

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD MEETING

Department of Workforce Services
Housing and Community Development Division
Price City, Utah

MINUTES

January 8, 2026

Members Present

Jerry Taylor	Five County Association of Governments (Acting Chairman)
Kirt Slauch	State Treasurer
Bill Winfield	Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments - SERDA
Jack Lytle	Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Ralph Brown	Sevier County
Laura Hanson	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Bruce Adams	State Transportation Commission
Scott Bartholomew	R6 Regional Council

Members Excused

Curtis Wells	Chairman
Greg Miles	Duchesne County

Staff and Visitors

Jennifer Domenici	Housing and Community Development
Russ Finlinson	Town of Leamington
Bart Jensen	Jones & DeMille Engineering
Randy Asay	Daggett County
Jesse Platt	Daggett County
Ed Long	Vernal City
Keith Despain	Vernal City
Clint Morton	Vernal City
Keith Heaton	Seven County Infrastructure Coalition
Jacob Sharp	Castle Valley Special Service District
Quinn Bennion	Vernal City
Alan Allred	Myton City
Jade Powell	SERDA
Justin Atkinson	Sunrise Engineering
Dave Oxman	Mt. Pleasant City
Michael Olsen	Mt. Pleasant City
Ben Coray	Sunrise Engineering
Jon Stearmer	Seven County Infrastructure Coalition – Legal
Brian Barton	Jones & DeMille Engineering
Ron Winterton	State Senate – Duchesne County
Mike Wanner	Gunnison City
Dennis Marker	Gunnison City
Kelly Chappell	Ensign Engineering
Michael Klein	Port of Longview, Washington State.

Virtual Attendees

<i>Candace Powers</i>	<i>Housing and Community Development</i>
<i>Paul Moberly</i>	<i>Housing and Community Development</i>
<i>Brook McCarrick</i>	<i>Attorney General's Office</i>
<i>Brittany Hardy</i>	<i>Department of Workforce Services</i>
<i>Kim Clausing</i>	<i>North Tooele Fire District</i>
<i>Buck Peck</i>	<i>North Tooele Fire District</i>

Kevin Nunn
Kevin Yack
Janell Quiroz
Heather Pattee
Alex Buxton
Bill Prater
Tyler Timmons
Kaylee Beck
Rebecca Banner
Heather Poulsen
Ann Harvey
Stan Holmes
Mike Johnson
Jay Johnson
Brian Somers
Michael Mowes
Koy Barton
Jared Mendenhall
Jeanette Harris

North Tooele Fire District
Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Housing and Community Development
Division of Drinking Water
Zions Public Finance
Bond Counsel
R6 Regional Council
Department of Workforce Services
Department of Workforce Services
Housing and Community Development
MD for 'No Coal In Oakland'
Sierra Club
Five County Association of Governments
Venable
Utah Mining Association
Housing and Community Development
Jones & DeMille Engineering
Department of Workforce Services
Zions Bank

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS 9:04 am

The Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB) Meeting was held on Thursday, January 8, 2026, at the Carbon County Courthouse Building, 751 East 100 North ~ Commission Chambers, Price City, Utah. Acting Chairman Jerry Taylor called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Introductions.

BRIEFING - ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. Financial Review & Review of Agenda Items [17.2]

All the applications placed on the Priority List at the November 6, 2025 CIB Meeting are on the agenda for final funding approval.

Kaylee Beck, DWS Finance provided a review of the Mineral Lease and Bonus funds. She noted the Board's efforts to allocate within the available balances at the November meeting; the Board moved \$3.3 million from grant funding to loan funding as well as reducing the amounts of funding being allocated. There is sufficient funding. A significant amount of requested funding was removed to prevent a deficit.

There are two projects requesting reconsideration and those amounts are not reflected in the current financial report. There is sufficient revenue to approve the projects as placed on the Priority List.

The applications for the 3rd Trimester are due February 2, 2026 by 5:00 pm.

Ms. Beck shared statistics concerning revenue which include a dip in the price of coal. The total amount of revenue from September-November was 70% of the monthly average for FY2025. The drop will likely continue through the next trimester.

