MINUTES of the public meeting of the Uintah County Commission held **March 31, 2026** in the Commission Chambers of the Uintah County Building at 147 East Main, Vernal, Utah. The meeting commenced at 3:00 pm.

PARTICIPANTS: Commissioners John Laursen, Sonja Norton, and Willis LeFevre.

ATTENDANCE: Trinna Gardner, Jana Fulks, JC Crow, Danny Harrell, Ben Moon Jr., Tim Crow, Dan Dilsaver, Caleb Hall, Bo Lamb, Greg Jensen, Wendi Long, Steve Labrum, Barry Johnson, Matt Wilber, Curt Smuin, Cindy Dilsaver, Brenda McDonald, Wally Cordell, Matt Cazier, Jenny Garcia, Scott Hardman, Terri Jorgensen, Daniel Ray, Bruce North, Danette Brooks, Joel Brown, Jess Hermann, Robin O'Driscoll, Randan Vincent, Jo Gardner, Jed LeFevre, Randy Vincent, Travis Campbell, Loren Anderson, Angela Hawkins
Minutes by Sheri Allen.

WELCOME: Commissioner Laursen, Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

PRAYER by Brenda McDonald.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE by Greg Jensen.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** March 24, 2026 and March 25, 2026 work session

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the minutes for March 24, 2026 and March 25, 2026. Motion passed unanimously.

2. **APPROVAL OF WARRANTS** – Caleb Hall, Deputy Clerk-Auditor

There were no warrants to present.

3. **TAX MATTERS:**

Danette Brooks, Assessor, requested a refund for mobile home personal property tax in the amount of $329.92; located at 126 N 500 E #29 Vernal, Utah, Tax District #4. After paying the personal property taxes on their mobile home, the tax payer submitted an appraisal and new information about the home and the Assessor's office stipulated a lower market value based on the evidence resulting in the refund.

Commissioner LeFevre moved to approve the tax refund in the amount of $329.92 as presented by Danette Brooks. Motion passed unanimously.

Wendi Long, Treasurer, requested an abatement on the 2025 property tax year for Silver King LLC on serial number 50:010:7218 in the amount of $763.13. This centrally assessed property was sold to the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service in January 2024. The State Tax Commission erroneously included it on the 2025 assessment roll, generating the tax. Wendi notified the State Tax Commission to remove the property from the assessment roll for future years.

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the tax abatement in the amount of $763.13 as presented by Wendi Long. Motion passed unanimously.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING**: Executive Officers Compensation

Loren Anderson, Civil Attorney, informed the public that this Resolution #03-31-2026 R1 concerns compensation for elected officials, department heads, and chief officers for the County. He clarified that this is not the same as the pay increases considered by the Commission in September 2025 following a public hearing, this resolution does not seek to change the base pay. Loren stated that under Utah Code, Counties must hold a public hearing whenever there is a potential change in wages or compensation for elected officials and department heads. The September resolution did not include provisions for bonuses and achievement awards, which the County refers to as Service Awards in policy. These awards include: Longevity Award for employees with 5, 10, 15, or 20+ years of service; Wellness Program Incentive where employees can participate in physical or mental fitness programs to help keep costs down, to receive PTO or they can receive $100; Achievement Awards are a one-time bonus dependent upon the Commission, available to all county employees and not intended to increase base salary. This resolution is intended to include the possibility of receiving these Service Awards (longevity award, wellness program bonus, and achievement award) for elected officials, department heads, and chief officers, who may be eligible this year. This is in conjunction with the resolution passed last year and does not change their base pay.

Don Hall stated he was a retired taxpayer and felt he misunderstood the purpose of the meeting, believing the 3% merit increase had already been settled at the last meeting. He clarified that his concern was not an "end run" with bonuses but questioned the timing of the meetings, which are held at 3:00 p.m., making it difficult for working people who pay the County's wages to attend and have a say. Mr. Hall noted that some of the council members' wages are twice the median wage of the county. He invited the council and Mr. Wilkins to walk downtown to hear how citizens feel about raises. He expressed a desire to hear justification for raises based on employees doing a "hell of a job," saving money, finding waste and abuse, and improving efficiency, rather than hearing about feelings of being "discriminated against" because a policeman makes more money, as he read in an article attributed to Mr. Wilkins. He shared his personal experience of having to go out of state for contract welding work ($100/hr locally, up to $225/hr in California) to earn the wages he wanted while maintaining his residence in the County. He suggested that if Mr. Wilkins feels he is not making enough, he should take "Sonja's advice and get a second job," which is what the people paying their wages have to do. Mr. Hall emphasized that people are paying their own insurance and taxes, which in turn pay the council's wages. He concluded by reiterating his request for the council to "find a way to listen to the people that are paying your wages," suggesting they might be interested in what they hear.

