planning and there is coverage to protect our
7 interests in the decisions we make. There is the possibility of defense cost as part of the overall coverage when
8 engaged in a public official's error and emissions dispute. The biggest share of costs associated with that become
9 legal. The most common types of claims that occur against public officials are failure to follow a prescribed duty,
10 undisclosed conflicts of interest, overreaching organization authority or overreaching individual authority. Darrell
11 said they have seen an increase in personal injury to others claims against public officials. Board members continue
12 to follow the model standard of conduct, with a standard of integrity in all transactions, clarity, and transparency and
13 civil discourse. As an organization, we should remind ourselves that all the training we do for respect in the workplace
14 applies to board members too.

15
16 3. Overview

17 i. Manager's Report

18 1. Year in review

19 Rich said there are multiple resources he uses to guide the District: 2020 Master Plan, 2025 Asset Management,
20 Compensation Policy, Cash Reserve Policy, 2026 CIP Budget Worksheet (250918), 2024 TSSD Staffing Plan,
21 TSSD Website, 2023 Zions User Rate Study, 2025 Budget Book, and 2025 TSSD Project Update. Rich said as we
22 go through this board retreat, we essentially go down the list on the CIP Budget worksheet which shows years
23 2020-2029 for each CIP and the approximate cost spent each year, Rich said his intent is as we go through the
24 retreat we actually go down this list and the engineers presentations should be pretty close to following each line
25 item. Rich said the updated costs are now \$1.432 billion; \$528 million for collections projects and \$904 million for
26 treatment projects. Rich said can see how those costs have escalated over the past five years. The major projects for
27 the treatment side are Package A - Thermal Dryer, Package B - Tertiary Filter Building, UV Disinfection, Outfall
28 upgrade, and Package C - Anaerobic Digesters. You can see those costs increase as we get into construction and
29 they will continue to increase. Rich showed a video:

30 <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1q2Ns2kx-znqWSgANzfEOzZ3GYcWGJGgS?usp=sharing>

31 Plant Compliance: Influent flows are consistently above 20mgd. Our ammonia numbers are within compliance,
32 and we are meeting the rule of the phosphorus removal as we are still at about .7 mg/L YTD average.

33 City Meters: The cost of billing is from the flow \$/1000 gallons, BOD \$/lbs., and TSS \$/lbs. We will be looking
34 at those metered flows more closely. Typically, staff look at that flow independently and then come together to go
35 forward. We will now meet as a group to put more scrutiny into those flows and make sure to bring up any
36 concerns the cities have had so everybody is aware, and we can address those.

37 TSSD moving to TSD: We will be moving to a local district, where we will be a special district and drop the
38 service part of that name. We are waiting for the transfer of property before we make that change. The
39 Administration Committee has gone through the By-Laws, and the rest of the Board can start reviewing those so
40 they can be adopted when we move to that new form of government.

41 Biosolids: We have talked about having a long-term plan as a board. We need to have a 50-100-year plan.
42 Currently we take all our biosolids to the landfill and with package A we are going to have a thermal dryer that will
43 dry those solids so that we will have less trucks on the road. Our intent is to land apply where applicable. The
44 CVWRF manager presented at the state legislature on the 16th. He gave this presentation to the Natural Resources,
45 Agriculture and Environmental Interim Committee to get the state and federal lands involved within the state of
46 Utah where we can do these land applications. Right now, several large facilities take their biosolids to Weber
47 County where they land apply and they have received notice that they are no longer going to be able to do that.
48 With WWTPs across the Wasatch Front and Heber Valley, we need about 50,000-70,000 acres of dry range land
49 for biosolids land application. We are looking at those types of land and need state and federal support to be able to
50 use such a large piece of land. One concern by legislators is whether PFOS/PFOA is going to be a problem. Rich
51 said it is a concern. We have been testing our biosolids for years and they are consistently below the threshold. Rich
52 continues to pursue that our biosolids be land applied. Rich received notice last night that the EPA will back, and
53 support entities (WWTPs) that are not the generators of the PFOS/PFOA, but who must deal with the outfall from
54 that. So, the federal government is going to support the backing for us to do land application of biosolids. Rich
55 thinks we are on the right path here with the PCAD system, renewable gas, and the dryers.

1 Odor control: At last year's retreat we had public comment on odor control and Rich said we have taken action
2 on that. Rich still follows the 2020 odor control study done by Jacobs Engineering and how we are trying to control
3 those odor sources. There are items in package A and Package C with long term odor control solutions. This last
4 year the board approved two different trailer purchases (2ea.) to help us keep the biosolids off the ground, which
5 has been significant in helping us control odors. We are also capping other smaller sources of odors, and we have
6 purchased and connected the odor control systems. We still need to connect the electricity and get the media in
7 there to control those odors, so we are still working on those. Rich said Brown and Caldwell has recently been
8 given us a Technical Memorandum enlightening us about what we can do for odor control in the near future. Rich
9 will share that with the board later.

10 Limno Corrals: We continue to do the Limno Corrals. We finished the big study last year, but we continue to put
11 those corrals out into the lake. It has been rewarding to continue testing that we can incorporate with our laboratory
12 testing in our annual budget. Rich has a draft report on that limno corral study and will put the final report in for
13 next month's board meeting. We will keep doing our ongoing basic monitoring. Rich anticipates multiple journal
14 articles as they do the analysis on combined results 2020-2024 and functionality traits and have a holistic approach
15 for restoration of the lake.

16 Reuse: Package B has multiple aspects of reuse. The tertiary filter building will make the water reusable for type
17 1 reuse. We continue to pursue the Federal Bureau of Reclamation Act Title 16, which is upwards of \$20 million or
18 more. We are in year two of when we should have been qualified but they have had some staff retire, which is
19 slowing down the review process. Rich will continue to pursue that. If we can help the lake by reducing the load of
20 nutrients going into the lake that would be helpful and doing reuse would be one way to do that.

21 Staffing: Rich said we have the 2025 staffing plan, and we hired a CFO, CTO, 2 inspectors, 1 operator and 1
22 part time lab technician.

23 ITC Update: Deloitte is the finance tax advisor that we are using on the tax rebate for package C. They have
24 been in talks to do three phases of work. The first is to determine eligibility. They have worked through that
25 documentation and are collaborating with the engineers and contractors to get that documentation in place. Rich has
26 put an estimated \$85 million refund. They gave us a number, but Rich is having them update as they did not put in
27 the primary clarifier filters. We will get an updated number that will be more accurate in the future. Ongoing
28 documentation is the second phase. They will be looking at contractors' information that we receive in monthly pay
29 requests. They will look at that quarterly to make sure we are up to date. The third phase is a final report that they
30 will prepare and have ready for submittal. Deloitte has told us we need to meet the requirements of starting by 2024
31 and need to complete the project by 2028. If we do not complete the project by 2028, we will need to have
32 continual construction and show we are injecting gas back into the grid by 2029. We are on task to meet that
33 timeline and should get our full 40% credit.

