

MT NEBO WATER AGENCY
BOARD MEETING
Salem City Offices, 30 West 100 South, Salem UT 84653
Monday, August 16, 2021

CONDUCTING

Marty Larson, Chairman

BOARD MEMBERS

Gene Shawcroft, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Marty Larson, Genola City
Warren Peterson, Goshen Valley Local District
ABSENT - Brett Christensen, Payson City
ABSENT - Howard Chuntz, Salem City
ABSENT - David Hathaway, Santaquin City
Brandon Gordon, Spanish Fork City
Boyd Warren, Strawberry Highline Canal Co

ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBERS

Chris Hansen, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
ABSENT - Paul Munns – Goshen Valley Local District
David Tuckett, Payson City
ABSENT - Seth Sorenson, Salem City
Lynn Mecham, Santaquin City
Chris Thompson, Spanish Fork City
Richard Nielson, Utah County

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Chris Hansen, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Travis Jockumsen, Payson City
Bruce Ward, Salem City
Norm Beagley, Santaquin City
Chris Thompson, Spanish Fork City
Richard Nielson, Utah County
ABSENT - Melanie McVicker, Goshen Valley Local District

STAFF

Kim E. Holindrake, Payson City Recorder

OTHERS

Steven Clyde, Clyde Snow
Steve Jones, Hansen Allen & Luce
Wes Quinton, Goshen Valley Local District
Dave Pitcher, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Richard Tullis, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Rachel Musil, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Jared Hansen, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Braden Sheppard, Farmland Reserve Inc.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Marty Larson called this meeting of the Mt Nebo Water Agency Board to order at 7:35 a.m. The meeting was properly noticed.

2. Public Comment Period

No public comments

3. Approval of Minutes – June 21, 2021 Meeting

MOTION: Gene Shawcroft – To approve the minutes of June 21, 2021. Motion seconded by Richard Nielson. Those voting yes: Gene Shawcroft, Marty Larson, Warren Peterson, Lynn Mecham, Brandon Gordon, Boyd Warren, Richard Nielson. The motion carried.

5. Technical Committee Report and/or Action

a. Groundwater Management Plan; Status Update

Chris Hansen reported the groundwater database work continues. The Technical Committee will meet with the other groups and prepare a budget for the WaterSMART Project, which is coming with the grant the Agency received.

b. WaterSMART Grant Project; Status Update

Chris Hansen reported the WaterSMART grant was approved. Kim Holindrake has been working feverishly getting all the applications and finance set up with the Bureau of Reclamation. The grant is a 50% match. He has prepared a tentative budget prepared on allocations among the Agency members, which will be finalized with the Technical Committee and presented at the next meeting.

c. Other

No other items.

6. WaterSMART Grant Project – Delegate WaterSMART Grant Project management to the Water Banking Committee and direct the Water Banking Committee to work with the Technical Committee to identify project participants; present a proposed project agreement, budget amendment, and participant assessments at the next board meeting; and work with the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare the WaterSMART Grant Project agreement for presentation to the Mt. Nebo Water Agency Board.

Warren Peterson stated a motion is needed to have the Technical Committee work with the Water Banking Committee to move the project forward. There is work to be done between now and the next board meeting.

MOTION: Warren Peterson – To approve the delegation outlined in Item 6 (Delegate WaterSMART Grant Project management to the Water Banking Committee and direct the Water Banking Committee to work with the Technical Committee to identify project participants; present a proposed project agreement, budget amendment, and participant assessments at the next board meeting; and work with the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare the WaterSMART Grant Project agreement for presentation to the Mt. Nebo Water Agency Board). Motion seconded by Gene Shawcroft. Those voting yes: Gene Shawcroft, Marty Larson, Warren Peterson, Lynn Mecham, Brandon Gordon, Boyd Warren, Richard Nielson. The motion carried.

4. Finance Report (7:38 a.m.)

Dave Tuckett reviewed the finance memo noting since the last meeting four invoices were paid and revenues included interest. Account balances include reserve account - \$5,000, administrative account - \$30,946.22, and Capital Projects, Project 4 account - \$20,599.13 for a total of \$56,545.35.

7. Update on the South Utah County/Juab County Plan Formulation Effort (7:42 a.m.)

Dave Pitcher reported since the last meeting, a summary report has been prepared of phases 1 and 2 of the planning effort, which will provide a draft for the Technical Committee to review. They are looking at an array of alternatives. The recommendation is to continue working at the ULS pipeline to deliver untreated water. They also anticipate the Highline Canal to be a facility needed in the future to deliver both agriculture and M&I water in the future. It's anticipated the Highline Canal will be rehabilitated. This project comes down to primarily meeting treated surface water. They look at different alternatives depending on decisions of communities of secondary systems or not secondary systems. Looking at these alternatives, they came up with cost estimates. The report will summarize where they are to date. The alternatives vary from \$320 million up to \$780 million. They will work with the Technical Committee to translate this to delivered acre feet with a cost over a long-term project. An additional \$800,000 has been approved to continue to closely look at additional planning. Recommended actions in phase 3 include further investigate ASR Pilot Program; stakeholder outreach/engagement with communities to gauge interest in future regional water supply system; advance infrastructure configuration, design, and costs; further refine financial analysis and investigate possible cost/repayment structures for future regional water supply system, further explore feasibility of preliminary identified potential future water supplies to meet potable needs; and further explore regulatory and institutional issues related to use of water supplies and infrastructure. The projections go to 2065 with a system sized to meet demands for potable water system. It doesn't include lining the Highline Canal or cities developing their own secondary system. Delivery and demand aren't always the same. They look at the demand, see what size of infrastructure is needed to meet that demand, identify where it's short in water, determine where water will come from, identify current sources, estimate agricultural conversion, and repurposing other water. All this varies community by community.

