

2 The Lindon City Council regularly scheduled meeting on **Monday, January 26, 2026, at**
3 **5:15 pm** in the Lindon City Center, City Council Chambers, 100 North State Street,
4 Lindon, Utah.

6 **REGULAR SESSION – 5:15 P.M.**

8

9 **PRESENT**

10 Carolyn Lundberg, Mayor
11 Lincoln Jacobs, Councilmember
12 Van Broderick, Councilmember
13 Jake Hoyt, Councilmember
14 Steve Stewart, Councilmember
15 Juan Garrido, Public Works Director
16 Adam Cowie, City Administrator
17 Britni Laidler, City Recorder

9 **EXCUSED**

10 Cole Hooley, Councilmember
11 Brian Haws, City Attorney

18

19 **1. Call to Order/Roll Call** – The meeting was called to order at 5:15 p.m.

20

21 **2. Review & Action: Resolution #2026-3-R; Central Utah Water Conservancy**
22 **District (CUWCD) agreement trading water shares for capacity in the Provo**
23 **River Aqueduct (PRA).** The Council will review and consider an agreement with
24 the CUWCD to trade Lindon owned water shares for capacity in the PRA. This
25 item was continued from the January 20th City Council meeting.

26
27 Adam Cowie, City Administrator, introduced this agenda item, which had been
28 continued from the previous meeting on January 20th. He explained that additional
29 information had been gathered and provided to the Council in the staff report. He then
30 introduced Juan Garrido, Public Works Director, to present the information.

32

33 Administrator Cowie noted that several experts were present to provide
34 information, including Brian Andrew (engineer with Hansen Allen Luce), John Tucker
35 (North Union Water Master), and Rick Malloy (representing Central Utah Water
36 Conservancy District).

37 Director Garrido presented detailed information about the city's water shares and
38 needs. He explained that the dissolution of the North Union Canal and Provo Bench
39 Canal companies has necessitated Lindon City to find alternative sources for delivering
40 its secondary irrigation water. The proposal involved trading 38 shares of Provo Bench
41 Canal Company water for 5 CFS (cubic feet per second) capacity in the Provo River
42 Aqueduct.

44

2 Director Garrido then provided a comprehensive breakdown of Lindon's water
4 portfolio:

- 6 • The city would need approximately 18.52 CFS at build-out (projected for around
8 2060)
- 8 • Current city water resources include various sources including the Alpine Reach
10 connection (2.6 CFS), Anderson Farms land drain system (0.45 CFS), and
12 existing PRA conveyance (1.2 CFS)
- 10 • After the proposed trade, Lindon would have about 11 CFS of the needed 18.52
12 CFS, leaving a 4.4 CFS deficit that would need to be addressed through future
acquisitions

14 John Tucker, Water Master for 11 years and Lindon resident for 29 years, outlined
16 numerous reasons why the North Union Canal was no longer a viable infrastructure,
including:

- 18 1. Liability concerns with the open canal
- 20 2. Reliability issues with aging infrastructure
- 22 3. Constant water leaks affecting Orem residents' yards and basements
- 24 4. Canal collapse in multiple locations
- 26 5. Inefficiency due to evaporation and delay time (6 hours for water to travel
through the system)
- 28 6. Water theft by unauthorized users
- 30 7. Poor water quality due to trash and moss growth
- 32 8. Manual operation requiring constant adjustments
- 34 9. Deteriorating communication with users
- 36 10. The 125-year-old canal infrastructure requiring significant investment
- 38 11. Changed access at the canyon due to construction

40 Brian Andrew provided additional technical information, explaining that the cost
42 to pipe the entire canal would be approximately \$20 million. He elaborated that the
44 project would entail not only the purchase and installation of a 48-inch pipe, estimated at
\$250 per foot, but also significant additional costs associated with digging through
neighborhoods and people's backyards. Furthermore, he mentioned the long-term
maintenance requirements that such an infrastructure project would necessitate. Building
a new piped canal would require substantial investment, and the logistical challenges,
such as navigating existing properties and ensuring minimal disruption to the community,
would further add to the overall cost and complexity of the project.

46 Rick Malloy explained that the 38 shares were determined based on measured
48 water losses in the Provo Bench Canal portion. He clarified that these losses included
50 conveyance, evaporation, and seepage factors, and the exchange was designed so that
Lindon City would not be left in a deficit. Additionally, Malloy highlighted that Central
Utah Water had invested approximately \$400,000 several years prior to help fund a

2 connection to the Provo River Aqueduct (PRA), which was part of efficiency
improvements across the Wasatch Front. This investment was made to facilitate a good
4 step forward in terms of water management across the region, aligning with the intended
goals of improving distribution efficiency and securing water for the community's future
6 needs.