Ms. Beck referred to an issue brief from the Federal Fund Information from states; a resource DWS Finance uses for all federal issues which referenced 2025 ending September 30, 2025. In an analysis of 2023 and 2024 of the national receipts there was a drop of 9% from 2023 to 2024 and 5% from 2024 to 2025. Utah had a decrease of 24% from 2023 to 2024 compared to 9% nationally; 13% from 2024 to 2025 compared to the 5% nationally. It stated because of the adjustments approved in the reconciliation law in 2025, they did not project what will happen in 2026; a significant reduction is anticipated in royalty revenue.

Ms. Beck recommended loans to keep the fund revolving as required in statute. CIB interest rates are very low and loans allow the funds to return for use on new projects.

Loans with an interest rate may be allocated from mineral lease or bonus funds. Grants can only be allocated from mineral lease revenue.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Taylor called for a motion to approve the minutes from the November 6, 2025 meeting.

Bill Winfield made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to approve the minutes of November 6, 2025 Meeting. The motion carried.

4. NEW PROJECTS [8:03]

4.1 Vernal City - Major Roadway Rehabilitation Project (Uintah)

Vernal City's funding request was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,000,000 grant and \$1,000,000 loan for 10 years @ 0.5% for roadway rehabilitation to include 16 center-line miles of Vernal City roadway rehabilitation to seal the pavement surface, improve skid resistance, and extend the life of the following roadways; 100 South, 100 North, 500 North, 400 South, East Main Street, West Main Street, 135 South, 335 South, 500 East, Vernal Avenue, 500 West and 1500 West; a 2-inch mill and overlay on 500 South to correct defects and restore the structural integrity and ride quality of the roadway, engineering and bonding.

**Prioritized Funding: \$1,000,000 grant and a 1,000,000 loan for 10 years @ 0.5% (total \$2,000,000)
1-8-26 Reconsideration: \$1,700,000 grant and a \$1,700,000 loan for 10 years @ 0.5% (total \$3,400,000)**

Vernal City is requesting reconsideration for the entire amount in the original application with no applicant cash.

Commissioner Lytle asked if the reconsideration funding was within the funding tool and it was noted that the requested funding package would require an exemption.

The applicant acknowledged the challenge of reduced funds, but hopefully the CIB might now be able to fund this project.

Ms. Hanson noted that every project that comes to the Board is important. At the last meeting, the revenue situation required cutting some requests; revenue was not sufficient to fund all projects at 100% of their requests. The Board could reconsider if there is sufficient funding.

Mr. Slaugh noted that at the November meeting there was no guarantee there would be sufficient revenue. He acknowledged the mineral impact on Vernal and other projects. If there is sufficient funding the Board may consider funding the project as presented for reconsideration.

Kirt Slaugh made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to fund this project as a \$1,700,000 grant and a \$1,700,000 loan for 10 years @ 0.5% (total \$3,400,000). The motion carried.

4.2 Myton City – Culinary Water Improvements – Isolation Valves (Uintah) [16:07]

Myton City's funding request was placed on the Priority List as a \$224,299 grant for culinary water improvements. This project consists of culinary water system improvements to include a storm water pollution prevention; covering nearby storm drains with filter fabric and lining irrigation ditches and other low or previously eroded shoulder areas with straw wattle, purchase and installation of 2 each 4-inch gate valves, 24 each 6-inch gate valves, 3 each 8-inch gate valves, 1 each 10-inch gate valve, removal of backfill and existing asphalt, purchase and installation of 141 tons of pipe bedding material, 1,404 tons of backfill material, 390 tons of untreated base course, 218 tons of 3-inch asphalt repair, landscaping as necessary, **de-mobilization, engineering, *UTERO fees of up to 2% of the project and bonding.

Prioritized Funding: \$224,299 grant.

Scott Bartholomew made and Ralph Brown seconded a motion to fund this project as placed on the Priority List. The motion carried.

4.3 Gunnison City – Culinary Water System – Tarr Canyon Well (Sanpete) [18:11]

Gunnison City's funding request was placed on the Priority List as a \$2,760,000 loan for 30 years @ 1.0% for culinary water system improvements and a new well. The reduced scope of work consists of culinary water improvements related to the Tarr Canyon Well project to include approximately 10,000 linear feet of 16-inch and 12-inch waterline, 4 service assemblies, 1,000 feet of horizontal drilling, road repairs, restoration of fences, crops, and utilities; well site and equipping to include well house, plumbing, well pump, miscellaneous well appurtenances, SCADA, fencing, electrical, engineering and bonding costs. DFCM \$5,500,000.

