



SEVEN COUNTY INFRASTRUCTURE COALITION
MEETING MINUTES

January 8, 2026 at 1:00 p.m.

Carbon County Commission Chamber (Anchor Location + Electronic)
751 East 100 North
Price, Utah 84501
(801) 712-7622

Board Members Present: Jared Haddock (Carbon County), Dennis Worwood (Emery County), Greg Jensen (Sevier County), Sonja Norton (Uintah County) virtual, Silvia Stubbs (San Juan County), Greg Miles (Duchesne County) excused, and Jack Lytle (Daggett County).

Also in attendance: Keith Heaton, Brian Barton, Stacey Herpel, Michael Hawley, Jon Stearmer, Melanie Sasser, Doug Rasmussen, Dan Hawley, Scott Bartholomew, and Michael Klein.

Attended telephonically: Kelly Carter, Melissa Cano, Candace Powers, Will Lane, Jay Johnson, Joel Brown, Mark Michel, and Jake Powell.

Others Present: (Please notify staff at 435-817-0025 of any spelling corrections or if you were present and not listed.)

Public Meeting Participation Information:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://jonesanddemille.zoom.us/j/81812623532>

Or Join by Telephone:

1-253-215-8782 or

1-346-248-7799 or

1-669-900-6833

Webinar ID: 818 1262 3532

1. Welcome and Pledge of Allegiance (Jack Lytle)

Chairman Lytle welcomed everyone to the meeting on January 8, 2026 at 1:00 PM. Chairman Lytle recognized everyone in attendance and online. Chairman Lytle led the pledge of allegiance.

2. Public Comment (Jack Lytle)

Public comment was accepted verbally, during the meeting, telephonically by Zoom, and by electronic written submission at stacey@7county.utah.gov. Electronic written comments will be forwarded to the Board Members. All comments are summarized in the meeting minutes. A complete copy of any written comments submitted may be requested at the email address provided herein.

Chairman Lytle then turned time over to Melissa Cano for those wishing to make public comments electronically.

There were no public comments online or in the room at this time.

Chairman Lytle thanked Ms. Cano. Chairman Lytle then moved to the next item on the agenda.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes for December 11, 2025 (Jack Lytle)

Chairman Lytle inquired about changes or updates to the minutes, there being none, Chairman Lytle requested a motion to approve the minutes as written.

Motion to approve the December 11, 2025 meeting minutes as written, by Commissioner Jensen and seconded by Commissioner Worwood.

Chairman Lytle called for a vote to approve the minutes as amended. **The motion passed unanimously.** Chairman Lytle moved on to the next agenda item.

4. Organization Name Change (Jack Lytle)

Chairman Lyle turned the time over to Director Heaton. Director Heaton stated that after several discussions after the last meeting, we had settled on the Rural Counties Infrastructure Coalition or Utah County Infrastructure Coalition. There were a few commissioners that did not feel this name really represented the coalition. We would want to go back to the original idea of Rural Utah Infrastructure Coalition, RUIC, so if everyone is in agreement with this name and is ready to move forward, we would just need a motion to make it official. Director Heaton stated that with the new name change, we will be welcoming San Pete County on board, a new checking account, and a new mailing address.

Chairman Lytle thanked Director Heaton and the board for the clarification and asked if there was any further discussion. There was no further discussion at this time.

Seven County Infrastructure Coalition

Chairman Lytle called for a motion to move forward with the Organization Name Change to Rural Utah Infrastructure Coalition.

Motion to move forward with the organization name change to Rural Utah Infrastructure Coalition by Commissioner Haddock and seconded by Commissioner Worwood.

Chairman Lytle called for a roll call vote with motion passing at 1:20 PM.

SEVEN COUNTY INFRASTRUCTURE COALITION VOTING:

Carbon Board Member	Yea <u>X</u>	No ____
Daggett Board Member	Yea <u>X</u>	No ____
Duchesne Board Member	Yea ____	No ____ excused
Emery Board Member	Yea <u>X</u>	No ____
San Juan Board Member	Yea <u>X</u>	No ____
Sevier Board Member	Yea <u>X</u>	No ____
Uintah Board Member	Yea <u>X</u>	No ____

Chairman Lytle thanked the commissioners and moved to the next agenda item.

5. Longview Port Presentation (Michael Klein)

Chairman Lytle welcomed Michael Klein and turned the time over to Mr. Klein for the Longview Port Presentation. Mr. Klein thanked the board for allowing him the time to come and talk today. Mr. Klein stated that the last time he was here was before 2021 and wanted to take this time to introduce himself and the project they are working on.