34 Asset Management: Rich said Brown and Caldwell completed the 2025 asset management. That report has four
35 different technical memos that go along with it in summary. Our replacement cost is \$391 million and that is going
36 to provide information for our CFP, which will hopefully be coming out by the end of the year. That will move our
37 CFP to 2035 and give us the next ten years to be able to capture impact fees and let us focus on where the facility is
38 going.

39 District Manager Outside Influence: Rich said we continue to do impact fee training with member cities where
40 we learn from them, and they learn from us. Hopefully, we have resolved issues over the last three years of training.
41 Rich continues to be a part of the Utah Lake Water Shed Council. We are now in year two of this. Rich also
42 continues to participate in the ULWQS Steering Committee. That is especially useful as we provide information
43 and direction on what our permit parameters are going to be for TSSD. Rich said he still teaches at UVU in the
44 spring, and the District did hire one of the students from the first year (Megan Pope).

45 * Chandler Goodwin arrived. 8:55 a.m.

46 Administration Asks: To prove our water rights, fleet 2026, employee staffing, and project specific-day
47 allocations.

48 Second Well: Rich said we have well here and have water rights. We need to take action, so we do not lose our
49 current over 300-acre feet of water rights. We have well #3 that we have been doing a study on and JUB will give
50 an update later. Essentially we have three options - rehabilitate well #3 and send the water to the dewatering
51 building for \$805,000, rehabilitate well #3 and send the water to tertiary filter building which will be sent through
52 the pump system back for utility water for \$1,095,000, or the third option is to provide a second well source and
53 send that water to the dewatering building for \$2,745,000. Rich put \$2.7 million in the CIP spreadsheet but the
54 board can discuss and choose what option they want. Rich can update that number on the spreadsheet with the

1 Board's choice. We have already proven half of those water rights with our XP water study that we did on the
2 ponds. We need to be able to prove the other half. If we use that water as part of our process, then we can use the
3 water as reuse water for the wetlands and then dedicate it for the improvement of the wetlands to get a better ratio.
4 Dave Epstein will discuss that in package D. We do not have enough wetlands mitigated to be able to do all the
5 projects in the 40-year span that we have going forward. Our intent is to reuse the water in at least the dewatering
6 process. When we do the BHPS we will be using almost a half million gpd in water and we do not want to pull that
7 from the city as potable water. We want to send that water back to reuse it for the cleaning of the rags and what is
8 needed for that building. We will reuse that water to relieve the pressure on the city. Rich said if we go with option
9 3 - provide a second source well, we will keep well #3 in operation; it will just be at a different level.

10 Fleet 2026: Operations have multiple smaller asks for \$65,000 for mules to get around, and two trailers.
11 The collections department ask is \$800,000. They currently have two tv trucks to televise the lines after they are
12 cleaned. That includes the truck, the box, the camera system, the tracker to pull the camera back and forth and
13 monitoring. This camera equipment was purchased in 1993 and is outdated. Rich showed the mileage of lines
14 televised and it has decreased over the years as some of the software has not been able to keep up with the outdated
15 camera and software. We have also been short staff but have hired and are now up to full staff again. We would like
16 to purchase 2 new gas trucks. The total cost on that is \$800,000. Mark Christensen asked if we knew the ROI; if
17 we were to hire a company to do that for us would that be a cheaper solution long term? Rich said he did not look to
18 see those costs, and he could look at that before the next meeting. Neal Winterton said he can attest to dismal
19 quality as it has been very frustrating to review the images and not see what is going on. Mark asked if Rich would
20 also propose at what point it would make sense to replace the vehicles as well, so we have built into our
21 replacement schedule. Rich said Sam has been using the manager plus system in the progression for each of those.
22 Neal said there are things that do not show up when you do a ROI analysis. The cleaning schedule is something that
23 we are in control of and we need to televise the pipes right after or in conjunction with the cleaning. Those other
24 companies are not available and cannot follow the schedule we have. Mark said it is not with the intent of going
25 away from it, it is just to say we have looked at it and feel that it is a good financial investment.

26 Project Specific Day Allocation: When a project comes forth, we will now have allocations for dollar amounts
27 on those and will now submit day allocation by projects. Some projects will have more than others and when it
28 comes to the board you can make comments of approval or not on those recommended day allocations.
29

30 2. Asset Management

31 Rich said Sam would talk about this in more detail. The asset management report from Brown and Caldwell
32 shows by year. The AWWA has a 3% guidance on CIP replacement cost which would be about \$11.7 million, and
33 we averaged about \$2.7 million just to give an indication of how we compare to a national evaluation of the asset
34 management program.

35 ii. Operations/Maintenance Report - Sam Grimes

36 1. Year in review

37 Sam said in 2018 Brown and Caldwell did phase 1 of our asset management plan. The most significant thing to
38 come out of that was the Master Plan, and many of those things in the master plan are in progress. Another
39 substantial effort was to adopt and implement a computerized maintenance management system (CMMS). We have
40 done that and onboarded all our assets. We were around 300 assets at that point. Forward to 2025, Brown and
41 Caldwell just finished the phase 2 asset management plan. They went through and did condition assessments ,
42 reviewed our CMMS for usability and effectiveness, did a gap analysis, and gave us a refurbish and replacement
43 projection. They started with the condition assessment, and they developed this risk matrix and analyzed all our
44 assets. From that they were able to give us values on refurbish intervals and replacement. We now have useful life
45 and replacement costs to go with all these assets. Staff are now integrating this data back into our CMMS. As of
46 right now, the District has 882 active assets in the CMMS. We do not record data on all of them, but all the critical
47 equipment is being looked at regularly. Staff are adding critical data, logging maintenance intervals, and recording
48 all of this per asset, including wages. We have looked at manufacture recommended service intervals and major
49 rebuilds and have created preventative maintenance plans. We also do daily inspections, with visual inspections
50 often multiple times a day and separate round where we record critical data for the equipment. This data goes into
51 the asset and gives us better picture of the actual health of the asset.

52 Our replacement cost plant wide is around \$360-\$370 million. The AWWA recommends 3% of that should be
53 your O & M cost. We have identified significant efforts that will be required based on the age of the equipment.

1 Some of those we will need to look at to see if they are too big for treatment staff and need to be incorporated into a
2 capital project. Sam said our budgets may go up or down and we have put significant effort into our analysis and
3 feel comfortable. We are somewhere around 0.7% rather than 3% and we feel good about that. Mark Christensen
4 said as we are looking out over a long period of time, there should be an increase in inflation, and we should keep
5 an eye on that.

6 Sam said Rich talked about our fleet purchase request. Sam said he has fleet operations and maintenance
7 requests. The overall budget is over 20% increase for a good reason, we have some increased regulations on above
8 ground petroleum storage tanks and increased fleet, so we have planned accordingly.

