

**Bear River Water Conservancy District  
Board Meeting  
Wednesday March 23, 2022 6:00 p.m.  
Bear River Water Conservancy District Conference Room  
102 West Forest Street, Brigham City, Utah**

**Minutes**

Trustees Present: Roger Fridal, David Forsgren, Mark Larson, Neil Capener, Richard Day, Dennis Bott, Jay Capener, Jeff Scott, Jay Carter

Attended via electronic meeting: Charles Holmgren

Absent: Joe Summers

Staff: General Manager Carl Mackley, Assistant General Manager Andrew Beecher, Systems Operations Manager, Rob Thayne, Administrative Assistant Jill Jeppsen

Other: Lance Nielsen, Hansen, Allen & Luce; Peter Gessel, Smith Hartvigsen PLLC; and others as listed on the Visitor's Attendance Sheet

**6:00 PM – CLOSED Meeting**

Pending or reasonably imminent litigation

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Forsgren to enter a closed meeting to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation. The motion was seconded by Board Member Bott. The board member votes are: David Forsgren, Aye, Jay Capener, Aye, DJ Bott, Aye, Neil Capener, Aye, Richard Day, Aye, Jay Carter, Aye, Jeff Scott, Aye, Charles Holmgren, Aye, Roger Fridal, Aye

A motion was made by Board Member Scott to end the closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Board Member Bott. All board members voted in favor of the motion.

**7:00 PM – Open & Public Meeting**

Chairman Roger Fridal: Welcome  
Invocation: Dave Forsgren  
Pledge of Allegiance: Jay Carter  
Declaration of Conflicts of Interest: None

**Adoption of the Agenda**

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Forsgren to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Board Member Day. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

## **Approval of the Minutes for the Board Meeting held January 26, 2022**

The minutes of the Board Meeting held January 26, 2022 were included with the packet that was provided to the Board Members.

Board Member Bott made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held January 26, 2022. The motion was seconded by Board Member Scott. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

## **Vice Chairman Forsgren – Financial Business, Approval of Financial Statements**

The financial statements for January 2022 and February 2022 were prepared and provided to the Board Members. Vice Chairman Forsgren has reviewed the reports and asked for the Board to approve them.

A motion was made by Board Member J. Capener to approve the January financial statements as presented. The motion was seconded by Board Member Bott. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

A motion was made by Board Member Bott to approve the February financial statements as presented. The motion was seconded by Board Member N. Capener. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

## **Child Richards CPAs – 2021 Audit Presentation**

Erin Winterton from Child Richards CPAs prepared and provided a copy of the 2021 Financial Audit to each of the Board Members. She reviewed a few items of the report with them pointing out there were no deficiencies in internal controls and the District is in compliance with the state requirements.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Forsgren to accept the 2021 Financial Audit as presented. The motion was seconded by Board Member Bott. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

## **Election of Officers**

A motion was made by Board Member Larson to retain the current officers. The motion was seconded by N. Capener. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

The officers are Chairman - Roger Fridal, Vice Chairman - Dave Forsgren, Financial Chairman - Charles Holmgren

### **Ray Packard - Marble Hills Water Company**

“Rob Thayne and Andrew Beecher have been out to look at our water system. We have greatly expanded due to new residents. We are struggling to keep a water master (certified water operator) and are proposing that the District provide that service to Marble Hills Water Company (MHWC) and to do the water testing required by the state. The current water master is resigning at the end of this month. MHWC would be interested in a detailed quote from the District”.

There was a discussion regarding the position if it is full-time or part-time, if we have enough manpower to do what they are requesting, and if each home is metered. It is part time, we do have the time right now, the meters are cellular smart meters. The District does not have a fee schedule set for this type of work. The initial request included the monthly utility billing, but they have someone to cover that.

There are quite a few small water companies in the valley that are all volunteer, we have noticed recently that there are some that are sharing and providing a common operator with a salary. These operators are running two or three water systems. We understand it is hard to find a certified water operator. Understanding the situation where you are losing your operator at the end of the month and no one in the community is interested in stepping into the roll.

It is the intent for this to be a permanent situation. It was suggested that MHWC explore options to share an operator with Thatcher/Penrose and Bothwell Water Co. The District is willing to help while options are investigated. The Board is supportive of helping while they will be without an operator.

There was a discussion regarding the fee we would charge. It was determined that we would charge \$40 per hour routine water operator duties. It was suggested that we have a fee schedule prepared for future requests. The discussion continued regarding how much time it would take to do the routine tasks requested. The details of the agreement would need to be worked out between the District and the MHWC Board.