Mr. Klein stated that he is with Pacific Port Group, which is a development company. Mr. Klein explained a little bit about himself, his background and that he comes from Heber, Utah but currently lives in Washington D.C. and was here in Utah visiting and was able to attend today's meeting.

Mr. Klein stated that the story for the Longview Port began in 2010, he worked with a group in Salt Lake City, Utah, who had worked with some Australians who had spent their career exporting coal from Australia to consumers in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. We were looking to export US coal to those same customers and we had acquired a mine in Montana and one in Wyoming, and started looking on the west coast for capacity and learned that it was difficult to find that capacity on the West Coast, which led to a year of acquiring an interest in the Longview

area and developing a port ourselves, Millennium Bolt Terminal in Longview, Washington. We spent a lot of time permitting, working with the state of Washington, and local officials. This was originally envisioned as a large coal export terminal, a 44 million metric ton terminal. This gives you a sense of the site and how large the site was and what it was intended to accomplish in terms of handling a large volume of rail that would bring in commodities from the interior and rural areas to the port and to access the Columbia River and transport those commodities across the Pacific and to our allies, trade allies, in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. We worked with NEPA and had the draft environmental impact statement. It was close to the final NEPA EIS in 2020, then the pandemic happened and there was a drop in commodity prices along with other factors that affected the company. Ultimately the project was abandoned and did not move forward. Some of the discussions that you are addressing now, there are other people who are similarly situated.

Mr. Klein stated that he appreciated the discussion in the Community Impact Board's meeting about potential partners. Mr. Klein stated that he wants to build on that, he thinks it is important to know that when you go into a project like this, that the partners you have are key, and that it is set up the right way with the right partners and the right groups that are similarly situated. As we pursued this port project, we encountered issues that related to interstate, foreign commerce, and the legal issues associated with that. There are many other states who jumped in terms of the litigation that was part of the project. Interior states have a right to engage in commerce and access the market overseas. We had many other states involved and partners involved in the railroad, the Federal Administration, and our customers in Asia.

Mr. Klein stated that six months ago he was contacted and was asked if a project like that would happen again. Mr. Klein stated that he was going to look at it again and see where the opportunity is and if this is something that is viable and something that could get done and not just as a coal terminal, but as a multi-commodity export terminal to link interior communities to foreign markets. It has been an interesting process to get re-engaged and to have the meetings with stakeholders or potential partners, to see where they are in the process and to have it start coming together and momentum to build. Mr. Klein stated that they are excited to have the Infrastructure Coalition do the study and report looking at the options that are available. It is important to connect rural Utah to global markets.

Mr. Klein stated that right before the pandemic, they were in discussions with the tribal nations and how they would be interested in a tribal port with Oregon. Mr. Klein stated that he has worked with the tribal nations for over ten years learning about their interests and how their economies are dependent on natural resources, natural resource development, and exports. He has known tribes who have seen a decline in revenues to fund government programs and how they are blocked.

Mr. Klein stated that he asked himself these questions if he was going to do this type of project again. What would he do differently and how could it be put together. The answer is partners. A lot of effort has been spent just going and talking to potential partners and seeing who is similarly aligned to put this together. You need a location. Mr. Klein stated that he spent a large amount of time in a year looking at different locations and they preferred that one site because of the footprint of the site, the size of it, and access to deep water to get to the Pacific. You do not need to partially load a vessel and then top it off somewhere else. There was good access to the rail connection to both major railroads. The economic distance to get your product to market economically. This is something that needs to lead to something that sits and stands on its own economically and not just in government action. It needs to be viable and have a real place in the marketplace where economics work.

Mr. Klein stated that the markets are always changing, but what is remaining consistent is having an access point to the markets. What goes through them will change, but what is the access point is what is important and was a big part of the founding of the country, having access through ports and who gets to manage and oversee interstate commerce. Currently, coal is low hanging fruit and is being exported off the West Coast and being exported to Canada. There is a market that transits along a well-established trade corridor. Ports have been a challenge, some ports are choosing to no longer handle the commodity, others refuse to handle it, so finding a facility or developing a facility that is able to handle it is the secret. The way to make that happen is to be partnered with others to have staying power, to have a proper balance in responsibilities and in contributions in making this work.

