

**Bear River Water Conservancy District  
Board Meeting  
Wednesday May 26, 2021 7:00 p.m.  
Bear River Water Conservancy District Conference Room  
102 West Forest Street, Brigham City, Utah**

**This meeting was held in the office conference room and electronically via GoToMeeting.com**

**Minutes**

Present: Trustees: Roger Fridal, David Forsgren, Charles Holmgren, Mark Larson, Russ Howe, Tyler Vincent, Jay Capener, Richard Day, Jeff Scott

Absent: Neil Capener, Jay Carter

Staff: General Manager Carl Mackley, Systems Operator Robert Thayne, Administrative Assistant Jill Jeppsen

Other:

**Welcome:** Chairman Roger Fridal

Invocation: Dave Forsgren

Pledge of Allegiance: Richard Day

**Declaration of Conflicts of Interest:** None

**Adoption of the Agenda** –Chairman Roger Fridal

A motion was made by Financial Chairman Holmgren to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Board Member Larson. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

**Approval of the Minutes for the Board Meeting held April 28, 2021**

The minutes of the Board Meeting held April 28, 2021 were included with the packet that was provided to the Board Members.

Vice Chairman Forsgren made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held April 28, 2021. The motion was seconded by Board Member Howe. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

**Approval of the Minutes for the Board Meeting held May 11, 2021**

The minutes of the Board Meeting held May 11, 2021 were included with the packet that was provided to the Board Members.

Board Member Day made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held May 11, 2021. The motion was seconded by Board Member Larson. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion except Jeff Scott who abstained due to not attending the meeting.

**Financial Business – Charles Holmgren  
Approval of Financial Statements**

The financial statements for April 2021 were prepared and provided to the Board Members. Financial Chairman Holmgren has reviewed the reports and asked for the Board to approve them.

A motion was made by Financial Chairman Holmgren to approve the financial statements as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Forsgren. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

**System Operations – Robbie Thayne**

South Willard – We are taking water from South Willard Water Company at a rate of about 115 gpm. This will give us about 14 feet in the tank and we will use it down to about 3 feet before we take water from them again. This gives us about 550,000 gallons to use over the next 2 and a half months. It works well for both companies rather than taking less water every month. We are going to install a duplexer that will allow SWWC to read our meter, either when we are taking water or giving water to them. We have ordered one, but like a lot of things right now, it is taking extra time to get.

Rod Mund has moved his equipment from the well site in preparation for Ron Warren with Peterson Brothers to come up and work on the well. We hope to see him in the next week or two. Peterson Brothers ran a camera down the well, but we did not see anything, other than at the top of the broken column the shaft is still there. The mystery is there are 1 ½ inch pieces of plastic pipe for feed tubes, that are not visible in the well. This may be what is trapping the pump. Ron is optimistic that he can remove all of this from the well. The question was asked how much water is above the pump. There is about 150 feet. We are planning to put a 10 foot plug in on top of the pump, leaving us 140 feet of water to work with. We will put a submersible pump in.

Harper Ward Test Well – We received two bids from excavators to work on the well pads in Harper Ward. The bids are within \$100 of each other. The bid was awarded to Grover Excavation based on availability. They have begun the work on the pad and the road. It looks like they are about halfway through the project. They have only found sand and gravel, nothing bad. They are putting road base down for the road. There is more work to be done on the road than on the well pad.

We had a pre-construction meeting with Mary Lamont and Fusion Pipeline. They are the developers putting in the Country Sunset Ranchettes in Collinston. It is south and west of the Rupp gravel pit in Collinston. They are hoping to begin next week. They are going to have Whitaker Construction do the boring under the highway for the 8 inch pipe. They will be pot-holing to find our mainline pipe. They will be doing the first phase of 6 homes right away, then the second phase of 11 additional homes as soon as possible after that. We had a discussion with them about installing a PRV to drop the water pressure to the subdivision. They have decided to have each of the homeowners install a PRV that is rated to 200 psi. We will inspect the home for the PRV before they are connected to our water system. Everyone should have a PRV in their home to protect their pipes.