Dan Dilsaver, asked for clarification on how the policy for the bonus/compensation works, specifically if someone who has been receiving a $100 bonus now gets $135, or if it is an escalator based on a schedule taxpayers can review. Commissioner Laursen explained that the employee compensation policy, including a chart detailing the amount, is on the County website. The amount is not set, but based on the number of years of service and salary. Dan followed up by asking why this was overlooked the last time the budget was discussed and what the cost would be, noting that if it was in the budget, it should have been approved last year and presented at the appropriate time. Commissioner Laursen admitted it was an oversight by the Commission. They were focused on the wage adjustments related to new legislation and simply overlooked the compensation policy as part of the overall compensation but confirmed that it is already in the budget. Commissioner Laursen accepted 100% of the blame for the oversight.

Randy Vincent asked for clarification on the bonuses, confirming his understanding that the funds were already allocated in the current budget and would not require opening the budget. Commissioner Laursen confirmed that the funds were budgeted, noting that this has been an ongoing program for years. He clarified that these are not merit increases. He then provided an example to explain the nature of the bonuses. The Public Defender was in a serious car accident and was out of work for nearly three months, spending the first two weeks in the hospital. The Public Defender's secretary coordinated with other contracted attorneys to handle all of the public defender's cases and paperwork for approximately a month and a half. This work was deemed "way above and beyond the call of her normal duties," and she was given a bonus for her exceptional service. Randy stated his complete agreement with compensating employees who "excel" and perform work "above and beyond" their normal position, as long as it is an established, budgeted program. He acknowledged that if it has been a practice for years and is part of the compensation program, he sees no problem with it.

Loren Anderson, Civil Attorney, explained that while the County policy regarding these matters has been in place for a while, State Code changed in 2025 requiring a public hearing concerning these matters, which was overlooked during the previous process. This public hearing is being held now to correct that oversight.

Tim Crow understood the past set of Commissioners stopped bonuses to save money and this set of Commissioners started them up again but then was told that was not true so he wanted to know what is correct. Commissioner Norton stated the policy has not changed. Commissioner Laursen agreed, as far as he knows the policy has always been in place. The policy was not changed but it might not have been followed. He couldn't provide a better answer as he wasn't in office during that time.

Commissioner Norton and Loren assisted Teri Jorgenson in locating Policy 310 on the County website after she encountered difficulty pulling up the site on her phone.

Jen Garcia, Interim HR Director, provided clarification on two policies. Longevity Award Policy (Policy 310, Section 10),has never been on hold. The award percentages are based on years of service: 1.5% (5 years), 2% (10 years), 2.5% (15 years), and 3% (20, 25, 30 years). Eligibility was expanded to include elected officials and department heads. Regarding the Wellness Program, the incentive remains $100. Employees can choose to receive the $100, put it into retirement, or take 4 hours of PTO. The PTO option is not available for exempt employees, such as department heads and elected officials, as they do not earn PTO. HR runs four one-month to six-week challenges annually; participants must complete all tasks to receive the incentive. The incentive is offered to all participating county employees.

Dan Dilsaver inquired about the calculation for the longevity award. Jen clarified that the award calculation is based on a fixed number of hours (2080), regardless of any overtime an employee might have worked. She noted that this set hour figure is the foundation for the calculation, but she did not believe it was connected to the 20-year average base salary due to the significant variation in salaries across different positions—even among elected officials or department heads. Jen stated she could not provide a precise example of the award amount without running the specific employee data through the computer program.

Randy Vincent asked when the longevity pay was enacted for elected officials and if they follow the same calculations. Jen responded it is the same amount; the amount and the percentages haven't changed. Elected officials were in the policy, removed from the policy and then included in the policy. There are different revisions to the policy in the handbook and Jen would have to review it to have exact information. There was a change in July 2024 that may have been when the elected officials were added and the longevity was increased to include 25 and 30 years of service. The prior change was March 2022. Department heads were included but elected officials were not. Jen couldn't say for sure which revision made the changes. She can get the information for Randy regarding exactly when each change was made.

Teri Jorgenson stated that the average county employee salary in 2022 was $80,000. She noted that an employee with 10 years of service could receive the 2.5% longevity incentive, in addition to other bonuses like the wellness incentive, allowing them to "stack all these bonuses up." She then commented, "Boy, I wish I could do that on social security."

Danny Harrell asked for clarification on the two types of bonuses available: the merit-based bonus and the time-in-service or Service Award. Commissioner Laursen clarified that the Service Award is not merit-based but is based on achievement/participation. An employee achieves the award by being employed for a set number of years; such as five or ten years. Danny then asked if Commissioners are entitled to the Service Award. Jen explained that entitlement depends on the length of service. A Commissioner serving one four-year term would not qualify for the five-year award. A Commissioner serving two terms of eight years would qualify for the five-year award but not the ten-year award. Loren added that the maximum calculation for the Service Award is 3%, and it does not increase beyond that percentage even with more years of service. The discussion then shifted to the Wellness Award, which is a $100 award for participating in and completing all wellness program requirements. Jen confirmed that all full-time, benefited employees are eligible for the Wellness Award and if there are any other questions please visit her in the HR department.

