

The Lindon City Joint City Council and Timpanogos School District Board held a Work Session on **Tuesday, September 8, 2026 beginning at 4:00 p.m.** at the Lindon City Center 100 N. State Street, Lindon, Utah.

REGULAR SESSION – 4:00 P.M.

Conducting: Carolyn Lundber, Mayor

PRESENT

EXCUSED

Carolyn Lundberg, Mayor

Brian Haws, City Attorney

Cole Hooley, Councilmember

Lincoln Jacobs, Councilmember

Jake Hoyt, Councilmember

Steve Stewart, Councilmember

Van Broderick, Councilmember

Michael Florence, Community Dev. Director

Mike Brower, Chief of Police

Heath Bateman, Parks and Recreation Director

Adam Cowie, City Administrator

Britni Laidler, City Recorder

Joe Jensen, Superintendent

Guy Fugal, Boardmember

Jason Sundberg, Business Administrator

Peter Galanse, Assistant Superintendent

Sterling Hilton, Boardmember

Michelle Sorensen, Boardmember

Jen Lyman, Board President

Dave Mower, Assistant Superintendent

David Smith, Boardmember

CURRENT BUSINESS-

1. Discussion Items:

a. TSD Vision and Values

Boardmember Sterling Hilton introduced the district's newly adopted Vision & Values document, the result of several months of broad stakeholder collaboration. The process included visits to every school in the district, with separate meetings held for teachers, administrators, parents, and students, as well as larger community cluster meetings. The document was formally adopted by the Board approximately six weeks prior to this meeting.

Board members highlighted several elements they found particularly meaningful. The district motto, "We Learn to Thrive," was identified by Superintendent Jensen as the most concise expression of the district's direction, noting it carries multiple layers of meaning. Board President Lyman elaborated on the significance of the concept of *belonging* — an element that

emerged strongly from student feedback — observing that students who feel they belong are more motivated to attend and engage in school.

Mayor Lundberg commented favorably on the document's integration of character development and civic preparation alongside academic skills, noting the recognition that critical thinking and creativity are as important as knowledge acquisition.

Councilmember Lincoln Jacobs raised the practical question of how the vision and values would be disseminated throughout the organization rather than remaining an aspirational statement. Superintendent Jensen acknowledged this challenge and noted that the district is actively working on a more accessible graphic representation. He further emphasized that the board itself genuinely lives by these values, which he viewed as essential to the document having real organizational impact. It was noted that the inclusive process by which the document was created — giving staff, parents, and students a voice — was itself a strategy to build authentic ownership rather than producing something that would simply hang on a wall.

Superintendent Jensen noted that the district's approach to the boundary study serves as a concrete example of the values in action, with community engagement far exceeding what state law requires.

b. Robust School Criteria

Superintendent Jensen and Business Administrator Sandberg presented the district's Robust School Criteria framework, which was developed before the boundary study commenced. Rather than beginning with a question of which schools to close, the district first asked what conditions are necessary for every student and staff member to genuinely thrive. The framework is organized around a foundational layer — comprising high teacher quality, effective school leadership, strong school culture, and safety policy and operations — upon which five additional criteria are built:

1. **Comprehensive Offerings** — The public consistently expressed a desire for students to be appropriately challenged at all levels, including robust AP and concurrent enrollment offerings at the high school level.
2. **Healthy Collaborative Environment** — Identified as closely linked to school size; it becomes difficult to maintain effective teacher collaboration and flexibility in managing student groups when elementary schools fall below approximately three classes per grade level.
3. **Adequate Support Staff** — Also size-dependent, particularly at the elementary level, where smaller schools struggle to sustain necessary support positions within their funding allocations.
4. **Proximity and Geography** — The physical location of a school relative to the population it serves, with centrality generally being preferable.
5. **Physical Facilities** — The age, size, and condition of buildings, which must be weighed when evaluating boundary and closure options.

The discussion noted that criteria one through three are, in practical terms, proxies for school size and are the primary drivers of the optimal enrollment ranges identified in the

framework — roughly three to five classes per grade at the elementary level. Criteria four and five are more relevant when analyzing specific closure or consolidation scenarios. Boardmember Sorensen emphasized that the goal is not to create oversized "mega schools," but to right-size schools so that principals have adequate funding flexibility and can offer programs without exhausting discretionary resources to compensate for under-enrollment.

Council members raised questions about enrollment projections and the role of charter and private schools in the data. Business Administrator Sandberg explained that enrollment projections are built using birth data (geocoded by mother's address), building permit activity, and historical enrollment trends. District-wide, projections have been accurate to within approximately 0.5 percent year-over-year. Charter school enrollment data is tracked as it is publicly available, though home school and private school populations are not captured. He noted that the greatest enrollment fluctuations occur at the first grade, seventh grade, and tenth grade levels. It was also observed that, given rising housing costs and an increasingly built-out geography — with the exception of the Vineyard area — the district does not anticipate a return to the higher birth rates or enrollment growth of prior decades, particularly at the elementary level.

c. Update on School Boundary Study

Business Administrator Sandberg provided a detailed update on the boundary study timeline and process. The study encompasses two major, parallel workstreams: (1) grade-level reconfiguration, and (2) school closures and boundary changes.