Mr. Klein asked to think about how important the Port of Los Angeles, Port of Long Beach, Port of Seattle, Port of New York or New Jersey. These are typically entities that are state or local government owned and operated with common infrastructure, some rails and docks. Then they lease areas and land terminals, commercial operators, or commercial terminals. This particular project is something that follows the same laws, looking at who would own the common infrastructure and land. Then you have commercial entities that could still come in and operate terminals. There is throughput, a secure throughput that would be vital to Utah and to be able to support the industry and the jobs that are here locally. It is just having a partner that you can work with in making that happen.

Mr. Klein stated that he has worked on projects in Oregon, Washington, and will eventually get to ship out of Canada to get the product to market. He has been to Asia and has seen the power plant that receives the coal, they import over 90% of their primary energy. The plant he visited provides about a third to a quarter of the power for Seoul, South Korea. If that plant goes down, the entire grid goes down. They burn close to 80,000 metric tons a day of coal, and they had less than a week of stockpile on the ground, their inventory is on the water. They are desperate and dependent on a reliable, consistent source of energy to fuel their economy, and Japan is no different.

Mr. Klein stated that he has learned a lot over the years and the importance of energy to economies both foreign and domestic. We all enjoy our phones, yet how many minerals are in here? What is required to have this in our hands? What type of infrastructure is required? Where does it come from across the globe so that we can enjoy the necessities that we have today? So with this port, he wants to introduce the concept that is the Civic Workgroup.

Mr. Klein stated that he would like to talk about the native nations, specifically working with native nations. There are a couple of points that are important to consider as we look at moving forward with partners and with the momentum that is building. There have been many meetings and discussions with those in Washington, other states and representatives, as well as talking to others overseas. There have been trade agreements and investment commitments made by foreign partners who have an interest in investing in the U.S. Infrastructure. One piece of the puzzle in terms of when we think of potential partners, we do not always think about our native nations. They have a long history of a large trading network across large geographic areas. They should not be at a disadvantage and dependent upon other state or local governments controlling their economies and controlling their rights under their treaties and the trust relationship that they have with the federal government. Having them as a partner includes some additional legal standing and strength that they bring with domestic sovereign nations and tribal sovereign native nations control 30% of US coal reserves west of the Mississippi. 50% of natural gas and oil reserves, and within 35 miles of Native American reservations, you have 50% of potential uranium reserves, 97% of nickel, 89% of copper, 79% lithium, and 68% of cobalt. With a new energy economy, these critical minerals, which are here in Utah, it is important that we work together to be able to have that for our future and for our own.

Mr. Klein stated that in discussions with the tribes, they are interested in strengthening their sovereignty, and that they have access to markets. They want to secure sustainable long-term revenue. A port development project is a generational investment. This is about transformation for an economy. They want to be able to have access to new and expanded sources of finance. There will be other sources of financing, they are not in this alone. Federal government sources, potentially foreign or other private investment needs to be structured properly, but to be able to carry the weight of this collectively is important. If you are able to successfully integrate the supply chain, you create jobs along the entire supply chain upstream, for them locally on their reservation, you have the rail network or the transportation network, and then at the port, and then the overseas that actually connects to them as well. We are talking about a structure that involves working with tribes, with the Tribal Port Authority, and to be able to have some commercial terminals with throughput access rights that would secure for partners the throughput that they are looking for. This process involves much of what you would expect, site selection, developing common infrastructure, executing terminal leases, and different locations.

Mr. Klein stated that we are not building from scratch due to the work that has been done previously. We have a good understanding of West Coast opportunities and where the best

opportunities exist, we can build on that with the EIS process. We can build on that where possible and updating it would help move quickly to access the market as quickly as possible while still meeting other obligations. Looking at environmental impacts, supply chain impacts, community impact, and other things that we look at are not being skipped over. By building on what has already been done before, it could and should result in a quicker path, instead of starting over. The startup goal is to make sure this is economic. When you make an investment decision, you know it is going to yield a return and a sustainable return. These are large projects, large footprints, and they have carrying costs you have to account for, you want a path to cash that will be sustainable and puts you on the right footing.

Mr. Klein stated that he had mentioned coal earlier because with the work that has been done, it is a path. You have current exports that transit past the preferred site every day, so they incur greater transportation costs that they would under an alternative scenario by transiting an additional 200 miles. They would have a large active shipping distance to a market that is in high demand, like Utah coal. Utah coal's quality is a Newcastle substitute, if not slightly better than a Newcastle substitute coming out of Australia, which is what the Japanese power generation fleet was built on. It is valuable coal with good characteristics. It gives the best change to have a product that has sufficient margins and a long-term demand. There is a demand and need for this today, if we do it right, at the appropriate scale for where it is today and you get the return on that investment.