5. **RESOLUTION #03-31-2026 R1:** Executive Officers Compensation - Loren Anderson, Civil Attorney

Loren Anderson, Civil Attorney, requested approval for Resolution #03-31-2026 R1: Executive Officers Compensation. This resolution captures items not included in the merit wage increase hearing on September 16, 2025. It does not change the prior increase but adds the potential for Service Recognition Awards for all employees, including elected officials, department heads, and chief officers. This award would cover wellness and similar items.

Commissioner Norton moved to approve Resolution #03-31-2026 R1: Executive Officers Compensation as presented by Loren Anderson. Commissioner Norton and Commissioner Laursen in favor and Commissioner LeFevre abstained.

6. **RESOLUTION #03-31-2026 R2:** Spring Clean Up - Greg Jensen, Landfill

Greg Jensen, Landfill, requested approval of Resolution #03-31-2026 R2: Spring Clean up, to waive landfill fees for residential waste for the week of Saturday, April 25 through Saturday, May 2. The waiver will include tires this year, with a limit of 12 tires per day, but will not include refrigerators or commercial loads. This is being coordinated with Duchesne County's cleanup day.

Commissioner Norton moved to approve Resolution #03-31-2026 R2: Spring Clean Up as presented by Greg Jensen. Motion passed unanimously.

7. **INVITATION FOR BID AWARD:** UC26-04 Trash Vacuum Attachment compatible with Bobcat UW56 - Trinna Gardner, Purchasing

Trinna Gardner, Purchasing and Grants, reported on the procurement of a trash vacuum attachment for the Landfill Department, which is intended to improve the collection and management of loose debris. This attachment is one of two components, the other being a compatible Bobcat UW56 unit. An Invitation for Bid (IFB) was issued for the trash vacuum attachment, requiring compatibility with the Bobcat unit. Only one responsive bid was received from Innovative Equipment Solutions. The bid was confirmed to meet all outlined specifications. The Commission was asked to award the IFB to Innovative Equipment Solutions in the amount of $49,000 for the trash vacuum attachment.

Commissioner LeFevre moved to award the IFB to Innovative Equipment Solutions as presented by Trinna Gardner. Motion passed unanimously.

8. **INVITATION FOR BID AWARD:** UC26-06 ½" Crushed Rock - Trinna Gardner, Purchasing

Trinna Gardner, Purchasing and Grants, coordinated with the Road Department to procure up to 3,000 tons of half-inch crushed rock for upcoming road construction projects, an estimate derived from a technical assessment of expected material needs. The Invitation for Bid (IFB) was solicited on a unit price basis, meaning the total cost will depend on the actual quantity used. One bid was received from Burdick Materials, which met all the specifications outlined in the IFB. The Commission was requested to award the IFB to Burdick Materials in the amount of $100,950 for the supply of half-inch crushed rock.

Commissioner Norton moved to award the IFB to Burdick Materials as presented by Trinna Gardner. Motion passed unanimously.

9. **INVITATION FOR BID AWARD:** UC26-07 Gilsonite-based Emulsion Sealer & Rejuvenator - Jana Fulks, Purchasing

Jana Fulks, Purchasing and Grants, addressed the materials needed for the road department's upcoming projects, which include purchasing up to 150,000 gallons of emulsion-based rejuvenated sealer and up to 200,000 gallons of gilsonite-modified emulsion. The total cost is based on a unit-price bid structure and will depend on actual quantities used, with an estimated material cost of $1,349,500. Two bids were received: Asphalt Systems Incorporated and Peak Asphalt. Asphalt Systems Incorporated submitted a complete, responsive bid, providing prices and responses for all required items. Peak Asphalt's submission was deemed non-responsive and disqualified because it failed to provide pricing for the emulsion-based restorative sealer. A request was made to award the IFB to Asphalt Systems Incorporated.

Commissioner LeFevre moved to award the IFB to Asphalt Systems Incorporated as presented by Jana Fulks. Motion passed unanimously.

10. INVITATION FOR BID AWARD: UC26-08 Hot Mix Asphalt Supply - Jana Fulks, Purchasing
Jana Fulks, Purchasing and Grants, reported on the invitation for bid (IFB) for hot mix asphalt for the Road Department's 2026 needs: 4,000 tons of hot mix asphalt for the period from April 1 to October 1. One responsive bid was received from Burdick Paving. Due to variable demand and fluctuating oil-based pricing, the contract will not include a fixed price. Following discussions with Loren and Scott Hardman, Road Department, a cost adjustment process has been established: the vendor may submit a written request for a cost adjustment once a month, the request must be accompanied by documentation supporting the cost change, and each request will be reviewed by the Road Department and Legal. Jana requested the Commission approve the IFB award to Burdick Paving and the contract, contingent upon the finalization of the cost adjustment language.

Commissioner Norton moved to award the IFB to Burdick Paving as presented by Jana Fulks. Motion passed unanimously.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT: none

ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:45 pm.

JOHN LAURSEN, CHAIR

MICHAEL W. WILKINS, CLERK – AUDITOR

UINTAH COUNTY, UTAH
CLERK-AUDITOR