SKYLINE MOUNTAIN
SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT

SMSSD Board Meeting Minutes
May 20, 2025, 5 pm to 8:30 pm
Senior Citizens Center - 101 East 100 North, Mt. Pleasant, Utah 84647

Available via Zoom and Mobile Phone
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/4287678058?pwd=TWxSbVR1NWFhTG9vNE0zVklZenBhdz09&omn=88648414810
One tap mobile +12532158782,,4287678058#,,,,*366822#

Attendees:
Board Members in person: Craig Godwin (J154), Trent Andersen (Section E lots), Ferris Taylor (K35, D46, D47), and Don Hunter (J133, J134)
Board Member via Zoom: Beca Mark (GC46)
Staff: Roy Fox (C48, C49, C50, Water Superintendent & SMSSD Treasurer), and Jeremy Fox (Water Operator)
SMSSD Customers in person: Jake Blaney (C13), Gary Knudsen and wife (GC31), Richard Scutt (C58), Kim and Michelle Hansen (D4), Jackie Hunter (J133, J134), Valerie Andersen (A8, A13), Todd and Becky Bird (GC18), Bob Capel (A37), Mont Pugmire (B19), David Weber (B110), Lou Erickson (A45) and one other (didn't sign in)
SMSSD Customers on Zoom: Beca Mark (Host – GC46), Tami Brems (G39), Parker Christensen (GC37), Monique (?), Michael (?), and the AI note taker account (FireFly).
Guests: None

The SMSSD Board Meeting was called to order at 5:03 PM by Board Chair Craig Godwin and attendees and Zoom participants were welcomed.

Opening Prayer: Don Hunter

Board Meeting Agenda (As Published in Bold)

1) **Swearing in of the new Board Member**
   a) Three candidates were presented to the Sanpete County Commissioners at their meeting today in Manti with the recommendation that Mont Pugmire be appointed to the SMSSD Board
   b) Commissioner Cheney made a motion to delay the appointment, instead requesting a copy of the SMSSD Bylaws, 2 years of bank statements and 2 years of SMSSD contracts.

c) The motion was seconded and approved by the Sanpete County Commissioners, so the agenda request was delayed until the next County Commissioner's meeting on June 3rd.

2) **Approval of Last Meeting Minutes**

a) A draft of the March 4, 2025, Board minutes had been circulated for review and additions, corrections and changes were in advance of the meeting to be returned by Monday, May 19, 2025.

b) Craig Godwin asked for a motion to accept the draft minutes with one additional correction of December 3, 2025 to December 3, 2024 in reference to the approval of that meeting's minutes.

c) Don Hunter made the motion, which was seconded by Ferris Taylor.

d) The vote to approve the March 4, 2025, minutes was:

i) Don Hunter – Approve

ii) Beca Mark – Approve

iii) Trent Andersen – Opposed. When asked, he stated he would discuss it in the Executive Committee Meeting.

iv) Ferris Taylor – Approve

v) Craig Godwin – Approve

e) The March 4, 2025, SMSSD Board Minutes were approved with the vote of 4 in favor and 1 opposed.

3) **Approval of Financials**

a) SMSSD Treasurer Roy Fox was asked to walk everyone through SMSSD Financials as of April 30, 2025, as provided in packets for the SMSSD Board and for attendees. Roy noted the following account balances and answered questions from the Board and attendees. Financial reports are on the State's Transparency Website.

1. Checking	$12,717.16	
2. Loan Payments	$98.635.31	
3. X-Press	$26,713.34	
4. Upper Mountain Acct	$5,001.65	
5. Birch Creek Acct	$5,001.64	
6. Petty Cash	$1,485.12	
Total	$149,554.22	
7. Public Treasurer Investment Fund (PTIP)	$63,961.70	Remaining Bond Restructure funds
8. Impact Fees Account	$20,010.19	Impact Study Funding and Interest
9. Capital Facilities	$3,203.93	
10. CD Capital Facilities Savings	$19,961.09	
Total	$23,165.02	Can't be used for Operations-except