Mr. Klein stated that with the findings from the State Environmental Policy Act, EIS, there was a discussion about greenhouse gases. What was found in the report was that exports off of the West Coast, including extraction and emissions associated with mining, that is is a net benefit environmentally to have West Coast exports from the US than to have more mining in Indonesia or China, where the associated emissions with their mining and the emissions associated with the deposits, geological features they have resulted in greater associated emissions. There is an environmental case, it is important to think about. The goal here is multi-commodity. Coal is low hanging fruit where the market is today, but agriculture, potash, other dry bulk commodities, and liquid bulk you would welcome anything that makes economic sense and that will be able to be handled by that facility. There are commodities that do make economic sense with the right design and layout with features that the site has. You can move material in and out more efficiently and have a competitive advantage.

Mr. Klein stated that in terms of the stakeholder engagement with tribes, federal, state governments, and private parties, some of those discussions are subject to NDAs and confidentiality agreements with commercially sensitive information. At this time he welcomes any questions and looks forward to updating the board as this process continues. He thinks that this project is worth serious consideration and study and has merit to move forward.

Chairman Lytle thanked Mr. Klein, and stated that we are grateful for his interest as well as his support in what we are trying to do as well as his time to come talk with the board. Chairman Lytle moved on to the next agenda item.

6. Wild Fire Resolution 2026-01 Draft (Jon Stearmer)

Chairman Lytle turned the time over to Jon Stearmer to review the Wild Fire Resolution. Mr. Stearmer stated that after the last meeting and several discussions a draft of the resolution was emailed out to each of the board members. If the board chooses, it is ready for approval.

Chairman Lytle called for a motion to approve the Wild Fire Resolution 2026-01.

Motion to approve the Wild Fire Resolution 2026-01 by Commissioner Jensen and seconded by Commissioner Stubbs.

Chairman Lytle called for a roll call vote with motion passing at 2:02 PM.

SEVEN COUNTY INFRASTRUCTURE COALITION VOTING:

Carbon Board Member	Yea <u> X </u>	No <u> </u>
Daggett Board Member	Yea <u> X </u>	No <u> </u>
Duchesne Board Member	Yea <u> </u>	No <u> </u> excused
Emery Board Member	Yea <u> X </u>	No <u> </u>
San Juan Board Member	Yea <u> X </u>	No <u> </u>
Sevier Board Member	Yea <u> X </u>	No <u> </u>
Uintah Board Member	Yea <u> X </u>	No <u> </u>

Chairman Lytle thanked the commissioners and moved to the next agenda item.

7. County Project Updates (Board Members)

Chairman Lytle stated that he will turn the time over to the board members for any project updates at this time.

Commissioner Norton stated that UAC is starting a centrally assessed program. We talked about it at the semi-annual conference in September. As a board we voted to move forward with a centrally assessed program through UAC, where all the counties will be participating, but you pay according to your proportionate amount of centrally assessed. This seems like a fair program where they will be able to utilize attorneys to help us with these appeals, working with the State

Tax Commission on those issues and any other things, so that we have more of a unified voice coming from UAC on the centrally assessed versus each county trying to do it individually.

Chairman Lytle thanked the commissioners and asked if there were any other updates at this time, seeing none he turned the time over to Director Heaton.

8. Executive Director Report (Keith Heaton)

Chairman Lytle turned time over to Director Heaton for the director's report and any project updates. Director Heaton thanked the chairman and the board. Director Heaton thanked everyone for being here today.

Director Heaton stated that the Community Impact Board approved the coalition's application to move forward with the port project and the advisory group. Many members of the board were involved in these discussions and instrumental in getting the coalition to this point to move forward. We are very grateful for Jade Powell and his organization, SERDA, for their support and willingness to work with us, along with R6 Association of Governments, Travis Kiel, Laura Hanson from the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, Chairman Curtis Wells from the Community Impact Board, and Brian Somers from the Utah Mining Association as the technical advisor. The agreement is that those individuals will be able to participate fully in any activities or actions that this board takes related to the project.