The goats are in service in Collinston, there are 4 at each tank site. They are slowing eating away at the weeds; doing what they do best.

Richard has temporary help. They are working on the Harper Ward meter replacement project. They are raising the lids up to grade and locating them on our GIS system, as they go. They have been doing a very good job. They have also found a couple meters that were not working at all, it may be a shock to the residents when they have a meter that works.

Andrew is working on mapping the service areas for the different water companies in the county. Everyone he has talked to have been willing to help and give input for the maps. We will share the completed maps with the other entities.

We will be doing the annual pumping of the reclaim tank in Beaver Dam shortly.

We had a windshield put in a truck and the owner backed it into a pillar and caused some damage to the back of the truck. He said he will get it fixed.

### **General Manager's Report – Carl Mackley**

Requests for Water – Brodie Calder wants to purchase 6 additional connections in Beaver Dam. If we sell him 6 additional connections we will have 12 left to sell. We approved 4 connections at the May 11, 2021 Board Meeting, now he is asking for 6 more. To our knowledge he does not want any more than that. The question was asked if there was a time frame to have them put into use. General Manager Mackley said he could not speak for Brodie, but he did not think his intention was to hoard them, he has property and wants to develop it and be done. That would be 10 connections total. He bought a lot of acreage in Beaver Dam. For the 4 connections there is no infrastructure that needs to be added. Our concern for the 6 is the need to enter into a water supply agreement with us because there is infrastructure that needs to be put in, this may also include a booster station because of the elevation. Another concern with Beaver Dam is we have an impact fee study that was done but does not really reflect the type of uses that there will be with the new users on the system. There were assumptions made in the impact fee study regarding the amount of water used per person. We do not have a significant amount of water on this system, it is about 27 acre-feet per year. Brodie does potentially have some water rights that he can sell to us, which we would be interested in. Regardless of this happening or not he wants these additional 6 connections. There were 22 connections when we first took over the system and all of the users have wells to irrigate with. People use a relatively small amount of water on the system, but new users coming in are not going to have the irrigation wells and are going to use more water than is accounted for in the study. Part of the concern is the quantity of water, and it is hard to figure what the quantity of water is going to be without knowing what their irrigated acreage is around their house. The question was asked if we know what the lot sizes are going to be? There was a discussion of the lot size and the amount of water that will be used on each lot. It was pointed out that in South Willard it is policy that our water is only indoor use and the developers have to bring secondary water to the developments. Financial Chairman Holmgren expressed concern about depleting the whole system without having secondary water for these new connections. Chairman Forsgren suggested tiered rates to encourage conservation. Board Member Scott asked about the location. There was more discussion regarding secondary water and what type of water rights does Brodie have to sell. General Manager Mackley added he thought it would be easier for each individual lot owner to apply for their own well application. This subdivision goes up a hill he will have to pump the water up to the properties. He purchased 160 acres total. Vice Chairman Forsgren noted he cannot develop if he does not have water. He is also not comfortable with the current drought conditions selling any additional connection. He suggested we should wait until the drought conditions improve

