

**ENOCH CITY WATER BOARD
NOTICE AND AGENDA
May 14, 2026 at 4:30pm
City Council Chambers
City Offices, 900 E. Midvalley Road
Join Zoom Meeting:
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84708920783>
Meeting ID: 847 0892 0783**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING**
 - a. Pledge of Allegiance –**
 - b. Invocation –Audience invited to participate.**
 - c. Approval of agenda for May 14, 2026 –**
 - d. Approval of minutes for April 9, 2025-**
 - e. Conflict of Interest Declaration-**

- 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- 3. DISCUSS THE UTAH PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM FEE POLICY AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

- 4. DISCUSS THE SECONDARY SYSTEM TIER AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

- 5. BOARD/STAFF REPORTS**

- 6. ADJOURN**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing auxiliary communicative aids and services for these meetings should call the City Offices at 586-1119, giving at least 48 hours advance notice.

CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I certify that a copy of the forgoing “Notice and Agenda” was delivered to each member of the Water board, posted on the Enoch City website, on the City Office door and published on the Utah Public Meeting Notice website on **5-13-2026**.



Lindsay Hildebrand, Recorder

05/13/2026
Date

**ENOCH CITY WATER BOARD
MINUTES
April 9, 2026 at 4:30pm
City Council Chambers
City Offices, 900 E. Midvalley Road**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Coby Zobell - Excused, Doug Grimshaw, Alan Miller, Spencer Jones, and Christopher Daughton

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager Robinson, Council Member David Harris - Excused, City Recorder Lindsay Hildebrand, Public Works Director Hayden White

PUBLIC PRESENT: Lina Hahne

1. **CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING by Chairman pro-tem Grimshaw**
 - a. **Pledge of Allegiance – Led by Chairman pro-tem Doug Grimshaw**
 - b. **Invocation –Audience invited to participate. Given by Spencer Jones**
 - c. **Approval of agenda for April 9, 2026 – Spencer made a motion to approve the agenda. Alan seconded and all voted in favor.**
 - d. **Approval of minutes for February 12, 2025- Doug noted several corrections needed on page two, including the addition of dollar signs to random numbers in the affordability standards section. Alan Miller suggested using a lowercase "m" for "mean adjusted gross income" to avoid confusion with tax terminology.
Alan made a motion to approve the minutes with the noted corrections. The motion was seconded and all voted in favor.**
 - e. **Conflict of Interest Declaration- Spencer Jones declared that he is a city resident and any water rate changes would affect him financially.**

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS – There were no public comments.**

3. **DISCUSS AMENDING THE WATER RATE STRUCTURE AND USER FEE AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

City Manager Robinson introduced Jacob from Waterworth, a company that provides financial modeling for water systems. Robinson explained that the board was considering two-tiered models: a five-tier system proposed by Ensign Engineering and a simpler three-tier system. The concern with the five-tier system was the assumption that

people would continue to pay higher rates rather than reduce consumption. The three-tier system was viewed as simpler and more conservative in its revenue projections.

Jacob explained that Waterworth's software performs financial forecasting and revenue calibration, helping utilities plan financially to avoid emergency rate hikes and make informed infrastructure investment decisions. The models incorporated actual data from 2023-2025, the 2026 budget, and projected 3% growth for operating expenses to account for inflation and an increased customer base. The projections also included both current and proposed debt service associated with future capital projects, with significant projects planned for 2031-2033.

Spencer Jones asked whether the debt projections accounted for proposed rate increases or were based solely on current rates. Jacob clarified that the debt projections represented principal and interest payments on loans for future projects, independent of revenue. Jacob confirmed that grants were included in the model, showing a grant in 2026, and that additional grants could be incorporated as they were received.

Alan Miller questioned whether the capital expenditures shown were due to growth and whether ratepayers would bear the entire cost. Hayden White explained that while impact fees could be used for growth-related projects, they could not be shown in grant and loan applications as guaranteed revenue, so the model had to demonstrate that user fees could cover all expenses. City Manager Robinson added that to qualify for grants and loans, the city needed to demonstrate adequate rate revenue and financial responsibility, even though impact fees would offset many growth-related costs. He noted that the city had approximately half a million dollars in impact fees available.

Jacob presented both rate structure scenarios side by side. The three-tier board proposal would require a 13% increase next year, followed by 10%, then 3% annual increases thereafter to maintain a healthy cash position above the \$1 million target. The five-tier engineer's proposal would require slightly smaller increases. 10% next year, followed by 10%, then 3% annually, assuming consumption remained steady. Robinson emphasized the preference for gradual increases over time rather than large, infrequent rate hikes.

Alan Miller requested that Jacob model an alternative three-tier structure with tiers at 0-20,000 gallons, 20,000-30,000 gallons, 30,000-40,000 gallons, and 40,000+ gallons, using the same pricing as previously proposed. Jacob quickly modeled this scenario and reported that it would generate approximately \$30,000 more in revenue than the board's original proposal and was comparable to the engineer's proposal. Jacob's analysis showed that 72% of bills were under 20,000 gallons, 9% were between 20,000-30,000 gallons, 6% between 30,000-40,000 gallons, and 14% were 40,000 gallons and above.