A motion was made by Board Member Scott that we offer to contract for services at the rate of \$40 per hour for actual service rendered until they can make a decision on a water operator for up to 90 days. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Dave Forsgren. Chairman Fridal, Board Member Larson, Board Member N. Capener, Board Member Day, Board Member Bott, board Member J. Capener, Board Member Scott and Board Member Carter voted in favor of the motion. Financial Chairman Holmgren voted against the motion. The motion carried.

**Kelly Lemmon** read a letter from some Collinston and Beaver Dam residents requesting the BRWCD Board withdraw Change Application a48040 to appropriate 210 acre-feet of water from a new well located on the mountainside above existing homes/wells/springs in Collinston. The letter listed six points for a basis of the request. A copy of the letter with the residents' signatures will be made part of these minutes.

**Lance Nielsen, P.E - Hansen Allen & Luce**

Mr. Nielsen gave a presentation on the proposed Collinston Well that included an evaluation of hydrogeology, recharge, discharge, and impact in the Collinston area in response to the protests received for the Water Right Change Application a48040.

## **Public Comment Period**

Richard Garrett, Collinston – Thanked Mr. Nielsen for his presentation. From the letter that Mr. Mackley plans to present in this meeting, Bear River Conservancy District states the desire to drill a non-production well on the Collinston site, that was just discussed. He used the rationale that it will provide useful data and that this approach has been used before. Additionally, the letter states ‘we request the State Engineer hold Change Application a48040 until the requested time frame lapses’ the time frame requested is June 2022 to July 2023, and the data has been gathered and distributed to the State Engineer and the protestants.’ We view this as an attempt to avoid a hearing and again preventing the protestants of having a voice in the process. The letter further states ‘however we expect at least some of the protestants will question the District’s motives in drilling the non-production well.’ We the protestants agree with that statement based on the District’s lack of transparency and the disregard for the water rights we hold, which is what Mr. Capener just addressed. We have senior water rights. We own our water; we don’t want you taking our water. The following excerpts from Mr. Mackley’s remarks during the board meeting on 17 November 2021, demonstrate what we believe have been the District’s plan to circumvent the well permit process from the beginning. ‘I am having Lance Nielsen and some others help the District with a small hydrogeological study to determine what the anticipated source capacity of the well might be and how the proposed well might affect other water rights in the area. (fine) Of course the best way to determine these parameters is to drill a well as a production well under a test well authorization (not very legal) and see what the well produces and the adjacent water sources respond to pumping the well. This has been described to the Board previously.’ So, this is not a new concept, apparently, he talked about it before. ‘However, outside funds via application funding or a loan or the combination thereof need to be in place before the well can be drilled. A decision on the application may or may not depend on the well being drilled first as a test well. There was a discussion on whether to drill a test well or drill a test well as a production well and the pros and cons of each.’ Mr. Mackley’s letter further states the District has the means and ability to drill a non-production well at the site of the proposed well under change application A48040, the District is willing to do so at its sole risk and expense in order to provide information that will be valuable to the protestants, the State Engineer, and the District.

Ted Dean, Collinston resident – I appreciate the presentation that Mr. Nielsen did, and the time and effort and the passion that goes into something like that. But under a water right application that the Conservancy District put together up in the Plymouth area, number 29-4624, which was a rejected application, because of time I will read the summary of that, and just a sentence, ‘in summary although it is difficult to estimate the recharge from precipitation to a certainty the information available from USGS study which is a more recent study than any

of the ones that Mr. Nielsen's referenced in his study, suggest the recharge is considerably less than the applicant's estimates'. Mr. Dean brought copies of a map from the Division of Water Rights website for the board members. He explained that the map has a circle that shows a one-mile radius of the proposed well location and shows all the water rights that are within that area. There is a sheet on the back that lists the water rights and the amount of beneficial use that is associated with each one of those. Within one mile of your proposed well location there is over 500 acre-feet of water that is already perfected, either as a certificate or a decree. There is a possibility that you are impacting somebody's ability to make a living, there are many farmers that are tied into some of these water rights. I know you indicated there is not going to be any impact on the shallow groundwater, but that is not proven. Nobody knows what is going on here. The fact of the matter is there is already over 500 acre-feet of water within one mile of your well that should be protected. We would ask that this be considered in anything that takes place.

