

# **SALT LAKE COUNTY**

2001 So. State Street  
Salt Lake City, UT 84190



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, January 28, 2026**

**2:00 PM**

Room N2-800

## **Debt Review Committee**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**Present:** Committee Member Darrin Casper  
Committee Chair Ralph Chamness  
Committee Member Mitch Park  
Committee Member Sheila Srivastava  
Ex-Officio Member Johnathan Ward

**Call In:** Committee Member David Delquadro  
Committee Member Greg Folta  
Committee Member Chris Harding

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**3. NOTICE OF 2026 MEETING SCHEDULE**

**3.1 Notice of Annual Meeting Schedule of the Debt Review Committee** 26-77

Presenter: Ralph Chamness

Informational

Attachments:

- 1. 2026 NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE

**Committee Member Chamness** stated the Debt Review Committee meetings would continue to be on the fourth Wednesday of each month at 2:00 PM, and these times would be subject to change as needed.

**4. OPEN AND PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT TRAINING**

**Committee Member Chamness** stated the committee members would need to complete the annual Open and Public Meetings Act training as required by state law.

**Mr. Craig Wangsgard**, Deputy District Attorney, provided the Open and Public Meetings Act 2026 Annual Training. He reviewed the reason for the committee's existence; the reason for the training; the purpose of a meeting; public notice; minutes and recordings; closed meetings; anchor locations; the penalty for violating the Open and Public Meetings Act; and curing procedures.

## 5. FINANCIAL ADVISOR UPDATE

**Committee Member Ward** reviewed the Municipal Market Outlook, dated Thursday, January 22, 2026. He explained the rates that day were close to where they were the week prior. They were about 20 basis points lower than the month prior on the front end of the yield curve, but about five basis points higher on the tail end. Looking at where rates were six months ago, there had been a visible steepening of the yield curve, meaning the short end had dropped and the long end had increased significantly. He noted he had been watching the Municipal Market Update / US Treasury (MMD/UST) ratio, as it related to a potential refunding transaction for a Lease Revenue Bond that was discussed many months ago. That ratio was at 65.93 percent. For the refunding to be worthwhile, the ratio would need to drop back down to around 55 percent.

Committee Member Ward also reviewed an amortization schedule for the \$60 million Library bond. Because this would be an essential government purpose, it would have a AA+ rating, which is very good. About \$55 million would need to be issued to deliver the \$60 million of construction proceeds. Investors would pay around \$6 million of premium.

Committee Member Ward also reviewed a Calendar of Events for the bond transaction. This calendar included the many things that needed to happen over the next few months for this transaction to be consummated.

**Committee Member Chamness** asked if anybody had any issues with the calendar.

**Committee Member Park** stated the Council had not included the meeting for the week of Easter on its list of potential meeting cancellations as it had in the past. Therefore, he did not foresee any issues. He asked if it mattered whether the Municipal Building Authority or the County Council held the 6:00 PM hearing on March 17th.

**Mr. Ryan Bjerke**, Bond Counsel, Chapman and Cutler LLP, stated the statute was not clear, but he felt that the Municipal Building Authority would be the better choice. There were two 6:00 PM meetings scheduled to be held that day, though only one was legally required to be held at 6:00 PM. The meetings would need to be held separately, with each meeting being officially opened and then adjourned.

## 6. REVIEW OF LIBRARY BONDING ISSUES

**Committee Member Casper** asked if the parameter resolution would incorporate capitalized interest through the certificate of occupancy, as was the traditional model.

**Committee Member Ward** stated it would depend on the construction cost. The amount to be delivered was \$60 million and the \$65 million would be sufficient to meet the cost, but the numbers did not include capitalizing interest.

**Mr. Ryan Bjerke**, Bond Counsel, Chapman and Cutler LLP, stated he had gone with the parameters Committee Member Casper had previously suggested to him through Craig Wangsgard.

**Committee Member Casper** asked Brad Kendrick if the modeling of the long-range plan for the Library had the capitalized interest version that starts the debt service after the completion of the construction.

**Mr. Brad Kendrick**, Associate Division Director, Library, stated he had not built that in. It was straight debt service.

**Committee Member Casper** stated because the long-range plan contemplates tax policy, it would be good to have maximum flexibility so the Council could go in either direction and pivot if necessary.

**Committee Member Ward** stated if the par amount needed to be increased to pay interest-only payments during the construction period, and the construction took two years, that would require an additional \$6 million of headroom since the yearly interest expense was around \$3 million. In that scenario, he would recommend bumping the amount from \$65 million to \$70 million and possibly \$75 million to cover that contingency.

