



SPENCER J. COX
Governor

DEIDRE HENDERSON
Lieutenant Governor

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
JOEL FERRY
Executive Director

UTAH OFFICE OF ENERGY DEVELOPMENT
EMY LESOFSKI
Director

Utah Energy Infrastructure Authority (UEIA) Board Meeting *Dec 15, 2025, 1:00 pm – 2:00 pm*

Meeting Minutes

Members in attendance: Emy Lesofski, Lynn Jackson, Logan Wilde, Lance Soffe, Wade Williams, Michelle McConkie, Clinton Painter

Members not in attendance: Cameron Cuch, Jordan Stephenson

Non-members in attendance: Luke Voss, Jake Garfield, Alex Motro, Joe Finley, Winston Smith, Allen Fore, David Gelinias, Jesse Broderick, Mark Mulligan, Matt Holton, Stan Holmes, Steve Styler, Kristen Lingley, Ryan Richards, Steve Morrey

Meeting Notes:

A motion was made to approve the prior minutes from August 22nd. The motion passed unanimously.

Kinder Morgan's application for the HCITC was previously approved by the board. The applicants from Kinder Morgan, however, reviewed their plans and realized there were amendments to be made to the application that affects their application details.

Allen Fore from Kinder Morgan described that in February 2024 they began to order materials related to this project, earlier than their original application stated for their start date. They asked the board to amend their project details and contract accordingly. The dollar amount of the credit they are eligible to receive and other details about the project will not change. The start year affects when the tax credit begins to be applied and their ability to claim these project-related expenses.

There was a call for discussion about this change, and there were no comments. A motion to approve the amendment to Kinder Morgan's application was made and passed unanimously.

Representatives from Waterleaf Resources then presented to the UEIA board their HCITC



application for a Lithium Extraction project.

Summary:

Waterleaf aims to bring more lithium extraction to the US, starting with a commercial project that would be extracting it from the Great Salt Lake. They project it will produce about double the current US lithium production. The project will be located on the north arm of the Great Salt Lake, by Gunnison Bay, close to where Waterleaf Resources is located. The plant is projected to provide 100 direct construction and 65 direct operations jobs, hiring in the area. The project is set to generate millions of dollars in local and state tax revenues and royalties. Waterleaf is a subsidiary of Lilac, and together they have several patents for various technologies including those that will be used in the lithium extraction process. The technology uses direct lithium extraction technology, that takes in lake water, extracts the lithium, and returns the lake water back to the lake. The lithium is then separately taken and converted into battery grade lithium. Waterleaf presented slides detailing the steps and components.

Lynn asked what percentage of the lake water ends up back in the lake, and Waterleaf said it was 99.99%, with the remaining water lost in moisture leftover in the filtration portion. To make up for that, fresh water is brought in from a well. It is needed in other parts of the process to properly extract the lithium, and once it serves its purpose the well water gets put into the lake as well.

Wade asked where the carbonate comes from, and they answered that soda ash is brought in and added for the processing.

Waterleaf continued to explain why the Great Salt Lake was chosen. They believe the Lilac technology is sustainable, can serve as a good demonstration in a tough area to extract from, and can bring in benefit to the Great Salt Lake. There was a pilot done on the Great Salt Lake in 2024 that operated for about 8 months, in which water rights were obtained and it was demonstrated that extraction could happen without the water being consumed. Details about the pilot, results, Division of Water Quality requirements, and water usage/results were discussed further. The pilot facility was closed and all components, buildings, and equipment removed after the demonstration and test was complete.

Their tests show that most levels of elements and compounds in the lake after the filtration process remained close to their levels before the filtration process, with notable changes in lithium, as planned, and surprisingly removal of arsenic as well. Lynn asked why the selenium seemed to have spiked in July based on a graph presented. It was curious to both Waterleaf and the Division of Water Quality, though it was a spike from the lake rather than from the process. The pH levels of the water, the temperature of the water, and dissolved oxygen of the lake water after the filtration process was within the required DWQ bounds during the entire pilot process. Over the course of the 8 month pilot, almost 40,000 net gallons of water was added back to the lake as a result.

Wade asked if there were any organic molecules introduced because of the process. A bioanalysis was done on the microbials and biologicals in the area, and the hired expert concluded that there was more activity in them after filtration, and no detriment to the local

populations. Wade followed up to ask if resins or other such materials got transferred to the water, and Waterleaf said they did not, and their technology keeps it that way.

Wade also asked if the lithium would be depleted with this process eventually, as an example over 20 years. The answer was that even at current commercial levels of lithium extraction, lithium gets replenished from the south arm makes it so it is not projected that the lithium will be used up even in 20 years.

Emy asked how long it takes for filtration for the water to be taken in and put back. The answer was that a filtration cycle for lake water to be taken in, the lithium extracted, and the lake water returned takes about 4-6 hours in total.

Waterleaf concluded that their pilot reports are ready and available on their website. They are set to obtain all permits for the full project by Q1 2026, to start construction in Q3 of 2026 and hopefully start operations by Q4 of 2027.

There was a question about recycling and materials, and Waterleaf said that they recapture the beads after they've been used up and send them for recycling.

The board had no further questions. The room was opened for public comment.

Stan Holmes asked about the proximity of the project to the Spiral Jetty. Waterleaf said it was about 2.1 miles. The planned facility is positioned so that from the spiral jetty one could see a only little bit of a building. They plan to paint the buildings to blend in with the natural surroundings to stay mostly out of sight. They've worked with local agencies to plan this.

Stan asked about where the waste goes. There is a waste cake that collects the arsenic and other waste material and gets removed and sent to other facilities for waste management. Gypsum also gets produced as the result, and they're looking to see if a cement company or other company wants to take it. It is not hazardous and will go into a landfill if there are not any takers.

Stan referred to another set of players through the inland port authority who were also working on lithium projects and asked if they were connected. Waterleaf said they were not, and Emy directed people to ask the inland port authority directly for questions about their operations. Stan also brought up some available funding he thought might help this project.

There were no more comments from the public.

There was a motion to approve the application from Waterleaf. The motion passed unanimously.

Next, the board discussed future meetings. There is another application to be ready for the board's review at the next meeting, and the board agreed to meet on January 23rd.

There was a call for any other matters. There were none. The meeting was adjourned.