Donna Garrett, Collinston on behalf of Warren and Twila Stoddard – when the Stoddard's drilled their well they were required by the Division of Water Rights to drill to a depth of 300 feet to avoid impacting the existing wells and springs in the area. Their well normally has a static level of 60 feet. As of 11:30 this morning the static level in their well was measured at 93 feet or 33 feet below normal. Their well has been measured every month since November and the static level continues to decline. Warren and Twila are rightfully concerned, they request that you withdraw this well application since the impact of the drought has already affected many wells in the area. And this well will only cause further harm.

We protestants are requesting the board withdraw the application. If that does not happen, we request that the State Engineer deny request for a NPW and move forward with the proposed hearing on the 14 April 2022. The State Engineer has received multiple protests requesting the hearing and we believe we can provide sufficient evidence to convince the State Engineer to deny the application A48040.

Kyle Potter, Collinston – I have known many of you on the board for a long time. Our family has water on the Pack Barnard spring, probably over 100 acres of ground is irrigated from that spring, so our concern is very real. If that is impacted and we don't have the water to run over those acres, it will severely impact our farms in the area. I would like to share with you a letter of concern that was written 13 months ago. 'I am writing this letter of concern on behalf of the residents of Box Elder County who reside in the area in which the above referenced application has been filed, and who are concerned that their prior existing water rights and sources may be diminished by the approval of this application. There are many shallow wells in this area that provide domestic water use for homes. There are also surface water rights used for irrigation and stock watering that could be diminished by granting of this application. There is a history of ground and surface water right owners in the area asking the State Engineer for protection of their water rights and resources and they feel that their rights may be in jeopardy here. In light of these concerns, I think that the decision makers need to consider all the facts pertinent to this area and should only approve developments in the area based on a healthy water supply that will not impair existing rights'.

Do you know who wrote that letter? It is signed by Carl W. Mackley. I appreciate your concern for those residents over in that Fielding area, but I am not feeling that same concern for the residents in the Collinston area. Mr. Mackley asked what Mr. Potter would like him to do about that. Mr. Potter said, we have already requested that the application be withdrawn, it doesn't appear it is, so what we would like is to go ahead with the process, it is the least we can do, and go before the Division of Water Rights and have our voices heard by them and our concerns. We don't want this end-around the process deal, that's not how government is supposed to work, we are supposed to be heard as citizens and have a right to voice our concerns. One thing that stood out to me as you looked at the one slide that he (Mr. Nielsen) showed was the number of red dots (representing existing wells), and he even admitted that not all the wells are on there. Why are taking a chance at drilling in an area where there are so many individual wells that these people have sunk tens of thousands of dollars into? And then the springs, this doesn't make sense to me, but I would hope you would reconsider and at least let us go through and have a hearing with the Division of Water Rights on this.

Raina Jones, Collinston – As board members and as trusted water protectors of existing water rights, people we trust to look out for our water rights, I would encourage you, plead with each of you to read each and every one of the protests that we took the time to file. Consider the stress, the sleep we have lost, the peace of mind. Please just read everyone of those before you make a decision on what you want to do, I would appreciate that.

Connie Lemmon for Therina Simmons from Beaver Dam area, her father lives in Collinston, she has an interest in Collinston and Beaver Dam. She said, 'I am unable to attend the meeting tonight, but I do have some questions'. As I read through this I realize this isn't a time for questions, I think she just wants you to think about them. 'I feel like a broken record asking this again but since water is the first permit given when someone is planning to build anything it is important for you to be well aware of you are allowing. It is vital to create a better tomorrow by planning. I have written numerous times to each board member, thank you to the two members who replied. I am asking again, how many of you are in favor or support our county's growth plan? Those of you who do not support this plan, have you spoken to Scott Lyons to make your opinion heard and get what you disagree with changed? Please email me with what you object to and I will bring it to the planning committee's attention. Having a plan and support will save this committee time and effort to use this plan in your meetings. I recognize you are volunteers being on this board, thank you for stepping up and doing this, I appreciate the time you give. In a perfect world the basic county entities would communicate often and check in with each other and the people they serve, sounds easy and logical but in reality it is easier to all promote our own agenda. My agenda is to protect my father's well in Collinston and my own in Beaver Dam. Right now, the numbers say you have plenty of water to supply the current needs and to support continued slow growth. Deweyville only needs their water back if the drought continues. If the drought continues, Collinston will be experiencing the same drought. Common sense says the proposed well is not a good choice. Please withdraw your test well. There are more profitable places to get water at this time. From an uniformed but logical point of view I would ask you to not pull every bit of water possible from Collinston's mountains when you have other sources more readily available.'