Prioritized Funding: \$2,760,000 loan for 30 years @ 1.0%

Commissioner Bartholomew noted that Gunnison City received \$5,000,000 from Burgess Owens' Community Project Funding and asked if they still need CIB funding.

The applicant stated the CIB request was reduced and they do need all the funding to do the project; \$5,000,000 from Community Project Funding, \$5,500,000 from DFCM and the \$2,760,000 loan from CIB.

Ralph Brown made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to fund this project as placed on the Priority List. The motion carried.

4.4 Castle Valley Special Service District – Consolidated Capital Projects 2026 (Emery) [22:07]

Castle Valley Special Service District's funding request was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,588,000 grant and a \$1,662,000 loan for 6y @ 1.5% (total \$3,250,000) for the 2026 consolidated capital projects. This project consists of consolidated capital improvements in Emery County to include \$778,600 for street improvements in Cleveland, Huntington, Castle Dale, Orangeville, Clawson, Ferron and Emery; \$290,100 for drainage improvements in Cleveland, Huntington, Castle Dale, Orangeville and Clawson; \$1,337,000 for culinary water in Elmo, Cleveland, Huntington, Castle Dale, Orangeville and Ferron; \$186,700 for sewer improvements in Elmo and Ferron; \$424,000 engineering; \$233,600 contingency and bonding. \$20,000 applicant cash.

Prioritized Funding: \$1,588,000 grant and a \$1,662,000 loan for 6y @ 1.5% (\$3,250,000)

Mr. Adams asked how many communities are affected by this funding.

The applicant indicated there are eight communities; Elmo, Cleveland, Huntington, Castle Dale, Orangeville, Clawson, Ferron and Emery. They pass a general obligation bond that covers several years of infrastructure improvements from which they pay the CIB loans.

Mr. Adams commended Jacob Sharp and the process as an exemplary way to fund the various communities. Commissioner Lytle further commended the Castle Valley Special Service District process.

Jack Lytle made and Bruce Adams seconded a motion to fund this project as placed on the Priority List. The motion carried.

4.5 Mt. Pleasant – City Roadway and Drainage Improvements 2026 (Sanpete) [25:29]

Mt. Pleasant City's funding request was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,800,000 grant and a \$1,300,000 loan for 7y @ 1.0% (total \$3,100,000) for the 2026 roadway and drainage improvements. This project consists of city roadway improvements on existing roads within the community transportation network to include 19,400 linear feet of thin lift HMA overlay, 3150 linear feet of milling and overlay, engineering and bonding. \$458,867 applicant cash.

Prioritized Funding: \$1,800,000 grant and a \$1,300,000 loan for 7y @ 1.0% (\$3,100,000)

The applicant noted the scope of work has been reduced to accommodate the reduced funding. Mt. Pleasant will come back at a later date to fund the chip seal components.

Scott Bartholomew made and Ralph Brown seconded a motion to fund this project as placed on the Priority List. The motion carried.

4.6 Town of Leamington – Water System Improvements – Back-up Well (Millard) [27:28]

The Town of Leamington's funding request was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,143,000 Grant / \$763,000 Loan, 30y @ 1.0% (total \$1,906,000). This project consists of \$699,400 for well drilling and testing, \$512,000 for well equipping and connection to mainline, well pump building and appurtenances, SCADA, power connection and construction staking, \$111,000 for distribution system improvements, \$30,000 for land acquisition, \$213,000 for engineering and \$10,000 for bonding.

Prioritized Funding: \$1,143,000 grant and a \$763,000 loan for 30y @ 1.0% (\$1,906,000)

Reconsideration – Reduced Scope and Reduced Funding: \$203,000 Grant

Revised/Reduced Scope: This project consists of distribution system improvements (water meter conversion) \$111,000, special engineering services (land survey & description preparation) \$5,000, construction engineering services (oversight & documentation) \$10,000.00, chain link fencing with barb wire to enclose the land being purchased (800 ft. @\$55.00/ft) \$44,000.00, double chain link gate \$2,500.00, contingency \$30,500.00.

