

# Community Renewable Energy Agency Board Meeting Minutes

The Community Renewable Energy Agency Board met in a regular public meeting on **Monday, May 4, 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*  
Glade Sowards, *Salt Lake City*  
Drew Quinn, *Holladay*  
Cheri Jackson, *Millcreek*  
Dustin Gettel, *Midvale*  
David Brems, *Emigration Canyon*  
Gay Lynn Bennion, *Cottonwood Heights*

#### ***Electronic***

Lorenzo Long, *Ogden*  
Rory Swenson, *Coalville*  
Randy Aton, *Springdale*  
Melodie McCandless, *Grand County*  
Pamela Gibson, *Castle Valley*  
Luke Cartin, *Park City*  
Chrystal Butterfield, *Kearns*  
Alexi Lamm, *Moab*  
Kyla Topham, *Springdale*  
Holly Smith, *Holladay*  
Dave Graf, *Ogden*  
Emily Paskett, *Salt Lake County*  
Molly Miller, *Park City*  
Roger Bourke, *Alta*  
Sheldon Howa, *Cottonwood Heights*

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

**Electronic Attendees:** Jeanne Evenden, *Ogden resident*; Brenda Salter, *Division of Public Utilities*; Monica O'Malley, *Salt Lake City staff*; Steve Burton, *Ogden staff*; Jeremy Shinoda, *Ogden resident*; Samantha Pensari, *Stewardship Utah*; Lina Costa, *Holladay staff*

**REGULAR MEETING: 1:00 p.m.**

**TIME COMMENCED: 1:03 p.m.**

## 1. Welcome, Introduction, and Preliminary Matters

### 1.1 Purpose and Overview of Meeting

Chair Dugan called the meeting to order, and introduction of attendees was made.

### 1.2 Current Participation Percentages included in Board Packet

Chair Dugan said that the current percentages are in the packet.

## 2. Business Matters

### 2.1 Approval of April 6, 2026 Board Meeting Minutes

**Board Member Gettel moved to approve the April 6, 2026, Board Meeting Minutes. Board Member Jackson seconded the motion. Chair Dugan asked for the vote. All Board Members voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

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

Board Member Quinton said the only change has been one payment out to the Agency legal team.

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

Sophia Nicholas, Salt Lake City staff, explained that the name of the program is the Community Clean Energy Program, and the coalition of communities is the Utah Renewable Communities (URC). Board Member Brems said that the names of the organization are confusing, and he supports the Community Clean Energy Program because he wants to emphasize the clean energy aspect of it.

The Utility Agreement states that the URC, each community, and Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) must review each other's press releases and promotional materials. The Agency and the communities can openly discuss the Program during public meetings or with residents, no approval needed. If your community would like to put out a press release or promotional materials that are different than what has already been approved by RMP, those materials should be provided to RMP to review.

Monica O'Malley said there was no update for the Low-Income Plan Committee.

Board Member Sowards gave the update for the Program Design Committee. The committee met twice in April, on April 13 and April 27, and has continued refining the startup cost agreement between Salt Lake City and Rocky Mountain Power to address costs incurred prior to program revenues beginning. Committee members also participated in bi-weekly implementation calls with Rocky Mountain Power on April 14 and April 28. Staff have continued supporting participating communities with ordinance adoption by responding to questions from council members and constituents and collaborating with the Communications Committee to develop and update frequently asked questions for board use and the program website. Representatives also attended and presented at various council and community meetings as requested.

In addition, Energy Strategies completed updated modeling work to assist with project selection, and Rocky Mountain Power/PacifiCorp was asked to re-valuate the system benefits associated with the shortlisted projects.

Board Member Sowards reviewed several frequently asked questions currently being received from communities and residents. Discussion included how the program applies to renters, explaining that participation depends on whether the renter or landlord is the direct utility customer. Board Member Sowards clarified that customers moving into participating communities or newly annexed areas after the program launches will automatically be enrolled and provided an opportunity to opt out. It was also explained that the program was established as an opt-out program through state legislation and administrative rules.

Additional discussion addressed ownership of clean energy projects, noting that projects may be owned either by Rocky Mountain Power or third-party developers through power purchase agreements. Board Member Sowards further explained that the program intends to add resources gradually to manage participation uncertainty and stabilize rates if participation declines significantly. Questions regarding rooftop solar customers, renewable energy development plans, program costs, air quality impacts, and business renewable energy claims were also discussed.

Mr. Sowards additionally provided an overview of renewable energy certificates (RECs), including their purpose and the ongoing regulatory discussions surrounding their treatment within the program. Staff explained that RECs are used to track renewable energy generation and may be necessary for certain renewable energy claims. Chair Dugan emphasized that the primary purpose of the program is to generate new clean energy in Utah for Utah's electrical grid rather than relying on renewable energy credits purchased from other states.

Board Member Gettel said that he has received questions regarding whether Program resources could be used to support nuclear energy projects or powering data centers. Board Member Sowards explained that the original legislation adopted in 2019 was amended in 2024, including a name change to the Community Clean Energy Program and an expansion of eligible resource types. The amendments added nuclear energy, demand-side management, carbon capture and sequestration, and energy efficiency as eligible resources in addition to renewable energy sources. Board Member Sowards clarified that while nuclear energy is technically eligible under the program, it was not included in the program's request for proposals because many participating communities have adopted goals to achieve net 100% renewable energy. The program's current resource procurement remains focused on renewable energy sources including wind, solar, hydroelectric, and geothermal energy.