		for emergencies, to be replenished
11. Debt Service	$2,602.21	
12. CD Debt Service Savings	$11,971.46	
Total	$14,573.67	Can't be used for Operations
Total of All Accounts	$187,292.91	

b) Lou Erickson (A45) asked why Impact Fee Balance was an odd number.
   i) Answered that it is an interest-bearing account and so there is some interest added each month

c) A motion to accept the financials as presented and discussed was made by Don Hunter, seconded by Ferris Taylor and approved:
   i) Don Hunter – Approve
   ii) Beca Mark – Absent (online) for vote
   iii) Trent Andersen – Approve
   iv) Ferris Taylor – Approve
   v) Craig Godwin – Approve

d) The Financials as of March 3, 2025, were approved by the SMSSD Board with 4 approving and one absent/offline.

4) Update on Water System

a) Update on water system

i) Two water system documents were shared

(1) The Rural Water Association of Utah "Potential Water System Infrastructure Project Information" that was submitted May 9, 2025, and shared in the printed material

(a) This gets SMSSD projects on the UWIP list to potentially qualify for future funding assistance from the State or other groups

(b) Projects submitted include replacing the lower (Area 1) 55,000 gallon tank with new 250,000 gallon tank, accessing Cottonwood Springs water, and 5,800 ft of transmission lines, Upper Mountain (Area 2) resizing well to 80 to 100 gallons per minute with a 310,000 gallon storage tank and 66,211 ft of transmission lines, and Birch Creek (Area 3) acquiring the Colledge well, a 225,000 storage tank, and 28,300 ft of transmission lines along with long-term need for office and maintenance building. Each project is prioritized #1 to #10

(c) The 10 submitted project estimates range from $110,000 to $13,340,000 (a total of $23,260,000), with a hope that grant funding might cover up to 60% of the costs with SMSSD portion estimated to be 40% from Impact fees, operations and/or bonds.

(d) Details were available in copies of the submission and questions were asked and discussed

(2) State DEQ Asset Management Plan for SMSSD was submitted April 7, 2025, and receipt and approval was acknowledged by the State Division of Drinking Water on April 21, 2025

- **(a)** The details of asset inventories, operation and maintenance tasks, and long-range financial plans were submitted and the DDW concurred with the SMSSD methodologies used.
- **(b)** Asset remaining life, current values, and replacement costs are estimates but the list and details are pretty close.
  - **(i)** The analysis and report is part of the bond information SMSSD has to do.
- **(c)** The dollars do not directly tie to the Impact Study but demonstrate that SMSSD has a comprehensive Master Plan, an Impact Study and an Impact Fee Program
- **(d)** The Board members (and customers) were encouraged to review the Asset Management Plan and contact Roy Fox with any questions or concerns.

b) RV Dump Station

- **i)** Kim Hansen and Jeremy Fox met yesterday and agreed on final placement for the RV Dump Station water meter, which will be removed from the road and placed inside the gate at the Burn pile
- **ii)** Doug Shelley will get the meter installed with the SMSSD staff.

c) Thad's Peak Well Project

- **i)** Cox Construction has been there this week trying to finish everything up
- **ii)** The electrical things have been installed, vents on the vaults are being put in, along with other outstanding work order items.
- **iii)** Still have work to do on the full SCADA and getting the security/surveillance systems installed
- **iv)** Pictures were shared of vandalism and destruction where the 2" fill hose had been cut off.
- **v)** Roy Fox mentioned we have been talking about security and surveillance needs for 5 months

d) CentraCom Tower – (This section abbreviates and summarizes a 40-minute Board discussion)

- **i)** Craig Godwin shared that back in October Internet access for security and surveillance cameras became an issue.
  - **(1)** There wasn't sufficient internet at Thad's Peak to support the system the State had recommended be part of the project and be installed at the Thad's Peak well site.
  - **(2)** After investigating a number of options for Internet access, CentraCom came, evaluated the situation, used a drone to test "line of sight" signal reception from other towers, and looked at what might make business sense for CentraCom and meet what was being required of SMSSD.
  - **(3)** Two public SMSSD meetings have been held, two Executive Committee meetings arranged with the SMR Board, an email with a description and pictures of the tower sent to all SMSSD customers, and a First-Class mailing to 20 lot owners who might be visually impacted by the tower. SMSSD did not get any negative reactions. Most were interested in better Internet services. Several owners near the Thad's Peak tower were contacted and they are supportive.
- **ii)** SMR did a survey of members and Trent Andersen was asked to provide the results with the hope that Upper Mountain and Birch Creek owners could be separated out.
  - **(1)** Jake Blaney was asked to talk about the SMR survey results.

