

**WEBER BASIN WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 2026, 9:00 A.M.
DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS**

- 1) Welcome & Pledge of Allegiance Chair Anderson
- 2) Consideration of Approval of Minutes for Regular Board Meeting and
Hearing on Petitions for Water Contracts held July 30, 2026,
and Orientation Meeting held July 27, 2026 Chair Anderson
- 3) Consideration of Approval of
July 2026 Financial Report Trustee Robinson
- 4) Hearing on Petitions for Water Contracts and Consideration
of Approval of Cancellations Mgr. Searle

A. DAVIS COUNTY:

Cancellations of Water

- 1. Spencer & Morgan Shuppy..... 0.28 a.f. Proj
Talbot Estates (11-914-0227)
- 2. Ronald Waite 2.4 a.f. Proj
Layton (09-013-0132)
- 3. Ronald Waite 0.2 a.f. Proj
Layton (09-013-0143)
- 4. Ronald Waite 0.3 a.f. Proj
Layton (09-013-0189)

Petition for New Treated Water

- 1. West Point City 0.76 a.f. Trilateral
West Point Culinary System

B. MORGAN COUNTY:

Petitions for New Water

- 1. Teresa Nelson 0.65 a.f. Dist. 4
Richville (01-003-124-03-3)

C. SUMMIT COUNTY:

Cancellations of Water

- 1) Pine Meadow Mutual Water Company..... 1.0 a.f. Dist. 1
PMMWC Service Area (TDS-II-2)
- 2) Jason and Rebecca Stolle..... 1.0 a.f. Dist. 2
Henefer (STOLLE-1)

D. WEBER COUNTY:

Petitions for New Water

1. Weber-Box Elder Conservation District.....3.67 a.f. Dist. 4
North Ogden (16-044-0028 & 16-044-0036)
- 5) Water Supply Report Mgr. Olsen
- 6) Consideration of approval for the North Weber Well #2 Gen. Mgr. Paxman
Well House Engineering Design Contract..... and AGM Nelson
- 7) Consideration of Approval of the Secondary Meter Gen. Mgr. Paxman
Phase 17 Installation Contract Amendment..... and AGM Nelson
- 8) Consideration of Approval of the AV Watkins Gen. Mgr. Paxman
Phase 3 Construction Contract..... and AGM Nelson
- 9) Consideration of Approval of the Temporary Lowering Gen. Mgr. Paxman
of Pineview Reservoir Agreement.....and Legal Counsel Malmborg
- 10) General Manager's Report.....Gen. Mgr. Paxman
- 11) Other Business
- 12) Closed Session: Discussion on Purchase of Water, Possible Litigation, and
Property Purchase

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE WEBER BASIN WATER
CONSERVANCY DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES HELD THURSDAY,
AUGUST 27, 2026, 9:00 A.M., AT DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS**

Present:

Chair Mark D. Anderson
Trustee Tom Day
Trustee Gage Froerer
Trustee Scott K. Jenkins
Trustee Angie Osguthorpe
Trustee Christopher F. Robinson
Trustee Julie Snowball
Trustee Bob Stevenson
Trustee Logan Wilde

Scott W. Paxman, General Manager/CEO
Michael Malmborg, Legal Counsel
Jody Williams, Legal Counsel

Brittney Bateman, Fin. Analyst
Calysta Bravo, Finance Manager
Suzy Eppens, Contracts Administrator
Greg Pierce, Mgr. of Strategic Initiatives
Darren Hess, Assistant General Manager
Josh Hogge, Mgr. of M&I
Shane McFarland, Mgr. of Engineering
Brad Nelson, Assistant General Manager
Riley Olsen, Mgr. of Water Supply & Power
Jon Parry, Assistant General Manager
Kendall Searle, Mgr. of Administration
Sam Sorensen, Mgr. of Construction and Maintenance
Kathy Wood, Mgr. of Human Resources

Ben Kirk, BOR
Rick Baxter, BOR

**I
WELCOME & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Anderson welcomed all in attendance. He then led the group as they recited the Pledge of Allegiance and began the meeting.

**II
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Anderson presented the minutes of the regular Board Meeting and Hearing on Petitions for Water Contracts held July 30, 2026 and Orientation Meeting held July 27, 2026 for review and approval. There were no additions or corrections.

Motion was made by Trustee Jenkins, seconded by Trustee Osguthorpe, and the motion carried with a unanimous vote, approving the minutes as presented.

**III
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF
JULY 2026 FINANCIAL REPORT**

Trustee Robinson asked Mgr. Bravo to review the July 2026 financial report. Mgr. Bravo stated this is the first month of the fiscal year so there is not much activity.

Mgr. Bravo then reviewed the O&M report and Sources and Uses statement for the month. She provided explanations for any category that was below or exceeded the total budget. Mgr. Bravo stated this is very early in the fiscal year, so the year-to-date budget looks exactly on track.

Motion was made by Trustee Robinson, seconded by Trustee Stevenson and passed unanimously, approving the July 2026 financial report as presented.

IV
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF CANCELLATIONS OF WATER

Mgr. Searle presented the following water contract cancellations for approval:

A. DAVIS COUNTY:

- 1) Spencer & Morgan Shuppy..... 0.28 a.f. Proj
Talbot Estates (11-914-0227)
- 2) Ronald Waite 2.4 a.f. Proj
Layton (09-013-0132)
- 3) Ronald Waite 0.2 a.f. Proj
Layton (09-013-0143)
- 4) Ronald Waite 0.3 a.f. Proj
Layton (09-013-0189)

B. SUMMIT COUNTY:

- 1) Pine Meadow Mutual Water Company..... 1.0 a.f. Dist. 1
PMMWC Service Area (TDS-II-2)
- 2) Jason and Rebecca Stolle 1.0 a.f. Dist. 2
Henefer (STOLLE-1)

Mgr. Searle explained the cancellations. He said the District mailed letters to the Talbot Estates area about a year ago, explaining there is no connection available for the property and they are welcome to cancel. Mgr. Searle stated the Layton properties owned by Mr. Waite are in the same situation and desire to cancel.

Mgr. Searle stated that Pine Meadow Mutual does not need this contract to provide service to the listed property and they have requested cancellation.

Mgr. Searle explained the Henefer parcel is already connected to a culinary water supply, and the owners do not have use for the additional water from the District.

Mgr. Searle stated the cancellations meet our policy and recommended approval.

Motion was made by Trustee Froerer, seconded by Trustee Day and the motion passed unanimously approving the water contract cancellations and adopting the following resolution.

RESOLUTION
BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District that the Chair and General Manager of said District be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to execute on behalf of said District cancellations petitions for the following, on the terms and conditions contained in the form of agreement presented to and considered at this meeting.

- 1) Spencer & Morgan Shuppy..... 0.28 a.f. Proj
- 2) Ronald Waite 2.4 a.f. Proj
- 3) Ronald Waite 0.2 a.f. Proj
- 4) Ronald Waite 0.3 a.f. Proj
- 5) Pine Meadow Mutual Water Company..... 1.0 a.f. Dist. 1
- 6) Jason and Rebecca Stolle 1.0 a.f. Dist. 2

V
CONSIDERATION OF UNTREATED WATER CONTRACT

Mgr. Searle presented the following contract for untreated water.

A. WEBER COUNTY

- 1) Weber-Box Elder Conservation District.....3.67 a.f. Dist. 4
North Ogden (16-044-0028 & 16-044-0036)

Mgr. Searle explained this contract is for a new subdivision development in North Ogden. He said the development will be provided secondary water service through Weber-Box Elder Conservation District. He said this meets the District’s efficiency standards and recommended approval.

Motion was made by Trustee Froerer, seconded by Trustee Day and passed unanimously, approving the water contract outlined above and adopting the following resolution.

RESOLUTION
BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District that the Chair and General Manager of said District be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to execute on behalf of said District water contracts for the following, on the terms and conditions contained in the form of agreement presented to and considered at this meeting.

1) Weber-Box Elder Conservation District..... 3.67 a.f. Dist. 4

VI
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF TREATED WATER CONTRACT

Mgr. Searle presented the following contract for water:

A. DAVIS COUNTY:

- 1) West Point City 0.76 a.f. Trilateral
West Point Culinary System

Mgr. Searle explained the trilateral agreements in general, stating the District agreed to purchase D&W stock from individuals to keep water available for future development on the land where the water was historically being used.