and we feel more comfortable selling him water. If we sell him water and we cannot provide it would we have to run a waterline from our Collinston system to provide water to Beaver Dam? General Manager Mackley answered that he thought our 3 springs could provide enough water, and we have other springs we could develop. Our water right is the limiting factor right now. Our impact fee study identified a certain number of connections at a certain number of acre-feet (a/f) per connection, which is about .72 based on people having existing wells on the properties. Currently the average use is about .45 a/f. It is primarily being used indoors. There were some connections sold in addition to the 22 original connections. We have sold 5 additional connections earlier this year for a total of 34 connections. With the 4 connections purchased by Brodie we have 12 remaining connections, using the calculations from our impact fee study. Financial Chairman Holmgren surmised we have connections available, it is a matter of determining what the outdoor water use will be for any new connections. General manager Mackley added we typically use 1 a/f per year to calculate residential use. We have to use the higher amount to estimate use, even though most of the current residents do not use that much. Also because there are so few connections and this is a small system, our impact fee study is very particular about setting the value of .72 a/f per connection, but if people are going to use more than that they will also have to pay their proportionate share of the impact fee. We need to try to limit their use to 1 a/f, and this is the amount they are going to pay for the impact fee. We can look at typical use in other areas and feel comfortable with 1 a/f of use per connections. We will need to increase the impact fee accordingly, since it is based on the .72 a/f per connection. This was an incredible project and we received significant funding for it. The majority of the cost was from 2 grants, then there was \$250,000 that would be paid through the impact fees. It is important that we recover all the impact fees so we can pay for that project. There was a discussion on the information that the impact fee study provides, including why the impact fees are set where they are for each system. The impact fee study provides direction and identifies an estimated amount of usage. In this case, in 2012 it was thought most users would have a secondary source for outdoor water. The original users did have, but the new users will not have a secondary source. Vice Chairman Forsgren said he is not comfortable giving 6 additional connections at this time, until we know the use on the 4 connections he already purchased. Financial Chairman Holmgren stated if we are planning on the 1 a/f usage for new users then the impact fee needs to be adjusted accordingly. General Manager Mackley answered that we can determine an average use looking at usage for all our customers in all our systems, which comes out roughly to 1 a/f per year. We need to look at how much water we have remaining and determine the remaining number of connections we have. And increase the impact fee a proportionate amount. There was a discussion on the size of the lots, Board Member Scott gave some details of the subdivision and a request to rezone some of the property that has been submitted to the County Planning Commission. The review has been tabled by the Planning Commission for further investigation into water and roads. There was further discussion on the number of connections we would have using the calculation for 1 a/f instead of the .72 in the impact fee study. One other factor, is that even though we are confident the new connections will be using more than the Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC) value of .72, as identified in the study, the existing customers are using under that amount. There was more discussion on the lot sizes, and if they are larger lots will the 1 a/f be enough? When you have a small system like this, each connection has a larger impact than it would on a larger system. The question was asked if we go over our water right, what happens? We do not know if we can apply for more water.

The board is concerned about giving more connections, and if Brodie has water to sell, then maybe he has water to irrigate with. How do we suddenly change our policy to not provide outdoor use.

The board suggested that he use his water right to provide outdoor irrigation water for these lots. It would need to be put in the CC&R's that the District's water is only for indoor use; or he needs to trade his water right to the district for additional connections. Board Member Larson asked if there is a point of diversion for his water right? Yes, there is an existing well and a spring. We have not had water from these tested for quality. It was asked if we can we transfer his water right into our sources? Yes, we could, we have been counseled to not buy any water right until the seller applies for a change application and that it has been approved by the State. We are using the numbers from the original impact fee study, and at some point as we sell connections we are getting closer to the limit. This 6 will not put us over the limit, but we are starting to watch it more closely. We have not had the interest in development in the past, it has just been single homes at a time. There was a short discussion that the development is going on everywhere in the county. Do we have a conservative number that we recommend? We should use the 1 a/f as usage. Do we need him to identify the lot size before we make a recommendation? Board Member Scott said even though Brodie has asked for a zone change to RR2, he mentioned he wanted to do 12 to 15 lots at 6 to 8 acres each. But if it is zoned RR2, you can do what ever you want. Two weeks ago in Smithfield, lots in a new subdivision went up for sale and 40 of the 47 sold in one day. They are 2 to 3 acre lots and sold for \$300,000 to \$400,000 apiece. It was felt if it is zoned for 2 acre lots, that is probably how they will be sold. We were pushing for him to bring water to the table. We asked for a legal opinion from Wendy Crowther, she said the decision needed to be based on the impact fee study. So, if we are saying the ERC is more than what it says in the existing impact fee study, then we need to update the impact fee study. The impact fee study is all under the purview of an engineer. Vice Chairman Forsgren again stated we should wait until drought situation is better before selling additional connections. General Manager Mackley continued by saying the spring production is double or more what the water rights will allow; the water right is the limiting factor. Honeyville spring production is down to 250 gpm, down from 600 average this time of year. A news headline read this morning was The Drought Will Continue. Board Member Jay Capener added there is concern about basing decisions on historic use, when the drought will continue to impact spring flows, how does this work? General Manager Mackley replied that low spring flows are addressed in the impact fee study. It seems like any more we are breaking records, then breaking them again, on low flows. The discussion continued with the following points: Could we limit the use to 1 a/f or even reduce it? Alternatively, we can say in drought years we have restrictions. Who is going to regulate that? Or do you price it to a level that people will not use it. You would have to put it in a contract that you have x amount of water to use and once it's gone there is no more. What do you do when they have used their 1 a/f by September then they do not have any allocation left for indoor water for the remainder of the year? We are making assumptions that the water supply will not be there, this is not the limiting factor, it is the water right that is the limiting. We have to price it at a level that will encourage conservation. There is concern about if the individual wells go dry for existing customers, then they will use more water. We have to base out study on the higher usage number. The whole county could be in this situation. Chairman Fridal added in Tremonton, we are developing secondary water. When someone has secondary water available, they have one year to connect. If they choose not to connect their rate for culinary water goes from \$1.00 per thousand up to \$5 or \$6 per thousand. That is what motivates people to connect to the secondary water. People will only pay attention to conservation if it costs them money. It is similar to the rates we passed for Harper Ward earlier this year, after the base rate.

