

# **PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD MEETING**

Department of Workforce Services  
Housing and Community Development Division  
Salt Lake City, Utah

## **MINUTES**

September 4, 2025

### **Members Present**

Curtis Wells  
Jerry Taylor  
Kirt Slaugh  
Bill Winfield  
Dean Baker  
Jack Lytle  
Greg Miles  
Ralph Brown  
Laura Hanson  
Bruce Adams  
Scott Bartholomew

Chairman  
Five County Association of Governments  
State Treasurer  
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments - SERDA  
Uintah County  
Uintah Basin Association of Governments  
Duchesne County  
Sevier County  
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget  
State Transportation Commission  
R6 Regional Council

### **Staff and Visitors**

Candace Powers  
Heather Poulsen  
Paul Moberly  
Jennifer Domenici  
Brook McCarrick  
Judy Wilkerson  
William Merckley  
Bart Jensen  
Ron Winterton  
Jon Stearmer  
Brian Barton  
Keith Heaton  
Laramie Morgan  
Trent Jackson  
Wyatt Hansen  
Jeff McCarty  
Kevin Yack  
Nate Zilles  
Ben Allred  
Cody Christensen  
Melani Torgersen  
Stephanie Steed  
Wyatt Hansen  
Milton Bryan Thayne  
Rebecca Evans  
Barney Zauss  
Brian Thayne  
Butch Johns  
Ben Mower  
Kelly Chappell  
Greg Pearson  
Kendrick Thomas  
Daniel Hawley  
Carson DeMille

Housing and Community Development  
Housing and Community Development  
Housing and Community Development  
Housing and Community Development  
Attorney General's Office  
Fruitland Special Service District  
Uintah Water Conservancy District  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
State Senate – Duchesne County  
Seven County Infrastructure Coalition  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Seven County Infrastructure Coalition  
Ferron City  
Ferron City  
Ferron City  
Sunrise Engineering  
Uintah Basin Association of Governments  
Uintah Basin Association of Governments  
Ballard City  
Five County Association of Governments  
Escalante City  
Escalante City  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Wellington City  
Wellington City  
Wellington City  
Wellington City  
Dutch John  
Ballard City  
Ensign Engineering  
  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Jones & DeMille Engineering

Rich White  
Bryan Gines  
Raleen Gines  
Willis LeFevre  
Jeff Baker  
Paul Cox

Escalante City  
Neola Water and Sewer District  
Neola Water and Sewer District  
Uintah County  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Town of Glendale

### **Virtual Attendees**

Sarah Nielson                      Department of Workforce Services – PIO  
April Gardner                      Department of Workforce Services  
Justin Atkinson                      Sunrise Engineering  
Heather Pattee                      Division of Drinking Water  
Of note: Several online Zoom attendees were not recorded

### **WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS** 9:02 am

The Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB) Meeting was held on Thursday, September 4, 2025 at 1385 South State Street, SLC, Utah. Chairman Curtis Wells called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Introductions:

Welcome back Commissioner Bruce Adams now representing UDOT on the Board.

Welcome to Brook McCarrick, Attorney General's Office and appointed legal counsel to the Board.

### **BRIEFING - ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

#### **1. Financial Review & Review of Agenda Items** [0:03:49]

All the applications received for the June application deadline (June 2) are being reviewed at today's meeting. Kaylee Beck, DWS Finance provided a review of the financial reality. The available revenue does not support the number of grant requests. The Board would need to convert some requests to interest-bearing loans wherein there is sufficient revenue for today's projects. The revenue indicated today includes mineral lease deposits through July 2025. *(Mineral Lease revenue can accommodate grants and 0% loans. Bonus MUST be as an interest-bearing loan.)*

Mr. Slaugh requested clarity on the available revenue referring to the CIB Financial Report with Projected Revenues.

From the CIB Financial Report:

#### **Funding as requested:**

|  | <i>Mineral Lease</i> | <i>Bonus</i> | <i>Total</i>     |
|--|----------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Total new grants                             | \$ 24,945,450        | \$ -         | \$ 24,945,450    |
| Total new loans                              | \$ 400,000           | \$ 1,602,000 | \$ 2,002,000     |
| Total Forecasted Trimester Funded Projects   | \$ 25,345,450        | \$ 1,602,000 | \$ 26,947,450.00 |
| Total available to commit as of Sept meeting | \$ (7,795,341)       | \$ 9,833,355 | \$ 2,038,014     |

Ms. Beck stated there is sufficient revenue if project funding can be accommodated through interest-bearing loans.

There are 8 new projects and 2 special consideration requests (Special consideration requires a vote to consider the project) on today's agenda.

### **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** [7:32]

Chairman Wells called for a motion to approve the minutes from the June 5, 2025 meeting and the June 5-6, 2025 Policy Meeting.

**Bill Winfield made and Laura Hanson seconded a motion to approve the minutes of both the June 5, 2025 meeting and the June 5-6, 2025 Policy Meeting. The motion carried with Bruce Adams abstaining.**

#### **4. NEW PROJECTS [8:26]**

##### **4.1 Ballard City –New Road Corridor – 1000 South from 500 East to 1500 East (Uintah)**

Ballard City presented a funding presented a funding assistance request for a \$3,264,000 grant for roadway and drainage improvements to create an east-west corridor including the installation of a box culvert on Cottonwood Creek, gulch embankments to bring the grade up for the construction of a 0.580 mile new 32-foot wide hot mix asphalt roadway on 1000 South from 500 East to 1500 East with 12-foot lanes and 4-foot shoulders, curb and gutter, concrete sidewalks on both sides , engineering and bonding. The project spans a small portion of property within Roosevelt City, with most of the project occurring within Duchesne County and Ballard City limits. Applicant cash \$294,000; Roosevelt City & Duchesne County cash \$794,000.

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$2,284,000 Grant / \$980,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%*

*TOOL MED \$1,142,000 Grant / \$2,122,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$3,264,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant indicated this project is to complete a new through street from Roosevelt through Ballard which will allow access to schools, parks and walking access off the highway. Ballard City is the applicant; Duchesne County, Roosevelt City and Ballard City are involved entities and are participating with funding.