Mgr. Searle said this contract does not take any water from the District’s pool of water to sell but uses the stock water already owned by the District. Mgr. Searle said the trilateral contract meets our policy, and District staff recommends approval.

Motion was made by Trustee Froerer, seconded by Trustee Day, and the vote was unanimous approving the contract for untreated water and the following resolution.

RESOLUTION
BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District that the Chair and the General Manager of said District be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to execute on behalf of said District a water contract with West Point City, on the terms and conditions contained in the form of agreement presented to and considered at this meeting.

1) West Point City 0.76 a.f. Trilateral

VII
WATER SUPPLY REPORT

Chair Anderson invited Mgr. Olsen to present. Mgr. Olsen presented the following reservoir content data:

<u>RESERVOIR</u>	<u>TOTAL CAPACITY</u>	<u>DISTRICT CAPACITY</u>	<u>ACCRUED</u>		<u>HISTORICAL RESERVOIR CONT.</u>	
			<u>TO DIST</u>	<u>% OF DIST</u>	<u>AS OF</u>	<u>AS OF</u>
			<u>TO DATE</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u>	<u>8/25/25</u>	<u>8/26/2024</u>
CAUSEY	7,870	6,870	3,247	47%	3,021	4,443
E CANYON	51,200	20,110	10,353	51	34,050	38,710
ECHO	73,940	6,357	0	0	37,450	44,610
LOST CRK	22,510	20,010	4,810	24	12,100	15,300
PINEVIEW	110,150	66,228	0	0	70,230	85,640
SMITH-M	8,351	6,560	5,464	83	5,316	6,128
WANSHIP	62,120	60,000	23,630	39	35,350	46,110
WILLARD	<u>247,302</u>	<u>222,273</u>	<u>107,205</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>91,970</u>	<u>188,628</u>
TOTAL	583,443	408,408	154,709	38%	289,487	429,569

Percent of District upstream storage is 26%.

Mgr. Olsen presented slides showing the Ogden River and Weber River storage trends. He explained the heavy use of Pineview Reservoir due to the anticipated Ogden City project that requires draining much of the reservoir this coming fall. Mgr. Olsen then reviewed the trends of each reservoir of the Weber Storage. He showed Lost Creek and East Canyon and explained these reservoirs started low and have been trending down to well below the 5 year average. Mgr. Olsen said Smith & Morehouse is holding at a storage number very close to where it was last year. Mgr. Olsen showed Willard Bay which has been staying steady this year with the increased use of Pineview water.

Mgr. Olsen shared a chart showing total storage from 2021 to the current year which gave a good picture of current storage compared to averages over the last few years.

Mgr. Olsen continued by reviewing overall precipitation with a chart showing the current year as slightly above where we were last year at this time. He then shared the soil moisture chart stating we are at 116% of the median, slightly up from last month due to the recent storms.

Mgr. Olsen gave a quick update on the Great Salt Lake levels. He said the low elevation point this year was 4,191 feet at the end of last September. He stated the current elevation is 4,190.1 feet as of August 24. He said the peak this year was in April at a total elevation of 4,192.3 feet. Mgr. Olsen said it is not anticipated to go below the record low this year, but we are not far from that number.

Mgr. Olsen then reviewed the weather, precipitation, and temperature outlooks for the month to come and said the weather shows higher chances of precipitation and higher chances of hotter temperatures this next month.

Mgr. Olsen answered questions from the board. Chair Anderson thanked him for the report.

VIII
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL FOR THE NORTH WEBER WELL #2 WELL
HOUSE ENGINEERING DESIGN CONTRACT

AGM Nelson said we are very pleased with this well. He said the pump test was just completed with exceptional results, pumping 2,400 gallons a minute. AGM Nelson said now that the well is drilled, we need to build a well house and equip the site.

AGM Nelson said the District signed a 2-year lease with Double Ott Ranch, ending November 30, 2026. He explained that within that contract was an option to purchase the land, and the District will now enter negotiations.

AGM Nelson said the District's hired consultant, Horrocks, completed the well drilling design and Lang Equipment and Widdison Well Services drilled and tested the well respectively. He said the next phase requires engineering design, permitting support, and bidding assistance. AGM Nelson said District staff have established a strong professional working relationship with Horrocks, LLC and they have direct knowledge of the site, permitting agencies, and extensive experience along the Wasatch Front.

AGM Nelson then shared the scope of the Professional Engineering Services for engineering design, permitting support, and bidding assistance necessary to complete the permanent well pumping facilities. He stated that District staff believes it is in the best interest to move forward with Horrocks, LLC and recommended approval. AGM Nelson answered questions from the board.

Motion was made by Trustee Jenkins, seconded by Trustee Osguthorpe and the motion passed unanimously approving the design contract and adopting the following resolution.

RESOLUTION

BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District that the Chair and the General Manager of said District be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to execute on behalf of said District, a professional services contract to Horrocks, LLC for a total of \$283,450.50 for the North Weber 2 Well House Project on the terms and conditions contained in the form of agreement presented to and considered at this meeting.

IX

**CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE SECONDARY METER PHASE 17
INSTALLATION CONTRACT AMENDMENT**

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said we are getting close to wrapping up the system-wide secondary metering efforts. AGM Nelson said this project is part of the effort to meter all secondary water connections by 2030. He said in order to make full use of the state funding we need to complete the metering by the end of this October.

AGM Nelson shared a map of the installed meters, then showed the meter install sites that would be part of Phase 17. He stated these installs are the more difficult and larger meters.

AGM Nelson said to meet the goal of utilizing all federal funds currently allocated, it is within the best interest of the District to amend the existing contract for Bridge Construction.

AGM Nelson then shared the bid from Bridge Construction totaling \$1,083,625.00. He said the District feels this is reasonable for the scope which includes installs, surface restoration, and exploratory excavation. AGM Nelson recommended approval.

Trustee Snowball asked about the lifespan and maintenance of the meters and AGM Nelson answered that District staff actively watch and replace when needed. Gen. Mgr. Paxman said the meters currently being installed have a 20-year warranty.

Motion was made by Trustee Stevenson, seconded by Trustee Snowball, and the motion passed unanimously approving the design contract and adopting the following resolution.

RESOLUTION

BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District that the Chair and the General Manager of said District be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to execute on behalf of said District, a contract amendment to Bridge Construction for a total of \$1,083,625.00 for the Secondary Meter Project Phase 17 on the terms and conditions contained in the form of agreement presented to and considered at this meeting.

X
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE AV WATKINS
PHASE 3 CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said this project is ongoing and the additional phases are ready to move forward. AGM Nelson said Phase 3 requires continuity and coordination with the Phase 2 contractor.

AGM Nelson shared a map of the project and explained the District is under a current contract with Whitaker Construction for Phase 2. He said in order to complete the project in the timeframe, by the end of October, the District feels it is best to work with the contractor on site. He said the District received a bid from Whitaker for Phase 3 Existing Siphons Removal in the amount of \$326,805.00.

AGM Nelson said District staff feels this is a reasonable bid for the work that needs to be completed and recommended approval. He then answered questions from the board regarding the scope and timeframe of the project.

Motion was made by Trustee Snowball, seconded by Trustee Day and the motion passed unanimously approving the AV Watkins Phase 3 project and adopting the following resolution.

RESOLUTION

BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District that the Chair and the General Manager of said District be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to execute on behalf of said District, a contract amendment to Whitaker Construction for a total of \$326,805.00 for the AV Watkins Phase 3 Siphon Removal on the terms and conditions contained in the form of agreement presented to and considered at this meeting.

XI
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE TEMPORARY LOWERING
OF PINEVIEW RESERVOIR AGREEMENT

Gen. Mgr. Paxman asked Legal Counsel Malmborg to present an overview of the contract to the board for consideration. Legal Counsel Malmborg stated this agreement is a culmination of 90 years of agreements, the first being in 1934. He gave the contract history that will be superseded and replaced by the 2026 contract.

Legal Counsel Malmborg shared the parties of the agreement which include Ogden City, Ogden River Water Users Association, Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, and the United State of America acting through the Bureau of Reclamation.