Financial Chairman Holmgren made a motion to update the Beaver Dam Impact Fee Study to consider usage at the rate of 1 acre-foot per residence. The motion was seconded by Board Member Day. All votes were in favor of the motion.

We will update our impact fee study, and the Board will not approve any additional connections on the Beaver Dam system until the study has been completed. We should have it ready to put on the agenda for the July meeting.

Board Member J. Capener asked the question if we are not going to approve any additional water connections until the County approves the subdivision, but the County will not approve the subdivision without water, how does that work? Board Member Scott explained that once we update our impact fee study and know how much water we have available, then Brodie can go back to the Planning Commission and present that to them and ask for approval of the subdivision. Board Member Howe asked if we need to do this for any other of them systems? (update the Impact Fee Study)

General Manager Mackley continued his report by stating we need to update our Master Plan. It will take a year to complete that. That will put us at the 5 year mark since it was last updated, so it will be time to update it anyways. There are several other factors that are in the GM report that need to be considered and other items like adding a drought chapter, getting cost estimates of projects and we have a better idea of the timing on some projects that need to be changed, or prioritized. Also, going through each of our systems individually and deciding on how self-sustaining they are, meaning reviewing the revenues and expenses for each system to figure out how to pay for projects.

This item will be added to the next month's agenda.

Requests for water out of Bothwell – West Corinne Water Company (WCWC) and Chanshare. WCWC wants an 8 year agreement where they will take 100 A/F in 2021, 200 next year then 25 additional for the remaining years up to 350 A/F and the agreement would end at that point. Our understanding in speaking with their president is they have other sources of water that they can develop, and they have additional water rights that they are not using. They have a well in Bothwell that is crooked, and they do not use it. They might want to re-drill that well. They want to be able to take care of some of the people on their waiting list so they can collect the impact fees and put in the infrastructure that they need. Vice Chairman Forsgren said, looking at the 350 A/F that is 350 homes and the lots are 5 to 7 acre each, that takes out a lot of farm ground. He thinks we should cut the requested amount in half. Can we supply this much to them along with our other customers and still supply Chanshare? General Manager Mackley answered that our water right is 1669 a/f of depletion, and he believes we can model exactly what people are going to be using based on existing contracts and what is being requested. We have several customers, and some we have to wheel water through Tremonton City to get it to them. We have talked to Tremonton regarding their supply needs. We do not have an unlimited supply for certain, but we can easily provide that amount of water to WCWC. Board Member Larson asked for clarification that after 2028 WCWC will be able to supply their own, and not need this water? General Manager Mackley answered that is correct. Also, there is not a lot of infrastructure that will be required to provide them the water. We can deliver about 320 gpm through the one mile pipeline that we installed in 2019. But to deliver more than that we will need to boost the

