

**APPROVED**

Timpanogos Special Service District

Administrative Board

Electronic Meeting Minutes

6400 North 5050 West Utah County, Utah

January 22, 2026

6:00 p.m.

Conference Room/Electronic Meeting

**Board Members**

**Present:** Sullivan Love (Chair) Blaine Thomas Mack Straw  
Dave Norman David Bunker Mark Christensen  
Shane Sorensen

**Electronic:** Richard Nielsen Joel Thompson

**Excused:** Neal Winterton Chandler Goodwin Brian Braithwaite

**District Staff:** Richard Mickelsen, District Manager David Barlow, District Engineer  
Shannon Hansen, Administrative Manager Steven Carter, CFO  
Danette Smith, Board Secretary Joe Martin, CPA  
Addison Winn, Risk Manager Sam Grimes, Treatment Manager  
Devin Langford, CTO

**Others:** Mark Bell, Hayes Godfrey Bell PC (online) Gary Vance, JUB Engineers  
Wade Stinson, Aqua Engineers Brandon Wyatt, Bowen Collins  
Trevor Lindsey, Brown and Caldwell Susan Spore, Brown and Caldwell  
Devan Peterson, Vineyard City (online) Naseem Ghandour, Vineyard City (online)  
Brandon Nielsen, JUB Engineers Keith Larsen, Bowen Collins  
Douglas Cortney Jaron Hamblin  
Lauren Woodland

**Call to Order**

Sullivan Love, Board Chair, called the meeting to order. 6:01 p.m. Sullivan welcomed new board member, Shane Sorensen, Alpine City representative.

**Public Hearing**

1. To receive public comments on the 2025 CFP, 2025 IFFP, 2025 IFA, Impact Fee Enactment

**Mack Straw made a motion to go into Public Hearing. Blaine Thomas seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – Sullivan Love, Shane Sorensen, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Blaine Thomas, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, and Dave Norman. Those voting "Nay" – None. The motion passed unanimously.**

There was no public comment.

**Shane Sorensen made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Mark Christensen seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – Sullivan Love, Shane Sorensen, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Blaine Thomas, Mack Straw, Mark Chistensen, Richard Nielson, and Dave Norman. Those voting "Nay" – None. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Approval of Minutes**

1. Approval of minutes of December 18, 2025 Board Meeting

1           **2. Approval of minutes of December 29, 2025 Emergency Board Meeting**

2  
3           **Blaine Thomas a motion to approve the minutes of the December 18, 2025, Board Meeting and**  
4 **December 29, 2025, Emergency Board Meeting. Mark Christensen seconded the motion. Those voting**  
5 **“Aye” – Sullivan Love, Shane Sorensen, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Blaine Thomas, Mack Straw,**  
6 **Mark Christensen, Richard Nielson, and Dave Norman. Those voting “Nay” – None. The motion passed**  
7 **unanimously.**

8  
9           **Consent Calendar**

- 10           1. TSSD Check Register  
11           2. 2026 Fraud Risk Assessment  
12           3. CL-R1 –  
13                 a. Replace & Upsize Lehi/AF outfall: Sundt pay Request #21 (\$607,578.95)  
14           4. TP-4/5 – Clarifier  
15                 a. East Clarifier: Archer Western pay Request #16 (\$1,105,990.00) retainage (\$58,210.00)  
16           5. Package B – Tertiary filtration and UV Disinfection  
17                 a. Gerber pay Request #11 (\$4,005,544.31) retainage (\$210,818.12)  
18           6. Package C – PCAD  
19                 a. GMP3 digester Complex Piles and Deep Foundations – Alder Construction pay Request  
20                     #11 (\$1,141,044.05) retainage (\$60,054.95)  
21                     b. GMP-EQ01 Equipment Procurement and Contract Transfers – Alder Construction pay  
22                     Request #2 (\$2,154,628.73) retainage (\$113,401.52)  
23

24           **David Bunker made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Richard Nielsen**  
25 **seconded the motion. Sullivan Love, Chair, took a roll call vote. Those voting “Aye” – Sullivan Love, Shane**  
26 **Sorensen, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Blaine Thomas, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Richard**  
27 **Nielson, and Dave Norman. Those voting “Nay” – None. The motion passed unanimously.**