**Committee Member Casper** asked if it was correct that the County was not required to capitalize interest.

**Mr. Bjerke** stated this was correct, and it had become an accepted practice.

**Committee Member Ward** agreed that it had become a more accepted practice, but he asked Mr. Bjerke if there were legal risks that needed to be discussed.

**Mr. Bjerke** stated he felt any legal risks could be discussed offline.

**Committee Member Casper** stated this was good enough for him.

**Committee Member Srivastava** asked why Salt Lake County, which has an AAA bond rating, would get a bond with an AA rating.

**Committee Member Ward** stated these types of lease revenue bonds require an

annually appropriated lease payment from the County to the building authority to repay the bond investors. This distinction from a full faith and credit bond makes the risk a little higher. Subsequently, rating agencies drop the rating a notch if the bond is for essential government purposes and two notches if it is for non-essential purposes.

**Committee Member Casper** asked if this issuance would have any bearing on a potential lease revenue bond for the jail.

**Mr. Bjerke** stated it would not. He explained that while there is a cap of \$200 million with lease revenue bonds, there is an exclusion for anything related to the construction, reconstruction, or remodeling of a correctional facility.

**Committee Member Ward** stated it might be a good idea to increase the maximum parameter from \$65 million to \$70 million or so. This would allow for more flexibility. He also felt it was likely that the investors would grant a 5 percent coupon maximum rate, but there was a possibility it could be 5.25 percent or 5.5 percent. He recommended raising the limit to 5.5 percent and allowing the investors to structure it the way they saw fit.

**Committee Member Casper** stated the \$65 million figure had already been presented as part of the long-range plan.

A motion was made by Committee Member Casper, seconded by Committee Member Park, to maintain the \$65 million debt cap, alter the interest rate cap to 5.5 percent, and keep it at 22 years. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**Committee Member Chamness** stated he would create a final document and submit it to the Council.

## 7. FINANCIAL ADVISOR RFP

**Mr. Craig Wangsgard**, Deputy District Attorney, stated the current municipal advisor contract would expire on December 31, 2026, and there was no provision for additional extensions. A request for proposal (RFP) would need to go out in the next three months.

**Committee Member Casper** stated he was working on this and Teresa Young, Associate Director, Contracts and Procurement Division, was putting it together. There would need to be a selection committee. He would circulate a draft when one became available.

## 8. OTHER BUSINESS

**Committee Member Chamness** stated the decision to not approve the minutes from the October meeting was deliberate on his part. They would be on the agenda at the next meeting.

**Committee Member Casper** stated Japheth McGee, Vice President, Zion's Public Finance, had reached out to Moody's Ratings regarding the sales tax component of the downtown revitalization bond. The County has pledged 68 percent of its fourth quarter sales tax revenue to the project. Moody's Ratings had previously indicated that the debt would be considered the County's. He had been pushing everything through the Public Improvement District (PID) for fear of the County's debt skyrocketing from \$350 million to \$2.5 billion in a matter of four years. Now, however, he thought the interest rate might be better if it were to be issued through the County.

**Committee Member Ward** stated initially, it was viewed as a County obligation because the County receives and disburses the tax revenue.

**Mr. Japheth McGee**, Vice President, Zion's Public Finance, stated this wouldn't be thought of as a sales tax revenue bond; it would look more like a lease revenue bond that Committee Member Ward spoke about earlier. The credit rating would be slightly worse due to the legal separation between the County and the PID.

**Committee Member Park** stated there might be some political salience when budget documents showed that the County now had a \$4 billion budget.

**Ms. Shanell Beecher**, Director of Accounting and Operations, Mayor Finance, stated she was worried about that as well.

**Mr. Ryan Bjerke**, Bond Counsel, Chapman and Cutler LLP, stated he would push back on that. The two entities were legally separate, and it seemed that was being ignored.

**Committee Member Casper** stated the issue where he stood was that a one-rating hit would be costly considering how he had been scrambling to find the proceeds for the project. Costs were not going down.

**Mr. McGee** stated Moody's Ratings was arguing an implied willingness by the County to support the obligation, even though it was not the County's debt.

**Committee Member Ward** stated the County did not have a legal obligation to the bond holders; it only had an obligation to the PID to the extent of what is stated in the

interlocal agreement. He felt it was necessary to push on that distinction because if Moody's Ratings started ignoring legal realities, other entities such as the auditor might as well.

**Committee Member Casper** stated his stance was that Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, and the State of Utah are all AAA rated entities that have an interest in the PID succeeding. If it could save money, it might be in the interest of Salt Lake County to issue the debt.

**9. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 PM.

LANNIE CHAPMAN, COUNTY CLERK

By  \_\_\_\_\_  
DEPUTY CLERK

By  \_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR, DEBT REVIEW COMMITTEE