The applicant expressed appreciation to CIB for their support of the town projects but they cannot accommodate an additional loan. They downsized the project omitting the backup well at this time. *In response to earlier comments concerning water waste, Mayor Finlinson indicated the residents do not waste water. There is a lot of water used through agriculture and watering animals.* The project only include digital distribution meters, engineering, fencing and contingency for a total of \$203,000.

Mr. Slaugh commended the Town for metering their water which helps with efficiency, acknowledging agriculture does take a lot of water. What the plan is for the future well; was it a backup well or is the water needed for current requirements.

The applicant indicated the older well is 63 years old and explained the newer well.

In 2023, Leamington Town Water's spring system was reduced from 260 gallons per minute to 65 gallons per minute and they had to shut off water for non-essential uses to refill tanks. Leamington received a \$1,000,000 emergency water grant from USDA, and CIB funds for drilling that new well; a 2,000,000.00 grant and a \$750,000.00 loan for 30y @ 1.0%. The new well is underway.

By February, they may have the new well house built around the new well. The old well is shut down totally and they are currently on spring water only.

The long-term plan is to have a back-up well but they cannot currently accommodate the loan.

Mr. Slaugh asked how many residents are in Leamington.

The applicant indicated that the population is approximately 260 with 530 water connections including agriculture.

Mr. Slaugh suggested funding the grant for the reduced scope for water metering at this time noting the ability to monitor water usage.

The applicant indicated that there are 130 residential hookups with a reasonable water rate. *Per the DDW review, a loan would take the rate above the 1.75% MAGI.* When the loan for the newer well is paid off, perhaps Leamington could accommodate a new loan.

Kirt Slauch made and Bruce Adams seconded a motion to authorize a \$203,000 grant for the reduced scope and metering project. The motion carried.

4.7 North Tooele Fire District – Lake Point Fire Station (Tooele) [42:30]

The North Tooele Fire District’s funding request was placed on the Priority List as a \$3,501,000 loan for 30 years @ 2.5%. This project consists of a full architectural remodel and modernization of the Lake Point Fire Station to include earthwork, concrete, masonry, woods/plastics as needed, thermal and moisture protections, doors and windows, finishes, furnishings as needed for the function of the building, fire suppression, plumbing, HVAC, electrical, communications, exterior improvements, site utilities, engineering and bonding.

Prioritized Funding: \$3,501,000 loan for 30 years @ 2.5%

4.8 North Tooele Fire District – Fire Apparatus Truck (Tooele) [42:30]

The North Tooele Fire District’s funding request was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,500,000 loan for 15 years @ 2.5% to purchase a new fire apparatus truck. This project consists of the procurement of one new ladder fire truck with specialized equipment to address the increasing number of multi-story buildings and complex fire scenarios within the district.

Prioritized Funding: \$1,500,000 loan for 15 years @ 2.5%

The applicant expressed appreciation for consideration of their application. They discussed funding offer with their Board and it was determined that they are at their maximum allowable tax rates with no margin in the budget to accommodate the loans; they declined the funding offered.

Mr. Slauch stated a new application may be submitted at a later date and the applicant acknowledged their understanding.

5. Supplemental Requests

5.1 Daggett County Municipal Building Authority – Community Health & Social Services Building

Daggett County Municipal Building Authority presented a supplemental request as a \$454,000 grant and a \$113,000 loan for 30y @ 0.5% (\$567,000) for the Community Health and Social Services Building.

6/6/24 Award - \$5,786,000 grant and a \$1,447,000 loan for 30y @ 0.5% (\$7,233,000).

This project consists of the construction of 18000 square foot Community Health and Social Services Center building to include the design and engineering for 15,000 sq. ft. of finished space, 3,000 sq. ft. of unfinished space in the basement, elevator, utilities, furnishings, concrete work, drainage, signage, and pavement for the provision of primary medical, optometry, dental, and mental health services, a large conference/multipurpose room, office space for the Tri-County Health Department, an exercise/physical therapy room and bonding. This is on a 0.70-acre site north of the Daggett County Courthouse Building.