Board Member Sowards also addressed questions regarding data centers, explaining that the program's clean energy resources are intended to benefit participating customers and that resource acquisition will be matched to participation levels within the program. He noted that all customers on the electric grid may receive some general system benefit from the additional energy resources procured through the program, including potential benefits to large energy users such as data centers. However, participating program

customers are only responsible for paying the additional premium associated with the clean energy component of those resources. He emphasized that the program is structured to prevent the transfer of costs or benefits between participating and non-participating customers in accordance with statutory requirements. Chair Dugan said that the Program is pushing for energy sooner than later and nuclear energy takes a long time to get setup.

Board Member Sowards thanked board members for the additional questions raised and stated that those questions would be added to the program's growing list of frequently asked questions. He explained that the program currently maintains two levels of informational resources, including formally vetted FAQs approved in coordination with Rocky Mountain Power and published on the program website, as well as more preliminary board resource questions intended to assist board members in responding to constituent and council inquiries. Board Member Sowards stated that these preliminary responses will continue to be refined over time and may eventually be incorporated into official website resources.

Energy Strategies recently completed updated modeling related to startup costs, administrative expenses, and resource reserve targets connected to the Public Service Commission docket. He further noted that two additional studies remain underway, including an optional transmission study expected shortly and a resource re-valuation process to reassess the system benefits and avoided costs associated with the shortlisted projects. He explained that these studies are intended to assist in determining final project selections and calculating net costs associated with program resources. Revisions to the power purchase agreement are currently being reviewed by legal counsel.

The board was informed by Board Member Sowards that one of the four projects originally included on the final shortlist had been withdrawn by the bidder. He noted that this possibility had been anticipated and was one of the reasons four projects were initially shortlisted. He stated that the program would continue focusing negotiations and evaluations on the remaining three projects. Additional negotiations with bidders and Rocky Mountain Power are expected following completion of the ongoing studies and contract revisions.

Participating communities have until June 2 to formally adopt the program ordinance. Following ordinance adoption, a five-month preparation period is anticipated to allow Rocky Mountain Power to complete billing system updates, staff training, and other implementation preparations prior to the projected program launch in late 2026. Customers will then receive a 60-day notification period followed by a four-month fee-free opt-out period, creating a combined six-month period during which customers may withdraw from the program without penalty. Board Member Sowards stated that after that period concludes, anticipated around May of the following year, termination fees would apply to customers choosing to leave the program.

The primary focus remains assisting communities with ordinance adoption before the June 2 deadline. Bi-weekly meetings with Rocky Mountain Power will continue to address implementation matters and that the committee will continue reviewing Public Service Commission materials to clarify approved program requirements and provide

additional guidance to participating communities.

Board Member Gettel said that six communities have voted to pass the ordinance and there are 13 pending. He asked if there were any who did not pass the ordinance. Board Member Sowards said he was not aware of any that had not passed it. Ogden, Millcreek, Kearns, all have meetings to discuss the ordinance soon. Board member Quinton said she would send updates when communities approve or reject the ordinance.

#### **2.4 Public Comment**

There were no comments.

#### **2.5 Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 26-04, Resolution of the Board Approving a Program Design Budget Change.**

Board Member Sowards spoke about the resolution which covers clarification and cleanup items associated with the program design budget. He explained that Millcreek City staff had previously identified an additional \$15,000 bid fee that had not been included in the original budget allocation. Although the expense had already been reflected in the February Treasurer's Report, it had not yet been formally designated for a specific purpose. The proposed resolution would allocate those funds to the program design budget.

Discussion also included the Municipal Investment Fund (MIF) grant previously awarded to Salt Lake City and SustainEnergy Finance to support the program. In an earlier resolution, the board had designated up to \$50,000 of that grant funding to reimburse consulting expenses associated with the Office of Consumer Services and the Division of Public Utilities. However, those consulting costs were ultimately covered through other portions of the program budget, leaving the previously allocated \$50,000 available for reassignment. The resolution would redirect those funds to the program design budget. Approval of the resolution would formally obligate both the additional bid fee and the redirected grant funding to the program design budget, increasing the total program design allocation to \$706,084.20.

Board Member Gettel moved to approve Resolution 26-04, Approving a Program Design Budget Change. Board Member Quinn seconded the motion. Chair Dugan asked for the vote. All Board Members voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.


#### **2.6 Board Member Comments**

Board Member Quinton acknowledged Glade for all the time he has spent helping to answer questions from communities. Board Member Graf concurred.

#### **2.7 Closed Session if needed (not held)**

### **3. Adjournment**

**Board Member Bennion moved to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Gettel seconded the motion. Chair Dugan called for the vote. All Board Members voted yes. The meeting adjourned at 2:22 p.m.**

APPROVED:  Date 6/3/26  
Dan Dugan, Chair

ATTEST:

  
Emily Quinton, Secretary