Kristy Ballard, my husband is Wayne. We have an underground tunnel... that is just south of the proposed well. We moved in 1997 our underground springs have been running since the 1890s. When we got here, we had it test rated at 21 to 22 gallons per minutes. In the 25 years that we have been here has significantly dropped from that. We are worried now with the drought and this proposed well that's going in could dry us out. We just wanted to have our voices heard tonight at your board meeting and we would also like the state to hear us at a hearing. I am with everyone else that is asking you to please withdraw your request for a well.

**General Manager Mackley** made the following comments in response to the public comments that were made today, in the written protests and at other times.

Many of you understand that I am your direct neighbor, we go to church together, we live in the same area. Relationships are important to me and at the same time I am in charge of a county agency that is in charge of developing and producing water for beneficial use. Both of us, you and me, have talked about the purpose of the District and things that it says on our website. You have your interpretation and we have ours. The District was created to develop water, to put it to use, to do so as efficiently and inexpensively as possible. To use that water wisely, to conserve. I feel like we have done a good job at doing all of those things. Some of you have, in trying to be helpful, suggested we look for water in other locations and develop water somewhere else. There isn't anywhere that we can develop water that people just like you won't object to. There is no magic water pocket somewhere where there is going to be no impact to anybody. I have been honest from the start saying I believe there will be impact. Do I know exactly what that impact is? No. We have better estimates now, but we will not know what that is unless we do the project or do a non-production well and monitor and find out what the actual data is and shows. To make it clear, the District is not trying to prevent any of you from holding a water right hearing with the State Engineers. We are happy to hold that, we know we cannot hold it on April 14<sup>th</sup>, but we would be happy to hold it the week following that.

We have followed a pattern in many areas of drilling test wells, of monitoring, and test pumping and it has been very successful. It removes the fear of the unknown and turns it into either legitimate concerns or relieves that burden from everybody to know what the actual information is and what it says. I am still interested in the District doing that. I think that instead of being afraid of what the impact might be, we find out what it actually is. That is at our expense and at our risk. It does not guarantee that we will get approval of our water right application, but it would answer those questions that could help you and us feel better about what we are proposing to do. We feel that this is the best option that we have for additional water for the Collinston area. Are there other options? Sure. Have we considered many other options? Yes. We have been planning for 30 years. Not all of our concepts have worked out the way that we planned. That is another reason why I am a big fan of doing a non-production well and test pumping and monitoring. Then we know.

Things are awkward for me with you guys. I understand your concerns. Sometimes it is hard for me to have as much empathy as I should. I am working on that, I am trying. But ultimately that does not matter as far as the decision-making process goes, but it matters to me because I live in your community, and I am seeking to do what I think is right. I believe there is water available to appropriate. I really wish that water was in nice little packages where

I could identify every single package that belongs to you guys and the District just take some of another package. We are not asking for all the water. We are only doing the same thing that you have done. All of you have developed water or your predecessor has developed water there. We believe that there is water available, and we are not taking all of it, we are going to be wise with it and before any of that happens, we will go through this process.

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

The board members were referred to the written General Managers report.

#### **Funding**

I am pleased to present to the board that pursuant to our Drought Resiliency Plan, which is an update to our Master Plan, that the board adopted last year, I have sought funding for projects identified in the plan and I have procured just over \$3.25 million in funding to be used according to our plan with \$6.3 million of projects all over the county. We have \$3.25 million already. The District has already spent some money of our own and I propose that we spend a total of \$500,000 of our own toward these projects. Which leaves about \$2.44 million of deficit which I propose that we bond for and file an application with the Division of Drinking Water (DDW), with the Drinking Water Board for money from the State Revolving Fund (SRF). Sometimes some of that money is principal forgiveness, meaning you don’t have to pay it back. They do an evaluation of the MAGI (modified adjusted gross income) to make that determination. We have recently paid off a couple of bonds. We have bonded for some small amounts lately. A typical bond is 20 years so the \$2.44 million over 20 years would be up to \$122,000 per year plus applicable interest. Interest rates are around 2%. It is critical that we do this right now. The timing is good as far as previous debt, the payment will basically replace the previous debt payment. We are fortunate that there is money available right now. The county has been supportive and generous to help us and our Drought Resiliency Plan that we did allowed us to score very highly to get \$2 million from the Bureau of Reclamation. Because we have time limits to use that money, now is the time to ask the DDW for the \$2.44 million so we can do our projects as has already been approved by our board under the Drought Resiliency Plan. General Manager Mackley asked the Board for the authority to file the SRF application with the DDW.