pressure. In a few years we may need to put in a booster station to provide the water to them. There was a short discussion on the location of this one mile pipeline. Financial Chairman Holmgren said his only complaint would be about the developers that come in and instead of incorporating into Tremonton and following their rules, they go to WCWC to get water to the development. He would feel better about 350 a/f going to Tremonton and 300 a/f going to WCWC. The subdivision by LeGrand Johnsons and Rupp's subdivision are probably the ones that used the last of WCWC connections. Chairman Fridal said at last week's Tremonton City's Counsel Meeting they talked about a developer that wants to develop 40 acres just west of Tremonton, he mentioned he did not want to have to deal with Tremonton City so he was going to go to the Water Conservancy District, and they will sell him all the water he needs. Chairman Fridal says it is irritating to have a have a city boarder then 1 mile outside those limits you have a 40 home subdivision. There is a concern about developers trying to use the District as leverage against other cities or towns in the county. There was a discussion regarding our water supply policy. General Manager Mackley asked the board if we are not going to sell to WCWC then who are we waiting to sell water to? A few of the board members agreed we should provide water to WCWC. General Manager Mackley explained WCWC has the largest service area in the county. And we have asked over the last 3 months if there are other current customers that want more water from Bothwell and only 2 have spoken up so we have the water to provide what WCWC is asking for. There was a discussion regarding the County's policy for development and how the upcoming generation do not want large lots to take care of. It was suggested then they need to go to the cities that have the infrastructure in place to support them.

Chanshare has also given a request for a 5 year agreement for 1200 a/f so they have some certainty that they do not have with their current agreement. If we give them the 1200 a/f, then we don't supply Ukon and Riverside North Garland by building a pipeline to do so. Financial Chairman Holmgren asked what the terms of the current Chanshare agreement are. They pay their share of the power bill and a flat rate of \$75,000 per year for land and water use for the 660 acres we own, plus they run some other ground they we do not own that they use some of the water on. There was more discussion on providing this amount of water and some different scenarios, but there will not be any decisions made until we know what Ukon, Riverside North Garland and Tremonton want to do. Of these three, we have had conversations with Tremonton and have a good idea what their needs are. They are thinking they will need an additional source in 5 years. We could sell water to Chanshare for 5 years and still fit this need. Riverside North Garland and Ukon are doing a study and looking at the possibilities of developing other sources. They need a couple more months until they have that information ready. We feel like WCWC has a plan and are ready for the water. We do not see them cutting into anyone else's allocation. We can sell them the water they are asking for and then we are either going to turn Chanshare down and know we will be doing some projects for Riverside North Garland, Ukon and Tremonton, or we are going to know in a couple months if we can give Chanshare a 5 year agreement. Several of the board members expressed the opinion it would be fair to Chanshare to give them another 5 years. We are allowing them to take 1200 a/f this year. They have been cut back from 1800 a/f. They have asked for an additional 100 a/f for September and October, but they will have to ask for that separately. They are having a hard time with the current year-to-year agreement. This is why we have been pushing our wholesale customers for a plan of what they want. The terms with Chanshare will change in a new agreement, and they will be paying more. We can meet all our

agreements and provide water to WCWC and Chanshare for 5 years. There was a discussion about the water going to Riverside North Garland and wheeling water through Tremonton's line.

The conversation went back to selling water to WCWC; at what point would we have to put in a booster station to be able to deliver the water to them. It is about the 5 year mark, then how much have we invested to provide it to them for the last 3 years of the contract. It was said we will make enough money selling the water to cover the costs of a booster station. We also need to look at an additional storage tank on the Bothwell system.