28  
29           **Finance**

30           **1. Financial Report**

31           The December financial report was in the board packet for review. There were no questions.  
32

33           **Action Items**

34           **1. Drill New Well (\$2,640,300)**

35           Blaine asked if we have the underground water to support what we would be taking out if we drill a new  
36 well. Rich Mickelsen said yes. Rich said we proved the District’s water rights by pulling 260 gpm out of well #3.  
37 We are hoping to pull 800 gpm out of the new well which will be located within 150 feet of the current well. Rich  
38 believes it will meet the needs of the District. The well drilled in 1978 had a ten-inch casing originally and at  
39 some point, a six-inch casing was put inside of that. We did not know if that would prove our water rights. We  
40 need 208 gpm to prove our water rights. A pump was hooked up and we were able to pump 260 gpm with the  
41 pump. Rich said if we put the high head pump to pull the 260 gpm, we would be able to provide water for the  
42 dewatering building, and can send that water to package B. The other option is a low head pump that would only  
43 provide water for package B; utility pump water that sends water back up to our system. The option for artesian  
44 flow does not prove our water rights. The other option is to drill a new well and request an extension of time to  
45 file proof of beneficial use by February 28, 2026. Rich said he met with American Fork City at the board’s  
46 request to see if we could use our water rights in their wells. We will make a change application to be able to have  
47 that option. Right now, there is an eight-inch line with a two-inch meter that comes to the District from American  
48 Fork. If we do have water come to TSSD from American Fork’s wells, we would need to upsize that meter. There  
49 will be costs associated with water and infrastructure that we would work through in an agreement later. Rich  
50 thinks we should have that as an option as it is wise to keep all options on the table if it does not cost a large  
51 amount of money. Rich recommends we drill a new well within 150 feet of the current well between the  
52 dewatering building and aerated digesters. If we drill this new well, we will be able to provide the water to the  
53 dewatering building directly, it will prove our water rights, and we can reuse those water rights again throughout  
54 our processes.

1 David Bunker said he spent time with Rich going through all the details of why we need a new well, and  
2 what the demand needs are for the plant. David said he had a lot of questions at the last board meeting, and he  
3 feels like all his questions have been answered. He is in favor of drilling a new well, making a change application  
4 for the water rights, so the District does not lose any water rights and filing an extension for proof of beneficial  
5 use. David appreciates Rich's vision of the District and making sure we have what we need going forward in the  
6 long-term. Rich said in the well report from JUB the cost includes the bare minimum materials needed to put the  
7 new well together. There will be additional costs if the board wants to have a more robust well. The cost estimate  
8 is \$2.6 million. Brandon Nielsen, JUB, said the cost estimate includes low carbon steel, which is very common, a  
9 step up would be high strength low alloy steel casing, which would be 2% more (\$40,000) and a step up from that  
10 would be stainless steel casing, not as common, which would be an additional 2%. Blaine asked why it was \$2  
11 million to drill a well. Rich said the details are in the packet. Brandon said the new well would be 350 feet deep,  
12 and the cost includes drilling the well, equipping it with a building, and putting the pump and motor down. Mark  
13 Christensen asked how the wells fare in this area, with the soil conditions. Do you see the casings deteriorate  
14 rapidly due to high alkaline and is there value in changing the alloy in the well casing? David Bunker said there  
15 are some conditions he thinks we should consider, such as upgrading that casing. David said we should put the  
16 RFP out for design, and when we receive those, we can assess the needs. David said this is just a cost estimate and  
17 once we get the design finished and put it out to bid for a driller, we will get hard numbers.  
18

19 **David Bunker made a motion to direct Rich and staff to prepare an RFP for the construction of a new**  
20 **well and to file an extension request to the State for proof of beneficial use. Blaine Thomas seconded the**  
21 **motion. Those voting "Aye" – Sullivan Love, Shane Sorensen, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Blaine**  
22 **Thomas, Mack Straw, Mark Chistensen, Richard Nielson, and Dave Norman. Those voting "Nay" – None.**  
23 **The motion passed unanimously.**  
24

## 25 **2. Resolution 2026-01 Impact Fee Enactment, 2025 CFP, 2025 IFFP and 2025 IFA**

26 Rich said this is a follow up to our December 29, 2025, emergency meeting. We had a public hearing about  
27 this at the beginning of this meeting. Resolution 2026-01, 2025 CFP, 2025 IFFP and 2025 IFA are in the packet.  
28

29 **Blaine Thomas made a motion to approve Resolution 2026-01 Impact Fee Enactment, 2025 CFP, 2025**  
30 **IFFP and 2025 IFA. Shane Sorensen seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – Sullivan Love, Shane**  
31 **Sorensen, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Blaine Thomas, Mack Straw, Mark Chistensen, Richard**  
32 **Nielson, and Dave Norman. Those voting "Nay" – None. The motion passed unanimously.**  
33

## 34 **3. TO 2023-02 Package C Final Design -Amendment 2 Brown and Caldwell (3,323,882)**

35 Rich said at the board retreat in September, board members were presented the costs of this amendment. The  
36 Board asked Rich if he had reviewed this and whether costs were inflated to meet costs of the project. Rich said  
37 he has reviewed this and prepared a summary for the board. Rich said much of this is owner driven by progress  
38 done on this project. The initial design was going to take three years and was to be a design/bid/build project.  
39 When President Biden introduced the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), it allowed the potential of up to 40% capture  
40 of this capital project to be eligible for a refund from the IRS. Doing that required a change in the delivery system  
41 from design/bid/build to CM/CG. In that, there have been multiple items that were not in Brown and Caldwell's  
42 scope as part of their design. Code requirements are part of this as the county has requirements we need to meet.  
43 These were not in the evaluation as they were doing their scope of work. The other part of this is prepurchase  
44 equipment, which requires design to fit the equipment in the buildings. There is \$276 million remaining in the  
45 budget for this project. The \$3.3 million amendment includes two phases. Part one is work completed by Brown  
46 and Caldwell as we have gone through the design portion of this. Part two is additional work they are anticipating.  
47 This amendment includes 100% digester complex, 60% gas upgrading, 30% thickening and straining, and 30%  
48 primary filters. There is approximately \$11 million in savings in doing this project as GM/GC.