Supplemental: The geotechnical report that was prepared during design indicated there was soft and damp soil. The extent was much greater than anticipated and significant dewatering efforts were employed to continue working. Rock, geotextiles, and drains were designed and implemented to mitigate the issues.

TOOL MIN \$340,000 Grant / \$227,000 Loan, 30Y @ 1.0%

TOOL MED \$170,000 Grant / \$397,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$567,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%

It was noted that the project is underway and the loan has closed; to allocate a new loan would require an additional bond.

The applicant indicated that when they started excavation for the foundation, they found a natural spring that produced 18,000 gallons per day. The expense to mitigate the water consumed the contingency funding for this project. Through the engineers, a permanent solution was implemented to protect the building at a relatively reasonable cost. The are 40% completed. They are requesting \$567,000 in supplemental funding to cover contingency and complete the project.

Commissioner Winfield asked if they could complete the project with that amount.

The applicant indicated they could and it is anticipated that the project will be completed on time. They have filed on the water shares associated with the discovered spring.

Commissioner Lytle declared his association to the applicant as a Daggett County Commissioner.

Commissioner Taylor asked what the plan would be if they did not get supplemental funding from CIB.

The applicant indicated the building plans would have to be altered to reduce costs.

Bruce Adams made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to approve the requested supplemental funding as a \$454,000 grant and a \$113,000 loan for 30y @ 0.5% (\$567,000).

The applicant indicated in discussions with the County Commissioners, the requested 80/20 ratio is based on financial hardship from the original application. In the original application Daggett County was contributing applicant cash wherein the CIB advised Daggett to hold onto the applicant cash. They asked if the \$113,000 loan request could be paid with the applicant cash and the supplemental funding be for the grant only; \$454,000 grant to avoid bonding expenses.

Bruce Adams made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to approve a supplemental \$454,000 grant citing a financial hardship exemption. The motion carried with Jack Lytle abstaining.

Commissioner Lytle commended everyone who has worked on this project. It is a very important project for Daggett County.

Break until 10:25 am. [59:07]
Curtis Wells joined virtually.

6. Throughput Infrastructure Projects (Not Mineral Lease Revenue)

Throughput Statute Section [§35A-8-309](#) (5) explicitly authorizes the Board to "condition its approval on whatever assurances the board considers necessary to ensure that proceeds of the loan will be used in accordance with this section."

6.1 Seven County Infrastructure Coalition – Bulk Commodities Ocean Terminal (Multi County)

Seven County Infrastructure submitted a Throughput Funding request in the amount of \$1,100,000 grant for a feasibility study and *conditional approval of up to \$54,254,000* for a Bulk Commodities Ocean Terminal. This project consists of [Phase I \\$1,100,000 - Study](#) for the review and determination of a potential ocean terminal for the purpose of commodity export for the State of Utah through a comparative feasibility study, a Plan of Development for the recommended ocean terminal and the initiation of the regulatory authorization processes to include a data-driven, "desktop" comparative feasibility study listing the pros and cons of each ocean terminal to identify the best opportunity to pursue and implement. Site visits will be completed to verify desktop findings to assess site suitability. Assessment of suitability – has a target draft depth of 35 feet minimum, land and water transportation access, land ownership and interests. Compare sites with regard to geographical location, infrastructure for transportation, water resources and transloading facilities; economic opportunities with regard to capital improvement costs. return on investment projections, concept rate and fee structure analysis; regulatory and permitting with regard to NEPA considerations, state and local permitting, US Army Corps of Engineers permitting; social/political dynamics with regard to local governmental support, Tribal support; operations and Maintenance with regard to win-win situations for all partners. Sites will be ranked via weighted scoring through Multiple-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) with sensitivity analysis resulting in a final site recommendation which will identify risks and mitigation strategies and prioritized actions to move the ocean terminal opportunities forward. Following selection of a preferred ocean terminal, the Infrastructure Coalition will then complete a Plan of Development (POD) that will outline the technical requirements required to make it operational and successful to include: Confirm vision and goals The POD will allow the Coalition to confirm vision and goals, site assessment, facilities improvement planning, regulatory and environmental compliance, financial and economic plan, implementation timeline and stakeholder engagement. The Coalition will initiate the permitting process with federal regulatory agencies. Phase 1 is to be completed by Q4 of 2026.