8. Update on Groundwater Database (7:50 a.m.)

Steve Jones stated they continue to meet with the different entities with a goal to collect as much data as possible. There are pretty good results from many of the entities. A plan is being created for those who don't have good data so there is training going on, etc. A preliminary draft was sent out with the data collected. The goal is to wrap it up in the fall. There will be another draft in a month and would like feedback at that point. The goal is for this effort to continue beyond this first initial phase.

Chris Hansen noted they want to incorporate this water year and then have a final product to move forward. The Technical Committee will meet in the next week or two.

Steve Jones stated they are making plans to install equipment for entities with no data. Others, they are taking the data available, trying to fill in, and estimate as best as possible. It goes from no data and creating plans up to pretty extensive data.

9. Update on Utah Lake Progress (7:55 a.m.)

Steve Clyde reported multiple meetings have been held with both subcommittees and a group as a whole. The timeline includes August 18, submit subcommittee reports; September 10, create smaller drafting teams; September 24, distribute draft to subcommittees, October 8, complete final draft, October 13, present to Water Task Force; and November, present to Interim Committee or Natural Resources Committee. In some instances, there may be some support while in others there is very little support. There are a lot of unanswered questions with the current proposed legislation with areas needing significant redrafting to address protection of water rights and looking at public trust doctrine issues. Utah Lake is a sovereign lands and trust lands, which the State manages on behalf of the citizens. There are serious questions on whether the management of the lake and public trusts resource can be delegated down to a local body. There is case law throughout the country that would indicate that may not be constitutionally valid when these are trust resources. So there are serious problems with the general approach and questions as to why the existing state agencies with existing technical expertise and experience in managing can't do what needs to be done with adequate funding and legislation. Representative Brammer has been outspoken to move this bill forward this year. Some questions were answered at the Utah Lake Symposium held at Brigham Young University about 10 days ago.

Warren Peterson stated the bill sponsor has been open to recommendations. His concern with these various subcommittees is making sure they speak their minds so the issues are on the table. It needs to be put together well and if needed brought back another year. The legislative leadership is very interested in moving it forward. The task is to get it in as good a draft as we can. If it's not where it needs to be, we need to say so.

Gene Shawcroft stated he understands there is a separate effort on Utah lake for restoration work. He questioned if that is connected in any way to this effort.

Warren Peterson stated the efforts are separate. The Utah Lake Restoration Project has been underway for three years with legislative funding and a great deal of activity. There has been a lot of core sampling of the lake bed, some modeling, and engaged efforts. The Utah Lake Restoration group wants input but are independent of this legislation. Interests are common but independent.

Gene Shawcroft recommended identifying these two separate processes on future agendas so the Agency can stay up to speed on them both.

Warren Peterson noted the Utah Lake Restoration Group could give reports to this Board. He clarified the work from all the various groups and committees he believes illustrates why Representative Brammer is creating the bill, which is to create better coordination among stakeholders. The biggest challenge is tying it all together in an intelligent way and creating a central reporting place for all the entities. Representative Brammer wants coordination of the interests and someone to speak on behalf of the lake.

10. Update on Water Banking (8:05 a.m.)

Marty Larson suggested having Emily Lewis attend the November meeting for an update on water banking.

11. Other Business

a. Information/Discussion Items for Future Meetings

- Utah Lake progress
 - Legislation
 - Utah Lake Restoration Group
- South Utah County/Juab County Plan Formulation Effort
- Groundwater Database
- Transfer of water between canal companies, water availability, and drought conditions
- WaterSMART Grant Project

b. Other

Bruce Ward stated they have been watching the water systems and canals very closely. This year, Payson and Salem were able to fund an interconnect between the two culinary systems for emergencies with two meters and two valves. Salem's next step is to interconnect with Spanish Fork on the north end. As water managers, we are still concerned about next year; it could be a real issue for many. Things are moving forward on moving water between canal companies, which is huge with all the canal companies. Some have excess while others have tremendous shortages.

Chris Hansen noted with the recent flooding, no one called to use the muscle wall. Richard Nielsen stated a lot of debris was stopped at the Thistle Debris Basin. Debris was at the top of the 14-foot tunnel and about 100 feet back. They were able to remove the debris and keep the water flowing.

12. Next Meeting – Monday, November 15, 2021

13. Adjourn

MOTION: Gene Shawcroft – To adjourn. Motion seconded by Richard Nielson. Those voting yes: Gene Shawcroft, Marty Larson, Warren Peterson, Dave Tuckett, Lynn Mecham, Brandon Gordon, Boyd Warren, Richard Nielson. The motion carried.

This meeting adjourned at 8:15 a.m.