Legal Counsel Malmborg said the terms of the contract break down into two major parts, the 2026 Drawdown and Future Construction and Maintenance. He then detailed the sections and shared the following summary:

2026 Project

- Reservoir Drawdown
 - Target September 15
- Dam Safety and Emergency Operations
 - District retains right to delay drawdown in event of emergency
 - Nothing in this Agreement shall limit the authority of the United States, the Association, or the District to take emergency operational actions necessary to protect public safety, dam safety, downstream property, or water infrastructure.
- Ogden solely responsible for construction, costs, environmental compliance, permits, etc.
- Liquidated Damages after January. Firm completion February 1

Future Construction and Maintenance

- Non-Emergency Maintenance
 - Impractical Engineering Determination
 - Parties select option
 - Ogden responsible up to 120% of base costs
 - District and Association responsible for costs above 120%
 - Right to approve/disapprove of any option above 120%
- Emergency Maintenance
 - Catastrophic failure of both of the City’s pipelines
 - Must pursue alternative options in good faith prior to drawdown

There was much discussion regarding the agreement, future drawdown possibilities, and future repair and replacement options and costs.

AGM Hess then recommended approval of the agreement and thanked Legal Counsel Malmborg and Williams for their efforts on this agreement.

Motion was made by Trustee Robinson, seconded by Trustee Wilde and the motion passed unanimously approving the agreement and adopting the following resolution.

RESOLUTION

BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District that the Chair and the General Manager of said District be and they are hereby authorized and empowered to execute on behalf of said District, an agreement with the District, Ogden City, Ogden River Water Users Association, and Bureau of Reclamation for the temporary lowering of Pineview Reservoir on the terms and conditions contained in the form of agreement presented to and considered at this meeting.

XII GENERAL MANAGER’S REPORT

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said the NWRA annual conference is coming up, so to mark calendars for November 2-5. He said this will be held in California on Coronado Island this year. He said to coordinate with Mgr. Searle if you plan to attend.

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said the Utah Water Summit will be held October 27, and to again coordinate with Mgr. Searle regarding attendance. He reminded the board that the October Orientation Meeting will take place during that conference.

Gen. Mgr. Paxman mentioned the Colorado River Record of Decision from the Department of Interior was released. He said Nevada has already filed a lawsuit to stay the decision. He said people don’t understand how the upper states operate, meaning we are always conserving because we have never had a normal year, yet lower states continue taking what they think they are entitled to take. Gen. Mgr. Paxman said

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said he and AGM Hess attended the UAMPS annual conference in Logan this past week. He said some of the major concerns are lack of power generation, lack of base power, and rising costs of power. Gen. Mgr. Paxman said the relationship with Rocky Mountain Power is also strained and that is a continuing concern.

AGM Hess stated that power transmission is a huge issue and the electrical industry is having to make some big decisions regarding the cost and scope of expansion and future demands.

There was much additional discussion on power demand and concerns.

**XIII
ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Anderson reminded the board of the annual Business Partner Appreciation BBQ taking place shortly after the meeting. There being no further business for discussion, meeting adjourned at 10:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott W. Paxman, General Manager/ CEO

The Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, Utah, met in public session August 27, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., at District headquarters, Layton, Utah. Meeting was called to order by Chair Anderson. On roll call the following members were found to be present:

Present:
Chair Mark D. Anderson
Trustee Tom Day
Trustee Gage Froerer
Trustee Scott K. Jenkins
Trustee Angie Osguthorpe
Trustee Christopher F. Robinson
Trustee Bob Stevenson
Trustee Julie Snowball
Trustee Logan Wilde

Scott W. Paxman, General Manager/CEO
Michael Malmborg, Legal Counsel
Jody Williams, Legal Counsel

Brittney Bateman, Fin. Analyst
Calysta Bravo, Finance Manager
Suzy Eppens, Contracts Administrator
Greg Pierce, Mgr. of Strategic Initiatives
Darren Hess, Assistant General Manager
Josh Hogge, Mgr. of M&I
Shane McFarland, Mgr. of Engineering
Brad Nelson, Assistant General Manager
Riley Olsen, Mgr. of Water Supply & Power
Jon Parry, Assistant General Manager
Kendall Searle, Mgr. of Administration
Sam Sorensen, Mgr. of Construction and Maintenance
Kathy Wood, Mgr. of Human Resources

Ben Kirk, BOR
Rick Baxter, BOR

Mgr. Searle stated the meeting was being held pursuant to notice to the public, duly published as required by law, for the purpose of permitting all interested persons to show cause why the respective petitions for water contracts of the individuals as set forth in the notice, copies of which are attached hereto and incorporated by reference as a part of these minutes, for the allotment of water to lands in Morgan County, Utah, by the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, should not be granted.

Mgr. Searle reported there have been no written objections filed against the foregoing petitions and asked for any other objections to be presented at this time. No objections were received.

Thereupon the following resolution was presented and read:

**RESOLUTION GRANTING PETITIONS FOR THE ALLOTMENT
OF WATER BY WEBER BASIN WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT**

WHEREAS, acting pursuant to Section 73-9-19, Utah Code Annotated, 1953, as amended, there has been filed in the office of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, the following petitions for water contracts requesting the allotment of Weber Basin water annually, pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in said petition:

A. MORGAN COUNTY:

- 1. Teresa Nelson..... 0.65 a.f. Dist. 4
Richville (01-003-124-03-3)

Page 2 – Petitions for Water Contracts Hearing – August 27, 2026

Whereas after the filing of said petitions, it was determined to hold a public hearing on same in the office of the Board of Trustees of the District, and the General Manager/CEO of the District caused due and proper notice of the holding of such hearing to be posted to the Utah Public Notice Website on August 12, 2026, which notice advised all interested persons of the holding of such hearing and of their right to present objections in writing showing cause why such petitions should not be granted, and

WHEREAS, at the hour and place named in said notice, or at a subsequent meeting adjourned there from, the Board of Trustees of the District has met in public session and has heard all persons desiring to be heard and written or other objections having been presented, and WHEREAS, after due consideration, it is the determination of the Board of Trustees that it is for the best interest of the District that such petitions should be granted.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it Resolved and Ordered by the Board of Trustees of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, as follows:

Section 1. That it is hereby determined to be in the best interest of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, that such petitions be granted.

Section 2. That said petitions are hereby granted and amounts of water in acre-feet are hereby allotted to the respective petitioners for the lands for which the same is petitioned, all as above set out.

Section 3. That the Chair of the District is hereby authorized and directed in the name of the District and on its behalf to execute formal orders granting said petitions allotting water to lands therein described, upon the terms, at the rates, and payable in the manner as in said petitions set forth and the General Manager/CEO of the District is authorized and directed to attest said order.

Section 4. The General Manager/CEO of the Board of Trustees in its behalf, is directed to cause a fully executed copy of said order, to which shall be attached a copy of the petitions upon which the order is made, to be recorded in the office of the respective County Recorder.

After consideration of the resolution and order, motion was made by Trustee Froerer, seconded by Trustee Day, and passed unanimously, approving petitions for water contracts in Morgan County and adopting the foregoing resolution.

Approved and adopted August 27, 2026.



Mark D. Anderson, Chair

ATTEST:



Scott W. Paxman, General Manager

(SEAL)

**WEBER BASIN WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT
PUBLIC TAX HEARING FOR PROPOSED TAX INCREASE
AND ADOPTION OF FY2027 BUDGET
MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 2026, 6:30 P.M.
DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS**

- 1) Welcome and Pledge of Allegiance.....Chairman Anderson
- 2) Public Hearing for Proposed 2027 Tax Increase
and FY2027 Final Budget Gen. Mgr. Paxman /Mgr. Bravo
 - Dollar amount of additional ad valorem tax revenue
 - Purpose for additional tax revenue
- 3) Public Comment Chair Anderson
- 4) Consider Adoption of Weber Basin Water Conservancy
District’s Final FY2027 Budget Gen. Mgr. Paxman /Mgr. Bravo

**MINUTES OF A TRUTH IN TAXATION PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE WEBER BASIN WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES HELD MONDAY,
AUGUST 24, 2026, 6:30 P.M., AT DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS**

Present:

Chair Mark D. Anderson
Trustee Tom Day
Trustee Gage Froerer
Trustee Scott K. Jenkins
Trustee Angie Osguthorpe
Trustee Christopher F. Robinson (electronically)
Trustee Julie Snowball
Trustee Logan Wilde

Excused:

Trustee Bob Stevenson

Scott W. Paxman, General Manager/CEO
Brittney Bateman, Fin. Analyst
Calysta Bravo, Finance Manager
Greg Pierce, Mgr. of Strategic Initiatives
Darren Hess, Assistant General Manager
Josh Hogge, Mgr. of M&I
Brad Nelson, Assistant General Manager
Jon Parry, Assistant General Manager
Kendall Searle, Mgr. of Administration

Drew Chamberlin, Citizen/Taxpayer
Michael Quin, Citizen/Taxpayer
Julian Snyder, Citizen/ Taxpayer
John Crofts, Citizen/ Taxpayer/ Davis Co. Commissioner
Blaine Fackrell, Citizen/ Taxpayer/ Morgan Co. Commissioner
Scott Fletcher, Citizen/ Taxpayer
Diana Fletcher, Citizen/Taxpayer
David Darcy, Citizen/ Taxpayer (electronically)
James of Sunset City, Citizen/ Taxpayer (electronically)

**I
WELCOME**

Chair Anderson opened the meeting by welcoming all who were in attendance, excusing Trustee Stevenson, and leading the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Anderson expressed appreciation for all in attendance and turned the time over to Gen. Mgr. Paxman. Gen. Mgr. Paxman invited Finance Mgr. Bravo to share a presentation to provide additional details on the proposed ad valorem tax increase and the FY2027 final budget.

**II
PUBLIC HEARING FOR PROPOSED 2026 TAX INCREASE
AND FY2027 FINAL BUDGET**

Mgr. Bravo provided information about the Interim FY2027 Budget and stated the budget is provided as a handout, it has been posted on the District website, and in the lobby of the main office. She said the budget has been posted for comment and public review since the end of May 2026.

Mgr. Bravo then discussed the FY2027 budget sources including water rates, bonding, taxes, reserves, grants, and miscellaneous sources. She stated the District performs an in-depth analysis of capital projects and prioritizes their repair and replacement or formation.

Mgr. Bravo gave an overview of the revenues and expenditures of the balanced budget. She then showed the total balanced budget for FY2027 for a total of \$171,180,662.00.

WEBER BASIN WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT TENTATIVE/INTERIM BUDGET FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2027	
REVENUES	FY2027 TOTAL ALL SUBFUNDS
1 Agricultural	\$ 1,434,000
2 Replacement	\$ 7,539,500
3 Secondary	\$ 15,466,800
4 Treated	\$ 23,724,000
5 Untreated	\$ 6,284,200
6 Carriage/Interconnect	\$ 5,675,600
7 Reserved/Leased	\$ 45,000
8 TOTAL WATER SALES	\$ 60,169,100
9 Interest	\$ 2,476,088
10 Impact/Water Development Fees	\$ 4,000,000
11 Power	\$ -
12 Reimbursements & Grant Awards	\$ 17,832,500
13 Misc	\$ 421,200
14 TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 24,729,788
15 Ad Valorem Taxes	\$ 25,011,940
16 Restricted Ad Valorem Taxes (due to tax rate increase)	\$ 1,738,797
17 Fee-in-Leiu of Taxes	\$ 925,000
18 TOTAL TAXES & FEE-IN-LEIU	\$ 27,675,737
19 TOTAL ANNUAL REVENUES	\$ 112,574,625
20 Transfers from Other Funds	\$ 29,064,003
21 Loan Advances/Bond Proceeds	\$ 25,750,000
22 Use of Reserve Funds	\$ 3,792,034
23 TOTAL TRANSFERS & USE OF RESERVE FUNDS	\$ 58,606,037
24 TOTAL REVENUES/TRANSFERS/USE OF RESERVES	\$ 171,180,662
EXPENDITURES	FY2027 TOTAL ALL SUBFUNDS
25 OPERATIONS	
26 WATER SUPPLY & POWER	
27 Annual Assessments & Agreements	\$ 1,342,500
28 Secondary System Operations	\$ 1,028,000
29 WS&P Facilities	\$ 1,632,000
30 Drought/Flood Mitigation	\$ 10,000
31 MUNICIPAL & INDUSTRIAL	
32 Chemicals	\$ 1,847,000
33 M&I Facilities	\$ 524,160
34 Lab	\$ 242,400
35 SUSTAINMENT	
36 MAINTENANCE	
37 District Facilities	\$ 440,000
38 Vehicles & Equipment	\$ 897,500
39 ENGINEERING	
40 Engineering Equipment & Services	\$ 5,500
41 STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	
42 CONSERVATION DIVISION	
43 Community Outreach/Education	\$ 239,000
44 Special Projects & Study Sustainment	\$ 100,000
45 INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION	
46 IT Equipment/Services	\$ 378,500
47 SCADA & Programming	\$ 140,000
48 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	
49 Professional Services	\$ 1,290,500
50 Office Supplies/Services	\$ 140,000
51 Dues/Memberships/Subscriptions	\$ 65,000
52 Overhead	\$ 413,900
53 HUMAN RESOURCES	
54 Payroll	\$ 11,780,000
55 Benefits	\$ 4,881,000
56 Safety & Employee Development	\$ 201,400
57 CAPITAL PROJECTS	\$ 85,567,600
58 STUDIES	\$ 770,000
59 MISC	\$ 12,987,040
60 SINKING FUND PLACEHOLDERS	\$ 175,000
61 Bond/LTD Payments (Principal)	\$ 8,595,131
62 Bond/LTD Payments (Interest)	\$ 6,309,128
63 Bond Escrow	\$ -
64 TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 142,002,259
65 TRANSFERS & ADDITIONS TO RESERVES	
66 Transfers to Other Funds	\$ 29,064,003
67 Additions to Reserves/Federal Projects Funds	\$ 114,400
68 TOTAL EXPENDITURES, TRANSFERS, AND ADDITIONS TO RESERVES	\$ 171,180,662

Chair Anderson recommended the public hearing be opened. Motion was made by Trustee Jenkins, seconded by Trustee Day, and passed unanimously, opening the public hearing for the proposed 2026 tax increase and FY2027 final budget.

Mgr. Bravo gave a brief history of the District and the Weber Basin Project. She stated the District is authorized to spend property tax dollars on District expenses, excepting revenue bond debt service, however the Board of Trustees maintains the philosophy that tax dollars should first be used to repay the Federal Government for the original project then for the operations and repair and replacement of the Federal Project. Mgr. Bravo stated the Federal Project obligations are increasing with aging infrastructure and yet the funding from the Federal Government is decreasing. Mgr. Bravo then stated the funds are also used on items that benefit the entire region. She said many of these regional items are unfunded mandates from the state level. Mgr. Bravo then outlined the numerous benefits the District provides to the entire community including regional water reliability and drought resilience, disaster preparedness and resilience, flood control, watershed protection, environmental stewardship, recreation, conservation programs and education, and research and innovation among other benefits.

Mgr. Bravo shared several charts and graphs showing the District's budget sources, highlighting the additional tax portion if the rate is raised to the statutory level. She shared the average cost of a home in our five counties is \$674,000.00 and for an average home, the average increased cost would be \$4.82 or \$0.20 per day.

Mgr. Bravo showed and detailed the Property Tax Impact Schedule. She said the proposed tax increase is anticipated to generate an additional \$1,738,797.00 in property tax revenue. Mgr. Bravo said the funds will be used to extend conservation rebate program availability as well as pay for the repair and replacement of Federal Project infrastructure, which is anticipated to be \$125M over the next five years.

Mgr. Bravo reviewed the combined notice for each of the five counties and stated copies are available as a handout on the table.

Mgr. Bravo explained that the certified tax rate collects the same dollar amount of taxes year to year, and the property value doesn't impact the amount of tax collected. She said if property values increase, the certified tax rate decreases and if property values decrease the certified tax rate increases. Mgr. Bravo gave an example for the average household value.

Mgr. Bravo shared the main office phone number, the website, and shared an email where all other questions can be asked.

Chair Anderson outlined the process for public comment. He thanked the attendees for being present and welcomed their comments. He stated each individual will be given up to three minutes to make comment, and the total public comment period will be limited to 60 minutes. Chair Anderson asked that each speaker please state their name, city, and county of residence before making their comments. He then asked the virtual attendees to use the "raise hand" feature to indicate that they wish to speak.

The public comment began.

