

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD MEETING

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

MINUTES

February 6, 2025

Members Present

Curtis Wells	Chairman
Jerry Taylor	Five County Association of Governments – Acting Chairman
Kirt Slaugh	State Treasurer
Bruce Adams	Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments
Dean Baker	Uintah County
Jack Lytle	Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Ralph Brown	Sevier County
Laura Hanson	Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget
Naghi Zeenati	State Transportation Commission
Scott Bartholomew	Six County Association of Governments
Greg Miles	Duchesne County

Board Members Virtual

Dean Baker	Uintah County
------------	---------------

Board Members Excused

Laura Hanson	Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget
--------------	--

Staff and Visitors

Candace Powers	Housing and Community Development
Heather Poulsen	Housing and Community Development
Paul Moberly	Housing and Community Development
Jennifer Domenici	Housing and Community Development
Christina Oliver	Housing and Community Development
Justin Anderson	Attorney General’s Office
Brittany Hardy	Department of Workforce Services
Kaylee Beck	Department of Workforce Services
Bill Prater	Bond Counsel
Travis Khyll	R6 Regional
Kevin Kunz	Washington County Solid Waste SSD
Shay Morrison	R6 Regional
Cady Penney	R6 Regional
Ryan Goodrich	Ashley Valley Water & Sewer Imp District
Justin Atkinson	Sunrise Engineering
Cody Christensen	Five County Association of Governments
Kurt Loveless	Kane County Hospital
Bart Jensen	Jones and DeMille Engineering
Bill Sudweeks	Kingston Town
Jay Christensen	Mona City
Dan Fechner	Jones and DeMille Engineering
Steve Forbes	Flaming Gorge Fire & EMS District
Willis LeFevre	Uintah County
Sonja Norton	Uintah County

Virtual Attendees

Brock Jackson	R6 Regional
Garrick Willden	Jones and DeMille Engineering

Nate Zilles	Utah Basin Association of Governments
Kevin Yack	Utah Basin Association of Governments
Stephanie Smith	Department of Workforce Services – Audit
Skyler Davies	Division of Water Quality (DWQ)
April Gardner	Department of Workforce Services
Christina Davis	Department of Workforce Services
Tyler Timmons	R6
Lora Braden	Department of Workforce Services – Audit
Michael Mowes	Housing & Community Development – CDO
Lacey Belnap	Centerfield City
Jacob Sharp	Castle Valley Special Service District
Casey Olsen	Flaming Gorge Fire & EMS District
Brittany Alfau	Bear River Association of Governments
J. Christensen	Centerfield City
Allison Schultz	Department of Workforce Services – Audit

The Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB) Meeting was held on Thursday, February 6, 2025 at 1385 South State Street, SLC, Utah. Chairman Curtis Wells called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Introductions [13:0]

Chairman Wells introduced Justin Anderson with the Attorney General’s Office as the Permanent Community Impact Board legal counsel. He will replace Christopher Pieper.

Justin Anderson noted that Christopher Pieper accepted a job with the foreign service. Mr. Anderson noted his diverse experience and expressed his appreciation to be legal counsel to CIB.

Chairman Wells introduced Commissioner Bill Winfield who was confirmed on January 27, 2025 representing SERDA.

Commissioner Winfield expressed his desire to serve with the Board but there will be no singing (referencing Commissioner Bruce Adams’ occasional song offerings. He noted he has known Chairman Wells for some time and appreciates his kind words.

A. Board introduction commenced. [3:34]

BRIEFING - ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

B. Up-coming Meeting Dates & Location; April 3, 2025. [5:30]

C. Financial Review & Review of Agenda Items [6:10]

All the applications received for the October application deadline (October 1, 2024) have been reviewed and placed on the priority list for possible funding approval at today’s meeting.

Kaylee Beck reviewed the available revenue which is insufficient for the current applications. The available revenue and loan payments have been posted through December 2024.

As this is the final meeting of the trimester, there is no additional revenue forecasted revenue for this meeting. Ms. Beck noted revenue is not consistent.