There was a discussion regarding the amount of the bond and how it compared to other projects we have done, and how this funding combines 4 projects. The amount of the bond payments has been reduced by about \$130,000 over the last 2 years. The new payment could be about \$160,000 and we have the cash flow to make the debt payment.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Forsgren to give the General Manager authority to apply with the Division of Drinking Water and the Drinking Water Board in the amount of \$2.44 million. The motion was seconded by Board Member Day. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

#### **Request for \$15,000 for Harper Ward monitoring**

For the test well that we did last year and under the water right approval, we are required to monitor the flow into and out of Harper Spring pond. We have been working with

Harper Irrigation Company and we will purchase the measuring equipment and they will install it.

We have a quote of \$15,000 for 4 measuring devices. One will monitor the spillage from the Bear River Hammond Canal near the pond. We will also make this data available to the canal company. Harper Irrigation is pleased to have measuring devices on their water rights, they are interested in the data. We estimate that there is about 5 to 10 CFS of water coming from the spring and there are 2 head gates that we will measure. We do not want this to come from the Harper Ward maintenance budget, it will be part of the test well funds. We want to have the monitoring devices in place before we do the test pumping on this well this year. The State Engineer wants to have hourly data for 5 years.

There was a short discussion regarding the measuring equipment that will be used.

A motion was made by Board Member Carter to approve \$15,000 for four monitoring devices for Harper Spring pond. The motion was seconded by Board Member Larson. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

### **Application for Non-production well in Collinston**

General Manager Mackley ask the Board for authority to request a non-production well from the State Engineer after the water right hearing. This has been done in Collinston previously under Water Right 29-3567 and others, as well as in other areas. The date for the water right hearing has not yet been set. If the outcome of the hearing is an approval, then the need for a non-production well goes away because the approval would generate the ability to drill the well. If it seems necessary to make the decision to drill the non-production well prior to the State Engineer deciding on the application, we want the opportunity to request the non-production well to collect the data.

A motion was made by Financial Chairman Holmgren to proceed with the process to request permission from the State Engineer to apply for a non-production well at Collinston after the Water Right Hearing. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Forsgren.

There was a discussion of the cost to drill the well, the quote also includes equipping the well, which we are not doing at this point. Board Member Scott added that he approved the process because if we find that there is negative impact on surrounding wells, the process would be stopped. If we find there is no negative impact, we can turn it in to a production well without drilling another well. It is also a good location for us because there is little infrastructure that would need to be constructed to put the water in production and it is an area that needs more water. The hesitancy comes from not wanting to spend the money to drill a well we cannot use. General Manager Mackley reminded the Board, the ARPA funds received from the County are specifically for this well and the Flat Canyon well project. If we have to bring water in from anywhere else, it would require huge costs in pipelines or treating water and purchasing property. The Board Members further discussed the risks and the costs. When you drill a well there is always risk involved. General Manager Mackley said we have had previous discussions about drilling this as a non-production well before we filed the water right application. At that time we didn't have funding and didn't think it was worth the risk.

Water development always costs money. Board Member Bott added that from his perspective he believes Brigham City is a very good steward of water, they have a good supply of water due to the forefathers who tested, found sources, and have protected those sources. Collecting data is keen and you have to spend money in order to do that. The residents would benefit from the test well. If it is bad, they would know there cannot be any more growth in the area, if it is good, they would know water is available. They would benefit from either one. Brigham City has had two bad wells, but we only found them because we tried.

All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

### **Beaver Dam Policy**

General Manager Mackley provided the Board Members with a graph showing the scenarios for Beaver Dam that he has presented in previous board meetings. He read the following from his general manager's report:

At the January board meeting, we discussed policy for Beaver Dam. Specifically, we had a discussion on whether or not we should sell any additional connections on the Beaver Dam System. The board did not make a decision on this issue at that time but instead a motion was made and supported by all board members to postpone that decision for six months while Keller Associates does a study to evaluate what other sources are available to the Beaver Dam and Collinston areas and to provide estimates of cost, conduct hydraulic modeling of the options and to make recommendations regarding the findings.