On grade reconfiguration, the district is actively exploring a shift to a K–5, 6–8, 9–12 configuration. Public input has been gathered extensively through focus groups and cluster meetings held at all four high school campuses. The data showed overwhelming preference for retaining the ninth grade at the high school level — a 9–12 model — rather than reducing to three high schools, with parents citing practical concerns such as transportation to athletics and the academic benefits of keeping students on a single campus through high school. The related question of whether to configure middle schools as 6–7–8 or 7–8 was noted as still under active discussion with principals. Formal public hearings on grade reconfiguration are scheduled to begin at the September 9, 2026 board meeting, with three separate hearings on high school, middle school, and elementary configurations.

On closures and boundary changes, thirteen schools have been formally named as part of the study, along with two programs — Cascade and Cherry Hill — under consideration for relocation or closure. Beginning in October and running through the first meeting in November, eighteen public hearings will be held across six board meetings. The board is targeting a vote on grade configuration by October 21, 2026, and a final decision on closures and boundaries by December 2, 2026, with a contingency date of December 16 if needed. Board President Lyman noted that the December deadline is both a practical necessity — state law requires closure announcements by December 31 of the preceding school year — and a response to requests from teachers and staff who have urged the board to make a clear decision rather than extend uncertainty. Board members expressed a commitment to honoring affected school communities with proper closure celebrations and transition planning, and explicitly cited

2 the experience of schools that were closed without an opportunity for commemoration as a
cautionary example. It was also noted that the district will consider grandfathering provisions to
4 allow students who began at a school to complete their tenure there, and is actively exploring
true feeder patterns so that cohorts of students progress together from elementary through high
6 school.

8 Superintendent Jensen cautioned that the cumulative effect of reconfiguration, closures,
and boundary changes is likely to affect virtually every family in the district in some way, and
10 encouraged all parties to recognize that not every preference can be accommodated, but that the
long-term outcome will be stronger schools for the community.

12
14 d. Update on bus garage; TSD agreement with Aspen Peaks SD

16 Mayor Lundberg and Board President Lyman confirmed that TSD has executed a
Memorandum of Understanding with Aspen Peaks School District to operate concurrently out of
the bus depot in American Fork for an initial three-year period. This arrangement — described as
18 the first of its kind in the state, distinct from the contracted model used by other districts —
allows both districts to share a facility while maintaining independent operational structures. The
20 three-year term is intended as a testing period. Both parties expressed satisfaction with the
staffing secured to support the arrangement.

22 Separately, TSD has also entered into agreements with Aspen Peaks SD covering online
24 school, adult education, East Shore, Polaris, and Summit programs, also for a three-year term.
Board President Lyman characterized the online education agreement as an interim measure
26 while the district focuses on boundary and reconfiguration priorities, noting TSD has its own
longer-term vision for online education, particularly around serving homeschool families.

28 The question of a potential TSD bus garage site in Lindon was briefly raised. Mayor
30 Lundberg stated that the City Council had not formally deliberated on the matter as a body, and
that the site in question had been identified by the community as a potential future school
32 location given substantial projected residential growth in the western portions of Lindon,
Pleasant Grove, and Utah County. No formal position was taken. Board President Lyman noted
34 that constructing a new elementary school carries an estimated cost of \$60 million and that the
board's present focus is on making the best use of existing facilities and resources rather than
36 committing to new capital expenditures that would bind future boards.

38 Business Administrator Sandberg provided a brief update on TSD's district office
construction. The district purchased a former car dealership property on State Street in Lindon in
40 August 2026. Plans are being advanced for submission to the Lindon Planning Commission, with
a target hearing date of either September 29 or October 13, 2026. Groundbreaking is anticipated
42 in October or November 2026, with a target completion date of June 15, 2026, ahead of staff
reporting for the new district on July 1. Funding for the building comes from capital funds built
44 up within Alpine School District over the preceding four to five years, with TSD's allocated
share estimated at \$30–35 million, including a \$10 million preloaded startup allocation, allowing
46 construction to proceed without new bonding or debt.

2 e. Other Items of Common Interest.

4 The bodies agreed to schedule their next joint meeting for December 7, 2026 at 4:00 P.M.
6 at the TSD District Office in Lindon, in consideration of Lindon City's annual tree lighting event
later that evening.

8
10 Approved September 21, 2026

12
14

Britni Laidler, Recorder

16
18

Carolyn Lundberg, Mayor
20