Drew Chamberlain of Layton, Davis County. Mr. Chamberlin stated his concern that there is a loss of focus and encouraged a line be drawn through the \$1M for social engineering. He stated he expects the water district to supply good drinking water at a reasonable cost and to be frugal. He stated he does not want the water district to be involved in social engineering or involved in other aspects of government. He encouraged the board to consider half the tax increase being asked for and expressed concern over the funds being used for conservation. He thanked the board.

Michael Quin, Layton, Davis County. Mr. Quin asked why allocate increased costs to taxes and not water sales/rates? He asked that the revenue be tied to the water and not his property and land.

Julian Snyder, Ogden, Weber County. Mrs. Snyder stated her husband is a plumber, and she is thankful for clean water and the work being done to keep people healthy and safe from disease and filth. She then asked the board to vote no on the tax increase because the District is using discretionary funds outside of essential services.

John Crofts, Davis County Resident and Commissioner. Mr. Crofts stated his disappointment that Commissioner Stevenson was not in attendance and that there was not more coordination between the District and the Davis County Commissioners regarding the tax hearing. He expressed his concern that the media was not present at the tax hearing. Mr. Crofts thanked the board and Gen. Mgr. Paxman for their good work and efforts especially in earthquake mitigation. He encouraged the board to reach out more to the media and be in front of the public.

Blaine Fackrell, Morgan County Resident and Commissioner. Mr. Fackrell stated he has already made complaints directly to Gen. Mgr. Paxman. He said his concern is where the water is actually coming from for well permits and those contracts in light of growth. Mr. Fackrell stated his concern about paper water verses wet water.

Scott Fletcher, Layton, Davis County. Mr. Fletcher stated he agreed with the comments previously stated and has two additional comments. He said he attended all three Truth In Taxation Hearings in Davis County and stated poor decisions are being made with taxpayer dollars, and he views this tax increase the same, meaning the tax income is not being used to benefit the taxpayers of Davis County. Mr. Fletcher asked what the unfunded mandates are from the state and how much they cost.

David Darcy, Kamas, Summit County (online). Mr. Darcy stated he has previously sent an email detailing his concerns regarding the tax increase. He stated concerns regarding the amount of funding that comes from Summit County. Mr. Darcy commented on the documents provided to justify the tax increase and expressed that these were not adequate to prove the need for the increase. He commented on the budget presented and stated it does not get to the root of the problem. Mr. Darcy ended by asking the board to consider staying at the certified tax rate, saying just because you can increase doesn't mean you should.

James, Sunset City, Davis County (online). James said he recently purchased a home in Sunset but has resided in Davis County for about 5 years. James said being a homeowner at the age of 25 stretches the budget quite thin. He said Davis County has gone up in taxes quite a bit and urged the board to consider voting no on the increase considering fixed incomes and other incomes being stretched so thin.

Diana Fletcher, Layton, Davis County. Ms. Fletcher brought up the state mandates that were discussed and in particular the picture that showed firefighting and "bucket dipping" in the reservoir. She asked if the entire state is responsible for funding these programs.

Chair Anderson thanked the attendees for their comments and stated the board and management will now give responses and answers to the comments and questions.

Chair Anderson said the first question was regarding the water conservation budget. He said the District was created to overlie all existing water companies within the five county boundaries. He said the individual companies could not provide for the demand and the District developed a supply to serve the population. Chair Anderson stated that conservation of existing water is one of the best and cheapest ways to create a new water supply. He said the conservation programs are critical to developing that supply.

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said *conservancy* is in our name. He said we are not only mandated to supply and develop water for our district, but also to conserve that water and stretch it to its limit. He said we are just about out of water, we have a small supply left, however if we use water at the rate we are using it, this will be gone in about 10 years. Gen. Mgr. Paxman said it makes a lot of sense to conserve what we have in order to grow.

Chair Anderson said another question was why allocate increased costs to taxes and not rates. He said the District does both. Chair Anderson said we have gone through a rate study and had a series of water rate increases. He said the tax funds go toward the Federal Project as well as

regional programs that benefit all residents within our boundaries.

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said our regional programs are public good programs, meaning they serve the entire public, not just our water users. He said putting the entire funding burden on only those who we deliver water to would not be right or fair. Gen. Mgr. Paxman said flood control, fire prevention, fishery releases, and other benefits are everyone's responsibility. He said this is why the District has tax funding and separate water rates.

Chair Anderson said there was another comment made stating increases should go toward essential needs only and not discretionary funding such as water conservation. He said this may have been addressed earlier regarding water conservation being imperative and not discretionary.

Scott Fletcher made a follow up comment. Mr. Fletcher suggested that the board take a wholistic approach, looking at water, zoning, conservation, all the elements. He asked for more coordination and integration across the conservation districts, the cities, the farmers, and so on.

Chair Anderson said we do integrate and meet with universities, counties, cities, and commissioners often.

Trustee Osguthorpe said that is a great suggestion, and we are trying to coordinate with all our entities. She said we have 15 cities in just Davis County alone and we are trying to educate and inform and get on the same page. She said we have come a long way, and we will continue to always try and do better.

Drew Chamberlin made a follow up comment. Mr. Chamberlin asked about the metric for the water supply running out. He related it to throwing a boogeyman out there and said we have no knowledge in what the history has been maintaining that supply. Mr. Chamberlin said information was not provided regarding new growth and what those users are consuming and spending. He said he is an engineer and would like to see the statistics.

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said we have tons of data available for the public and we simply could not present it all in a public meeting. He urged Mr. Chamberlin to go online and visit the District website. Gen. Mgr. Paxman said there are reams of data, and we would be happy to provide it.

Chair Anderson said yes, we can provide that data, but it was not our purpose to provide those metrics today.

Chair Anderson said there was a comment about the press not being present at the hearing, to which he stated the press have been notified of the hearing and were welcome to attend and the District takes and answers calls from the media frequently.

Gen. Mgr. Paxman spoke to the concern about tax dollars not benefiting Davis County citizens and what the federal and state mandates are and how much they cost. He said every year there are several legislative state mandates that are unfunded, and a good example would be the secondary water meters. Gen. Mgr. Paxman said there was partial funding provided, but the District is required to come up with the remaining portion. He said the District has spent over \$30M in the past five years alone in the effort to get everyone metered, and this is just one example.

Mgr. Bravo stated she would be happy to provide total amounts spent over the last several years on these mandates if an email is provided. She said some items in which the District is required to participate, as well as the other large water districts, are watershed protection programs including both flooding and drought conditions, wildfire mitigation, and the Water District Water Development Council. Mgr. Bravo said bills get passed from the state legislature but there is no funding so the four large water districts, serving 90% of the state, are tasked with taking those costs on and dividing them amongst the districts.

Gen. Mgr. Paxman said he testifies in many legislative meetings and explained Prepare60. He said the four large water districts of the state have created Prepare60 to meet together monthly and strategize how to take on the legislation out there. He said all four districts attend legislative

committee meetings and testify against or for certain legislative items as much as possible. He said for the most part, the districts push back on these costly items.

Trustee Jenkins said we do shake our heads at some of the new mandates and legislature and we do push back. He shared the example of purchasing water shares and stock. Trustee Jenkins said when the state offered to purchase water for the Great Salt Lake, the price of water shot up and basically doubled. He said the District now competes for purchasing that water. He said the District was mandated to manage the water, so this was upsetting, especially when water makes it to the lake eventually. He said this is just an example of the push back we do give when things do not make good sense.

Scott Fletcher made an additional comment. He thanked Trustee Jenkins for pushing back and said he appreciates that effort. Mr. Chamberlin said you should not “go it alone” and the citizens of Davis County can be leveraged to push back as well.

Chair Anderson asked Trustee Robinson (online) to respond to the Summit County resident’s comments. Trustee Robinson said before that he wanted to comment on conservation in general. He said we are facing changing hydrology, meaning the amount, timing, and type of precipitation we receive. Trustee Robinson said the Weber Basin has a difficult job to deal with a lot of variability. He said the District has storage systems, natural flow rights, wells, and much of the infrastructure is old, so there is a lot of work in dealing with the change in water received from mother nature. Trustee Robinson said property tax and water rates are constantly being evaluated, but frankly more money than we can even conceive is needed in order to rebuild 70 year old infrastructure, to update it, make it seismic proof, and have redundancy. He said the property tax is limited in the types of things for which it is able to be spent. Trustee Robinson said for many years, while we had authorization to tax at .0002%, we did not raise the rate. He said the rate did go up in 2022 and we look at the rate each year to address the funding needs and have not raised it since.