There was some confusion regarding the nature of the study that Keller Associates has been assigned to complete. The purpose of that study is to identify potential new water sources for the Beaver Dam and Collinston areas and not to determine whether there are any additional connections available for sale from either of those systems. It is kind of a small-scale regional source plan.

I have already provided the Board and residents of Beaver Dam with sufficient supply and demand information for the Beaver Dam system for the Board to make an informed decision. The information that I have presented suggests that while we could sell 52 connections on that system, there is a high probability that we would have to cut the users back in the months of July and August in most years with 52 customers on the existing system. While it is certainly possible to do that, the existing customers are not in favor of that scenario and as I have thought more about it as well, I am personally not in favor of selling any more connections at this time. It would create routine problems and challenges in the peak summer months that don't seem worth the cost of selling additional connections without additional sources of supply. That being the case, I don't see a need to withhold a board decision on that issue for five more months. I would hope that the Board can make that decision at [tonight's] meeting so that we know what to tell people currently on a "waiting list" for connections in Beaver Dam.

General Manager Mackley wanted to clarify to the board that he thought they were waiting to make this decision based on the Keller report, when that report is to identify new sources and what we are talking about is our existing sources.

A motion was made by Board Member Larson to extend the moratorium on selling new connections in Beaver Dam until such time as more sources are available for water in the Beaver Dam system. The motion was seconded by Board Member N. Capener. All Board Members voted in favor of the motion.

### **Rob Thayne – System Operations**

We have hired a new operator, Kylee Jeppesen. He is going to be a good employee.

We had a breaker go out on the backup well, we had it repaired yesterday. Parts have been hard to get.

We had a meeting with Ukon Water Company regarding working together to supply water to the communities in the county. We had a nice discussion on how we can work together. We also had the same discussion with Tremonton.

Rural Water Conference – Kylee received his water operator certification during the conference.

We have been looking at the air release valves on the Harper Ward system. We are repairing the vents that have been covered or damaged. There are 8 valves in Harper. We will look at Bothwell next.

Richard and Andrew have been working on GPS information and locating points in the canal for Bear River Canal Company. We continue to map pieces of our own system. It has been great to have the system. We can get up to 3-inches of accuracy with the GPS.

We replaced a 12" check valve that wore out in Bothwell.

South Willard well; the project continues. We were able to get the tube and shaft out, we have not been able to get the column out, yet. We have tried to cut the column off by cutting around it in the inside about 420 feet down. We were able to put a camera down and found we happened to cut it right at a coupler, so it would not come apart. We thought we were going to get it out but instead, we broke the tool. We are going to try and cut it off again, about a foot higher.

The goats will put at the tank sites in May.

### **Chairman Roger Fridal**

**Board Member Responsibilities.** Recently, we have heard some comments that maybe we are not filling our responsibilities as well as we should. Maybe we get a little narrow focused and we need to represent the people we are supposed to represent. Most of us have multiple areas that we represent. The board members were encouraged to review their service areas and check with those in their area and report back on their water situations.

The work done by the board members is greatly appreciated. We sacrifice our time and effort to help the members of the county.

### **Trustee Reports**

**Jeff Scott** – The money that has been appropriated by the County for the District through the ARPA funds will be transferred as soon as the second tranche has been received.

**Richard Day** – Thought the Rural Water Conference was a good conference.

**Dave Forsgren** – Checked with Troy McNeely in Honeyville a couple of weeks ago, the springs should be running about 400 gpm this time of year, they are running at 180 gpm.

**Jay Capener** – Stated his concern that the \$42 million to save the Great Salt Lake (GSL), will have a negative impact on the residents of Box Elder County. Board Member Scott stated his opinion: GSL being a terminal lake, everything deposited there stays there. As the lakebed continues to dry and the dust travels, it decreases our snowpack because it melts faster, and you don't have the snowpack that attracts more snow. There is work that needs to be done. One thing they are considering funding is to get rid of the Bear River Development Project, which has been postponed due to conservation efforts. If you are not going to lose your beneficial use, it would be a benefit to let the water run down to the GSL. He also added that 62% of growth in BE County is domestic.

**Charles Holmgren** – There is an effort to work harder on weather modification. There is a possibility of taking water from the Green River and bringing it in to the basin, but Lake Powell is so empty that is not likely. Sevier Lake is what GSL could be, and we are not hearing of anyone that wants to restore Sevier Lake back to a regular water body to promote snowpack or dust control in Central Utah. Some of the policies get to be a bit hypocritical.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Forsgren to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Board Member Larson.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM.