

TIMPANOGOS SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT  
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

APPROVED

January 17, 2019 6:00 p.m. Conference Room

Board Members

Present:

|                   |               |                  |
|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| David Bunker      | Dale Ihrke    | *Jay Meacham     |
| Sullivan Love     | Blaine Thomas | Mark Christensen |
| Brian Braithwaite | Mack Straw    | Craig White      |
| Chandler Goodwin  |               |                  |

Excused: Chris Condie Lynn Walker Commissioner Bill Lee

District Staff: Richard Mickelsen, District Manager

David Barlow, District Engineer

Joe Martin, CPA

Danette Smith, Board Secretary

Others:

Craig Carlile, Ray, Quinney and Nebeker  
Brandon Heidelberger, Brown and Caldwell  
Brandon Wyatt, Bowen Collins & Associates  
Kasey Chesnut, Horrocks Engineers  
Randy Zollinger, Jacobs  
Jim Goodley, JUB Engineers  
LeGrand Bitter, Utah Association of Special Districts

**Call to Order**

David Bunker, Board Chair, called the meeting to order. 6:01 p.m.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Approval of Minutes**

**1. Approval of the November 15, 2018 Administrative Board Meeting Minutes**

Blaine Thomas made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2018 Administrative Board Meeting. Brian Braithwaite seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – David Bunker, Dale Ihrke, Mark Christensen, Mack Straw, Brian Braithwaite, Blaine Thomas, Craig White, Sullivan Love, and Chandler Goodwin. The motion passed unanimously.

**Consent Calendar**

There were no items on the consent calendar.

\*Jay Meacham arrived. 6:06 p.m.

**Finance**

**1. Financial Report**

Joe Martin said he had not received any questions from board members on the financials from November. November is about 91% through the year. The expenses are below that in the budget to actuals. Joe said there are

1 several impact fee graphs in the packet. Joe said comparing the impact fees for 2017 to 2018, we are significantly  
2 lower in 2018. David Bunker asked what we budgeted in 2018 for impact fees. Joe said we budgeted \$5.7 million  
3 and brought in \$6 million. David Bunker said that is why it is important for us to budget conservatively. Joe said  
4 yes, especially on impact fees. Joe said last time we discussed this, these were tracking very similarly, and it seems  
5 construction has slowed down a little bit. Mark Christensen said there is talk we are entering a possible down turn  
6 this year and next year. If we are off significantly come mid-year, what is our process, would we do a budget  
7 adjustment on impact fees? Joe said he thinks we would. We use the budget as a tool, generally for our expenses, to  
8 make sure we are not over spending and to be transparent to the public. Anytime we are going to open the budget,  
9 we would also look at interest earned on PTIF and impact fees. Brian said we have a cash management policy, we  
10 can adjust early enough and have a buffer, so we do not get hit hard. Mark said if we are seeing a shortfall in impact  
11 fees, obviously we would suspend future projects. Brian said yes, we have enough money to carry out projects we  
12 have, but we can cut back on those if needed.

13 Mark said the graph is great and he understands impact fees are down from a revenue standpoint, but he would  
14 love to see the total number of connections or permits issued to track and see where we are. Mark feels we issued  
15 more permits this year but, because we reduced the rate, we brought in less. We need more data to make that  
16 determination. Joe said he thought we had that information, he will go back and look, and put that in dropbox.  
17 Another thing Mark would like to see are total projected ERU's and residual ERU's, so that we can account on a  
18 month to month basis where those ERU's reside. David Bunker said the projected ERUs would have to come from  
19 the cities; they have their projections for growth. David Bunker said if we are going to do projected ERU's going  
20 forward that will take some coordination with the cities. David said American Fork, is down about 11% on permits  
21 from last year. Mark said Saratoga Springs is still moving along with about 1,000 active permits. Brian said  
22 Highland is down about 50%.

## 23 24 **Action Items**

### 25 **1. Election of Timpanogos Special Service District Administrative Board Chair and Vice Chair**

26 David Bunker said according to the District By-Laws, the Chair serves for a period of two years. In the case that  
27 a chair cannot fulfill the rest of his term, the vice chair would then take that position and complete the term. That is  
28 what happened this last year when Mark Johnson, who was Board Chair, was no longer on the board. David Bunker,  
29 as Vice Chair, took the position of Chair and Dale Ihrke was elected as Vice Chair. It is now the end of Mark  
30 Johnson's two-year term that David Bunker had fulfilled, and it is time to vote for another Board Chair. In the past,  
31 we have taken nominations, then taken a vote. David Bunker opened the nomination process for Board Chair.