Ms. Hanson acknowledged the other cash to the project. It was noted that Ballard is a small community but available funding is as a loan; could they take some of the funding as a low interest loan.

The applicant stated they would prefer a grant; there are three different communities involved and a loan would require involvement and tracking with three entities which would be more difficult. This is part of a larger transportation plan and projects have been completed with other funding so Ballard City considers they have a lot of 'skin in the game'. The other cash match for this project is \$1,088,000.

**Bruce Adams made and Jack Lytle seconded a substitute motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$3,264,000 grant.**

Mr. Slauch referenced the available revenue stating if the Board does not want to make difficult decisions today, those decision will need to be made at the funding meeting.

**Bruce Adams made and Jack Lytle seconded a substitute motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$3,264,000 grant citing a special circumstance exemption. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

##### **4.2. Uintah Water Conservancy District – Engineering – Jensen Unit Pumping Plant Phase 1(Uintah) [1:35:04]**

Uintah Water Conservancy District presented a funding assistance request for a \$4,000,000 grant for Jensen Unit Pumping Plant Engineering Phase 1. This project consists of feasibility study, environmental impact statement and preconstruction design engineering in preparation for the construction of at the Jensen Unit Pump Station on the Green River. The feasibility components include assembling existing studies, identifying and evaluating alternatives for utilizing BOR & UWCD water rights, an evaluation and update of existing cost estimates for the installation, operation and maintenance of the facility, alternative analysis of economic benefit, evaluation of water rights and culinary water demands for Ashley Valley, public outreach and 36-inch HDPE pipeline for the Burton/Burns to Sunshine road crossing. The environmental impact statement (EIS) scope includes plan of development, notice of intent, scoping, preliminary design and alternatives, right-of-way application, baseline environment field surveys and analyses, preparation of draft EIS, final EIS and record of decision. Studies and plans require 50% cash match. The preconstruction design engineering includes topographic survey, pipeline routing and connection to existing pipelines, preliminary design, pipeline and pump station hydraulics, utility and site designs, pump station structural design, design review, cost estimates, specifications and contractor and material procurement and construction permitting and water rights for use of 12,000 Acre Feet of Green River Water.

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$2,800,000 Grant / \$1,200,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%*

*TOOL MED \$1,400,000 Grant / \$2,600,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$4,000,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant thanked all those who helped with the application. The Uintah Water Conservancy District was created in 1956 and Red Fleet reservoir is the Jensen Unit. This project is the final component of a pumping unit on the Green River which was approved congressionally in the 1950's. The final plan report was compiled in the 1970's by the Bureau of Reclamation. The pumping plant will pump up to 12,000-acre-feet from the Green River for irrigation of lands in the Jensen area. The Brush Creek primary rights are being used by irrigators currently that pass through the Red Fleet Reservoir, pumped over to treatment facilities at the head of Ashley Valley and made available for municipal and industrial use. Municipal water suppliers that are pumping out of their emergency supply. Emergency contracts were made this year due to the very dry conditions and low water. Uintah Water Conservancy District is a wholesale water provider to irrigation companies in the area, Vernal City, Jensen Water and Ashley Water and Sewer. This project is pre-construction activities that are necessary; updating all the Bureau of Reclamation planning and EIS/NEPA process concerning environmental impacts. Engineering consultants and partners have provided an opinion of probable cost of nearly \$20 million dollars for the full facility. They have been seeking other funding noting the project was included in the House appropriations bill where it will hopefully be approved by the House, then the Senate.

Chairman Wells referenced the mineral lease revenue (grant funding) which is low. He suggested waiting on this project to see if funding will be appropriated and then returning to the CIB when other funding is determined.

The applicant indicated it was anticipated that by October, a decision would be made and it would be possible to wait; an answer should come soon.

Ms. Hanson stated that planning and study requests require a 50% cash contribution from the applicant. It is uncertain if the Board can fund this without the required cash match.

Commissioner Miles stated this is not general planning but is for a portion of a project.

Ms. Hanson indicated the project 'consists of feasibility study, environmental impact statement and preconstruction design engineering in preparation for the construction' and suggested waiting until the project funding is clarified.

Commissioner Lytle reiterated this is not planning in the sense of planning; NEPA is a different form of planning and is a significant part of this project. This is an anomaly, but not general planning.

Ms. Hanson stated she would like it clarified in policy.

Commissioner Lytle suggested the entity compartmentalize the project for less funding; not hold the entire \$4 million. What is immediately needed.

Commissioner Taylor asked if they have the water rights.

The applicant indicated the water right is with the Bureau of Reclamation and has been since this project was authorized. They have submitted their 40-year plan to the State of Utah for the purpose of constructing this pumping plant.

Mayor Baker suggested a partial funding of \$2 million now and additional funding as funds are available.

The applicant indicated they could work with a phased approach but would like to maintain the momentum to the point where they could initiate the NEPA process which will be a multi-year effort.

Chairman Wells referenced the status of available revenue and asked the applicant what funding would be necessary to 'keep the momentum'.

The applicant indicated \$270,000 for the pre-phase. The 'Feasibility Study' has been satisfied by the Bureau of Reclamation earlier. 30% is for design engineering to satisfy the purpose and need in getting to the NEPA

process; \$1.5 Million design engineering.

Chairman Wells suggested funding in the median funding tool range; \$1.4 million grant and \$2.6 million loan for 30 years @ 2.5% to accommodate where CIB available revenue is.

Mayor Baker disclosed he is on the Uintah Water Conservancy District Board and suggested an initial funding of \$2 million to move the project forward.

**Dean Baker made and Greg Miles seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$2,000,000 grant.**

Commissioner Miles noted Utah needs protections in the Colorado River to be able to utilize that water and finish the project and the UWCD is heavily bonded; additional debt would be difficult.