49 Rich said the primary filter covered building and the primary filters will accept flows from the headworks  
50 screening. There will be two major flows of water coming into this building. Rich has asked that we not just look  
51 at the hydraulic flow, but us recommend to build a model at USU (\$219,764) to show the flow pattern of the  
52 solids and how they are distributed through different filters. Right now, there are bioreactors and a distribution  
53 tower that distribute the influent flow to the bioreactors. The west bioreactors receive double the load of the east  
54 bioreactors. Even though the hydraulic load may work, we need to be mindful of the organic load distributed to  
55 these different filters. If not distributed evenly, some filters may fail more often. The \$219,764 for this model has

1 not been approved but is in this amendment. Rich thinks it is wise to do this model, so we do not have operational  
2 issues when this starts up. As we approach 2040, we are going to reach capacity of hydraulic load before we hit  
3 organic load, and we need to be able to hold about three million gallons of flow during peak time. USU will  
4 include that as part of their scope of work to see what that looks like. There is also phosphorus removal we need  
5 to comply with. If we need to go to .1 mg/L, we will need the food to do its job for the biological removal  
6 process. There are three other chambers we would put in for the future if that is the option we are pushed to by  
7 regulation from the EPA. We could add a couple of perforated screens to provide us with other options. Rich said  
8 at a minimum he needs approval for part 1 tonight for the \$2,443,822.00 for design work Brown and Caldwell  
9 have finished and come back for part 2 which is anticipated additional items.

10  
11 **Shane Sorensen made a motion to approve Part 1 of Task Order 2023-02 Amendment 2 for**  
12 **\$2,443,822.00. David Bunker seconded the motion. Sullivan Love, Chair, took a roll call vote. Those voting**  
13 **“Aye” – Sullivan Love, Shane Sorensen, David Bunker, Joel Thompson, Blaine Thomas, Mack Straw,**  
14 **Mark Chistensen, Richard Nielson, and Dave Norman. Those voting “Nay” – None. The motion passed**  
15 **unanimously.**

16  
17 **Communication**

18 **1. Manager’s Report**

19 **a. Plant performance**

20 Rich said this shows the 2025 year-end plant performance. The influent flow is 21.9 mgd. When Rich started  
21 here seven years ago, influent flow was 16 mgd. That shows how much growth we have had. Our effluent  
22 phosphorus yearly average is .786 mg/L which is under the 1.0 mg/L parameter. We are meeting all other  
23 parameters. Staff have been working very hard to keep the plant going during the bypass of our headworks, which  
24 was not a small operation. Most of those pumps are out of the way now. Rich said once they were able to get into  
25 that chamber, there was additional erosion found inside. Rich made the decision to spend an extra bit of time and  
26 money while we were doing the bypass to line into the headworks a few more feet. Rich does not have a cost for  
27 that yet, but knows it was worth the effort to spend the extra time doing that while the bypass was in place. Rich  
28 said when that cost comes out just be aware it was something that came up in just the last few days and was well  
29 worth the money. Rich said we now have inflow going into the headworks. We have not finished pulling all the  
30 equipment and closing the doors to reduce odors, but we will get there soon.

31 Sullivan asked if there has been an increase in influent loading with the increased flow. Rich said yes, when  
32 we started doing this plant upgrade, we were planning to do primary clarifiers, which typically remove 35% BOD  
33 and 50% TSS, which would take load off the bioreactor. Rich expected us to have more organic load in the plant  
34 but that is not the case, as it is starting to get concentrated. We are not going to get as much expansion as Rich  
35 thought. We are still going to be at 43 mgd but we must be aware that we did lose some capacity due to increased  
36 concentration. This is why impact fees are lower and the 239.1 gpd/ERU has dropped down to 204 gpd/ERU.  
37 David Bunker thanked Rich for the report and the quick decision to expand the lining while we already had the  
38 bypass in place.

39 **Closed Session**

40 **1. To discuss Litigation, Property Acquisition and Personnel**

41 There was no closed session.

42  
43 **Adjourn: David Bunker made a motion to adjourn. Mack Straw seconded the motion. All present “Aye”.**  
44 **Meeting adjourned. 6:43 p.m.**