Trustee Robinson said the majority of his taxes in Summit County go towards the school, and he does not have children in the school system, so you could say “I’m not getting anything” or if you stay inside all the time, mosquito abatement might not be the biggest benefit to you. He said Weber Basin provides a lot of essential services that benefit everyone, and those essential services are provided by an entity that is strong, robust, progressive, and forward thinking, preparing for what is to come is such a value. Trustee Robinson said he pays a lot for Weber Basin on his Summit County taxes, not nearly as much as the school district, but that he values having a robust system of water delivery and it is important to 750,000 people in northern Utah. He said the cheapest way to do that is conservation, doing more with less, and the District has reduced the amount of water allowed for new connections, but that we do need more coordination with municipalities and land entitling entities. He said part of that is help from the state for a more unified system of what responsible growth and water use is for new development. Trustee Robinson said in the meantime, Weber Basin is doing the best we can, while not being the land use authority, with new policies, metering, and education on water wise landscaping. He said there are so many important reasons Weber Basin needs to keep up with the statutory rate and it does benefit the entire region. Trustee Robinson said the District does a great job planning for the most precious resource we have and delivering it in high quality and needed quantity and will continue to do so in the future. He said that is why he is in favor of the tax increase.

Chair Anderson thanked Trustee Robinson for his comments and entertained a motion made by Trustee Jenkins, seconded by Trustee Day, to conclude the public comment portion of the tax hearing.

III ADOPTION OF 2026 TAX INCREASE AND FY2027 FINAL BUDGET

Trustee Wilde made a motion to adopt the 2026 tax increase and FY2027 final budget. Motion was seconded by Trustee Froerer, and the vote was unanimous adopting the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of Weber Basin Water Conservancy District at a public hearing held the 24 day of August 2026, at the hour of 6:30 p.m. of said day, at District Headquarters, 2837 E. Highway 193, Layton, Utah, County of Davis, State of Utah, pursuant to the order of the District Court of Weber County, State of Utah, made and entered in that certain matter entitled "In the Matter of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District", that it be determined by the Board of Trustees, and said Board of Trustees does hereby determine, that the amount of money necessary to be raised by taxation for the year 2026, under property tax levy, as provided in Section 17B, Chapter 2a, Title 1006, Utah Code Annotated, 1953, as amended, taking into consideration other sources of revenue of the District, is the sum of \$26,750,737.00 to supply funds for repaying costs of constructing and repairing the federal facilities of the District.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees hereby adopts the District's Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2027, including the additional ad valorem tax revenue to be generated by the property tax rate established herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees fix, and does hereby fix, the rate of levy which when levied upon every dollar of assessed valuation of property within the District, and with other revenues, will raise said amount required by said District for the year 2026, at the tax rate of .0002 on the dollar of said assessed valuation of property within the District.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees certify and it does hereby certify to the Board of County Commissioners and County Councils of each County within the District, or having a portion of its territory within the District, the rate so fixed as aforesaid, and hereby directs that at the time and in the manner required by law for the levying of taxes for County purposes for the year 2026, such Board of County Commissioners and County Councils shall levy such tax at said rate upon the assessed valuation of all property within said District in addition to such other taxes which may be levied by such Board of County Commissioners and County Councils, as follows, to-wit:

By the Board of County Commissioners of Davis County upon all the property in Davis County within said District, being all the property within said County, except the Islands of the Great Salt Lake therein.

By the Board of County Commissioners of Weber County upon all the property in Weber County within said District, being all the property within said County, except the islands of the Great Salt Lake therein.

By the Board of County Councils of Morgan County upon all the property within said County.

By the Board of County Councils of Summit County, upon all the property within said District, particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the Summit County Boundary with the West line of Section 36, Township 6 North, Range 7 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence South to the Southwest corner of said Section 36, thence South along the East Range line of Range 7 East to the southeast corner of Section 36, Township 5 North, Range 7 East; thence West to the northwest corner of Section 2, Township 4 North, Range 7 East; thence South to the Southwest corner of Section 26, Township 4 North, Range 7 East; thence East to the point of intersection of the South line of Section 28, Township 4 North, Range 8 East, with the Utah-Wyoming Boundary; thence South along said Boundary to the Southwest corner of Wyoming; thence East along the Utah-Wyoming Boundary to the Northeast corner of Section 13, Township 3 North, Range 8 East; thence South along the East Range line of Range 8 East to the Northeast corner of Section 24, Township 2 North, Range 8 East; thence West to the Northwest corner of Section 24, Township 2 North, Range 8 East, thence South to the Southeast corner of Section 35, Township 2 North, Range 8 East; thence West to the Northwest corner of Section 2, Township 1 North, Range 8 East; thence South to the Southwest corner of Section 11, Township 1 North, Range 8 East; thence East to the Southeast corner of Section 12, Township 1 North, Range 8 East, thence South along the East range line of Range 8 East to the Southeast corner of Section 25, Township 1 South, Range 8 East; thence West to the Northwest corner of Section 34, Township 1 South,

Range 8 East, thence South to the Southwest corner of said Section 34; thence West along the North Township line of Township 2 South to the East Range line of Range 7 East; thence South along the East Range line of Range 7 East to the Southeast corner of Section 25, Township 2 South, Range 7 East; thence West to the Southwest corner of Section 26, Township 2 South, Range 6 East; thence North to the Northwest corner of said Section 26; thence West to the point of intersection of the South line of Section 23, Township 2 South, Range 5 East with the Summit County Boundary; thence Northwesterly along the Summit County Boundary to the point of intersection of said Boundary with the South line of Section 36, Township 1 South, Range 4 East; thence West along the South Township line of Township 1 South to the point of intersection of said line with the Summit County Boundary; thence Northerly and Easterly along the Summit County Boundary to the point of beginning.

Township 2 South, Range 3 East, Salt Lake Base & Meridian: Lots 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14; W 1/2 SE 1/4; SW 1/4, Section 1. Section 11. Lots 1 & 2, Section 12. Lot 3; NW1/4, W1/2 NE1/4; Section 13. Lots 1, 2, 3, 4; W 1/2 E 1/2; SE 1/4 NW 1/4, Section 13. SE 1/4, NE 1/4, Section 14.

Lots 1, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, Section 24.

Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian: Lot 15, Section 12. Lots 6 and 9, Section 6. NE 1/4 NE 1/4; NW 1/4 NE 1/4; Lots 15, 16, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, Section 7. Lots 7 & 8, Section 6. W 1/2 NW 1/4 Section 8. Lot 2; SW 1/4 NE 1/4 Section 5. Lots 15, 16 & 19 Section 18.

That part of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian lying in Summit County only.

All that part of the Northeast Quarter of Section 12, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian lying in Summit County only.

All of that part of the East 1815 feet of the North Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 12, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, lying in Summit County only.

All that part of the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 6, Township 2 South, Range 5 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, lying in Summit County only.

All that part of the West 1/2 of the Northwest 1/4 of Section 7, Township 2 South, Range 5 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, lying in Summit County only.

All of the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, excepting the South 1/2 of the Northwest 1/4 of the Southeast 1/4 of the Northeast 1/4 of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East.

Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

The North one-half of the North one-half of the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 4, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

Also, the South one-half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 33, Township 1 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

Also, beginning at a point on an existing fence line, said point being West 600 feet more or less, and South 30 feet more or less, from the NE corner of Section 30, T2S, R6E, SLB&M, thence S. 0 deg.06'07" W along an existing fence 707.39 feet to an existing fence corner, thence N 89 deg 09'49" E 569.46 feet to a point on an existing fence, thence South along said fence 2021.05 feet, thence West 1121.20 feet to a point on an existing fence, said fence being the East Boundary of Weber-Provo Canal, thence N. 01 deg 33'33" W along said fence 818.79 feet, thence continuing along said fence N 09 deg 00'13" E 1033.15 feet, thence continuing along said fence 10 deg 16'02" E 165.58 ft, thence continuing along said fence N 11 deg 07'09" E to an existing fence corner, thence N 89 deg 53'29" E 243.06 feet along an existing fence to the point of beginning. Said parcel containing 55 acres more or less.