Linda Hahne from the public asked whether the highest tier users were commercial or residential connections. Jacob explained that while there were 10 commercial service connections that paid the same rates, high usage in the top tier included both residential and commercial users, with residential users showing more concentrated usage at lower levels and commercial users showing more usage at higher tiers. City Manager Robinson clarified that rates were based solely on consumption, not on whether a user was residential or commercial, so both categories paid the same rate for the same usage.

The board discussed several cost-saving measures. Alan Miller suggested encouraging customers to switch from credit card autopay to direct checking account transfers to avoid card processing fees, which totaled approximately \$35,000 annually for water and an equal amount for sewer. He estimated that if the city could move 50% of customers to checking account transfers, it could save significant money and potentially reduce the need for rate increases. Miller also stressed the importance of notifying customers about rate changes well in advance, as many residents have set maximum autopay amounts that could result in non-payment if rates increase unexpectedly.

Doug Grimshaw noted that the three-tier proposal from two months prior was simpler and easier for people to understand, and if it generated revenue in the same ballpark as the engineer's proposal, there was no reason to complicate it further.

Alan made a motion to recommend amending the water user rate structure

as follows:	Base Rate/fee \$30	Tier 1: 0 to 20,000 gallons
	\$1 per 1,000 gallons	Tier 2: 20,001 to 30,000 gallons
	\$2 per 1,000 gallons	Tier 3: 30,001 to 50,000 gallons
	\$3 per 1,000 gallons	Tier 4: 50,001 and above gallons

Christopher seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

4. DISCUSS THE UTAH PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM FEE POLICY AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL

Hayden White explained that by July 2027, the state required water systems to impose a fee of 1.5 cents per 1,000 gallons sold to customers, which would generate approximately \$12,000 to \$17,000 annually for the city. This fee would fund the state's Department of Environmental Quality, as the government was no longer providing full funding. The city would need to collect this fee monthly and remit it to the state once per year.

White asked whether the board wanted to implement the fee a year ahead of the deadline or wait until next year to add it alongside other rate adjustments. Alan Miller recommended getting ahead of it, as this would allow the city to bank the money until payment was due, avoiding stress over finding the funds when required.

The board debated whether to add the fee to the base rate or calculate it per gallon. Christopher Daughton suggested adding a flat 30 cents to the base rate for simplicity. Alan Miller countered that since the city pays the state based on total gallons sold, it might be more appropriate to incorporate the fee into the per-thousand-gallon charges, ensuring high users contributed proportionally. Miller also recommended conducting a detailed analysis of the base rate and fixed costs to determine the most equitable approach.

Christopher Daughton made a motion to add 30 cents to the base rate to address the state fee and evaluate its effectiveness over the year. However, the motion died for lack of a second, as Alan Miller expressed concern about implementing a change without better information about costs and impacts. The board agreed that City Manager Robinson and Hayden White would analyze where the money would come from and bring the matter back to a future meeting.

5. DISCUSS THE SECONDARY SYSTEM TIER

The board then discussed the secondary water system tier structure. Hayden White explained that customers with secondary meters received 10,000 gallons of culinary water for indoor use and 25,000 gallons of non-potable secondary water for outdoor irrigation, all for the same base rate as drinking water customers. Usage between 25,001-60,000 gallons was charged at \$2 per 1,000 gallons. If drinking water exceeded 10,000 gallons, customers were charged \$5 per 1,000 gallons to discourage outdoor use of potable water. White proposed reducing the secondary water allowance from 25,000 to 20,000 gallons to promote conservation while the board was already reviewing rate structures.

Alan Miller asked whether the secondary system generated adequate revenue to support itself. White acknowledged he could not definitively answer that question, as the revenues had not been fully separated and analyzed. Miller recommended analyzing secondary system revenues, expenses, and conservation impacts before making changes to the tier structure. He noted that while reducing the allowance from 25,000 to 20,000 gallons made sense for conservation, better financial data would be needed to make an informed recommendation.

White explained that the secondary system was funded through impact fees for new infrastructure and general water funds for connections to existing facilities like schools and parks. The city's long-term goal was to transition to reuse water for the secondary system once water treatment facilities could produce near-drinking-quality reclaimed water. The board agreed that staff would analyze the secondary system finances and bring the matter back to a future meeting along with the state fee analysis

6. BOARD/STAFF REPORTS

Hayden White

- At the Anderson well, drilling work was scheduled to begin in 2 weeks, with the goal of achieving 1,500 gallons per minute, though he anticipated they might only pump at 60% capacity as had occurred with previous wells.
- The Little Eden well tested high for nitrates and was currently offline. The state encouraged retesting in July and August with weekly tests to monitor whether nitrate levels declined or held steady. If levels remained high, the city might lose that well or would need to invest in expensive treatment. White indicated he would prefer drilling a new well and converting the Eden Well to the secondary system if treatment costs were equivalent to drilling costs.
- White noted that nitrate contamination appeared to be affected by nearby agricultural wells, with contamination levels dropping when large farming operations pumped from wells upstream and increasing when those wells were not operating. He planned to monitor whether nitrate levels declined when farmers activated their irrigation systems in the coming months.

7. ADJOURN – Alan made a motion to adjourn. Christopher seconded and all voted in favor.

DRAFT