32 **Blaine Thomas made a motion to suspend all nominations and put David Bunker back in as Chair of the**  
33 **Timpanogos Special Service District Board, and Dale Ihrke as the Vice Chair. Craig White seconded the**  
34 **motion.**

35 Brian Braithwaite asked if we could suspend nominations. David Bunker said he thought the board should take  
36 other nominations. There were no other nominations.

37 **Those voting "Aye" – David Bunker, Dale Ihrke, Mark Christensen, Mack Straw, Brian Braithwaite,**  
38 **Blaine Thomas, Craig White, Jay Meacham, Sullivan Love, and Chandler Goodwin. The motion passed**  
39 **unanimously.**

40 David Bunker said it is great to work with each of the board members, it is a great board, and we get a lot  
41 accomplished.

### 42 43 **2. Award Contract for Capital Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Facilities Plan Study**

44 Rich said they have gone through the process on the RFP's. In the packet there is an excerpt from the process;  
45 including the evaluation process. Those on the evaluation committee were Rich, David Barlow, David Bunker, Dale  
46 Ihrke, Sullivan Love, and Jay Meacham. Rich said they evaluated each of the submittals. For the technical part,  
47 there was the potential to have 80 total points, with an additional 20 points on the financial part. There were four total  
48 submittals. Three of the firms teamed up with other firms, one to do the collection part, and one for the treatment  
49 part. The fourth firm was going to do the complete package. After the first evaluation process, they had to score a  
50 minimum 36 points, or be excluded. One firm did not meet that minimum 36 points. The remaining three came back

1 for oral presentations. After the oral presentation, they were scored. They had to meet a minimum of 48 points. All  
2 three firms met that minimum. The financial package was then opened up and given a score. The points were  
3 totaled up. Rich said Bowen Collins & Associates scored at 75.8 points, the next proponent was 71.3 and the third  
4 proponent was 65.5. The committee recommend that Bowen Collins & Associates are awarded the contract.

5 Brian Braithwaite said he has some serious scars from two lawsuits the District has gone through, and tens of  
6 millions of dollars that we have dealt with. Brian said he puts the majority of that on Bowen Collins and Associates  
7 in what they did or did not do in providing this board with accurate information. We are not experts at this kind of  
8 information and we rely on those organizations that we contract to do this. Brian said the \$40,000 difference here in  
9 the submittal doesn't even cover a day's interest on the money we ended up paying for these lawsuits. They are  
10 proposing a significant lower number of hours they are putting into it, which should be a red flag. Brian said he  
11 loves the process that was gone through and it is fair. If they came out ahead, he is willing to go with them under one  
12 condition; that they indemnify us, so if it comes back on us again we do not have to face the same thing. David  
13 Bunker said he appreciates those comments and it was something they discussed as a committee.

14 Mark Christensen said Saratoga Springs uses a lot of different firms, as they update their impact fees on an annual  
15 basis. All firms deal with the information you give them, in the best way they possibly can. If we, as an  
16 organization, do not provide good information, the study will reflect that. He has worked with Bowen Collins and  
17 thinks they are fantastic. Mark said his city entered into a contract with them and it includes an indemnification  
18 clause that if their impact fees are found to be flawed and it is on them, they would have to redo the study. Mark said  
19 the better solution is to get an outside attorney, who is proficient with impact fee law, to make sure it meets the letter  
20 of the law and is very defensible. He has done that with all of his city's impact fees. David Bunker said in Bowen  
21 Collins proposal they included to have informational meetings with Utah Valley Home Builders, and to take the  
22 proposal to the ombudsmen for review prior to adoption.

23 Chandler Goodwin asked if Bowen Collins methodology is vastly different than the other proposals. Rich said  
24 no, their methodology wasn't significantly superior than the others. Proponent B actually scored higher by a few  
25 points on the technical side so when the dollar value came in, it pushed Bowen Collins Associates into first place.  
26 Chandler asked where they are not allocating hours where others are? They are at least 25% lower in hours than the  
27 others. Rich said he did not bring that information, but he could provide that. David Barlow said it is mainly that  
28 Bowen Collins already have a model established. David Bunker said they were put through the ringer and asked very  
29 in-depth questions regarding past mistakes that were made, and how they were going to ensure those same mistakes  
30 are not made again. David Bunker said impact fee law has been very fluid; it has changed a lot, it is hard to keep up  
31 with. Bowen Collins are up to speed with the impact fee law. Hats off to them for standing up and saying they can  
32 do this and have learned from the things they have done wrong. They are open to the scrutiny.