There was a discussion regarding when we are selling to wholesale customers, can we do something to encourage conservation from their customers. Our take-or-pay contracts do not encourage conservation, but they are good from a business point of view. The way that WCWC is requesting the water is intelligent and designed in a way they can meet some of their demands. They want to keep the usage measured on a calendar basis. This gives them a limitation and a way to space the growth out over the next few years, until they develop their own sources. There was more discussion on the take-or-pay contracts in general and requiring conservation from the wholesale customers. It is not our job to tell our wholesale customers how they can use the water after we sell it to them. It is our job to sell them the water and let them manage it in their company. Financial Chairman Holmgren mentioned two of the largest dairies, and other industry in the WCWC service area and we need to be careful in trying to apply restrictions on them. If we have the water to sell to them, and they are working on developing their own sources, this goes along with our mission statement. The question was asked what incentive do they have to develop their source if we sell them the water? The agreement is limited to 8 years. They have an engineering firm and legal council on staff, so they are working on their goals.

There was a discussion that we stick to the contract limitations on the amounts of water we provide.

Board Member Larson made a motion to accept the proposal to supply West Corinne Water Company what they have requested in this 2021 through 2028 agreement. The motion was seconded by Financial Chairman Holmgren. Board Member Scott, Board Member Day, Board Member J. Capener, Board Member Howe, Board Member Vincent, Board Member Larson, Financial Chairman Holmgren and Chairman Fridal all voted in favor of the motion. Vice Chairman Forsgren voted in opposition to the motion.

There was discussion on if we want to wait a couple months to make a decision on Chanshare's request. The answer was we really don't want to make a decision until we hear from Riverside North Garland on what their needs are going to be after they receive the results of their study. The question was raised how do we prioritize what we are selling other than by the order in which they come to us and ask?

Another question was raised about our Mission Statement and how does irrigation fit in to it? General Manager Mackley answered by talking about the roll of the Bear River Canal Company and how they control most of the irrigation water in the north part of the valley. All three points of our mission statement allow us to do irrigation, but we have not had to supply a lot of irrigation or agricultural water because the canal company is already taking care of that. Financial Chairman noted that he appreciates the Cloud Seeding program that the District is involved in (although you need a cloud to seed). This helps agriculture along with the culinary water. The District is partnering with the canal company under the PL566 grants to help support agriculture. They have been supporting

agriculture for over 100 years, so we do not have to re-right the book on that. Some concepts of the Bear River Development were mentioned. General Manager Mackley asked if the Bear River Canal Company has a Master Plan for the future. It was thought the PL566 might require one. We would be willing working with the canal company addressing their service areas. We are working on this with the public water suppliers to identify these boundaries, our Master Plan needs to also identify what buildout in these service areas would look like. One thing that we do not know is what assets are in these areas as far as irrigation water. We need to question if buildout happens in a certain area, how much water would be needed, and we need a plan of where that water is going to come from, including the canal shares associated with that property. It is important for the District needs to know this where we float in between service areas.

There was more discussion on how you define the boundaries when municipalities have the option to annex. The boundaries will change, and this type of plan could help develop more consistent policies in the county. This is where it would be advantageous for the District and the canal company to work together on addressing this on some level in a Master Plan. The question was asked when a farm is developed, where does the irrigation go? The discussion was left there.

A Motion was made by Board Member Day to table the Chanshare approval for 2 months. The motion was seconded by Board Member Scott. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

Harper Test Wells – we put the two test wells out to bid and tried to get several drillers to bid. We gave them more time to complete the project hoping to get more bids; we only received 2 on the last day. One from Hydro Resources and one from Lange Equipment and they came in within \$11,000 or a 2% difference, which is a little strange that they came in so close. This is a direct result of the work we put in describing exactly what we wanted and how we want the wells to be constructed. It is good they are so close. It is also a result of the drought and how busy the well drillers are. Hydro Resources was the low bidder. They are a large company out of Colorado. They have a lot of equipment and do a lot of wells in Utah. The problem is, our budget is \$400,000 for the whole project and for these two wells we are in the \$560k to \$570k range, just for the wells. Vice Chairman Forsgren suggested we only drill the upper well. That is the choice that needs to be made. Do we want to postpone the project and try to get more money, or do we want to have them just do one well? The question was asked how important is it that we drill two wells? Our water right allows us to drill two, but if we find water on the top one, we should be good to go. Will they stay with the same bid if they are going to only drill one well? The mobilization will probably increase but need to know how much. It was questioned if they would come if they knew it will only be one well. Hydro Resources does not think it will be an issue to do one. Our budget is \$400,000 and we will spend all that money for one well. There was a question on a test well vs. a production well. If we get a good result on the upper site, will we also drill a production well on the lower site? The answer is we will address that when we have some results of the first test well.

Board Member Scott made a motion to move forward with one test well. The motion was seconded by Board Member Vincent. All members voted in favor of the motion.

General Manager Mackley asked Board Member Scott to clarify the American Rescue Plan funding and that it is intended to be used for infrastructure, particularly water and wastewater. Box Elder County gets \$10.8 million of that money to distribute. We sent an email to the County

Commissioners to ask if there is any of that money that the District can use. The answer came back that we would have to match, and the District should be looking at other funding. Board Member Scott replied it is a definite maybe. The legislature is taking a cautious approach with this money. You have until the end of 2024 to spend it, so they are looking to allocate about 1/3 in the next session and they would hold the remaining 2/3 and let it go gradually. One of the problems is if you are putting that much money into the economy it will create inflation. If it is released gradually, it should help keep prices down. The list of projects on the District's list would take everything the County will receive plus to do them. The County is implementing a match to make the funds go further. If you have a match, it goes up on the priority list. Each city and town in the county also receive an allocation based on population. There is some money for some of the smaller areas that need assistance or are growing. On the CARES Act funding they allocated everything to the States. Utah was one of the better States and gave a direct allocation to cities and counties, but it was administered by the State. This time the National Association of Counties and the League of Cities and Towns went to the Federal Government and asked for the money to be given directly so each entity could decide how to spend it. So, each city and county will receive an allocation and the State will also receive an allocation. The County is getting \$10.8 million and expects to get requests for \$25 million over the next 3 years. Some of the approved uses are water, sewer and broadband are the top 3. We have a lot of requests for broadband in the smaller areas. The private water companies can ask, but the county does not think they should support a private company when the money could go to a municipal or public water supplier. Treasury sent a document for guidance on allocating the money, it is 157 pages long and will probably change weekly. Financial Chairman Holmgren added he has seen many communities come to the Board of Water Resources to get loans as matching funds for Federal grants.

Truth in Taxation (TNT) – The Board Members were provided with the scenarios showing the budget numbers if we accept the Certified Tax Rate for this year, if we do TNT and keep the same rate as last year, or if we increase the rate to the maximum rate for a District. The question is what would the District be providing in return to the people we would be taxing? Focusing on things that would benefit, not just a single water system, but the entire county are things like updating the Master Plan, implementing some of the drought projects and monitoring. There is also a possibility of adding another permanent employee. Which we don't need right now, but if we are going to do more for the county like helping them with drought and with planning, we will need an additional employee. We can use Andrew to do a lot of these things, but it takes him away from the maintenance side of things. We can add value to what we do for the county, but it obviously costs additional money. We would need to go through TNT to increase our budget to cover these expenses. TNT is decided through a public hearing, and we would have to notify every household in the county by mail, which is expensive. Board Member Scott said if there are other tax entities that are looking to do a tax increase, the notice can go out in a single mailing with the tax notices. The District last did TNT in 2016. A lot depends on how specific you can be on how you would spend the money. If we go through TNT, we would ask for the maximum, then the County can adjust the rate as they see fit.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Forsgren to proceed with Truth in Taxation proposal as outlined up to the .00029 rate. No second was made, the motion failed.

Closed Session

The character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual.

Vice Chairman Forsgren made a motion to enter a closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Board Member Day. There was a roll call vote: Jeff Scott, aye, Richard Day, aye, Jay Capener, aye, Russ Howe, aye, Tyler Vincent, aye, Mark Larson, aye, Charles Holmgren, aye, David Forsgren, aye, Roger Fridal, aye.

Board Member Vincent made a motion to end the closed meeting and return to the open meeting. Board Member Larson seconded the motion. There was a roll call vote: Jeff Scott, aye, Richard Day, aye, Jay Capener, aye, Russ Howe, aye, Tyler Vincent, aye, Mark Larson, aye, Charles Holmgren, aye, David Forsgren, aye, Roger Fridal, aye.

General Manager Mackley continued his report talking about Andrew's new skills with GIS and how we can do a lot of different things for the District and other water suppliers in the county. Andrew recently completed a course at Weber State and received a Certificate of Proficiency in GIS. We are proposing to 1) amend the budget to reduce our engineering budget from 60,000 down to 40,000 and take the additional money to put into employees, and 2) we would like to create a new position and offer Andrew an Assistant Manager position. His responsibilities will be over asset management, conservation and outreach to the other public water systems, and all things GIS, including helping us to update and create a better Master Plan. This will save a lot of money in what we are currently paying in engineering costs. We can reduce our engineering budget and pass some of this money to him, because he will be falling under that category in some of his responsibilities, and then we would do more of those things in-house. General Manager Mackley would also like to consider himself as not only the General Manager, but also the Staff Engineer. This does not mean taking on every project, but if we want to update impact fee studies and those types of projects we can do them in-house. We had previously asked to update our general services engineering RFP, but what we are realizing is when we have a specific project like drilling a new well, we need to budget engineering into the project. The large projects will take us over our engineering budget so it needs to be tied to the project budget. But the smaller things we can do in-house, we want to have Andrew help us out and do some things that the District has never done before. We have never had an asset management system before, and along with his skills using GIS, he can help with some studies and help with the Master Plan. At some point we will have to hire someone to help with the maintenance that he was doing.

There was further discussion on making this change by bringing some engineering in-house and offering the promotion to Andrew. It makes sense, especially when it is budget neutral. We would like this new position a salaried position. We would also like to give all the employees a 5% increase, the board members were in favor of this rate. There was also a discussion about rewarding Andrew for getting the GIS Certificate and letting him know we want him to stay with the District.

A motion was made by Board Member Day to decrease the engineering budget by \$20,000 and move it to employee benefits. The motion was seconded by Board Member Vincent. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

## **Trustee Reports**

**Jeff Scott** – Let it rain!

**Richard Day** – Agreed with the above statement about rain.

**Jay Capener** – the Canal company is reducing the flow in the canal by about 10% to get us through to the end of the year.

**Russ Howe** – Thatcher was losing about 30% of the water from their well. They found out there were 3 lines at the well heads that did not have meters on them. These have now been installed.

**Tyler Vincent** – Brigham City is good; rain would be nice.

**Mark Larson** – Wants to make it unanimous, we need rain.

**Charles Holmgren** – Heard on a conference call this week that since 1997 the flow of the Bear River from Preston, ID to Cutler has reached its lowest level in 25 years. Even cutting back on the canal flow, it will be difficult to make to the end of the irrigation season this year.

The Board of Water Resources is going to begin meeting in person next month.

**Dave Forsgren** – The springs in Honeyville have dropped by 5 gmp in a week, down to 260 gmp. It is usual for them to drop this time of year. The static level at the wells are maintaining. We are in good shape for water. This gives us high hopes for our Harper Ward well, that we will have good water from it.

**Roger Fridal** – Tremonton City is working on the next phase of secondary water. It is an expensive project. It is important for conservation. We appreciate working with the canal company.

A motion was made by Board Member Larson to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Board Member Howe. All Board Members voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 PM.