Mr. Slaugh stated in Jensen there are already pumps in the river to provide irrigation in Jensen. One pump went down and asked if that part of the project? Was this not already worked out with the Central Utah Water Compact that allows the access? What is the scope not already in the Compact and how does this project correlate to the pumps already in the river?

The applicant stated the other pump station is called the Burns Bench pumping station with two small pumps in the river. The water right associated with that pumping facility is owned by the Burns Bench Irrigation Company which augment irrigation supplies into the Jensen Unit. The Jensen pumping plant is for replacement of irrigation water from Fresh Creek in the Jensen area; they have those water rights held in Red Fleet north of Vernal and is a part of a larger federal project which is a wholly private pump station. The smaller Burns Bench pumping station is used to augment irrigation supplies; the Jensen pumping station will replace irrigation supplies for increased water supply.

Mr. Slaugh expressed concern that the project would cost \$20 million dollars.

The applicant indicated they built a pumping station near Pelican Lake in 2010 with a 10,000-acre-foot capacity and the project cost was \$12 million. This facility will have redundancies in place to prevent down-time as it will include culinary water. *Water will be pulled out of the Green River and used for Jensen irrigation; Brush Creek rights will be held in Red Fleet Reservoir.* There is a pumping station at the dam at Red Fleet. There is a large aqueduct that pumps water from Red Fleet north of Steinaker to the Central Utah Water Conservancy District treatment plant north of Vernal. All of those structures built in the early '80's contemplated this additional 12,000-acre-feet being made available and the demand is now evident.

Mr. Slaugh asked about their procurement process; following state procurement is essential for money coming from CIB.

The applicant indicated that the construction portion will be done with federally appropriated dollars through the Bureau of Reclamation. The \$4 million request to CIB will require procurement for engineering services and their administrative code follows the state procurement policy; there would be a competitive process.

Commissioner Bartholomew referenced combining this project with an irrigation project expressing uncertainty that irrigation is an eligible CIB project. Why isn't Central Utah Water Conservancy funding this project?

*CIB cannot fund irrigation projects when it is a pass through of public funds to a private entity such as a private irrigation or canal company.*

The applicant acknowledged that CIB cannot fund projects that have a private component. This project is ultimately a drinking water project though it involved irrigation regarding the exchange. The customers of this pumping station will be those four main municipal water suppliers in the Ashley Valley and Jensen service areas. They will contract with UWCD for municipal and industrial purposes. Central Utah Water Conservancy is the regional conservancy district while Uintah Water Conservancy District is locally in Uintah County. As a

part of the Jensen Unit it is the UWCD responsibility. Central Utah Water Conservancy has the Bonneville Unit of the same Central Utah Project which is vastly larger.

Commissioner Adams referenced the 9188 residential connections, 771 commercial connections and 340 other connections which is a total of 10,299 connections associated with this project and stated the entire population of San Juan county is 15,000 people. Ashley Valley could qualify to be another county. It is understood this project is to exchange water to have water for residents and commercial.

Commissioner Lytle stated none of this water is being transferred to the Wasatch Front.

The applicant stated the Central Utah Water Conservancy District operates the treatment facility that will treat this water to be delivered to the UWCD customers downstream.

Mayor Baker indicated he also is part of the Ashley Valley Water & Sewer District which is geographically the biggest culinary system in Ashley Valley. They do not have the water for the growth that is coming in the Valley. They have put limits on connections etc. to meet demands.

The Chairman indicated the motion on the table for a \$2 million grant and asked if they could take a \$1.5 million grant and the rest of the \$4,000,000 as a \$2.5 million interest-bearing loan.

The applicant indicated they might be able to accommodate that; it will need approval from the District Board of Trustees. The information will be presented at their next Board meeting before the CIB funding meeting.

The Chairman acknowledged the need for approval indicating it would allow the CIB, with their limited grant availability to fund the \$4 million.

Mr. Slauch indicated this project is a multi-year process so not all the funding is needed up front. It would be better for CIB to fund a lesser amount and the applicant can return for additional funds as needed. Perhaps \$2 million now; \$1.5 million grant and \$500k loan.

The Chairman asked the applicant how much is needed to commence the project.

Commissioner Lytle suggested the CIB Board could suggest a funding package for the applicant to present to their board for approval and perhaps come back with alternatives or place the project on the pending list as requested.

Mr. Slauch acknowledged the situation with water in the Basin. This is a good solution to bring more water into the valley. Even a portion of the funding will allow them to get started.

Commissioner Lytle noted that all of the federal monies will have to be paid back so they are already taking a loan for this project. CIB has to consider the available funding but there is a lot of other funding.

Chairman Wells noted that a reduction in grant funding (\$2 million instead of \$4 million) does help out the revenue situation for CIB.

Commissioner Taylor asked what the interest rate is on the federal monies.

The applicant stated their last major loan with the federal government was 3.222%.

Chairman Wells indicated if the applicant would rather take a \$2 million grant for now and come back as needed and that's what the Board decides... The Board has a recommendation (the Chairman suggested \$1.4 million grant and \$2.6 million loan for 30 years @ 2.5%). The median interest rate is 2.5% but the board may adjust the rate. The CIB wants the project to be able to move forward. Unless there is a substitute motion, the motion on the table is for a \$2 million grant.

**Laura Hanson made and Jerry Taylor seconded a substitute motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1.4 million grant and \$2.6 million loan for 30 years @ 1.0% citing a financial hardship exemption. The motion carried with Dean Baker opposed and the chairman abstaining.**

Commissioner Lytle clarified that the applicant can review the offered funding package with their board.

4.3. Fruitland Special Service District – Mill Hollow Water Treatment & Water Acquisition (Duchesne) [57:25]  
Fruitland Special Service District presented a funding assistance request for \$2,250,000 (a \$1,850,000 grant and a \$400,000 loan for 30y @ 0.0%) for the Mill Hollow Water Treatment & Water Acquisition. This project consists of water system improvements to include the purchase of 121 acre-feet of Strawberry River water rights and the construction of a water treatment facility, connections to the existing water line, 3,900 linear feet of 3-inch PVC waterline, SCADA and telemetry, electrical service utilities, environmental permitting, engineering, easement acquisition, testing to accommodate regulatory compliance and bonding. Applicant Cash \$150,000.

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$1,575,000 Grant / \$675,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%*

*TOOL MED \$787,000 Grant / \$1,463,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$2,250,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant this is a critical situation. One of the major springs has been contaminated by ground water and the Division of Drinking Water has required that this water be treated before it can be turned back into the system. Several residents have had to reduce their water use and it is becoming critical. The District needs to provide clean drinking water for the current residents. They also need to purchase water rights for existing and future growth.

Chairman Wells referred to their request and asked if the Board could accept modified terms if necessary. The minimum funding tool suggestion is \$1,575,000 Grant / \$675,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%.

The applicant indicated they have reviewed the funding tool option. Rural Water has done an analysis on their rates. The rates were increased to \$60; higher than most culinary water rates in the state. They have significant loans and would prefer not to allocate all their system reserves as loan payments.

Commissioner Taylor asked what current property owners that want to build on their property do for water?

The applicant indicated if there is water in the area they want to build. Water infrastructure is sparse and not in some of the areas. What is there is older and does need to be replaced. Many are drilling wells.

Commissioner Taylor expressed concern that new residents drill their own well and not contributing to the system; taking water rights from the area that the community as a whole could be using.

Commissioner Adams noted they have 595 connections and 90 of those have only one source; what are the other sources for the rest of the connections?

Fruitland has 3 springs. One of them is the Little Red Creek Spring which serves the majority of the system. The 90 connections can only be served by the other two springs; one of which is under the water advisory. They also have a well in the valley, but is not capable of serving very many. Most connections are on the bench.

Mr. Slauch stated this is a good project for the Division of Drinking water and asked if they have pursued DDW for funding.

The applicant indicated they have contacted DDW but the terms were a lot higher; the maximum in grant was possibly 30%. Historically Fruitland has not been awarded any grant from DDW based on MAGI.



Mr. Slauch noted the applicant could get a loan from DDW but they want grant so they are coming to CIB. If CIB gave a portion of the grant, could they go back and get the rest from DDW?

The applicant indicated it is a timing issue. They redeveloped the spring two years ago anticipating more water to the area. In the spring during heavy runoff they tested the springs. One of the springs was deemed unsafe and they spent a lot of money on the redevelopment of the spring.

Commissioner Miles stated for a time the District had a moratorium; new homes being built had to haul water. The neighboring water district only has a fill station because of the challenging landscape and availability of water. The west side of Duchesne County has a very limited supply of water. Their rates are high comparably and their residents are low/moderate income. He suggested funding as requested but it is the Board's discretion.

**Bill Winfield made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,850,000 grant and a \$400,000 loan for 30y @ 0.0% (total \$2,250,000) noting a financial hardship exemption.**

Ms. Hanson suggested a 0.5% interest to accommodate the loan from the bonus revenue.

**Bill Winfield made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,850,000 grant and a \$400,000 loan for 30y @ 0.5% (total \$2,250,000) noting a financial hardship exemption. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

#### 4.4. Neola Water and Sewer District – Well and Distribution Improvements 2025 (Duchesne) [1:11:32]

Neola Water and Sewer District presented a funding assistance request for a \$3,261,000 grant and a \$362,000 loan for 30y @ 1.0% (total \$3,623,000) for well and water distribution improvements. This project consists of water distribution system improvements to include design, subsurface investigation, 15,000 linear feet of 8-inch C900 PVC pipe, 77 each ¾-inch service laterals, 7 each ¾ inch service lateral missile, 84 each ¾ inch meter assembly, 12 each fire hydrants, 45 each 8-inch gate valves, 11 each water system connections, culinary well development, 4 each 8-inch canal crossings, engineering and bonding. DDW \$227,000.

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$2,536,000 Grant / \$1,087,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%*

*TOOL MED \$1,268,000 Grant / \$2,355,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$3,623,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant stated the springs have reached capacity. (DDW review: "A 2019 project improved the spring site efficiency; however, in recent years, the supply from the springs has been insufficient to keep up with capacity requirements.") A well needs upgrades to bring it up to code and there is currently a moratorium on new connections; 7 have been denied this year. The need is for an additional well.

Chairman Wells acknowledged their request includes some loan with an interest rate but the request is outside the funding tool guidance.

Mr. Slauch recommended the funding tool minimum of \$2,536,000 Grant / \$1,087,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5% which represents a bit more loan but with a reduced interest rate.

The applicant stated there is approximately \$20,000 annually for a loan payment. They have asked the Division of Drinking Water for funding (\$227,000 for the design. DDW has suggested they go to CIB to see what CIB would do, then come back.

Commissioner Bartholomew asked if CIB gives you funding then DDW will give you the design funding?

The applicant indicated the funding that might be offered from DDW is likely a loan and the District only has \$20k annually after all existing expenses. They have raised rates and the tier rate is large based on MAGI.



Most of the residents are moderate to low income and many are conserving on water but some are not and pay higher. It is noted that if the water usage is lower, the income is also lower.

Chairman Wells noted the request is for \$362,000 loan 30y @ 1.0%. The funding tool minimum is triple the loan amount but with a lower interest rate.

Commissioner Winfield asked about subsurface investigation and if they suspected some water loss occurring; has the SCADA system indicated loss?

The applicant stated it is likely there is leakage; If 150 gallons a minute is going in the tank, there is 170 gallons going out. They have looked for leaks but have not found any and have had their meters replaced. There may be some loss but not much. The subsurface investigation is for discovery; they have an older system (perhaps 50 years old) which needs to be located to replace the older areas. They have been mitigating the lead and copper issue. They have installed their own system pipelines to circumvent another city water system so as not to have their water shut off at will.

Commissioner Bartholomew requested a review of what the payments would be for the requested loan versus the funding tool recommended loan.

Chairman Wells indicated the difference would be \$20k more annually.

Commissioner Bartholomew acknowledged drinking water is critical throughout the State due to the dry conditions.

**Scott Bartholomew made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$3,261,000 grant and a \$362,000 loan for 30y @ 1.0% (total \$3,623,000) citing a financial hardship exemption. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

Break @ 10:29 am [1:27:00]

#### 4.5. Wellington City – Administration and Public Safety Building (Carbon) [1:27:57]

Wellington City presented a funding assistance request for a \$6,000,000 grant and a \$1,150,000 loan for 30y @ 1.0% (total \$7,150,000) for an administration and public safety building. This project consists of the demolition of approximately 25,050 square feet of existing deteriorated structures, the construction of a new 7,800 square foot administration building to house the city's administrative offices, council chambers, and police department with secure evidence storage, interview rooms, police reception and waiting areas, administrative offices, council meeting space, and public service counters, a new 3,372 square foot Fire Apparatus Bay to accommodate modern firefighting equipment, additional firefighting vehicles, renovation of existing fire bays (4,262 square feet) to meet current safety and operational standards, renovating 3,078 square feet of space to include fire chief's office, training rooms, decontamination areas, and laundry facilities for protective gear, site grading, structural fill, and paving, sidewalks, curbs, gutters, pedestrian ramps, and signage, landscaping and irrigation, engineering and bonding. Applicant cash \$50,000 In-kind demolition \$500,000

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$3,575,000 Grant / \$3,575,000 Loan, 30Y @ 1.0%*

*TOOL MED \$1,787,000 Grant / \$5,363,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$7,150,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant acknowledged the large request but their current building is falling down. They have moved the police department to a part of the building that was not leaking and the fire department is in the newer part of the building. They spend close to \$6,000 per month just in heating. A feasibility study exposed many issues with the building and the majority of the building has been sealed off due to air quality. The intent is to demolish the old school. The building will be vacated regardless of whether they receive funding. The current office space is in a double wide trailer they purchased and rehabilitated with donated labor. The project will have a

building for the police department, fire department and administrative staff with space to accommodate a future ladder truck for the fire department.

Chairman Wells referenced the minimum funding tool recommendation; \$3,575,000 in grant and asked if a \$4,000,000 grant and \$3,150,000 loan @ 1% would work.

The applicant stated they could only accommodate an annual payment of \$45,000 per year.

Chairman Wells suggested a 0.5% interest.

Ms. Hanson referred to her amortization calculator; the minimum funding tool loan amount with a 0.5% interest would have an annual payment of \$125,000.

Commissioner Miles referenced their negative \$3.4 million debt capacity.

The applicant indicated they have implemented a tax increase.

Commissioner Lytle asked if the tax increase was on property tax and has it been approved?

The applicant stated the increase will be approved soon.

*The Board and applicant discussed budget issues.*

Commissioner Bartholomew asked if they could phase the project.

The applicant stated the feasibility study included a number of recommendations - up to \$14 million but was scaled back to the \$7 million. *"Can it be phased... we'll just stay in the double wide. Perhaps the fire department across the back could be eliminated... not bring the fire department up to code and just continue to do what we're doing. Anything can be phased. One building is easier than several. They can do the administrative side... CIB can give the money just to tear the building down and then they come back later."*

Chairman Wells suggested a \$5,000,000 grant and \$2,150,000 loan with a 0.5% interest; the payment would be \$66,000.

The applicant indicated that would have to be presented to their board.

Chairman Wells referenced the CIB grant deficit. This gets the funding closer to being within the tool, but is still outside the funding recommendations.

Commissioner Adams noted Carbon County has historically contributed a significant amount to the CIB revenue and expressed reluctance to ask *this community* to move into a *double wide trailer*.

The applicant stated they anticipate future growth; 100 homes are in the process of annexing and a company that develops carbon fiber.

Chairman Wells restated funding of a \$5,000,000 grant and \$2,150,000 loan 30 years @ 0.5% to get closer to equalizing the available revenue.

Commissioner Adams proposed a \$5,150,000 grant and \$2,000,000 loan 30 years @ 0.5%,

Ms. Hanson noted there are some grants available through the Department of Public Safety and Federal Emergency Management Administration to help with fire prevention. [GOPB.utah.gov](http://GOPB.utah.gov); planning coordination; funding resources.

Mr. Slauch asked if they have researched federal funding sources for this type of project. CIB wants to assist

but should be the last stop.

Commissioner Winfield indicated there is a .30 sales tax for public safety that can be implemented with a vote at the commission level. It provides a revenue stream - he could find more information.

The Chairman called the question.

**Bruce Adams made and Jerry Taylor seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$5,150,000 grant and a \$2,000,000 loan for 30y @ 0.5% (total \$7,150,000) citing a financial hardship. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

#### 4.6. Ferron City – Ferron City Agricultural Center (Emery) [1:50:46]

Ferron City presented a funding assistance request for a \$3,000,000 grant for an agricultural center facility. This project consists of the design and construction of a 36,750 square foot agriculture facility within the existing fairgrounds to include demolition of existing building site, geotechnical report, site grading, structural fill and untreated base course, concrete sidewalks, signage, livestock Infrastructure containing 88 pig/sheep pens, 16 wash racks, and a large wash rack to support livestock shows and auctions, bleacher seating for over 1,000 attendees, a 27,600 square foot arena and adjacent structures, engineering and bonding. Applicant cash \$2,260,000 Emery Co. Tourism \$500,000 Emery County, Ferron City in kind \$240,000

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$2,100,000 Grant / \$900,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%*

*TOOL MED \$1,050,000 Grant / \$1,950,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$3,000,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant stated the barn which housed the livestock show since 1939 burned in June 2024 - deemed a total loss by the insurance company. They are waiting for solid numbers from the insurance and the project is shovel ready. They have received a legislative appropriation for the project. The facility to be built will be used by Emery and Carbon County to accommodate rodeos, youth programs to practice year around.

Chairman Wells proposed funding at the minimum funding tool range \$2,100,000 Grant / \$900,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5% with an annual debt service of \$30,000.

The applicant stated that it would be reviewed by the council. A \$2,500,000 grant and a \$500,000 loan for 30 years @ 1.0% with an annual debt service of \$20,000 might be more doable. This is a building that will be used by the whole community and financing would come through the general fund.

Mr. Slaugh asked if there was an expectation as to when the insurance settlement might be paid and is the full replacement value expected?

The applicant is seeking the full replacement value and the insurance company offer right now is \$1,600,000.

Mr. Slaugh asked if they were planning the same facility as the original; the building was covered for full replacement costs on the facility. Does the entity plan on having a bigger, more expensive facility than before?

The applicant stated it will be a bigger facility. The barn that burned down was built in 1939, specifically for the stock show and the new building is going to bring the stock show back to Ferron as well as allow the use of the facility in the winter to include a meeting room for the stock show and other entities who want to have meetings there.

Mr. Slaugh referenced other projects on the agenda; people that are in pretty dire circumstances needing water and sewer. CIB should know what the insurance settlement is going to be and what is needed before funding.

The applicant indicated the insurance has already provided \$1 million and have suggested they're not going to *budge* from their projection. Ferron has received estimates from contractors that *will* hopefully *budge* the

insurance company to at least \$2.2 million - another \$1.2 million from insurance. The total \$3 million indicated in the application includes the \$1 million already received plus the anticipated \$1.2 million.

Commission Adams referenced in San Juan using a road department tire shed for a junior livestock program and now have a nice facility at the fairgrounds. He further stated that Ferron and Emery County have big power plants funded by coal suggesting they are a contributor to CIB. Their facility burned down and Junior Livestock and other programs are important to the community.

Ms. Hansen asked if there would be a possibility to phase the project?

The applicant said they could phase it but worry that it won't get completed. It could be phased but preferably not.

Commissioner Winfield referred to the Emery County \$500,000 asking if it is a commitment.

The applicant stated Emery County has *kind of* settled in on \$500,000 but Ferron has not received a letter of commitment. \$500,000 is probably what will be settled on. The big goal that was presented to the legislature is to have a facility like Duchesne's with multiple classrooms etc. but no luck. They scaled the project back but can still hold different events.

Commissioner Miles noted the Duchesne Facility is expensive to maintain. The building was insured through the Local Government Trust and asked what the building was insured for in dollars.

The applicant indicated it was insured for total replacement cost but they have not seen an amount.

Commissioner Miles expressed concern that CIB will have to cover what the insurance did not; CIB becomes the backup for the trust.

Mr. Slauch stated he would rather CIB wait on this project until there are final numbers. It is not an emergency and CIB has limited funds.

The applicant stated this was pushed for this meeting because next year the stock show has nowhere to go. Castledale City has offered their facilities; this is their last year. It is hoped to have construction final by June so Ferron can accommodate the next years stock show or there will not be a livestock show. They are trying to get a real number from insurance; they are not going to have a number anytime soon.

Mr. Slauch indicated it is difficult to fund something so uncertain.

Ms. Hanson acknowledged the uncertainty and made a motion to place the project on the priority list as a \$2,500,000 grant and a \$500,000 loan for 30 years at 1.0% which is a \$20,000 annual payment.

**Laura Hanson made and Bruce Adams seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$2,500,000 grant and a \$500,000 loan for 30y @ 1.0% (total \$3,000,000).**

Commissioner Miles requested adding '*pending confirmation of insurance payment*'.

The applicant stated they will try to have a final number by the October meeting.

Ms. Hanson suggested phasing if the funding cannot accommodate the entire project. She cited a 'special circumstance' exemption given the timing of the stock show.

The Chairman called the question.

**Laura Hanson made and Bruce Adams seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for**

**possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$2,500,000 grant and a \$500,000 loan for 30y @ 1.0% (total \$3,000,000) citing a special circumstance exemption pending confirmation of insurance. The motion carried with Kirt Slauch and Dean Baker opposed and the chairman abstaining.**

Commission Miles asked if the insurance only pays the \$1,000,000; where will the other funding come from?

The applicant stated they would come to the CIB or revisit a legislative appropriation.

Ms. Hanson reiterated the suggestion of phasing the project.

Commissioner Brown stated he doesn't think there are many county facilities in the state that don't charge a fee. And if you're not charging a fee, are you requiring an insurance waiver when they come in? Sevier County charges fees and the facilities are expensive to maintain.

The applicant indicated that is going to change.

#### 4.7. Town of Dutch John – Fire Station/EMS Building Remodel (Daggett) [2:42:41]

The Town of Dutch John presented a funding assistance request for a \$612,750 grant a fire station/EMS building remodel. This project consists of remodeling the 1990 fire station to include design and planning, roof repair, new bay heaters, installation of a fire/carbon monoxide detector system, a vehicle exhaust system, a new seal system for the garage doors and entry doors, ambulance bay secure storage and lockers, new LED lighting system, new electrical panel, new air recharging system, remodel bathrooms, breakroom, office, training room, tankless hot water heater, storage room renovation to accommodate exercise equipment, communication updates, exterior regrading and rewiring and the removal of the existing 'old post office' building to construct a new 1000 square foot 2-story EMS/Clinic building to accommodate a ground floor medical clinic and 2 upper floor apartments, engineering and bonding. Applicant cash \$54,750

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$366,750 Grant / \$246,000 Loan, 30Y @ 1.0%*

*TOOL MED \$183,750 Grant / \$429,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$613,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant indicated this project is to remodel the fire station, built by the Bureau in 1989-90 which doesn't pass safety codes. They want to change or remodel the ambulance bay for a future ambulance and upgrade all the safety systems and handicap standards. The building leaks and has high maintenance costs. There will also be a clinic behind the fire station. it's a two-story building; the bottom floor would be the clinic and the top floor would have two apartments for medical personnel such as visiting EMTs, doctors, medical staff at no cost.

Commissioner Miles noted the minutes discuss a different amount than the application; \$492,750.

The applicant indicated the architect came back with a different number than first thought.

Commissioner Miles said the minutes were from May 16<sup>th</sup> and suggested another public hearing to let the public know about the funding increase.

Commissioner Bartholomew indicated the population of Dutch John is 144; in his opinion, it is unlikely that they could accommodate a loan.

**Scott Bartholomew made and Ralph Brown seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$612,750 grant citing a financial hardship exemption.**

Mayor Baker commented that many of the Dutch John homes are short-term rentals.

The applicant stated there are 57 full time residents and approximately 37 secondary homes.

Commissioner Lytle asked how many of the homes are short-term rentals that have at least gotten business licenses for the nightly rentals?

The applicant did not know. The property tax just passed for the first time ever is for emergency services only; 1/3 law enforcement, 1/3 EMS and 1/3 fire.

Ms. Hansen noted there are some FEMA grants that help with firefighting, equipment, trucks and training. They can contact Ms. Hansen.

Commissioner Taylor also noted there are fire departments that donate equipment to smaller communities when they are done.

The applicant indicated the facility will be owned by the Dutch John under their Business Authority; they will verify ownership prior to the October funding meeting.

The Chairman called the question.

**Scott Bartholomew made and Ralph Brown seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$612,750 grant citing a financial hardship exemption. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

The Chairman asked Kaylee Beck for an update of the financial status.

Ms. Beck indicated the mineral lease revenue has a minus <\$4,000,000> and the bonus revenue has a plus \$8,000,000.

#### 4.8. Town of Junction – Road Improvement Project 2026 (Piute) [2:30:54]

The Town of Junction presented a funding assistance request for a \$1,750,000 grant for road improvements. This project consists of large-scale road improvements to include land leveling and approximately 7,800 tons of hot mix asphalt (HMA) overlay on the majority of its existing paved roads as follows: patching, crack seal and chip seal at Old Highway and Church Farm Road, partial depth reclamation with cement-treated base on Thompson Lane, full roadway reconstruction at 100 South and 200 South (east of the highway), miscellaneous patching, shoulder reinforcement with base course, drainage improvements as needed on all town streets, design, engineering and bonding. Junction has considered self-funding this project, but doing so would require saving its entire B&C Road budget for the next 38 years.

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$875,000 Grant / \$875,000 Loan, 30Y @ 1.0%  
TOOL MED \$437,000 Grant / \$1,313,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%  
TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$1,750,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%

The applicant stated Junction wants to get all roads up to a serviceable condition and then maintain them. This project has overlays over most of the city streets, some reclamation and some rebuilds.

Mr. Slauch asked if the traffic on the roads is local or through traffic and how many residents are in Junction.

The applicant stated they are paving all the city roads that are currently paved; the population is 224. Some of the roads are currently gravel. They have chip sealed some roads several times which continue to deteriorate. The edges are grass and there are several pot holes.

Chairman Wells acknowledged Junction does not have much ability to service debt but CIB grant funding is in the red. At the funding meeting there may be more revenue, but it is uncertain.

Commissioner Brown suggested funding as requested stating this is not a place to make up the shortfall.

**Ralph Brown made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,750,000 grant citing a financial**

## hardship exemption.

Mayor Baker asked if Junction had contacted UDOT which has smaller grants to fix the roads but acknowledged the project must be on the list.

The applicant indicated Junction did a drainage system to put in new larger culverts through all the roads. There is a county road that runs through it with smaller culverts and they asked for those culverts to be upsized but UDOT would not. The Town cleans out their culverts and UDOT is supposed to clean theirs but they do not and told the Town not to! They have to clean it or people will be flooded indicating UDOT has been difficult for the town.

The Chairman called the question.

**Ralph Brown made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the October 1, 2025 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,750,000 grant citing a financial hardship exemption. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

### **8.1 Request for Special Consideration – (Requires a vote of the Board to Consider) [2:39:27]**

*The Town of Glendale requested time on the September 4, 2025 CIB Meeting to discuss water system improvements – Hops Well replacement.*

Chairman Wells called for a motion and vote to consider the request.

**Laura Hanson made and Jerry Taylor seconded a motion to bring the project to the table for discussion. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **8.1 Town of Glendale – Water System Improvements – Hops Well Replacement (Kane County)**

The Town of Glendale presented a funding presented a funding assistance request for a \$810,000 grant and a \$90,000 loan for 30y @ 1.0% for water system improvements – Hops Well replacement. This project consists of a hydrogeologic study to identify a new well location, drilling and development of the new well, well casing and gravel pack, pump testing, video inspection, new well pump house, well pump, controls and electrical equipment, chlorination equipment and Hops Well abandonment, engineering and bonding

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$630,000 Grant / \$270,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%*

*TOOL MED \$315,000 Grant / \$585,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$900,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant stated there are 310 residents and 223 water connections. There have been regular improvements. On July 2024 there was an earthquake and the casing broke and it is now getting sediment in the system.

Commissioner Lytle asked what the Division of Drinking Water has offered.

The applicant indicated DDW said there is no funding available. USDA did not have funding Glendale could accommodate. DDW has been keeping an eye on the situation; the DDW funding offer exceed the range of affordability.

Commissioner Bartholomew asked what they are currently using for water. Could the situation be related to the current drought?

The applicant stated the well is still producing but is decreasing significantly; originally producing 135 gallons per minute (gpm) -now it is 100 gpm and slowly diminishing. It meets demand but they need to address the issue before it completely fails. It is uncertain if the drought conditions are contributory. The project is to drill a well next to the existing well with the hope that it will produce similarly and the issue is only a cracked well casing allowing sediment.



Commissioner Taylor acknowledged the emergency and suggested approval as requested.

Commissioner Miles asked if they are ready to drill the new well immediately.

The applicant stated they will be ready fairly quickly. If the well fails, there is a secondary source but would not meet demand.

Commissioner Winfield asked if they could distance the new well from the damaged well then repurpose the damaged well as a secondary water source.

The applicant stated they have looked at other sources to determine the best option which is to drill next to the existing well and abandon the existing well. It would be more expensive to try to replace the cracked casing. They have scoped the well and the casing is indeed cracked.

**Jerry Taylor made and Ralph Brown seconded a motion to suspend the rules and fund the emergency request as an \$810,000 grant and a \$90,000 loan for 30y @ 1.0% citing a financial hardship exemption. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

### **8.2 Request for Special Consideration – [2:48:45]**

*The Town of Escalante requested time on the September 4, 2025 CIB Meeting to discuss emergency funding for spring restoration and water issues.*

Chairman Wells called for a motion and vote to hear the request.

**Bill Winfield made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a motion to bring the project to the table for discussion. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **8.2 Town of Escalante – Emergency Spring Restoration and Water Issues (Garfield County) [2:49:47]**

The Town of Escalante presented a funding presented a funding assistance request for a \$517,700 grant for emergency spring restoration and water issues. This project consists of an emergency restoration of the springs which provide the culinary water by stabilizing the mountain slope above the spring source which has caused water contamination, redeveloping the spring collection system, including reconstruction of collection boxes, installation of protective structures, and improvements to prevent contamination to ensure long-term reliability of the City's water supply.

*\*Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

*TOOL MIN \$309,700 Grant / \$208,000 Loan, 30Y @ 1.0%*

*TOOL MED \$154,700 Grant / \$363,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%*

*TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$518,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%*

The applicant stated on August 30, 2025 there was landslide near the spring source causing the collection boxes to fill with mud. It overflowed into 3 collection boxes, which brought lead into the system. They have had a boil water order and homes were without water for a while as they had to turn the springs out. They are working with the Division of Drinking Water which has issued a state of emergency. They need to stabilize the springs before it rains as the springs are exposed on the mountain. An auxiliary well is used as a secondary water source but it's not great water.

Commissioner Taylor noted he helped the city employees, staff, volunteers on the mountain and they were in mud up to their hips trying to get the springs cleaned out and get water flowing. The slide took out 3 quarters of the springs and there was mud in the line. This is an emergency.

The applicant indicated there is still a boil order for the water.

**Bruce Adams made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to suspend the rules and fund the special consideration request as a \$517,700 grant.**

Commissioner Miles asked for clarification of what the funding is for.

The applicant indicated this is to stabilize the slope and put the collection system on the slope that intercepts the water. There is a shale layer on the edge of the mountain and the water is flowing on top of the shale. Prior to the mud slide, the collection system was in the slope below the shale outcrop. The bulk of the soil was saturated which caused the slope to fail. It is a narrow spot and an unstable slope with safety issues. They will provide long term stability to the slope seeking to prevent future issues. The pipe below the collection system broke when the slope split so they need to assure stability. There will be geotechnical investigations to make certain the slope is stable long term.

**Bruce Adams made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to suspend the rules and fund the special consideration request as a \$517,700 grant citing an emergency response exemption. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

**5. Infrastructure Projects                      N/A**

**6. Pending Projects                        N/A**

**9. Board Member Discussion and/or Action Items**

9.1 GOPB – RPP; Ratify the Combined CIB & GOPB AOG Assistance Funding Contracts - \$754,000 – Board Ratification. Permanent Community Impact Fund RPP Funding (CIB - RPP Funding) for FY2026; \$754,000.00 will go through GOPB to provide the approved funding as follows:

1. Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments – SERDA – \$150,000
2. R6 Regional Council - \$150,000      3. Five County Association of Governments - \$150,000
4. Bear River Association of Governments - \$150,000
5. Uintah Basin Association of Governments - \$150,000
6. Mountainland Association of Governments - \$2,000
7. Wasatch Front Regional Council - \$2,000

Ms. Hanson indicated the State provides technical assistance resources to local communities through the AOG. This has represented 3 separate contracts annually so to simplify and streamline the process, those 3 separate contracts have been combined into one contract between the State and the AOG. The Board gave preliminary approval for the consolidation at the policy meeting with a vote to ratify at the next CIB meeting; today. The contracts have been combined and executed. The CIB has a Memorandum of Agreement with GOPB explaining the relationship between CIB and GOPB. There are reporting requirements and compliance. CIB funds \$150,000 to each of the rural AOG's and \$2,000 to the urban AOG's to assist communities per the historical guidance. This includes compiling the CIB application list now using the Utah Project Portal.

**Scott Bartholomew made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to ratify processing the RPP funding annually through GOPB.**

Mr. Slaugh referred to the Asset and Review Task Force looking at public fund balances across the State which have grown tremendously. The AOG fund balances have grown the most. Why are they coming to CIB if they have such excess funding?

Ms. Hanson could not respond on behalf the AOG's but noted they receive funding for a variety of things; not just this planning and assistance funding. They do weatherization, aging services and other services. The three funding sources they receive through this joint contract includes a full-time planner as a shared resource for the communities that do not have a planner; city administration funding to help approximately 147 communities that have no paid administrative staff develop budgets, public noticing requirements, taxes, fee increases, annexation policies, HR policies, etc. The CIB program funding that has been allocated for over a decade [Since 2006] to help ensure communities have the support needed, assist with CIB applications and have a good inventory of what their assets are.

Mr. Slaugh stated that CIB funds important projects and \$754,000 needs to be checked referencing the Asset Review, the AOG's receive more funding than their expenses.

Ms. Hanson stated that the CIB funding is only for \$150,000 to the 5 AOGs.

Mr. Slauch indicated the Asset Review is public information and he will send out the link for review. There has been a lot of growth and it is getting the attention of the legislature.

The Chairman called the question.

**Scott Bartholomew made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to ratify processing the RPP funding annually through GOPB beginning in FY2026. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.**

**9.2 CIB Board Meeting – October 1, 2025, Salt Lake City**

Chairman Wells has a conflict for the October 2, 2025 meeting date. The Board discussed alternate dates; the date most available and conducive to project funding was October 1, 2025 in Salt Lake City.

Commissioner Taylor noted he would not be able to attend that meeting.

Meeting Adjourned 12:36 PM.

Submitted by;  
Candace Powers