33 Mark Christensen said he appreciates what has been said about us losing money. The reality is, if the math wasn't  
34 right in the first place, it was never our money to begin with, and we have to return it. The law clearly says if you  
35 over-calculate, it shall be returned. Mark Christensen said he wasn't here then, so he does not have the wounds some  
36 others have. Mark said he thinks the money spent on an engineering firm, often with impact fee studies, is great and  
37 an important thing. But, the better money is spent on the attorney to challenge the numbers to make sure there is not  
38 a flawed research. Our job is to make sure it is a fair, equitable and honest study. As long as Bowen Collins is doing  
39 that, it will be just fine, and having the public scrutiny is not a bad thing. Brian said he did not disagree, the issue  
40 was not returning the money, it was the black eye that we get. We trusted a firm to deliver what they should have  
41 delivered, and they didn't. Brian said we cannot go down that same path without having some ability to make sure  
42 that it doesn't happen again, and that we are not liable for it. Mark said, to this point, you and your team are just as  
43 responsible because the engineers can only calculate and only work with the numbers they get.

44 Craig White said it is important to keep in mind that this is only for the CFP and the IFFP, it does not include the  
45 IFA. That is where the impact fee is calculated. There still has to be a financial advisor brought on. David Bunker  
46 said this is the engineering side. We are looking at some financial groups to complete the IFA. David Bunker said  
47 they have to work very closely, and that data has to be accurate, otherwise the IFA will not be accurate. David  
48 Bunker said he was impressed with this process and Rich and David Barlow have done a fantastic job. It really  
49 highlighted the firms that were qualified to do this job. David Bunker said it was not just a cost-based proposal, this  
50 is a technical evaluation of their abilities, but cost needs to be part of that, we have a fiduciary duty to the people of

1 this District to do that. Brian said he thinks not only should indemnity be part of this, but having a lawyer review it  
2 is a critical piece. Craig Carlile said you cannot add indemnity if it is not included in the proposal. Mark Christensen  
3 asked if there was a draft contract provided with the RFP. David Barlow said no. Mark said, absent a draft contract,  
4 we could award it contingent upon the signing of the contract and make indemnification a term of the contract. They  
5 have a choice of accepting the terms of the contract with indemnification language or not. Craig Carlile said you  
6 could do that.

7  
8 **Mark Christensen made a motion to approve the contract with Bowen Collins and Associates, as indicated**  
9 **in the staff report, contingent upon them executing a contract with Timpanogos Special Service District that**  
10 **has been approved, as to form, by our Attorney and District Manager, which includes indemnification**  
11 **language, that if the contract is challenged and found to be flawed, Bowen and Collins Associates would redo**  
12 **the whole scope of their work at their cost. Chandler Goodwin seconded the motion.**

13  
14 Sullivan Love said currently we are receiving approximately \$1,704 for impact fees. If they come back and say  
15 \$1,500, no one will challenge that because it is less than the settled amount. But, is it going to cover the costs of the  
16 projects we have to do. David Bunker said they are not setting the fee, this is not the IFA. Mark said the intent of  
17 what he is proposing is if they screw it up then they should redo the study and should re-provide all of that work that  
18 they were contracted to do. Someone challenging it doesn't mean it is wrong, it just means they are challenging it.  
19 Brian said part of the discussion needs to be having an attorney review this or have them on board, whether that  
20 needs to come up in a motion at our next meeting or be executed administratively. David Bunker took a vote on the  
21 motion.

22  
23 **Those voting "Aye" David Bunker, Dale Ihrke, Mark Christensen, Mack Straw, Brian Braithwaite, Blaine**  
24 **Thomas, Craig White, Jay Meacham, Sullivan Love, Chandler Goodwin. The motion passed unanimously.**

25  
26 Mark said we need to get the ball rolling and he would really love to get an attorney. Mark is not saying our in-  
27 house counsel is not capable, but he would like someone who is impact fee specialized. David Bunker said he  
28 proposes we have Rich start the draft contract with Bowen Collins and Associates, and make sure we can come to  
29 terms with that contract. If we can come to terms, we can talk to them about an attorney. Rich can report back at the  
30 next board meeting on whether the contract has been executed, and what the process will be. Rich said we have put a  
31 tight schedule on this, and we expect them to be done with the CFP and IFFP by July 18, 2019. Rich said he  
32 proposes to update the board as soon as they can finish with the negotiations, early next week, to determine whether  
33 we are making progress. If not, we would need to come back and award to another proponent at a special meeting.  
34 Rich said we need to be able to meet our timeline, and the Board is anxious to get our rate studies done, and our  
35 impact fee set. Mark said he does not think it will be a problem with Bowen Collins. As far as getting an attorney,  
36 he wants to make sure the attorney is on board and participating to the extent that we have got a very clear set of  
37 rules established, not just with the consultant, but also that staff understands those rules. Mark wants those impact  
38 fees done absolutely correct and does not want there to be any reason to have it questioned. Mark said if Rich's sign-  
39 off authority allows him, then to go ahead and get that taken care of right away.

## 40 41 **Communication**

### 42 **1. LeGrand Bitter, UASD – Presentation**

43 LeGrand Bitter, Utah Association of Special Districts, was present to give information about converting from a  
44 special service district to local district. LeGrand said there were some differences between a special service district  
45 and a local district, as it would relate to the decision of converting from one to the other. David Bunker said the  
46 board is just exploring the idea at this point. LeGrand said there are two general types of districts in Utah. A special  
47 service district is sometimes referred to as a dependent district, local districts are often referred to as independent.  
48 Special service districts are normally created by county commissions or county councils. A county commission can  
49 create a special service district on their own without a request by anyone else. Because the county commission is  
50 ultimately the governing body, that is one of the reasons special service districts are called dependent districts, as

1 they are somewhat dependent on the county commission. The commission creates the administrative control board  
2 and have members be appointed or elected. They can also delegate certain powers to that administrative control  
3 board. Once the county commission creates an administrative control board, they could, at any time dissolve it if  
4 they choose to do so.

5 Another power retained by the creating entity is the power to go through truth and taxation. A special service  
6 district has the authority to tax, statutorily, but that is not switched on until a vote of the people in the district. At that  
7 point, if the people vote in favor to tax to the amount set in the ballot initiative, the statutory power to go through truth  
8 and taxation has been switched on. The only entity that can go through the hearing on truth and taxation on behalf of  
9 the district is the entity that created the district. They are the ones that vote on and adopt the tax. Because of that  
10 dependency, the state auditor's office requires that special service districts be shown as a component unit on the  
11 financial statements of the creating entity. Normally that is in the notes section; the financial information is not  
12 combined or merged, they are two separate political subdivisions.

13 A local district is completely independent; they are normally initiated by petition. A petition is prepared by a  
14 certain number of property owners, then taken to the county commission for public hearings on whether or not it is to  
15 be created. Once the hearings have been gone through, and conducted successfully, it would go to an election of the  
16 people. If the people vote in favor of the creation of the local district, it is then created. At that point it is  
17 independent. An exception is if two thirds of the property owners in the area propose for the local district and sign a  
18 petition, it is then created without a vote of the people. The administrative body can be of any number that is chosen  
19 if the entities involved initiate the creation of the district.

20 LeGrand said if participants in districts understand better up front of the differences between the two, it generally  
21 makes it very clear the direction they want to go. Converting to a local district is relatively simple. The number one  
22 provision is the entity that created the special service district is the initial gatekeeper. In this case, the county  
23 commission is the gatekeeper, and they would be the ones to initiate the process. They would pass a resolution  
24 stating the three things found in the statute; intent to convert to a local district, the services provided, and the  
25 geographic area involved. Once they do that, they go through a notice process, and public hearing. After the  
26 county initiates the process, every one of the cities involved in the district also need to adopt a resolution that  
27 confirms they want to convert from a special service district to a local district. If they all do that, it goes through the  
28 hearing process and if there are no major objections, the county adopts a resolution meeting the requirements. The  
29 paper work is submitted to the lieutenant governor and a certificate is issued at that point. In that resolution, the  
30 county would address many things, including what the initial board is going to look like.