(2) Although statistics were not posted or shared, Jake stated about 75% of responders approved of the Internet tower. That is out of the 23% of the members who responded to the survey.

(3) SMR has posted a 7-page summary of comments members made, with Parker Christensen's and Jake Blaney's responses. The SMR survey did not mention the initial driver for the tower being Internet access for Thad's Peak security and surveillance. Expanded and less expensive Internet access for SMR members was a side benefit of the initial investigations and considerations.

(4) Starlink is an option but without any financial benefits to SMSSD or SMR and some variability in service has been experienced by Starlink customers. Hughes was also investigated.

(5) The question was asked if it is believed that there would be much more negative reaction to the tower. Trent Andersen expressed concern that some might be upset after a decision is made.

(6) Jake stated that the SMSSD need for high-capacity bandwidth is potentially misleading and the SCADA system is a pulsing update and has very low data transfer.

iii) There was extensive discussion on whether the tower should be on SMSSD or SMR property.

(1) The SMR position is that at Internet tower should be on SMR common area property across the road from the Thad's Peak facility.

(2) The counterview point has been that the SMSSD lot is already a construction site, is fenced and was where the placement of the tower had been considered up to this point. Why have more construction on a sloping and difficult piece of SMR common property where the SMSSD customers and the SMR members are all the same property owners and all benefit either way.

(3) The urgency of having full remote control of the Thad's Peak property and security and surveillance in place before winter was emphasized by several board members.

(4) Sixty to ninety days from a signed agreement means it will already be into September before a CentraCom tower will be in place. It is a non-started to allow this decision to be delayed.

(5) The topic of systems to monitor fire/smoke across the valley was raised and as reported in prior minutes, is a future option or capability of the tower but at a significant cost. Any consideration would likely have to involve grant money or broader funding beyond either SMR or SMSSD.

(6) After much discussion on whether the tower should be on Thad's Peak property or SMR common area property and whether any revenue from the two should be used for water system improvements or SMR expenses, Craig Godwin requested a motion was that the two boards get together on the project to optimize the location, revenue sharing, and finalize contracts.

(7) Trent Andersen questioned whether the motion was to simply hold a joint meeting or to have the boards reach a conclusion to move ahead with the tower (after 6 months of discussion).

(8) A past Board Member of both boards, Mont Pugmire, spoke that he absolutely does not understand. If ¾ of membership of SMR and SMSSD, which are the same people, have all said they would like to go ahead with this, why are we still debating it. He just doesn't like to see things drag on and on. What are we waiting on?

(9) Craig Godwin again called for a motion to move forward in collaboration with the SMR Board so together we can contractually come to a conclusion and get the internet tower project completed, whether it is on SMSSD property or SMR Common Area property and no matter how the benefits of the CentraCom contract are shared. We are all the same members.

(10) That motion was made by Ferris Taylor, seconded by Don Hunter, and approved by the Board, with Trent Andersen asking for time until tomorrow to contact the SMR Board before committing to the May 28th 7 pm date for a virtual combined SMR and SMSSD Board meeting. The time will be at the convenience of the SMR Board members in response to Trent's inquiries.

(11) The Board and the attendees were thanked for their support of the need for progress for the tower to be in place before winter and the extensive open discussion on the issues.

5) **Report from SMSSD/SMR Liaison**

a) Trent Andersen stated that one of the SMR attorneys still says he should have gotten information requested a while ago and that he didn't get everything.

i) The list of documents had been discussed and noted in the March 4, 2025, minutes.

ii) It was stated the requested documents were sent to the lawyer and delivered to the SMR offices.

b) Trent suggested that he walk the board through the issues in the Executive Committee Meeting following.