Commencing 1208.5 feet South and 2502.6 feet North 89d50'West from the Northeast corner of Section 1, Township 2 South, Range 3 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian and running thence North 89deg.50'West 629.4 feet; thence North 1 deg.50'W 138.1 ft; th East 400 ft; th North 541.9 ft; thence East 250.4 feet, more or less to Boundary line of property heretofore conveyed by grantors; thence South 680 feet to the point of beginning.

Summit County, Utah.

All of Lot 100 Alpine Acres Subdivision Plat E, according to the official plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the Summit County Recorder. SUBJECT to easements, covenants, restrictions, rights-of-way, and reservations appearing of record and taxes for the year 1983 and thereafter.

PARK CITY ANNEXATION:

All of Section 4 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East.

The Northwest Quarter of Section 3, Township 2 South, Range 4 East.

All of Section 9, Township 2 South, Range 4 East.

The South half of Section 10, Township 2 South, Range 4 East.

All of Section 15, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, excluding that portion of the Southeast Quarter of that section that is located in Wasatch County.

All of Section 16 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East.

The North half of Sec. 21 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East.

The North half of Section 22 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East, excluding that portion of the Northeast Quarter of that Section that lies within Wasatch County.

That land located within the Northeast Quarter of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, and within the South half of the South half of Section 33 of Township 1 South, Range 4 East, all as described as the Park Meadows Mountain Annexation to Park City on the annexation plat recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 155568 on May 7, 1979. (Portions of the area described on this plat are also included within Section 4 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East, described above).

That land located within the Northeast Quarter of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East described on the annexation plat of the Quarry Hills Annexation to Park City, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 155566 on May 7, 1979.

That land located within the Southeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East described on the annexation plat of the McCleod Creek Annexation to Park City, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 155564 on May 7, 1979.

That land located within the Northeast Quarter of Section 8, Township 2 South, Range 4 East described as the Armstrong Property Annexation on the annexation plat recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 139759 on August 23, 1977.

That land located within the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 8 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East described on the annexation plat of the Old Sewage Treatment Plant Annexation to Park City, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 195494 on September 2, 1982.

That land located in Section 8 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East described in the annexation plat of the Treasure Mountain Annexation to Park City, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 113624 on July 28, 1971.

That land located within the Southwest Quarter of Section 5 and the Northwest Quarter of Section 8 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East described on the annexation plat for the Iron Canyon Annexation to Park City, Recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 212517 on October 28, 1983. That land located in the Southeast Quarter of Section 8 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East described in the annexation plat of the Spiro Annexation, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 156248 on May 25, 1979.

That land located in the Northwest Quarter and the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 10 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East described in the annexation plat of D. C. Anderson's Annexation to Park City, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 120370 on August 1, 1973. Some of the land included within that annexation is located in Section 9, which has been previously described.

That land located within the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of Section 2, South Half of the Southeast Quarter of Section 3, and the Northeast Quarter of Section 10, all of Township 2 South, Range 4 East described on the annexation plat of the Wortley/BLM Annexation to Park City recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 221635 on June 18, 1984.

That 53.481 acre parcel of land located within the Southeast Quarter of Section 21 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East described on the annexation plat of the United Park City Mines Company Annexation to Park City (Ontario Canyon) recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 221597 on June 15, 1984.

That land located in the Northwest Quarter of Section 27, and the East Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 27, and the South Half of Section 22, and the East Half of the Southeast Quarter of Section 21, all Township 2 South, Range 4 East described in the amended annexation plat of the Lake Flat Annexation to Park City, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 149809 on October 2, 1978. Containing 340 acres; excluding therefrom that portion of the land located in Wasatch County.

The Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 8, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, including that portion thereof described on the annexation plat of the Holiday Ranch Annexation to Park City, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 119887 on June 16, 1973. The majority of that annexed land is located in Section 4, described above.

Those four miscellaneous parcels described on the annexation plat of the Silver Lake Annexation to Park City recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 193492 on July 12, 1982, excluding portions of these tracts that lie within Wasatch County.

Those three miscellaneous parcels located in Sections 10 and 11 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East described in the annexation plat of the Solamere Annexation to Park City recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 193491 on July 12, 1982, containing approximately 17.5 acres. Those lands located in Section 15 of Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake

Base and Meridian described in the annexation plat of Queen Esther Annexation to Park City, recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 228286 on December 17, 1984, containing 7.6553 acres.

ADDITIONAL PARK CITY AREA ANNEXATIONS (approved October 22, 2004):

That land located within the Park City Limits Boundary described as follows:

The Middle School Annexation located within the Southwest Quarter of Section 3, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 239565 on October 1st, 1985.

The Chamber Bureau Kiosk Annexation located in the South Half of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 244420 on January 2nd, 1986.

The Smith Ranch Annexation located in the Southeast Quarter of Section 5 and the Southwest Quarter of Section 6, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 292902 on July 14th, 1988.

The Thayne's Creek Annexation located within the South Half of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 308863 on June 2nd, 1989.

The Annexation Parcel Number 2 located within the Section 22, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 323406 on March 1st, 1990.

The Arsenic Hall Annexation located within Section 8, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 345954 on August 27th, 1991.

The Osguthorpe Dairy Annexation located within the Northwest Quarter of Section 5 and Northeast Quarter of Section 6, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 345955 on August 27th, 1991.

The East Hillside Annexation located within the West Half of Section 3, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 345956 on August 27th, 1991.

The Peterson Property Annexation located within Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 374692 on February 26th, 1993.

The Morning Star Estates Annexation located within the Southeast Quarter of Section 10, the West Half of Section 11 and the Northwest Quarter of Section 14, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 376611 on March 31st, 1993.

The Ross Property Annexation located within Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 400284 on March 17th, 1994.

The Hidden Meadow Subdivision Annexation located within Sections 10, 11 and 15, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 425892 on March 8th, 1995.

The Sandstone Cove Subdivision Annexation located within the Northeast Quarter of Section 5, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 478857 on May 15th, 1997.

The Flagstaff Mountain Resort Annexation located within Sections 21, 27, 28, 29, and the North Half of Sections 32, 33 and 34 within Summit County, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 545098 on July 28th, 1999.

The Hidden Hollow Annexation located within the West Half of Section 14, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 548172 on September 9th, 1999.

The Spiro Tunnel (Silver Star) Annexation located within Section 8, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 710473 on September 10th, 2004.

The National Ability Center Annexation located within the Northwest Quarter of Section 2, and the Northeast Quarter of Section 3, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 715426 on October 29th, 2004.

That land located immediately west of Park City within Summit County described as follows:

The Colony at White Pine Canyon Phase 1 Annexation located within Section 1 and the North Half of Section 12, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, SLB&M, and Section 6, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 518278 on September 24th, 1998 (this annexation was superseded by the following related Annexation Plats).

Colony at White Pine Canyon Annexation located within Sections 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 24, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, SLB&M, and Sections 6, 7, 8 and 18, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, SLB&M, as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 534009 on March 26th, 1999.

The Colony at White Pine Canyon Phase 2 Annexation located within Sections 1 and 2, the Northeast Quarter of Section 10, Sections 11 and 12, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, SLB&M as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 548270 on September 10th, 1999
The Colony at White Pine Canyon Phase 3A Annexation located within Sections 11 and 12, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, SLB&M as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 579433 on December 29th, 2000.

The Colony at White Pine Canyon Phase 3B Annexation located within Section 11, the Southwest Quarter of Section 12, the Northwest Quarter of Section 13 and the Northeast Quarter of Section 14, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, SLB&M as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 606728 on October 24, 2001.

The Colony at White Pine Canyon Phase 3C Annexation located within Sections 11, 13 and 12, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, SLB&M as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 621557 on June 10, 2002.

The Colony at White Pine Canyon Phase 1B Annexation located within Section 1, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, SLB&M as recorded with the Summit County Recorder as Entry Number 686710 on January 26, 2004.