31 LeGrand said it seems to him there are some options with converting to a local district. One would be to be a  
32 basic local district. The other two options you may want to more seriously consider are in 17B-2A part 4, which is  
33 the Improvement District Act, or 17B-2a part 9, the Service Area Act. Either one of those would work for a district  
34 that provides sewer treatment. For districts such as this, the portion of the act used most frequently is Part 4, the  
35 Improvement District Act. It is specifically designed for water and sewer treatment. There are some very unique  
36 provisions in there with respect to representation on the board. The board could be a combination of elected,  
37 appointed or hybrid. There are some very specific guidelines in the Improvement District Act with respect to the  
38 representation on the board, particularly making sure cities have representation. Craig White said his board is a  
39 hybrid board. Craig thought the way it worked with the act is if the municipality is wholly within the boundaries of  
40 the district, then they have the right to appoint, if the municipality is not wholly within the boundaries then  
41 representation is elected to the board from that area. LeGrand said there is flexibility there and it will depend  
42 somewhat on the boundaries of the district and how it cuts into the cities.

43 Rich asked if one city decided to not be part of the process, does it cancel the whole process. LeGrand said that  
44 has never been tested before, he thinks it would. Normally, the cities want it, because they want to have equal  
45 footing at the table. Brian said part of our interest in this is that the county does not engage within our organization  
46 unless it is somehow politically motivated. We function completely separate and it feels odd that we are tied to them  
47 and yet they really do not care unless something happens. We are looking at it as a possibility and every city is going  
48 to have to see how they fit into a new organization versus the old one, which is probably going to take a long time.  
49 LeGrand said being patient and making sure everyone is well informed is wise. Once you get through all that and the

1 board and the county commission are comfortable, the process to get through the creation of the district can be done  
2 in couple of months.

3 David Bunker said we have bonding, that has been done under a master agreement. That master agreement took  
4 the county to set up, so there would need to be some kind of adjustment. David asked LeGrand how he has seen the  
5 financials handled. LeGrand said there have only been a couple of conversions in the state of Utah, he hasn't seen  
6 how that has occurred. It seems to him that it would be very seamless. You would want to talk to your bond  
7 attorneys to see, but it seems that this entity converting to a local independent district, all obligations and assets  
8 would not be affected. Dale Ihrke said this is something we as a board have started to look into, but we do not know  
9 if the county is going to go for this or not. In his mind, we need to be looking at pros and cons, so the county can say  
10 maybe it is a benefit to sever this. LeGrand said you may want to talk with some improvement districts, and their  
11 counsel.

## 12 13 **2. Manager's Report**

14 Rich said he has continued to keep the format of the manager's report with the three different committees. Rich  
15 said this is how he sees his priorities. Rich said the plant is running very well. The influent phosphorus is 6.72 mg/L  
16 average for the year. The total effluent phosphorus is 1.35 mg/L average for the year. The state is supposed to be  
17 taking the yearly average in our DMR; they have chosen that Rich report the highest value during the month. Rich  
18 said he is going to take every option that he can to play with inside the rules that they have set. The state has been  
19 good to work with us in different areas. Rich said they have 70+ employees and it could be as simple as the bottom  
20 employee is putting that in the DMR, and Rich asking may get that changed.

21 For the Administrative Committee, Rich said we are well on our way with the personnel policies update. There  
22 should be a complete draft by next Thursday. Rich said the salary compensation review has been on here for some  
23 time and we will bring that up again in our committee meeting. Rich said for public relations, he has met with  
24 Highland and American Fork. Any other entities that would like him to come, let him know. David Bunker said it is  
25 very informative, and Rich does a great job with it. Jay Meacham requested that Rich let them know when these  
26 meetings occur, as some of the board members are at large and may not be aware.

27 Rich said the 2019 legislative session is coming up and he wanted to point out a couple of legislative items he is  
28 watching. HB 31: Water Supply and Surplus Water Amendments – Rich is interested to see how they go through  
29 this process and how it applies to water reuse. HB 32: Rulemaking Fiscal Accountability Amendments – Rich said  
30 that was actually started by from the Wasatch Front Water Quality Council. The purpose was, if there is another  
31 nutrient requirement DWQ wants to put upon us and it costs us money, we think the legislators ought to have a vote  
32 or a say in whether that is a rule that should be adopted. If it costs any one entity more than \$2 million or costs a  
33 group of entities more the \$10 million then the legislators want to look at that rule. The Blue Stakes Bill (not yet  
34 numbered): If a contractor wants to find out where the District's collection lines are, and want the ability to do core  
35 drilling, we would not only have to determine where the line is but how deep the line is. Tax on transfer  
36 stations/food waste (past years 2017-HB 115, 2018-HB 373). Rich said we are taking green waste and making  
37 compost, and they think there should be taxation on that. We are saying we are under the 503C Regulations and they  
38 do not have any right or authority to tax us. Other legislation Rich wants to keep an eye on are: Appropriation  
39 Request, DWQ's Draft Concurrent Resolution, Water Quality Act Sunset Reauthorization, and State Revolving  
40 Fund.

41 Rich said there is a safety summary report for the last three years in the packet. Rich informed the board that lab  
42 director, Michael Scheetz, is retiring on February 28, 2019. He worked here about four years and 35 years with the  
43 state.

44 For the Engineering Committee, Rich said his approach in handling all the projects is to go to staff first. Since we  
45 have so many projects and a number of grade IV certified treatment operators, Rich is going to put them over certain  
46 projects to follow those through. If we do not have the staff or expertise to make it happen, we will do project  
47 management by getting other firms involved. Following up on those, there will be some construction that needs to  
48 happen. There is a 2019 CIP Project Schedule, with 27 projects. It shows our progress week by week. Rich said we  
49 have acted on every single one of those items this year, except for one. Rich said you may start seeing a lot of those  
50 getting done later in the year. On the blower project, the RFP's were pushed out due to the fact that Rich did not

1 have air demand from the state. Rich said Brown and Caldwell has been pushing the state quite forcefully and they  
2 were successful to negotiate with the state engineers to show that we have more air demand than what is required.  
3 We obtained that letter from the state yesterday, so we will move forward with that now.

4 Rich said North Pointe Solid Waste has said they are going to raise our rates come June 1, 2019. Right now, we  
5 are hauling out to Bay View at \$15/ton. They will keep that price until that date. They are going to raise the rate at  
6 their board meeting to \$30 - \$40/ton. David Bunker asked if we had a contract with a longer term. Rich said there is  
7 no contract with them. He wanted to get that done, but it didn't happen. Mark Christensen said many of the cities  
8 are members of that District and are paying a lot less than that. Are they raising rates across the board or are they just  
9 targeting this entity? David Bunker said he was told by Rodger Harper that the only rates they were going to increase  
10 was the public drop off, and it went up \$2/ton. David Bunker said it is \$32.50/ton for municipal solid waste. Mark  
11 said that is to deliver to North Pointe and then they still have to transfer it out. If we are delivering out to Bay View,  
12 why are we paying a premium rate. If so, just dump it at North Pointe and let them haul it. Rich said he wanted to  
13 inform the board, and he will keep working through that and looking at other options. Brian said Mark's point is that  
14 this board is tied to cities, and almost, if not all of these cities, have a place on that board. Our board members could  
15 talk to those members on North Pointe's board to make sure it is done right.

16 Rich said on the CMMS, and asset management, the assignments have been given out to staff, the plant has been  
17 divided up and we are moving forward with that. Rich said he would let the board know if more money is needed for  
18 assets, but he thinks for now we are ok. Rich said initial feedback from staff is they cannot believe he is letting them  
19 do this interactive work. It has been positive, and we are moving forward. Rich said we budgeted \$2 million to  
20 purchase belt presses, and we have ordered those. The West Side Interceptor was completed back in October, and  
21 final payment has been made.

22 For the Finance Committee, Rich said the approved amended, and proposed budgets have been uploaded to the  
23 State Auditor's website. David Bunker said this is a great report, and he feels it is very helpful for the board to  
24 understand everything that is going on. This helps the board to know what is on Rich's plate, how they are being  
25 handled, and how the board can best support him in getting those things done. Rich said he appreciates the board's  
26 willingness to support the District. Being able to pass the budget to fund the projects we have is a huge help to us.

27  
28 **Closed Meeting**

29 There was no closed meeting.  
30

31 **Adjourn: Brian Braithwaite made a motion to adjourn. Blaine Thomas seconded the motion. All present**  
32 **"Aye". Meeting adjourned. 7:35 p.m.**

33