Director Heaton stated that the first step that we are going to take is to seek state procurement methods with a company or individual firm to do the analysis and a study of our options when it comes to the Pacific Port. We are aware of Oakland, Longview, and Guaymas, along with several others. We are going to move as quickly as we can, but make sure that we are doing things properly. There is a window of opportunity with the political and economic environments that we are currently in and we want to take advantage of that.

Director Heaton reminded the board that the February 12th meeting will be at 1:00 PM in the Elk Room, which is the new North Capitol Building. If there are any concerns or problems, please let him know as early as possible.

Director Heaton stated that things are moving forward with the railroad. Mark Michel reported directly to Governor Cox and that conversation went very well. We appreciate them and appreciate them being here online today.

Director Heaton stated that the Jensen Water Project, the Greendale Resort Project and other projects are moving forward, but nothing new to report.

Director Heaton stated that he is happy to answer any questions at this time, and he appreciates all the work and support.

Chairman Lytle thanked Director Heaton for the update and all the work he has been doing. Chairman Lytle asked if there were any questions about the Executive Directors Report, seeing none, he then moved on to the next agenda item.

9. Engineers Report (Jones & DeMille)

Chairman Lytle turned the time over to Brian Barton with Jones & DeMille for the Engineers Report. Mr. Barton stated that they sent out a memo yesterday to all the commissioners. This report includes funding coordination applications, supporting documents to support all those efforts, and budget tracking.

Mr. Barton stated that with the approval of the Ocean Terminal Project, they have more things to do. They are going to start working on getting unaffiliated professional specialty consultants online that specializes in ocean terminals. Mr. Barton stated that the next step, based on the scope of work is to have the planning or the feasibility study work done by the end of the second quarter, which means the end of June. There is a comparative feasibility study, meaning comparison between the different port options using a number of criteria. Lots of dynamics to think through, like site issues, what does it look like geometrically on the ground?, What are the land use implications, who owns the property, transportation access, all of these things that are critical questions, need to be answered. After the feasibility study is completed there will be a plan of development. Once we understand which port or ports will be utilized, then what does that look like? What can we do to actually help secure opportunities for the State of Utah at that selected location(s)? After the development plan, there would be initiation of the regulatory permitting process. Mr. Barton stated that the role for Jones and DeMille is going to be making sure that we have a solid scope of work, we are hitting schedules, and hitting budgets.

Mr. Barton stated that they plan to issue an RFQ, a request for qualifications, as soon as possible, so that we can make a selection at the next meeting. There are going to be a lot of conversations with these specialty consultants to make sure that we have a consultant that is highly qualified, but also unassociated and unobligated to any particular one of those ports or the operators. We want to take an honest, integrity-filled look at this opportunity for the coalition and for the state.

Mr. Barton stated that they want to make sure that the advisory committee has all the information at their fingertips, that they are aware of the needs and can put together a plan of attack, and make sure that we are united with respect to how to pull this together. We want the RFQ responses to be received in time for the advisory committee to get together and make a recommendation to the board on the 12th of February.

Chairman Lytle thanked Jones & DeMille for their update and all the work they have been doing. Chairman Lytle asked if there were any questions about the Engineering Report, seeing none, he then moved on to the next agenda item.

10. Communications Report (Melissa Cano)

Chairman Lytle turned the time over to Melissa Cano for the communications report. Ms. Cano thanked Chairman Lytle and stated that we now finalized the name. The new name for approval is going to be Rural Utah Infrastructure Coalition with new branding. Ms. Cano stated that she is going to be working on this starting now and will bring some of those branding ideas to the meeting in February. Ms. Cano stated that everything on the railway website and social media has been quiet and answers questions as they come up.

Chairman Lytle thanked Ms. Cano for their update and all the work she has been doing. Chairman Lytle asked if there were any questions about the Communications Report, seeing none, he then moved on to the next agenda item.

11. Presentation, Approval and Adoption of Monthly Expenses (Smuin, Rich & Marsing)

Chairman Lytle turned the time over to Doug Rasmussen for the presentation, approval and adoption of monthly expenses. Mr. Rasmussen presented the financial information and requested payment approval today. He went on to request payment approval amounting to \$137,912.23. If there is any discussion or review of any items included in the payment request today, he is happy to entertain or discuss those individual line items.