ADDITIONAL PARK CITY AREA ANNEXATION (approved April 27, 2012):

That land located within the Park City Limits Boundary described as follows:

A parcel of land located in portions of Sections 2 and 11, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, said parcel being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a Park City Boundary Aluminum Cap marking the West Quarter Corner of said Section 11, and running thence North 00°19'41" East 1,474.01 feet, along the Section Line, also along the Easterly Boundary Line, and the projection thereof, of the Hidden Meadow Annexation as recorded in the Office of the Summit County Recorder; thence, continuing along said Easterly Boundary Line the following four (4) courses: (1) North 63°17'52" East 344.36, (2) North 75°52'07" East 1,501.92 feet, (3) North 38°46'13" West 606.70 feet, (4) North 40°21'31" West 1,259.11 feet; thence North 53°41'29" East 893.22 feet; thence South 89°38'17" East 48.30 feet to an Alliance rebar and cap; thence North 00°00'41" East 1,323.98 feet; thence North 89°48'30" West 56.09 feet to the Southeasterly Right-of-Way Line of Highway 248; thence along said Southeasterly Right-of-Way Line the following (2) courses: (1) North 22°01'00" East 602.75 feet to a Right of Way Marker, (2) North 21°57'41" East 273.27 feet to a Schuchert rebar and cap; thence South 89°53'41" East 1,087.42 feet; thence North 00°24'48" East 109.53 feet; thence North 25°15'30" East 568.97 feet to the Westerly Right-of-Way Line of Highway 40; thence along said Westerly Right-of-Way Line the following six (6) courses: (1) South 07°07'53" East 1,242.07 feet to a Right-of-Way Marker, (2) South 18°23'00" East 203.90 feet to a Right-of-Way Marker, (3) South 07°04'36" East 746.67 feet to a disturbed Right-of-Way Marker (bent over), (4) North 84°22'10" West 133.07 feet to a Right-of-Way Marker, (5) South 07°02'52" East 965.75 feet to a Right-of-Way Marker, (6) South 07°03'48" East 1,299.91 feet to a Right-of-Way Marker; thence South 42°31'04" West 3,012.86 feet; thence South 103.66 feet to the projection of the Northerly Boundary Line of the Morning Star Annexation as recorded in the Office of the Summit County Recorder; thence, along said Northerly Boundary Line and the

projections thereof, North 89°30'31" West 1,368.96 feet to the Point of the Beginning. Containing 278.71 acres.

ADDITIONAL PARK CITY AREA ANNEXATION (approved December 1, 2016):

A parcel of land located in Section 35, Township 1 South, Range 4 East, and in Sections 2 & 3. Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian said parcel being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the center of Section 3, Township 2 South, Range 4 east, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Summit County, Utah, (basis of bearing north 00°47'58" east a distance of 2,616.19 feet between the center of said section 3 (a found rebar with yellow cap marked "ls #3082") and the north quarter corner of said Section 3 (a found rebar with yellow cap marked "ls #3082"); thence along the north-south center section line of said Section 3, north 00°47'58" east a distance of 1,308.56 feet; thence leaving said north-south center section line south 89°27'21" east a distance of 2,637.96 feet to a point on the east line of said Section 3, said point also being on the southerly boundary of Park City recreation complex subdivision; thence along said southerly boundary line south 89°50'19" east a distance of 1,602.97 feet to the northwesterly right-of-way of State Route 248; thence along said northwesterly right-of-way and easterly boundary of said Park City Recreation Complex Subdivision the following six (6) calls: (1) thence north 22°01'00" east a distance of 527.41 feet, (2) thence north 17°42'46" east a distance of 399.75 feet, (3) north 28°04'06" east a distance of 200.00 feet, (4) thence north 37°37'06" east a distance of 115.81 feet, (5) thence north 42°52'13" east a distance of 57.93 feet, (6) thence north 46°13'24" east a distance of 339.56 feet to the westerly right-of-way line of highway 40; thence along said westerly right-of-way south 27°45'07" east a distance of 360.10 feet to a point on the southeasterly right-of-way of state route 248; thence along said southeasterly right-of-way line the following six (6) calls: (1) thence south 63°51'50" west a distance of 13.75 feet to a point on a 638.50 foot radius curve to the left; (2) thence along the arc of said curve 338.83 feet through a central angle of 30°24'19"; (3) thence south 34°07'11" west a distance of 544.70 feet; (4) thence south 22°00'39" west 1,005.18 feet; (5) thence south 21°58'40" west a distance of 273.27 feet, (6) thence south 22°02'06" west 602.76 feet to a point on the east-west center section line of said section 2; thence leaving said southeasterly right-of-way line and continuing along said east-west center section line south 89°47'17" west a distance of 199.82 feet to the northwesterly right-of-way line of said State Route 248; thence along said northwesterly right-of-way line, south 26°17'01" west a distance of 477.04 feet; thence leaving said westerly right-of-way line north 89°47'52" west a distance of 732.08 feet; thence north 00°03'08" east a distance of 200.00 feet; thence north 89°47'52" west a distance of 153.20 feet to the easterly line of the southeast quarter of Section 3, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence along said easterly quarter section line south 00°34'37" east of distance of 1,082.49 feet to the east-west 1/16th line of said Section 3; thence along said east-west 1/16th line north 89°31'08" west a distance of 2,634.57 feet to the north-south center section line of said Section 3; thence along said north-south center section line south 00°03'33" west a distance of 310.33 feet to a point on the northerly boundary line of tax parcel pca-98-c-1-x; thence along said northerly boundary line the following five (5) calls: (1) thence south 66°33'26" west a distance of 402.55 feet, (2) thence south 75°13'12" west a distance of 211.20 feet, (3) thence north 21°57'05" west a distance of 593.43 feet . (4) thence north 20°37'22" west a distance of 811.06 feet, (5) thence north 29°33'29" west a distance of 581.91 feet to a point on the easterly line of tax parcel pca-98-c-x; thence along said easterly line north 23°04'37" east a distance of 33.39 feet to the southerly line of "Sunny Slopes Park Meadows Subdivision No.6a"; thence along said southerly line of "Sunny Slopes Park Meadows Subdivision No. 6a" and along the southerly line of "Fairway Hills Estates Phase 1" subdivision north 89°41'29" east a distance of 1,356.67 feet to the center of said Section 3, also being the point of the beginning. Containing approximately 263 acres.

By the Board of County Commissioners of BOX ELDER COUNTY, upon all the property within said District, particularly described as follows:

Beginning at intersection of the West right-of-way line of Utah Highway 84 and Weber-Box Elder County line, which point is North 345.88 ft and East 1958.75 feet from Southwest corner of Section 14, Township 7 North, Range 2 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian. Thence West along Weber-Box Elder County line to a point 288.7 feet North of the Southwest corner of Section 16, Township 7 North, Range 2 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; continuing West along the same

Weber-Box Elder County line 14,846.9 feet, thence North 22 deg 20' W 1111.8 feet; thence North 18 deg 00' East 600.0 feet; thence North 52 deg 00' East 271.5 feet; thence North 10,095.1 feet; thence East 349.8 feet; thence North 3551.4 feet; thence North 49 deg 30' East 11,837.9 feet; thence North 48 deg 27' East 10,565.0 feet; thence North 2 deg 49' W 1267.9 feet to the Northwest corner of Lot 2, Section 21, Township 8 North, Range 2 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence South 86 deg 30' East 2325.8 feet; thence North 71 deg 25' East 680.5 feet; thence North 48 deg 37' East 103.0 feet; thence North 5 deg 00' East 85.8 feet; thence North 73 deg 50' East 1422.2 feet; thence South 80 deg 26' East 1358.8 ft; thence South 0 deg 25' West 413.2 feet; thence South 20 deg 15' West 23.8 feet; thence South 1 deg 00' East 461.4 feet; thence South 22 deg 08' East 933.2 feet; thence North 88 deg 00' East 400.0 feet to the Westerly right-of-way line of the Oregon Short Line Railroad; thence Southerly along said Westerly right-of-way line 15,697.7 feet; thence West 1386.4 feet; thence South 273.8 feet; thence South 35 deg 31' East 407.0 feet; th. North 88 deg 56' West 1001.4 feet to a point from which the Northeast corner of Section 3, Township 7 North, Range 2 West bears North 1526.3 feet and East 1320.0 feet; thence South to the Southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 10, Township 7 North, Range 2 West, thence East to the Southeast corner of said Section 10; thence South 148.5 feet; thence East 1320 feet; thence South 2491.5 feet, which point is the Northeast corner of the Northwest quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 14, Township 7 North, Range 2 West; thence East along said Quarter Section line to the intersection of said line and Westerly right-of-way line of Utah Highway 84; th SW'ly alg said Hwy r-o-w line to the point of beginning.

**III
ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business for discussion, meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.



Mark D. Anderson, Chair

ATTEST:



Scott W. Paxman, General Manager/CEO

(SEAL)