[Phase 2 \\$54,254,085](#) – **Implementation depends on the outcome of Phase I**, involvement may include regulatory authorizations, infrastructure improvements, commercial partnerships, establishing equity and/or ownership in the terminal(s) and other opportunities for involvement discovered during Phase I. The Infrastructure Coalition requests that the full \$54,254,085 in the Throughput Infrastructure account be obligated immediately for the Bulk Commodities Ocean Terminal project, with the understanding that the scope and final amount of the expenditures will be coordinated with the CIB Board as informed by the Phase I planning project.

Presenting January 8, 2026 Throughput funding request: Keith Heaton, Director of the Infrastructure Coalition, Jade Powell, SERDA, John Stearmer, Coalition Legal Counsel, Brian Barton, Jones & DeMille Engineering, Brian Sommers, Utah Mining Association.

Mr. Heaton stated there have been numerous meetings involving numerous people to facilitate collaboration and cooperation for this important project. He noted that CIB has funded many important projects in rural Utah and expressed appreciation for the work the CIB Board does and has done over many years. It is the intent that the CIB Board and the Coalition continue to support rural Utah. The application being presented is for Phase I in the amount of \$1,100,000 as a grant to implement a study and an evaluation of potential Pacific deep-water ports.

Michael Klein was introduced as one of the developers of one of the Ports in consideration; the Port of Longview, Washington.

On November 6, 2025, two applications were presented for the Port; one from SERDA and one from SCIC. Since that time they have been working together on a single application from a single entity as the law requires. The Coalition will be acting as the applicant and recipient of the funding to be administered by a council of individuals to include SERDA, R6, Laura Hanson from GOPB and Chairman Curtis Wells from CIB has expressed interest and will be included. Brian Sommers with Utah Mining Association will act as technical advisor.

Mr. Adams noted that SCIC is the applicant with the others mentioned acting as an advisory group.

Mr. Heaton indicated they are an advisory group to the Coalition on anything to do with the Port project and will be included in all discussions.

Commissioner Winfield acknowledged the cooperation of GOPB, R6 and SERDA and suggested that all decisions have the support of those entities without separation on the side to move forward without their support.

Mr. Heaton indicated that SCIC is doing this collectively with additional entities involved noting we accomplish more by working together and believe that these entities along with others that may yet be identified bring tremendous value to this project. The intent is to provide a means to get Utah's bulk commodities to market.

Mr. Adams asked at what phase will the actual commitments from markets to export Utah commodities occur.

Mr. Heaton indicated the study to show pros and cons of a port is the first requirement. The Coalition is not seeking to be the developer of the deep-water port; they do not have the resources or capacity. It is time to capitalize on the funds set aside for this important project. The energy administration has indicated that the demand for coal for the first time in a decade is going up. Part of the study will be to look at what opportunities are available to the State and industries within the State to secure throughput access and hopefully in 6 months there will be more clarity.

Again, the first \$1,100,000 is to do the study and begin plan development and determine how much resource can be allocated in which places. The actual commodities will also be determined as there may be a market for natural gas and agricultural commodities. Utah needs to move quickly and expressed appreciation for the foresight to have these funds set aside for this project. Once the study is completed, they will report to the Board for approval to utilize the balance of the funding available for one or multiple deep-water ports.

Mr. Slauch stated \$1,100,000 is a lot of study money for 6 months. He asked if the Coalition was going to oversee the contracts that are awarded with that funding and if they plan on following State Procurement in how that is awarded.

Mr. Heaton stated they would oversee the contracts and follow state procurement. The Coalition and associated partners have much experience as government entities. He acknowledged a deep-water port study is a very specialized field so they will seek an entity that specializes in this type of evaluation. The intent is to do the study, prepare a plan of development and begin the environmental work. It is a multi-generational opportunity, and it is important to get it done correctly with the best people at its inception.

Mr. Slauch concurred they should get the best expertise, and the contracts are to be awarded through a competitive procurement and stand public scrutiny in terms of the contracts.