6) **New / Old Business and Open Time for Customers**

a) It was mentioned that in the September meeting there was a discussion and shared language to be added to the SMR Construction form with respect to impact fees.

i) Trent Andersen said it had fallen off the list but also that we want to be careful as to whether SMR is supporting the Impact Fees.

ii) The Board was reminded that his concern was how it was written could have some potential legal ramifications. He asked if we could discuss that in the Executive Committee following this meeting.

b) David Weber (B110) shared a bit of history that the first meeting he came to of this board was because his water pressure was 17 psi. And that is what got him put on the board. It is fixed now he has 120 psi. His question now is where the water leaks were dug up and fixed, the asphalt and dirt has settled. There is another spot down by the back gate that needs repair. Roy Fox responded that they will be doing those road repairs.

c) Bob Capel (A37) questioned whether it's within the charter of SMSSD to host or sell Internet Services. Craig Godwin responded that SMSSD will not be hosting or providing Internet Services – CentraCom is doing that. Bob does not believe that leasing space to an Internet Service Provider is in the SMSSD charter and would be better in the charter of SMR. He was reminded that the tower was not an Internet tower when it came up, it was a critical component of the security and surveillance system for the million-dollar Thad's Peak well project.

(1) Craig Godwin acknowledged Bob perspective but read from the February 1, 2013 Water System Operating Agreement, Section 4.2 (a) that states, "The District is a Utah special service district duly organized, validly existing, and in good standing under the laws of the State of Utah, and has full power and authority to own, operate and lease its properties as presently owned,

operated and leased," and (b) states that, "The District has the absolute right, power, authority and capacity to enter into and perform this Agreement in accordance with its terms without any other or further authorization, action or proceeding."

(2) The agreed upon collaborative meeting with the two boards will solve the issues. He also reminded everyone that we are all the same members, and the benefits will come to all members, either way including the $10,000 CentraCom fiber services to the SMR offices, cabins, RV park and like that. The CentraCom agreement is both cost savings and revenue generation for the benefit of SMR members and SMSSD customers.

ii) Michelle Hansen reminded Kim that there is an SMR Member Breakfast on May 24th from 8 am to 10 am, which could be an additional opportunity to collect informal input on the CentraCom tower and the many associated questions that have been discussed.

(1) SMR Board applications are also due to SMR by 5 pm on May 21st.

iii) Becky Bird (GC18) and Lou Erickson (A45) both echoed Bob Capel's comments.

d) David Weber let the Board and attendees know that he is with the American Legion and they will be firing their weapons a block from the Senior Citizens Center, so don't be alarmed if you hear weapons going off.

7) **Open Time for Customers**

Member questions and discussion took place throughout the meeting and further comments were captured in #6 above. Those on Zoom were asked if they had any comments, and hearing none, the Board Meeting closed.

Action Items:

- Follow up with CentraCom to assess optimal tower location
- SMR to provide a breakdown of tower survey results by Upper Mountain, Birch Creek and Full-Time area
- Roy Fox to follow up on repairing settled dirt and pothole during next asphalt replacement
- Follow up on adding Impact Fee section to SMR construction form
- Address in Executive Meeting issues raised in the Board meeting, including:
  - Trent Andersen objections to the March 4, 2025, Board Minutes
  - Documents Trent Andersen believes have not been sent to the SMR lawyers
  - Potential legal action against SMSSD for the language in the Impact Fee Resolution
  - Other Executive Meeting agenda items

8) **Adjourn**

a) Motion to Adjourn the Board Meeting was made by Trent Andersen, seconded by Don Hunter, and approved 5-0 by the SMSSD Board.

b) The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 pm with an Executive Meeting to be held as soon as members exchanged thoughts and left the center.

SMSSD Next Meeting

The next SMSSD Board Meeting will be held as soon as the County Commissioners appoint a new SMSSD Board Member and after SMR and SMSSD Boards meeting to finalize the CentraCom negotiations. For SMSSD, there will be a public meeting to share what has been decided on CentraCom so things can move forward.

Executive Meeting