Seven County Infrastructure Coalition

SEVEN COUNTY INFRASTRUCTURE COALITION PAYMENT APPROVAL

January 8, 2026 at 1:00 pm

Carbon County Commission Chambers

751 East 100 North

Price, UT 84501

Expenses Previously Approved by Board :

Vendor	Check #	Invoice #	Amount	Description	Funding Source
Keith Heaton - Payroll	Direct Deposit	01/01/2026- 4/13/2026	66,564.59	Payroll/Admin	General Grant

Checks Currently Being Approved:

Vendor		Invoice #	Amount	Description	Funding Source
Smuin, Rich & Marsing	ACH	53903	5,196.55	Consulting Per Contract	General Grant
Keith Heaton	ACH	44	154.15	Director's Travel and Admin Expenses	General Grant
Stacey Herpel	ACH	1225	2,288.17	Contract Labor	General Grant
Public Employees Health Program	ACH	696725	1,843.08	Insurance Premiums - January	General Grant
Public Employees Health Program	ACH	Feb	1,843.08	Insurance Premiums - February	General Grant
Health Equity	ACH	3mkv2se	2.10	HSA Administration Fees - January	General Grant
Deseret News	3292		104.06	Budget Hearing notice	General Grant
Jones & DeMille	ACH	0139814	3,919.25	Program Management and Engineering	General Grant
Jones & DeMille	ACH	0139807	750.00	Program Management and Engineering - Jensen Unit Pump Station Planning	General Grant
Kunz PC	ACH	380	5,022.20	General - Legal Service	General Grant
Kunz PC	ACH	382	200.00	General - Legal Service - EPA Ozone Matters	General Grant
Kunz PC	ACH	381	975.00	Uilta Rail Line - Legal Service	Uilta Basin Railway Project Grant - STB Regulatory and Other Legal Services - Phase 2
Venable LLP (1/2 Invoice)	ACH	2890124	10,000.00	Uilta Rail Line - Litigation Challenges to STB Decision	Uilta Basin Railway Project Grant - STB Regulatory and Other Legal Services - Phase 2
Jones & DeMille	ACH	0139809	14,500.00	Uilta Rail Line - Engineering	Uilta Basin Railway Project Grant - Program Management Services - Phase 2
Jones & DeMille	ACH	0139809	13,900.00	Uilta Rail Line - Engineering	Uilta Basin Railway Project Grant - Strategic Communications - Phase 2
Jones & DeMille	ACH	0139809	9,900.00	Uilta Rail Line - Engineering	Uilta Basin Railway Project Grant - BSA Draft ROD Prep - Phase 2
Jones & DeMille	ACH	0139805	750.00	Greendale Resort Planning - Engineering	Daggett County
Total Payment Approval			\$ 137,912.23		

Motion to approve expenses for December in the amount of \$137,912.23 was made by Commissioner Worwood seconded by Commissioner Jensen.

Chairman Lytle called for the vote. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Rasmussen then reviewed the balance sheet which was completed by December 31, 2025. It shows the total assets and liabilities of the Coalition with the second page showing profit and loss statements for December. We also have included a profit/loss by class which shows the funding and expenditures by project. We have detailed information for activity that has happened through December by project as well. He then asked if there were any questions regarding the financial information.

Motion to approve the financial report for December was made by Commissioner Jensen seconded by Commissioner Stubbs.

Chairman Lytle called for the vote. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Seven County Infrastructure Coalition

Mr. Rasmussen stated for information purposes only, then reviewed the project sheet. This does not require any approval from the Coalition. He stated that this concluded the financial update to the Coalition.

Mr. Rasmussen stated for information purposes only, then reviewed the fourth quarter financial report. This does not require any approval from the Coalition.

Chairman Lytle thanked Mr. Rasmussen and Smuin, Rich & Marsing for their work efforts and moved to the closed session.

12. Motion to Adjourn (Jack Lytle)

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Jensen at 2:42 PM.

Seven County Infrastructure Coalition

A motion to approve the January 8, 2026 meeting minutes was made by Commissioner _____, seconded by Commissioner _____.

SEVEN COUNTY INFRASTRUCTURE COALITION VOTING:

Carbon Board Member	Yea ____	No ____
Daggett Board Member	Yea ____	No ____
Duchesne Board Member	Yea ____	No ____
Emery Board Member	Yea ____	No ____
San Juan Board Member	Yea ____	No ____
Sevier Board Member	Yea ____	No ____
Uintah Board Member	Yea ____	No ____

Co-Chair: Greg Miles

Co-Chair: Jack Lytle

(COALITION SEAL)

ATTEST:

Stacey Herpel