9
10 4. Engineer Updates (Update/2026 Ask)

11 i. JUB (Well update)

12 Gary Vance, JUB Engineers, is working on a project with the District to help utilize and protect their existing
13 water rights. February 2026 is when they will need to demonstrate beneficial use of the water or at least show they
14 are making good progress towards that. The purpose is to not only use your water rights but to provide higher
15 quality well water to areas around the plant that are sensitive to clogging and corrosion. They completed a well
16 feasibility study and met with the District. The decision was made to evaluate the well to figure out its condition.
17 That is currently underway. Gary said they worked with Widdison to evaluate the condition and pumping capacity
18 of the well. If all looks good with well #3, we would move forward and provide that supplement water at the
19 dewatering building. By next week, they should know what that well can produce using the test pump. The District
20 has 336 AF/year of water rights available, which equate to about 208 gpm if you are running 24/7. The dewatering
21 building demand is about 800 gpm and it runs about 50 hours/week which is 383 AF/year. Well #3 will only get
22 about 300 gpm. They will know next week and if it is tied to the dewatering building that is only 144 AF/year so
23 not even close to utilizing your water right. It could run to the tertiary filter building, the utility water or wetlands
24 continuously and you could satisfy your water rights if you run continuously. If you drill a new well, it needs to be
25 within 150ft of the existing well. The beauty of drilling a new well is you go down deeper into the aquifer, and you
26 could get about 800 gpm. That would go straight to the dewatering building, you get the advantage of clean water
27 and use your full water rights.

28 Gary said they will have pump results next week and if they are good, they could equip it with vertical line shaft
29 pumps. That would be about \$800,000. Alternatively, you could consider drilling a new well and getting a
30 dedicated supply of water to the dewatering building at a higher cost. You would need to run it continuously to
31 satisfy your water right. Richard asked if the \$2.8million option includes a new building, Gary said yes. Rich said
32 option 3 is in the budget at \$2.8 million and that will be up for approval next month. So, if the board wants to
33 change it then it can be brought up at next meeting. Chandler said option 1 does not fully satisfy the water right
34 proof and option 3 does. Rich said for us to maintain our water rights we need to put that water somewhere to hold
35 it so we can use it during the hours of operation. Rich said we are getting our potable water from American Fork
36 right now and we do not want to have the two different systems connecting. Our current water source for the
37 dewatering building is raw wastewater as it is processed. Mark asked if option 3 would provide an addition to the
38 redundancy and resilience of that supply. Rich said the main thing it does is let us have water rights and another
39 part of this is the wetland mitigation. The reason we are not getting as good of a credit is because our wetlands
40 need water and there is no guarantee it is going there. It is Rich's understanding that we can take this and use it in
41 our process; like at the new BHPS we will be using a significant amount of water in that process. With pkg B, we
42 have put in utility pumps and are cleaning the water better with tertiary filters. That water is going to get pumped
43 back up to the plant to be able to use at our headworks and the BHPS. So that is where we can use more of this
44 water. And then as we use our water and do that reuse inside for our process and as it goes out of the plant, we can
45 dedicate portions of that to wetlands to get a better ratio of the wetland mitigation.

46 ii. Bowen & Collins

47 1. Westside Collections Projects

- 48 a. LS-1: Boat Harbor Pump Station
- 49 b. CL-N2: 66-inch Lakeside Interceptor
- 50 c. CL-N4: Boat Harbor Force Mains

51 Brandon Wyatt said these westside collections projects are an effort to address capacity issues between Lehi
52 Center Street and the treatment plant along the north shore of Utah Lake. The pipeline and pump station are
53 bringing in flows from American Fork, Lehi, Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain. The center piece of these
54 projects is the new BHPS, located to southeast of the current BHLS and adjacent to the American Fork Boat Harbor

1 and Marina. The Lakeside interceptor is coming into the BHPS and the size of that pipeline is 78-inch. The Boat
2 Harbor force mains are coming out of the BHPs and over to the treatment plant. The pump station is going to be
3 fitted to 57 mgd, and the force mains will be dual barreled 54-inch HDPE pipes or similar. The BHPS will be
4 comprised of screenings and grit structure pump station, a chemical and generator building. Brandon said with
5 planning and developing they have been able to combine the grit removal structure and the screening structure into
6 a single building. The goal is to treat all the water coming into the pump station, removing all the floatable solids,
7 grit and then pumping the effluent to the treatment plant directly to the primary filtration building being planned
8 here at the plant. This project meets needs of expanding capacity in the collection system but also foregoing future
9 expansion that needs to take place at the treatment plant.

10 There is a significant effort in wetlands permitting, annexation with American Fork City and site plan approvals.
11 The Lakeside interceptor project pipeline extends from Lehi Center Street to the new BHPS crossing some of the
12 choicest land in Utah County, with significant wetlands. Brandon said they expect there will be many challenges as
13 we do this, with many easements across that project. There will be an access road on top of this pipeline so District
14 staff can get in there and maintain that. There will be new meters on the 78-inch and existing 60-inch line to
15 facilitate monitoring of the flows coming into the system. They are moving on right of way design and property
16 acquisition relative to new easements that are required. They will be pre-qualifying contractors relative to this
17 project and working with Jacobs on wetlands permitting and on DWQ permitting. There is also significant
18 coordination going on with American Fork City and Lehi City as we try to coordinate the work we are doing with
19 some of the road work they are planning in those areas.

20 1. CL-R1: Replace and Upsize Lehi/American Fork Outfall

21 This project has been under construction and is wrapping up. This took the existing 42" pipe to 54" that
22 extended from 570 West American Fork all the way into the treatment plant. The work is mostly complete on the
23 upper side. There are some punch list items and still active work zones in the lower areas. In order to make a new
24 connection to the existing headworks, there had to be some structural modifications made to that building, and this
25 is why the existing headworks are under bypass. There is a coating being painted on the new headworks structure to
26 protect from hydrogen sulfide related corrosion going forward. They have to finish the headworks structure and
27 then there is about 300 ft of pipe that needs to be put in between headworks and 1500 south. All that work is
28 expected to be completed this year. The only ask anticipated on this project is to extend the construction schedule
29 from September to November. There is anticipated additional engineering costs due to that extended schedule.

30 2. LS-3: Dry Creek Lift Station Improvements

31 This lift station is wedged into the right of way of SR-92. It was built around 2002 by the developers of the
32 Suncrest development. It was installed with 10 hp pumps and the District has increased those pumps to 25 hp
33 pumps over the years. It is time to upsize them one more time. We will be replacing three - 25 hp pumps with four -
34 40 hp pumps, reworking the piping inside, and adding a structure to house some new electrical equipment. The
35 project will basically be a refurbishment of the lift station, mechanical and electrical. We anticipate that this
36 expansion will get to build out if growth projections continue as they are. There are no planned changes to the
37 piping outside of the lift station. This covers all the growth that is taking place upstream of the lift station which
38 serves Suncrest, Highland, Draper (South Valley Sewer District) and some new work coming in from Lehi. The
39 30% design is complete and under review and we have some coordination to do with Rocky Mountain Power
40 relative to some nearby power lines. We are looking at design and then going into construction next year. The
41 request will be to include CMS for engineering and notice of award for construction.

