

Community Renewable Energy Agency Board Meeting Minutes

The Community Renewable Energy Agency Board met in a regular public meeting on **Monday, March 2, 2026**, at Millcreek City Hall, located at 1330 E. Chambers Avenue, Millcreek, UT 84106 and participated electronically via GoToMeeting.

PRESENT:

Board Members

In person

Dan Dugan, *Salt Lake City*
Emily Quinton, *Summit County*
David Brems, *Emigration Canyon*
Glade Sowards, *Salt Lake City*
Drew Quinn, *Holladay*
Cheri Jackson, *Millcreek*

Electronic

Lorenzo Long, *Ogden*
Chris Cawley, *Alta*
Chrystal Butterfield, *Kearns*
Gay Lynn Bennion, *Cottonwood Heights*
Joe Frazier, *Oakley*
Luke Cartin, *Park City*
Melodie McCandless, *Grand County*
Suzanne Harrison, *Salt Lake County*
Randy Aton, *Springdale*
Pamela Gibson, *Castle Valley*
Brandon Brady, *Coalville*
Alexi Lamm, *Moab*
Roger Armstrong, *Summit County*
Miles Loftin, *Moab*
Holly Smith, *Holladay*

In Person Attendees: Kurt Hansen, *Millcreek*; Alex Wendt, *Millcreek*, Sophia Nichols, *Salt Lake City*

Electronic Attendees: Monica O'Malley, *Salt Lake City staff*; Jeanne Evenden, *Ogden resident*; Steve Burton, *Ogden City staff*; Samantha Pensari, *Stewardship Utah*

REGULAR MEETING: 1:30 p.m.

TIME COMMENCED: 1:33 p.m.

1. Welcome, Introduction, and Preliminary Matters

1.1 Purpose and Overview of Meeting

Acting Chair Emily Quinton called the meeting to order, and introduction of attendees was made.

1.2 Current Participation Percentages included in Board Packet

Secretary Quinton said that the current percentages are in the packet.

2. Business Matters

2.1 Approval of February 2, 2026, Board Meeting Minutes

Board Member Quinn, moved to approve February 2, 2026, Board Meeting Minutes. Board Member Jackson seconded the motion. Acting Chair Quinton asked for the vote. All Board Members voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

2.2 Treasurer Report (Year-to-Date Contributions and Expenses).

Acting Chair Quinton gave a status check on the budget. Total agency revenue to date is \$1,022,084.20. This is made up of payments from member communities, bid fees, Stewardship Utah grant reimbursements, and SustainEnergy Finance grant reimbursements. There is an additional \$88,879 from Sustain Energy that has gone directly to legal and technical expenses. Based on the latest report expenses are calculated at \$900,618.75 and \$121,465.45 remains. Chair Dugan arrived at the meeting at 1:42 pm. Upcoming work streams include the RFP/solicitation, interpretation of the PSC order, future conversations with RMP, all of which will require legal work. Finalizing the program resource solicitation and preparing for program launch will require technical analysis. The Board will need to prepare for and implement the agency's responsibilities around program launch, such as working with RMP on noticing costs, and education and outreach to customers and other communications needs. Legal and technical help is expected to cost (on average) \$11,126.13 per month. Once the URC program commences ongoing Agency Costs of \$150,000 per year will be built into the program rates. A process will be needed to move that from RMP to the Agency. Staff continue to seek fundraising opportunities. Acting Chair Quinton posed the question, will the approximate 11 months remaining in the Agency's existing budget be enough to cover the remaining costs? Might communities consider making a voluntary contribution the Agency budget later this year?

2.3 Reports From Committees (Program Design, Low-Income Plan, Communications)

Board member Chris Cawley gave the update from the Communications Committee. The Committee is seeing more chatter from residents in all the communities about the program. People are often asking, "who decides whether their community participates, how much will this cost, and how will the URC ensure residents know they can opt-out?" Residents are also asking how the URC is different from Blue Sky or Subscriber Solar, and how much will the program cost for businesses. On March 26th, 2026, the Communications Committee will hold a workshop for the member public information officers and communications staff.

Monica O'Malley, Salt Lake City staff, gave the update for the Low-Income Plan Committee. The Committee is currently in a planning and monitoring phase, with most

of their work dependent on the PSC decision and what comes next. Monica noted that once the PSC issues its ruling, the next step for the Committee will be to send an email to the Agency's low-income listserv, which is made up primarily of organizations identified in the outreach sections of each community's adopted low-income assistance plan. That email will summarize the PSC's decision, highlight any resulting changes to the program's low-income assistance strategies, and outline the next steps for both the program. Monica emphasized that, beyond this initial communication, it won't be until closer to the launch of the program when there is more work for the committee. She concluded by acknowledging that several new board members have recently joined and invited any board member, especially newer ones, to contact her or Emily directly with questions about the specific low-income assistance provisions in their community's plan or about low-income outreach more generally.