8 Mayor Lundberg asked for any public comment from those present, the following
comments were made:

10

Jim Dain - a long-time Lindon resident and former mayor, emphasized his concerns about
12 the impact on former water users. During the meeting, he expressed his apprehensions
about Lindon City's decision to move away from utilizing the North Union Canal,
14 arguing that the change imposed a significant burden on individuals who had been
relying on the system. He highlighted the example of his brother-in-law, who resides in
16 Orem, explaining that the shift would entail substantial financial costs for upgrading his
water infrastructure, including the need to expand from a 1-inch to an inch and a half
18 meter and develop a delivery system through his property.

20 Mr. Dain questioned whether the council had genuinely considered all feasible options,
suggesting that piping the canal might have been an affordable and viable alternative
22 rather than abandoning the system. He challenged the projected costs presented by city
officials, noting that a construction company had estimated that it could cost about \$1
24 million per mile for a 36-inch HDPE pipe, implying that the scenarios presented might
have been overly pessimistic. In his view, the council had not been provided with
26 sufficiently optimistic or comprehensive solutions.

Moreover, Mr. Dain advised the council to actively pursue the development of the city's
28 Copley water resources to bridge the projected 4.4 CFS water deficit, underscoring the
importance of not delaying such projects until they become prohibitively expensive. He
30 urged the council to prioritize these developments before their terms expire to ensure that
Lindon's future water needs are met adequately, thus safeguarding the city's water future.

32

Larry Ellertson – also brought forward his perspective, referencing his historical
34 understanding of water management in Lindon. He sought clarification on technical
aspects of the water supply agreements and storage rights, raising points about how water
36 resources and infrastructure changes are accounted for. He underlined the need for a fair
secondary water rate structure, one that respects the contributions of original water share
38 owners, acknowledging that past agreements around water shares must be considered
when assigning costs to current users.

40

Alan Colledge –having sat on the board of minutes for irrigation for 20 to 30 years,
42 emphasized the necessity of the current water management decisions, acknowledging that
the opportunity to pipe the ditch had passed and commending the efforts of local officials
44 in handling the transition.

2 Kim Bonnett – another local resident, raised concerns about how the decision-making
process had been conducted. He expressed apprehensions regarding whether all potential
4 solutions, like the previously discussed piping of existing water channels, had thoroughly
been examined by the council. Mr. Bonnett hoped that the current council was utilizing
6 all possible information and options to responsibly secure Lindon's water future,
reminding them of the historic importance of water to the community and encouraging
8 transparency and community trust-going forward.

10 The Council discussed various aspects of securing additional water capacity,
specifically considering potential trades with Jordan Valley Water Conservation District
12 and Orem Metro, which owns 8.7 CFS in the PRA that they don't currently use. During
the meeting, it was highlighted that additional sources, such as the Cobley water and
14 other developed water resources, could play a significant role in closing the projected 4.4
CFS water deficit at full build-out. Mayor Lundberg explained the importance of these
16 strategies being implemented in consideration of projected city growth to ensure adequate
water resources are available.

18 Several technical and logistical considerations were shared, such as accessing
20 existing water sources more efficiently and utilizing capacity in the PRA optimally.
Andrew Brian pointed out that the city's current infrastructure could support up to 13
22 CFS from the PRA, offering scope for further capacity utilization as needed.
Administrator Cowie also mentioned preliminary talks with Jordan Valley regarding
24 potential exchanges, highlighting that they had already made offers for such an exchange,
and mentioned that exchanges were a viable method to enhance long-term water security
26 for Lindon City.

The council discussed the necessity for strategic planning to maintain and secure
28 water resources. There was also a strong sentiment about learning from regional water
management success stories and applying relevant practices to minimize risks associated
30 with transitions from historical infrastructure, such as the dilapidated North Union Canal
system, to more modern, efficient solutions.

32 Mayor Lundberg emphasized the critical need for a reliable delivery system that
34 can be depended upon long-term, considering both the potential risks and benefits
associated with maintaining the old system versus transitioning to the new arrangement.
36 She reiterated the commitment of the council to reduce dependency on outdated
infrastructure to mitigate future risks and ensure sustainable water management practices.

38 Mayor Lundberg asked for any further comment from the council. Hearing none,
40 she called for a motion.

42 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION
#2026-3-R. COUNCILMEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION. THE
44 VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:
COUNCILMEMBER HOYT AYE

2 COUNCILMEMBER JACOBS AYE
COUNCILMEMBER STEWART AYE
4 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK AYE
THE MOTION CARRIED.

6

8 **Adjourn** –

10 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING
AT 6:40 PM. COUNCILMEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL
12 PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

14 Approved – February 2, 2026

16

18

Britni Laidler, City Recorder

20

22 _____
Carolyn O. Lundberg, Mayor