42 3. SR-1: Structural Rehab of 60-inch RCP (Boat Harbor to TSSD Plant)

43 This project has been in the CFP for many years and has been batted around. This pipeline connects the existing
44 BHLS to the treatment plant. It is a 60" pipe that was built around 1998 when the lift station was built. The lift
45 station had a significant hydrogen sulfide problem and was replaced around 2009. Part of that corrosion extended
46 into this pipeline and in 2009 at least three or four sections of this pipe were lined with a CIPP liner. In 2021 the
47 District asked to look at this pipeline again and see the condition. It was noted that sections of pipe, which had not
48 been previously lined, did have some corrosion. At that time, it was minimal with no exposed rebar, but it was
49 evident some corrosion had taken place. Brandon said we knew that this line was going to be abandoned as part of
50 the new BHPS project, so there was hesitation at the time to put significant effort into rehabbing that pipeline. The
51 recommendation in 2021 was to play it conservatively and keep an eye on it. Due to the construction taking place
52 with the Lehi/American Fork pipeline, they were right by there, and this pipeline was looked at again this summer.
53 There was significant corrosion continuing to take place, with exposed rebar in majority of the pipe and missing

1 rebar in several sections. Brandon said we do not think we are in danger of a collapse, but there is a significant
2 issue that needs to be addressed. The pipeline is still scheduled to be abandoned within the next three to five years,
3 depending on the progress of the BHPS. The recommendation is that the pipeline does need to have a lining.

4 Brandon said there was concern with the American Fork Outfall construction being done right by this that
5 maybe we better get this done right away. We reached out to Sundt Construction to get a cost for change order
6 pricing and to add that to their project. Those costs came back, and, in the meantime, they finished their work next
7 to that pipeline. Looking at it and knowing it was a change order cost, we didn't really feel we had a competitive
8 price. The right way to do this is to go with a stand-alone project and hopefully get a better price. Brandon said the
9 estimated price to line that pipe would be \$7-\$10 million. Mark Christensen asked if the board is being asked to
10 spend \$7-\$10 million for an additional 3 years needed. Brandon said yes. That project that was intended to be done
11 several years ago, and we have tried to extend the life of that pipeline, but it doesn't look like it is going to make it.
12 This has been in the CFP since 2019. Rich said he tried to milk this project, but with that first cage gone, it is not
13 likely this pipe will last the 3-5 years needed. The two force mains will replace this pipe. The board discussed other
14 alternatives. Brandon said they will sharpen their pencils and make sure they have explored all options.

15 5. AD-5: Capital Facility Plan 2025

16 This has been in the budget, and they are working on this 2025 CFP update. It includes a new collections system
17 model for existing and future conditions, new flow projections based on city growth projections and new capital
18 projects for both growth and maintenance in collections and the treatment plant. This will also include an IFFP,
19 IFA and results. That will be completed this year and next year we will be back to look at project costs and make
20 sure impact fees are keeping up.

21 iii. Horrocks

22 1. CL-R2: Replace and Upsize Alpine/Highland Outfall (North Segment)

23 Kasey Chesnut said Horrocks Engineering is working on the CL-R2 project. This replaces an 18" line with a 24"
24 line. It starts just south of SR-92 and extends down 6400 West all the way to 10400 North, a little to the east and
25 then south. They are currently at the 60% design phase. They have been meeting with Highland City and the
26 District to get their thoughts on plans. Next steps are 90% and final design coming soon with bidding early in 2026.
27 The public involvement phase is about to begin to make public aware of what is coming. Next year's requests are
28 to bid, award to the contractor and the construction management phase.

29 iv. General – Rich Mickelsen/David Barlow

30 1. EL-1: Power Quality (Switchgear/Generator)

31 2. EL-2: Plant Control System PLC Replacement

32 David Barlow said the EL-1 was our power quality and switchgear project. We completed that around May.
33 There was an addition to the existing generator building and added a switchgear for plant. In conjunction with that
34 project, Carollo is going to do a power quality study. As part of that project there was a replacement generator for
35 the BHLS. Another project is EL-2, which is going to be completed in the next few months or early next year.
36 There are also some security upgrades that are getting underway as part of EL-2.

37 v. Master Plan Phase I

38 Trevor Lindley said Brown and Caldwell are working on the Master Plan Phase 1/Resource and Recovery
39 projects. These are all the projects here at the plant site. These are in packages A, B/E, C and D.

40 Package A is the Dryer with Aqua Engineering. This will reduce hauling costs, and water weight to be hauled
41 off site and also improve odor management and make a nice Class A product. This is out to bid right now, and we
42 anticipate a construction contract towards the end of this year.

43 Pkg B has some of the Pkg D elements in it and is being done with Carollo Engineers. That is the outfall
44 improvements, filters and UV disinfection to ensure a good quality effluent going to Utah Lake. That is under
45 construction with Gerber Construction. Shoreline improvements, (wetlands improvements) are being done with
46 Jacobs Engineers and are folded into pkg B along with future packages.

47 Pkg C is led by Brown and Caldwell, and much of that is in design but some construction has started. This is the
48 renewable natural gas project, primary treatment and extensive odor control improvements.

49 Pkg E is with Carollo and in the early design phase. That is the side stream treatment, and they will be ready to
50 go to construction in 2026.

1 There is a construction management team working on these projects and all the different program partners make
2 a contribution to make sure construction goes according to what the District is paying for.
3

4 1. Package A/Biosolids Disposal Facility

5 Wade Stinson, Aqua Engineering, said they have completed design with Pkg A, and it is out to bid now. There
6 have been minor changes to the structure. There are two separate odor control systems. The biosolids will be
7 conveyed through the Huber dryer system and into the silo for storage. We are removing water from biosolids that
8 will substantially reduce the number of trucks that are hauled each week. It is projected to reduce that from 56
9 trucks a week down to about 8. That will reduce a lot of risks associated with hauling those solids. The product
10 being produced is of an exceptional quality for Class A, which reduces restrictions and allows for beneficial use.
11 With that we can utilize and market that product for its nutrient value, for soil amendments, fertilizers, and other
12 various aspects of use. We are projecting the end of October to receive the bids back and hope to have a contractor
13 on board by the end of the year.

14 The request for this is an amendment for additional \$305,000 due to the extension of how long it has taken to get
15 to this point. Wade said the CM ask is around \$3 million and the projected future Pkg A construction is about \$49
16 million above that which has already been spent for the Huber equipment. Mark Christensen asked the total price
17 on that. Wade said \$66 million, and the original cost was \$30 million. Mark asked what is driving up the large
18 change. Wade said most of this was started before the inflation so that is a lot of it, then just through the design
19 process the changes that have been made. Mark said he would like to get more detail on that at some point in the
20 future and asked Rich to make sure that makes sense because that seems a very large change to what we
21 anticipated. Rich said this is why we identify the cost of inflation and highlighted that at the beginning of this. It is
22 consistent with what is happening around other construction projects since 2020. Mark said the engineering cost
23 has gone up 50% as well and asked if we are paying substantively more based on the inflated costs of products. We
24 are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars in changes and contracts going up incrementally with that just
25 because of the cost of tariffs or whatever is added to the project. Mark does not think the cost of engineering
26 services has increased that much. Neal said direction should be to ask Rich and David Barlow to evaluate and see if
27 there is something that can be done because we had a \$20 million cost that is now \$76 million. As Mark is saying,
28 the engineering costs probably didn't go up 2.5 times and Neal thinks that is probably a fair statement. If we can
29 have the engineer quantify that, it would help us understand better. Mark said we are looking at a hyperinflated
30 market that is driving up costs. Susan Spore, Brown and Caldwell, said they charge the time that they are billed.
31 The projects are not tied to construction costs. It took a year to negotiate submittals and reviews with Huber, and
32 we also went with a more robust odor control system, but \$300,000 for an extra year of work is pennies on the
33 dollar compared to the increase in construction since Covid.

34 Wade said additionally with Pkg A, the District has acquired 48 acres of property in Elberta. The intent of that
35 property is to be used as a landing spot for distribution of these dried biosolids. With the nutrients that are located
36 in those biosolids being Class A, it is possible to land apply on irrigated and non-irrigated land. The idea with
37 Elberta is that it is close proximity to a lot of irrigated parcels and well as it is near a landfill that is already
38 contracted with the District. The intent on that property would be a potential use of long-term storage as well as a
39 distribution. With distribution, there would be a need for a shop for maintenance and distribution of that as well as
40 fire protection to prevent any catastrophic concerns. The District has been sampling the biosolids monthly to
41 determine what type of nutrients are available there in the event that we want to pursue a TSD nutrient label. That
42 would provide a minimum value for those nutrients to create a fertilizer label. Some of the benefits that are
43 included with this are really hard to market as it is not a slow-release fertilizer, but the carbon content of 35.4% is
44 very valuable for the agricultural world. Through efforts to get the property rezoned, comments about metals have
45 come up and the District is tracking those in addition to PFOS/PFOA. The District does see PFAS, but it is far
46 below the threshold of even the proposed and drinking water limits for PFAS. Wade said they are currently working
47 with the planning commission to get the language in line so the District can utilize that property as intended. If the
48 Elberta property were to be developed, the fees are estimated at \$300,000 for engineering design and approximately
49 \$155,000 for construction management and about \$2.6 million construction.

50 2. Package B/E

51 Ryan Bench, Carollo Engineers, said Pkg B includes secondary effluent pump station, tertiary filtration, UV
52 disinfection, and new outfall out to Utah Lake. It also includes a chemical building for chemical phosphorus
53 removal and sodium hypochlorite. All these structures are designed for a 2060 design build out peak hour flow. Pkg
54 B was bid last November, and the engineers estimate was \$143 million. The construction bid came in at \$123
55 million and was awarded to Gerber Construction. Activities taking place have been excavating, shoring, and auger

1 cast piles. It will be about 4 - 4.5 years of construction for this project. Design was finished under budget, and we
2 are on track with all budget numbers.

3 Package E is the side stream phosphorus and side stream nitrogen. We are combining these two processes and
4 putting them in one building and using existing tanks. Ryan said taking 15%-17% off your load coming into the
5 return flow is going to save bioreactor capacity in the future. At some point, you will need to build new bioreactors
6 and secondary clarifiers on phase 2, and you are looking at about \$20-\$30 million savings by doing this process
7 now. It improves dewatering 2% - 3% and then reduces yearly chemical cost. If you get low phosphorus limits, then
8 doing it biologically is the right way to treat that. Ryan said we have pre-selected equipment for side stream
9 phosphorus from EloVac and for side stream nitrogen it is a process called AnitaMox. They just finished 30%
10 design, and next steps will be to go from final design to bidding sometime in 2026-2027. Future scope items will be
11 construction costs for contractors, resident engineers, and construction management services.

12 3. Package C (PCAD)//TP-4/5 Secondary Clarifiers

13 Trevor Lindley said Brown and Caldwell is process lead on Pkg C with contractor Alder Construction. The
14 PCAD process will capture carbon, which is the energy producing part of the wastewater. That will be conditioned
15 in the thickening/straining building and then put it in the digesters to convert it to renewable natural gas (RNG).
16 The gas upgrading system will separate some impurities and get it ready to go to market.

17 MP-1.1 Primary Treatment - Back in March, the Board elected to go to make sure this is low odor risk by
18 having it in a covered building. It also reserves space for future south expansion because it is a low footprint
19 solution. It will be at the north end of the plant located by headworks, and IPS. These will receive all the flow from
20 the Boat Harbor Force Mains as well as the pump flow from your existing lift station. Trevor said they are moving
21 toward 30% design. They have procured cloth disk filters and are looking at some early ground improvements to
22 keep the schedule moving efficiently along.

23 MP1.2 Gravity Thickening - This is the conditioning step where we take the carbon and separating primary
24 filters and thicken it to put in the digesters. This building will be located near the digesters and will be fully
25 enclosed. The District selected a centrifuge technology to thicken this carbon before it goes in the digesters. It is
26 low polymer use and allows you to control your spin, which reduces your reliance and polymer. It will have a
27 tunnel on one end to connect to the digester complex and the boilers keep the digesters at the right temperature.
28 This has been optimized for multi-purpose. This is nearing 30% design, with the addition of the gravity thickening
29 facility approved in March.

30 MP-1.3 Anaerobic Digester Complex - Susan Spore, Brown and Caldwell, said they have finished the design.
31 The District procured the equipment, and Alder is doing pricing for now. Next steps are to continue construction.

32 MP-1.6 Gas Upgrading – Susan said some of the equipment has been procured and the waste gas burners are on
33 site at the south end of the plant. A Partial notice to fabricate was issued for both Quadrogen and Varec so we
34 could have two pathways for significant construction start and we hit the groundbreaking. Next steps will be 60%
35 design in late October, and we anticipate being ready for Alder to price around the first of the year. Susan said on
36 RNG and RIN pricing, the market has been a little depressed and volatile but at the end of the day you will still
37 make five times more selling gas out on the grid than what you would be buying from Enbridge. We are making
38 these into smaller packages called GMPs, and the contractors bid at 90%-100% so that is what you are paying. We
39 did this in order to maintain and hit the construction start for IRA, also to maintain continuous construction and
40 expedite construction schedules. We had the groundbreaking celebration on December 2, 2024, so we beat the
41 required construction date by almost a month. Susan reported the progress on the digesters complex. There was a
42 change order which initially came in at \$3 million but they worked with Alder and subcontractors to reduce that
43 change order to about \$1.3 million after final numbers come in.

44 Break

45 B. Public Hearing for Impact Fee Enactment 11:00 a.m.

46 **Blaine Thomas made a motion to go into a Public Hearing. David Bunker seconded the motion. Sullivan**
47 **Love, Chair, took a roll call vote. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen,**
48 **Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and**
49 **Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” – None. The motion passed with a unanimous vote. 11:01 a.m.**
50

51 Rich Mickelsen said the board had the Technical Memorandum Amendment to the IFFP from Bowen and
52 Collins that has the actual cost update on the projects. These updated costs are from the engineers on different
53 projects. We are not changing any methodology; we are just updating the costs of the projects. Also, Zions Public

1 Finance did the IFA and incorporated those costs then updated the Impact Fees in this report. Public is welcome to
2 make any comments on this.

3 There was no public comment.
4

5 **Richard Nielson made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Blaine Thomas seconded the motion.**
6 **Sullivan Love, Chair, took a roll call vote. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark**
7 **Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal**
8 **Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” – None. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.**
9 **11:05 a.m.**

10
11 Package C (PCAD) (cont.) - Susan said a lot of the downstream processes are in construction. The primary
12 treatment, gravity thickening is close to 30% design. Future scope items will be additional design amendments,
13 doing GMP's through the GMGC contract for Alder and will continue with pkg C construction services for
14 engineering. In October 2025, some of the scope updates in the amendment will be submitted in an engineering
15 task order. Some of these are district directed changes, some come from building code reviews and also utility
16 sequencing and coordination among packages A,B,C and E. Susan said they have done some value engineering
17 which is saving in construction costs and adding more odor control and coordination among packages. The board
18 should expect an engineering amendment this fall. Alder is getting pricing for the balance of the digester complex
19 and Construction services will be done at the same time. Susan said they figured it would be more fiscally
20 responsible to submit the engineering services by GMP as they have much better idea of the scope of submittals and
21 can be mindful of ratepayers. Mark Christensen asked if the direct engineering costs for this are \$9 million; \$2
22 million in future engineering amendment and \$7 million in future resident engineering? Susan said yes, that
23 includes time and materials. They will be starting the digester complex construction in January and expect
24 substantial completion in April 2029, so that is 3.5 years of submittal review requests. If the money is not spent it is
25 credited back. Mark asked Rich to follow up on those costs. For 2026 they expect the bid package to be ready for
26 gas upgrading and later next year will be the thickening and straining, primary treatment and resident engineering
27 packages specific to those GMPs. At the end of all the packages, it is more efficient to do one site restoration
28 instead of piece meal, it will all get taken care of at the end.

29 TP-4/5 – Clarifiers – Susan said these are fifty years old and at the end of their service life. By rehabbing them
30 you get extra life out of them. The District went ahead and purchased the diffusers from EDI. They are generating
31 shop drawings and will produce 5-10 drawings to hand over to the contractor.

32 4. Package D

33 Dave Epstein, Jacobs Engineering, said pkg D interacts and supports all the other packages. This is to achieve
34 the goals of: facilitate expansion, meet regulatory requirements, enhance, preserve, and connect Utah Lake
35 Wetlands and wildlife habitat. Also to build partnerships with other agencies to facilitate development of the Utah
36 lake Shoreline Trail. Task Order 1 is complete which included TSSD wetland delineation, and conceptual
37 mitigation planning. Task Order 2 is complete which included CL-N2 wetland delineation, pkg B permitting, initial
38 trail design, conceptual advanced mitigation planning and submitted that to the USACE. Jacobs is currently
39 working on Task Order 3 which includes: continuing mitigation and trail engineering design, pkg B planting and
40 construction, CL-N2/pump Station permitting. David said their work involves a lot of different efforts and permits
41 and engaging with a lot of different agencies, partner engineers and stakeholders. They are working on advanced
42 mitigation and parcels adjacent to the UTA railway to the east and then to the west at AF Boat Harbor. They are
43 thinking big and long term and trying to plan for and get ahead of mitigation needs for impact to wetlands due to
44 these expansion projects. The shoreline trail, which is a collaboration with Utah County, is going to connect the
45 Lindon Marina to AF Boat Harbor. There are some Utah county lands that have been incorporated into the
46 mitigation area. We are able to use those lands as part of the advanced mitigation plan and are attempting to partner
47 with the state to utilize additional lands for mitigation.

48 The mitigation area for Pkg B is adjacent to the former chlorination ponds where construction is taking place.
49 Permits are in place, and they continue to coordinate with the USACE. We are planting now, and there will be more
50 planting later this month and, in the fall of 2026, and then there will be a five-year monitoring period to ensure
51 success of the project. We have about a 1:5 mitigation ratio. We have good relationship with USACE and are
52 working with them to continue to get good ratios as we permit future projects. The mitigation area was highly
53 invaded by phragmites, Russian Olive and mostly noxious and non-native weeds. The District has done a ton of
54 work to remove the Russian Olive and there has been a lot of treatment of phragmites in collaboration with the
55 State and County. The first projects that will dip into that advanced mitigation area will be CL-N2 and the BHPS.

1 Currently we have about 80 acres of land to be used in mitigation and are anticipating needing another about 63
2 acres for these two projects. They have completed 60% design on the shoreline trail going from the Lindon Marina
3 over to about pkg B mitigation area. There is 30% design in progress for TSSD to the AF Boat Harbor. They are
4 hoping to permit and then construct as much of that as possible at the same time. Dave said they are working with
5 the County, and they are planning on leading the procurement and construction of the project. The future scope and
6 ask is related to the actual construction of the advanced mitigation areas for CL-N2 and BHPS impacts. Also,
7 involvement in planting and procurement of those plants, construction oversight and permitting support.

8 **C. Approval of Minutes**

- 9 1. Approval of the meeting minutes from August 21, 2025 Administrative Board Meeting.

10 **Chandler Goodwin made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2025 Board Meeting.**
11 **Blaine Thomas seconded the motion. Sullivan Love, Chair took a roll call vote. Those voting “Aye” -**
12 **Sullivan Love, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Mark Christensen, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Dave**
13 **Norman, Chandler Goodwin and Mack Straw. Those voting “Nay” – None. Neal Winterton abstained**
14 **from voting. The motion passed.**
15

16 **D. Consent Calendar**

- 17 1. TSSD Check Register
18 2. CL-N1 – 66-inch Parallel Westside Interceptor
19 i. Change Order #7 (\$385,335.07)
20 ii. Sundt pay Request #33 (\$1,060,800.65) plus interest (\$9,176.10). Final payment (includes
21 Change Order #7 costs)
22 3. CL-R1 – Replace and Upsize Lehi/American Fork Outfall
23 i. Replace & Upsize Lehi/AF outfall: Sundt pay Request #17 (\$5,249,197.32) retainage
24 (\$276,273.54)
25 4. TP-4/5 – Clarifier
26 i. East Clarifier: Archer Western pay Request #12 (\$363,850) retainage (\$19,150.00)
27 5. Package A –
28 i. TO 2023-04 Package A Thermal Drying Project Final Design Professional Engineering Services –
29 Amendment 2. Brown and Caldwell (\$305,813)
30 6. Package B – Tertiary filtration and UV Disinfection
31 i. Gerber pay Request #7 (\$3,570,814.40) retainage (\$187,937.60)
32 7. Package C – PCAD
33 i. GMP1 Mobilization and Site Prep – Alder Construction pay Request #9 (\$52,142.04) retainage
34 (\$2,744.32)
35 ii. GMP2 Earthwork and Shoring – Alder Construction pay Request #7 (\$90,255.92) retainage
36 (\$4,750.31)
37 iii. GMP3 digester Complex Piles and Deep Foundations – Alder Construction pay Request #7
38 (\$2,573,542.40) retainage (\$135,449.60)
39 8. Olympus Insurance (\$294,475)

40
41 **Neal Winterton a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Richard Nielson seconded the motion. Those**
42 **voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, David Bunker, Joel Thompson,**
43 **Neal Winterton, Mark Christensen, Dave Norman, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” – None.**
44 **The motion passed with a unanimous vote.**
45

46 **E. Finance**

- 47 1. Financial Report – Matthew Ferguson

48 Matt Ferguson went through the July financials with the board. Matt presented the draft Budget Book for 2025-
49 2026. Matt said some amendments still need to be made. Included in the budget book this year is the District’s cash
50 reserve policy which was approved and put in place by the Board last year. This year the District hired Moreton
51 Asset Management to help optimize our cash investment returns. Mark asked about projecting next year’s revenues
52 and how many years we are looking forward, from an operations standpoint. Matt said we have it going out to
53 2030. Matt said the 2023 revenue Bond and 2024 Revenue Bond schedule are included in the book and the 2017

1 revenue bond was rolled into the 2024 bond. Matt said we want to avoid paying money back to the government, so
2 our goal is to spend down \$101.6 million of that \$225.9 million bond and it looks like we are on target for that. In
3 conjunction with the financial report, we do have a healthy financial position. Our credit rating remains high despite
4 our increased debt. That allows us to borrow at lower rates. There are also opportunities to get funding through the
5 EPA's WIFIA program.

6 Matt said there are a few 2025 budget amendments. We received money from the state for the work on Utah
7 Lake that we had not budgeted for, so that \$200,000 would be put into the 2025 amended budget. Interest income
8 was higher than budgeted so we increased by \$5 million. We have \$12 million in grants in the budget which we did
9 not receive so we will take that money out of the budget. We no longer have the 2017 bond so that bond interest of
10 \$583,200 will be taken out. The Fleet budget will be increased by \$436,516.00 for the hauling trailers the board
11 approved for purchase earlier this year. Depreciation has gone up a little, so we added \$363,000 to be in line with
12 actual.

13 The 2026 Capital Budget should be tied to the CIP worksheet Rich presented earlier, but it is a little off due to
14 the fleet which Matt needs to adjust. The 2026 revenue budget is \$78,669,828.00. Wastewater treatment is the
15 District's main source of revenue. It is based on actual flow, BOD and TSS load demands on the system. We use
16 our Zions User Rate study to come up with the projected wastewater revenue at \$42.6 million for 2026. Impact
17 fees are projected at \$26.8 million in 2026 with an increase of \$1,092.00/ERU, based on the Zions Impact Fee
18 Analysis. Matt said there are funds available through the American Rescue Plan Act and we are expecting \$2
19 million from the state and \$2 million from the County.

20 The 2026 increase in operating expenditure is \$331,000 for 3 new operators, \$141,000 for increased HVAC
21 costs, \$19,000 increase for parts and material and an increase in memberships of \$17,000. There are 5% increases
22 in the line items: waste disposal, chemicals, equipment rental, diesel and unleaded fuel costs. There are also 3%
23 increases in the line items: power, sewer line repair, computer replacement, and parts and tools. Matt said some
24 budget lines are spread across departments such as IT Software, Safety Training and supplies. There are a couple of
25 new line items in the lab budget related to wetlands items. Matt said a lot of people have put work into this budget
26 and it is a collaborative process. They have looked at and scrutinized line items to come up with the best and
27 conservative estimates for projections. Matt thanked staff and coworkers for their input into this process.
28

29 **F. Closed Session**

30 1. To Discuss Litigation, Property Acquisition, and Personnel

31 **Mack Straw made a motion to go into closed session to discuss Litigation, Property Acquisition, and**
32 **Personnel in the District Conference room. Chandler Goodwin seconded the motion. Sullivan Love, Chair,**
33 **took a roll call vote. Those voting "Aye" – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson,**
34 **Blaine Thomas, Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin.**
35 **Those voting "Nay" – None. The motion passed with a unanimous vote. 12:00 p.m.**

36 **Others in attendance for the closed session: Mark Bell, Mason Kjar, and Jon Schutz**

37
38 **David Bunker made a motion to go back into regular session. Chandler Goodwin seconded the motion.**
39 **Those voting "Aye" – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave**
40 **Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting "Nay" –**
41 **None. The motion passed with a unanimous vote. 1:05 p.m.**

42
43 **G. Action Items**

44 1. Resolution 2025-02: Ratify TSSD Pretreatment Rules and Regulations

45 Rich said last month the board approved the Pretreatment Rules and Regulations. According to our Attorney,
46 Mark Bell, this needs to be ratified with a Resolution.

47
48 **David Bunker made a motion to approve Resolution 2025-02: Ratify the TSSD Pretreatment Rules and**
49 **Regulations. Richard Nielson seconded the motion. Sullivan Love, Chair, took a roll call vote. Those voting**
50 **"Aye" – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, David Bunker,**
51 **Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting "Nay" – None. Dave Norman was**
52 **out of the room at the vote.**

53
54 2. Resolution 2025-01: Adopt the Amended IFFP/IFA and Revised Impact Fee Enactment
55

1 **Chandler Goodwin made a motion to approve Resolution 2025-01: Adopt the Amended IFFP/IFA and**
2 **Revised Impact Fee Enactment. David Bunker seconded the motion. Sullivan Love, Chair, took a roll call**
3 **vote. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas,**
4 **Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay”**
5 **– None.**
6

7 3. Resolution 2025-03: Approve WIFIA loan application

8 Rich said this is to file our application for the WIFIA loan. That loan is contingent upon us receiving our letter
9 of intent acknowledgment from WIFIA inviting us to apply for this loan. This loan does come with some cost to the
10 District as we apply for this roughly \$580 million. This was presented to the Finance Committee. The WIFIA
11 program is federally funded and there are certain obligations for us to comply such as BABA, Buy American Steel,
12 prevailing wages and apprenticeship programs, which we are already doing on several of the projects here in the
13 plant. As part of our letter of intent we shared our CIP list. They reviewed that list and are allowing us to borrow up
14 to 49% of the approved projects on the list. Of the \$1.4 billion, approximately \$1.2 billion is currently eligible to
15 apply for. WIFIA is about .5% - 1% higher than what is on the market right now. We will have to spend about
16 \$150,000 on the application fee. There is a potential off ramp once we get approval from WIFIA, and there is
17 another opportunity to look at the actual contract and review those details. Rich said it is our intention to follow
18 through with that program to get approximately \$580 million available. The benefits to TSSD are lengthy. There is
19 the flexibility of being able to borrow this money with a one-time rate adjustment once it is locked in without a fee
20 and we do not have to pay any interest unless we start using this money. WIFIA has generous, lengthy timelines on
21 these loans with up to 35 years to pay back. If we have additional revenues or get our ITC refund, then we could
22 pay those loans off quicker. Mark Christensen said the finance committee was in support of this. Mark Anderson,
23 Zions Public Finance, said if you were to lock a WIFIA loan today the rate would be 4.6% and about a week ago it
24 was 4.9%. With anticipated additional cuts from the Fed, we expect that rate to continue to come down. It is fair to
25 say that package C where the debt has to be issued taxable, this makes sense. That is with the assumption that once
26 you get the investment tax credit back, you use it to pay down bonds. It is nice to know you could use it for the
27 other packages.
28

29 **David Bunker made a motion to approve Resolution 2025-03: Approve the WIFIA Loan Application.**
30 **Mark Christensen seconded the motion. Sullivan Love, Chair, took a roll call vote. Those voting “Aye” –**
31 **Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave Norman, David**
32 **Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” – None.**
33

34 4. Resolution 2025-04: Approve Lehi Resolution

35
36 **Neal Winterton made a motion to authorize the District Chair and the District Manager to negotiate with**
37 **Lehi and ultimately create a subsequent resolution for the board to approve based on the terms discussed in**
38 **the closed session.**

39 There was discussion on the motion.

40 Neal amended the motion.
41

42 **Neal Winterton made a motion that the District Chair and the District Manager negotiate with Lehi and**
43 **come to a full agreement, which they have the authority to do, based on terms discussed in the closed session**
44 **and that agreement will eventually be ratified by the board. David Bunker seconded the motion. Sullivan**
45 **Love, Chair, took a roll call vote. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen,**
46 **Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and**
47 **Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” – None.**
48

49 5. Rocky Mountain Power Change Order1 (\$3,215,385) construction cost to move 345KV line.

50 Rich said this is for construction costs to move the 345kv line. this went out for bid to a third-party contractor,
51 and the initial cost was Rocky Mountain Power estimate. This additional cost covers the third-party contractor to
52 come in and do the work. This is about a 30% increase. Richard Nielson, said for the existing easement we have
53 already approve the easement for the future relocated alignment of the power line. Rich said much the new
54 alignment is on TSSD property and then when it goes over line out into the wetland there may be about 10 ft there
55 and we got clearance from FFSL and Rich needs to follow up to make sure they are releasing those easements.
56

1 **Richard Nielson made a motion to approve Change Order No. 1 for \$3,215,385.00 for the construction to**
2 **move the 345K line. Blaine Thomas seconded the motion. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw,**
3 **Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal**
4 **Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” – None.**

5
6 6. **Fronrunner TSSD Supplemental Agreement No. UT50-01 (\$1,286,368.01): Upsize 24-inch line to 36-inch**
7 **Rich said Fronrunner is adding a third line that line is going underneath Pioneer Crossing. We do have a meter**
8 **and a pipeline that goes through that area. Our line is going to be relocated. They have the cost in there for a 24”**
9 **line for relocation. The cost of \$1.2 million is just the cost to increase the line from 24” to 36”. This is on our CIP**
10 **outside of the 10-year window. As they are going through this they will have to bore into the in abutment and we**
11 **would just have to pay the cost to increase it from 24” to 36”. Rich thinks this would be a wise investment for**
12 **District. David Barlow said he thinks the cost for the relocation of the 24” is about 3x times the cost of the upsize.**
13 **David said the length of the line to be upsized is around 1000 ft. they have to put in a bore through the abutment**
14 **and do a casing. Mark Chistensen said that was a lot for a 1000 ft of upsize. It seems like we may be absorbing a**
15 **little more than the upsize. David said we can have our consultant look at this and it is actually 1700 ft. Mark said**
16 **it is just going to get more expensive, but it just seems awfully high.**

17
18 **Blaine Thomas made a motion to accept the Fronrunner TSSD Supplemental Agreement to upsize 24” to**
19 **36” sewer line for \$1,286,368,.01. Richard Nielson seconded the motion. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love,**
20 **Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel**
21 **Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” – None.**

22
23 7. **Tentatively Adopt the 2025 Tentative Amended Operations & Maintenance and 2025 Tentative Amended**
24 **Capital Budgets**

25
26 **David Bunker made a motion to tentatively adopt the 2025 Tentative Amended Operations &**
27 **Maintenance and 2025 Tentative Amended Capital Budgets. Chandler Goodwin seconded the motion.**
28 **Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave**
29 **Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” –**
30 **None.**

31
32 8. **Tentatively Adopt the 2026 Tentative Proposed Operations & Maintenance and 2026 Tentative Proposed**
33 **Capital Budgets**

34 **Chandler Goodwin made a motion to tentatively adopt the 2026 Tentative Proposed Operations &**
35 **Maintenance and 2026 Tentative Proposed Capital Budgets. Mack Straw seconded the motion. Those voting**
36 **“Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine Thomas, Dave Norman,**
37 **David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting “Nay” – None.**

38
39 9. **Set a public hearing date for October 16, 2025, for the 2025 Tentative Amended Operations & Maintenance**
40 **and 2025 Tentative Amended Capital Budgets and the 2026 Tentative Proposed Operations & Maintenance**
41 **and 2026 Tentative Proposed Capital Budgets**

42
43 **Neal Winterton made a motion to set a public hearing for October 16, 2025 for the 2025 Tentative**
44 **Amended Operations & Maintenance and 2025 Tentative Amended Capital Budgets and the 2026 Tentative**
45 **Proposed Operations & Maintenance and 2026 Tentative Proposed Capital Budgets. David Bunker seconded**
46 **the motion. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine**
47 **Thomas, Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those**
48 **voting “Nay” – None.**

49
50 10. **Set a Public Hearing Date for October 16, 2025, to receive public comment on a proposed user rate increase**
51 **of 15% to be effective January 1, 2027**

52
53 **Rich said this public hearing needs to be set for November 20, 2025 to meet the public hearing 30-day notice**
54 **requirement. This is to receive public comment on a proposed user rate increase of 15% to be effective January 1,**
55 **2027. This is consistent with the user rate we started with the 2023 Zions User Rate Study and in accordance with**
56 **the Board’s desire to set the user rate in advance of the member cities’ budgeting process, which usually takes**

1 effect July 1st. Rich said last year, we approved the 15% rate increase for January 1, 2026. This will be the last of
2 the three 15% increases that are in the User Rate Study.
3

4 **Neil Winterton made a motion to Set a Public Hearing Date for November 20, 2025, to receive public**
5 **comment on a proposed user rate increase of 15% to be effective January 1, 2027. David Bunker seconded**
6 **the motion. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, Blaine**
7 **Thomas, Dave Norman, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Neal Winterton, and Chandler Goodwin. Those**
8 **voting “Nay” – None.**
9

10 **H. Communication**

11 1. Handouts

- 12 a. 2026 CIP Budget Worksheet
- 13 b. Amendment to Impact Fee Facilities Plan 2025
- 14 c. 2025 IFA

15 **Adjourn**

16 **Chandler Goodwin made a motion to adjourn. David Bunker seconded. All present “Aye.” The motion**
17 **passed with a unanimous vote. Meeting adjourned. 2:06 p.m.**
18