Mr. Heaton affirmed that all regulations and requirements will be adhered to with transparency and the advisory committee will assist through that journey.

Commissioner Lytle disclosed his affiliation with the Coalition and noted the cumulative experience within the Coalition and the committee.

Mr. Heaton stated that R6, SERDA, Utah Mining and many others have been very involved and he thanked all those who have provided their wisdom and input for this important project.

Commissioner Brown concurred this project will bless the entire state. He asked how the sum of \$1,100,000 was determined and how much of that is administrative and where is the funding going?

Mr. Heaton indicated the \$1,100,000 is the amount allotted in statute which will be maximized to move the project as far along as possible and provide updates to the Board. This Board funds the Coalition's administrative costs which are not excessive. The professional service providers will actually bill the project for the work they put into the project at the agreed upon rates per the Coalition Board. If other entities bring additional services to the project and wish to bill the project for those services, those expenses will be reviewed by the advisory group and the Coalition Board. This funding is not for administrative costs of the Coalition.

Commissioner Lytle noted the costs referenced in the application:

Scope Category	Estimated Budget
Comparative Feasibility Study	\$ 250,000.00
Plan of Development	\$ 470,000.00
Initiate Regulatory Process	\$ 240,000.00
Contingency	\$ 140,000.00
Total	\$ 1,100,000.00

Mr. Slauch requested to see the report; where the funds are spent and who received the payment.

Mr. Heaton confirmed a report would be provided as requested by the Board.

Brian Somers stated that in conversations with SERDA, Utah Mining Association and R6, all want to see the costs on this but they have other contracts that fund their work so there will not be admin expenses for those entities.

Commissioner Lytle noted that the Coalition has gone through the procurement process for other projects and that should go smoothly in terms of getting other contractors and expertise. There will be reporting at every meeting as requested for transparency.

Commissioner Winfield also requested that there be an ongoing ledger and accounting for this project. This is going to receive much scrutiny. Having details in an ongoing report will be beneficial.

Mr. Heaton indicated that there will be a quarterly report and he will attend the CIB meetings to possibly present and answer questions.

Ms. Hanson presented a proposed motion for this project to capture the nuances of this project. It includes the state statute which gives the Board the option of approval based on different assurances to make sure expectations are met. The goal is to create a formal commitment that reserves the funds for the port project as requirements are met.

GOAL: *Commences a study and creates a formal commitment that reserves the funds for the project, without obligating payment until the conditions are satisfied.*

Suggested Motion Displayed:

Per the Board's authority under §35A-8-309(5), _____ moved and _____ seconded a motion to approve:

- 1. A \$1.1 million grant to the Rural Utah Infrastructure Coalition for Phase I feasibility study of a bulk commodities ocean terminal. The grant would be contingent upon:*
 - a. A competitive procurement process for any contractors assisting with performing the feasibility study.*
 - b. Direction by an Advisory Committee with representation from SCIC, SERDA, R6, PCIB Board chair, and the State of Utah.*
 - c. Technical consultation with the Utah Mining Association.*
 - d. A quarterly report to the PCIB including a detailed breakdown of how the Phase I funds were spent.*
 - e. Any unspent funds from the initial grant would be returned for use in a future Phase II.*
- 2. Conditional approval of up to \$54,254,000 (all terms to be determined) that is conditioned on:*
 - a. Identification of a specific project or projects (e.g. bulk commodities ocean terminal)*
 - b. Designation of a qualified recipient and clear description and legal agreements that clarify the nature of all relationships and responsibilities between the recipient and all potential project partners, such as:*
 - i. SCIC*
 - ii. SERDA*
 - iii. R6*
 - iv. Utah Mining Association*
 - v. States of Wyoming and Montana*
 - vi. Port operator*
 - vii. Federal partners*
 - c. Completion of the Phase I feasibility study showing project viability, including:*
 - i. Detailed demand forecast for Western US commodity exports to foreign and domestic customers.*
 - ii. An assessment of Utah's competitive position versus current and future suppliers.*
 - iii. A pro-forma financial project analysis showing how the net financial benefits of the projects are distributed.*

No additional funds will be disbursed until these conditions are met, and failure of the project's Phase I activity to justify Phase II would initiate a reconsideration of the conditional funding approval.

The Board discussed the proposed motion and some amendments were suggested.

Mr. Stearmer, legal counsel to the Coalition, noted by way of clarification, because there was an application made, the motion would be to approve the application as modified or approved by this motion; unless the motion states that, we didn't hear that there was an approval of the application.

Ms. Hanson suggested 'approved the application as modified below'...

Mr. Slauch indicated the proposed motion already says 'conditional approval' ...

Ms. McCarrick, legal counsel to the CIB, indicated reluctance to approve Phase II until these conditions are satisfied.

Ms. Hanson noted reluctance to approve Phase II due to all the unknowns.

Mr. Stearmer reiterated they did not hear approval of the application in the motion.

Ms. Winter indicated it says, 'I move that we approve....'.

The Board asked if Mr. Stearmer is seeking the word 'application' in the motion.

Mr. Stearmer stated if it fits with Board and CIB legal counsel, it is sufficient.

Ms. Hanson suggested approval of the \$1,100,000 for Phase I – complete the study and that Phase II is conditional. It is not approving the application as submitted.

Mr. Heaton stated Phase I is the focus of this application.

Ms. Hanson stated the motion does indicate the intent; approval is for funding the study and stating that Phase II \$54 million is reserved citing conditions.

Mr. Adams asked why the motion lists entities such as Wyoming, Montana, etc. The existing entities – SCIC, SERDA, R6, Utah Mining are the only entities currently participating.

Ms. Hanson stated it references potential partners but the motion could simply say all potential project partners. They were enumerated to help guide who might participate; there have been conversations with outside entities.

Mr. Slauch stated other states have not contributed funding towards the study. It would be fair to request funding if they wish to participate in the port project going forward.

Ms. Hanson noted if they do become a partner, then those details could be determined.

Commissioner Lytle indicated there have been conversations with the other states but Utah is funding it initially for the interests of Utah. Others may become partners.

The Board concurred with keeping 'potential partners' in the language and potential financial participation when determined.

Chairman Taylor called the question. [1:48:07]

Per the Board's authority under §35A-8-309(5), Laura Hanson made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to approve Phase I as a \$1,100,000 grant to Seven County Infrastructure Coalition for the feasibility study of a bulk commodities ocean terminal citing the following requirements;

- a) A competitive procurement process for any contractors assisting with performing the feasibility study;**
- b) Direction by an Advisory Committee with representation from SCIC, SERDA, R6, PCIB Board chair, and the State of Utah;**
- c) Technical consultation with the Utah Mining Association;**
- d) A quarterly report to the PCIB including a detailed breakdown of how the Phase I funds were spent; and,**
- e) Any unspent funds from the initial grant would be returned to the fund.**

The motion includes conditional approval of funding Phase II up to \$54,254,000 (recipient and terms to be determined). Conditions precedent to distribution of the funds include;

- a) Identification of a specific project or projects (e.g. bulk commodities ocean terminal);**
- b) Designation of a qualified recipient and clear description and legal agreements that clarify the nature of all relationships and responsibilities between the recipient and all potential project partners;**
- c) Completion of the Phase I feasibility study showing project viability, including but not limited to:
 - i) Detailed demand forecast for Western US commodity exports to foreign customers.**
 - ii) An assessment of Utah's competitive position versus current and future suppliers.****

iii) A pro-forma financial project analysis showing how the net financial benefits of the projects are distributed.

No additional funds will be disbursed until these conditions are met, and failure of the project's Phase I activity to justify Phase II would initiate a reconsideration of the conditional funding approval. The motion carried with Jack Lytle abstaining.

7. Pending Projects

8. Special Consideration

9. Board Member Discussion and/or Action Items [1:49:40]

9.1 CIB Board Review Meeting – April 2, 2026 in Salt Lake City, Utah.

9.2. CIB Board Funding Meeting & Policy Retreat – June 4-5, 2026

A list of prior locations was provided.

The choices to be finalized as to the location of the June Meetings include Price, Bryce Canyon, Moab and the State Capitol Building in Salt Lake City. A survey will be provided to determine the final location.

Meeting Adjourned 11:29 AM.

Submitted by;
Candace Powers