During the Program Design update, Board Member Glade Sowards explained that the Program Design Committee met twice in February and remains focused on preparing for the PSC's pending program approval while also advancing work that can proceed in parallel, such as ordinance adoption preparation and startup cost planning. He reminded the board that once the PSC issues its decision, a 90-day ordinance adoption window will open, during which each participating council or commission will need to consider and adopt the program ordinance. He encouraged jurisdictions to "dust off" the template materials that staff previously prepared and be ready to move items through their local legislative processes. Board Member Sowards noted that on the solicitation side, the board previously selected all four short-listed projects to move into contract negotiations, that PacifiCorp's merchant function has initiated an "optional transmission study" with its transmission group to identify any constraints or costs on the grid associated with those projects (expected to take about 90 days), and that the agency and PacifiCorp are refining updated power purchase agreement (PPA) language.

Board Member Sowards reviewed the broader program timeline: after PSC approval comes the 90-day ordinance adoption period, followed by approximately five months of billing system preparation by Rocky Mountain Power, leading to the "implementation date" when a 60-day notice period begins and two opt-out notices are sent; at the end of that period, the "commencement date" marks the start of program revenue collection and the appearance of program charges on customer bills, followed by an at least 100-day, three-billing-cycle opt-out period with no termination fee.

Turning to program costs, Board Member Sowards explained the difference between resource costs, and administrative costs (which includes (1) agency costs the board must pay, (2) startup costs fronted by the utility before revenue collection begins, (3) potentially a full-time URC program administrator within PacifiCorp and (4) ongoing administrative costs once the program is operating). He explained that startup costs, estimated in the RMP's filing as about \$820,000, would be tracked in a balancing account and are proposed to be the first priority for repayment from program revenues. Because these startup costs are incurred before revenue begins, Board Member Sowards said a separate "startup cost agreement" is needed (beyond the existing Utility Agreement in the Program Application) to clarify what happens if, for example, opt-outs are so high that insufficient revenue is collected to fully pay back those early costs. Salt Lake City, anticipating the need for such an agreement, is moving forward with a budget

request to backstop these startup obligations so PacifiCorp will be willing to proceed with software and system upgrades. He emphasized that while the dollar amount is large, the probability that revenues would be insufficient is considered low. Salt Lake City would welcome other communities voluntarily joining a side agreement to help share that contingent risk.

Glade concluded by listing next steps: monitoring for the PSC decision; supporting councils and commissions in preparing for ordinance adoption and any needed ordinance revisions once the decision is known; executing the startup cost and any side agreements; entering contract negotiations with shortlisted bidders; and, to enable those negotiations, securing board approval (via Resolution 26-03) for the chair to sign the required non-reliance letters.

2.4 Public Comment

There were no comments.

2.5 Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 26-03, Resolution of the Board Authorizing the Chair to Sign Non-Reliance Letters

Board Member Glade Sowards explained that, to move into contract negotiations with the shortlisted RFP bidders, the Agency must execute three-party non-reliance letters between PacifiCorp, the bidders, and the Agency. He noted that the bidders already signed this document last fall. The letter clarifies that the agency may terminate consideration of any project at any time for any reason, that entering further discussions does not constitute acceptance or selection of a project, that both the agency and PacifiCorp may engage with multiple bidders simultaneously, and that the agency reserves the right to reject all proposals. Board Member Sowards stated that PacifiCorp will not proceed with bidder kickoff meetings or contract negotiations until this non-reliance letter is signed, which is why the board is being asked via Resolution 26-03 to authorize the chair to sign it on behalf of the agency.


Board Member Armstrong made the motion to approve Resolution 26-03, Resolution of the Board Authorizing Chair to Sign Non-Reliance Letters. Board Member Bennion seconded the motion. Chair Dugan called for the vote. All Board Members voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

2.6 Board Member Comments

During board member comments, Emily Quinton briefly recapped recent activity on House Bill 238, noting that only about two and a half weeks earlier the board and staff had been in an urgent response mode over a second substitute version of the bill that would have created major obstacles for the program, potentially even requiring a restart of the PSC process. She described how staff quickly emailed the board, many communities alerted their lobbying and government affairs teams or contacted legislators directly, and some representatives attended the committee hearing. Emily reported that roughly 30 minutes before that hearing, the bill sponsor introduced a third substitute that was far more workable for the program: it makes a single change to state code related to the content of customer notices, which appears manageable. She closed by thanking her Summit County elected officials and the full board for their rapid, collaborative response and advocacy on the bill.

3. Adjournment

Board Member Jackson moved to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Quinn seconded the motion. Chair Dugan called for the vote. All Board Members voted yes. The meeting adjourned at 2:26 p.m.

APPROVED:  _____ **Date** 4/13/26
Dan Dugan, Chair

ATTEST:

 _____
Emily Quinton, Secretary