There are 11 priority projects and 1 supplemental request on today’s agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES [8:08]

Chairman Adams called for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 5, 2024 meeting.

Naghi Zeenati made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the December 5, 2024 CIB Review Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

4. PRIORITY PROJECTS [8:30]

4.1 Ashley Valley Water and Sewer Imp District – New Administration Office (Uintah)

Ashley Valley Water and Sewer Improvement District's p funding assistance request was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,000,000 grant and a 2,935,000 loan for 30 years @ 1.0% (total \$3,935,000) for a new administration office. This project consists of the construction of a 7,200 SF administrative office at 1753 E 1500 South in Naples, UT to include a board room, lobby, reception area, copy and file room, office spaces, restrooms, storage, conference rooms and break room, remodeling the east bay of the existing shop to provide of restrooms, storage, and utility spaces and relocating an existing 30'x60' wash bay building, utilities, engineering and bonding.

Prioritized Funding: \$1,000,000 grant and a 2,935,000 loan for 30 years @ 1.0% (total \$3,935,000)

Mr. Zeenati asked if the project was ready to commence.

The applicant indicated they are ready; finalizing the engineer drawings. The project will bid at the end of April with construction this summer.

Motion #1: Naghi Zeenati made and Greg Miles seconded a motion to fund this project as placed on the Priority List. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Lytle suggested all applicants address the Board so the Board has a better idea of how to prioritize funding.

Chairman Wells and the Board agreed that upfront discussions with applicants prior to funding authorization would be appropriate to clarify their project and timelines prior to authorizing funding.

4.2 Uintah Transportation SSD – Independence East Road Improvements (Uintah)

The Uintah Transportation Special Service District's funding assistance request was placed on the Priority List as a \$8,015,000 Grant and a \$3,435,000 Loan for 15 years @ 0.5% (total \$11,450,000) for the Independence East Road Improvements. This project consists of roadway and drainage improvements in the Independence East Area at 4000 South, 6500 East, and 4750 South to include removing 8,456 cubic yards of existing natural asphalt, importing and compacting granular borrow, placing untreated base course and approximately 6-inches of new HMA, a chip seal coat, widening the road to 30 feet (12-foot wide travel lanes and 3-foot shoulders), paint striping and signage while following the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) safety and design standards. The project will utilize approximately 29,766 cubic yards of granular borrow, 15,559 cubic yards of untreated base course, 18,821 tons of hot mix asphalt (1/2 inch), 33 tons of emulsified asphalt CSS-1, 50,734 square yards of chip seal coat – type II, 92 tons of emulsified asphalt LMCRS-2, engineering and bonding.

Prioritized Funding: \$8,015,000 Grant and a \$3,435,000 Loan for 15 years @ 0.5% (total \$11,450,000)

Commissioner Lytle referenced the December 5, 2024 meeting and the discussion to reduce the request by \$1,000,000 and asked the applicant about their project as of today.

The applicant noted that at the December 5, 2024 review meeting, Uintah Transportation SSD was the only applicant that took a reduced amount which was \$1,000,000. It was decided they could make that work but could not reduce the amount further; impacts of heavy-duty vehicles on the smaller roads are significant. The project will require at least the reduced amount.

Mr. Slaugh acknowledged the reduction of funding at the review meeting and noted the discussion was to come back to the Board for the next phase and asked if this phase of the project could be further reduced today.

Commissioner Norton stated that an earlier application was submitted for the whole project in 2023 as a special consideration; (it was not on the CIB application list and was not deemed an emergency by the Board). They

divided the larger project into 3 phases and this is Phase 1. The applicant indicated the roads continue to deteriorate. If maintenance is done before the deterioration gets extreme it is less expensive to repair. The road department cannot keep up with the repairs and they cannot wait longer to address this road. The applicant stated this is an area that contributes greatly to the CIB revenue.

Mr. Slauch acknowledged the need and asked how quickly the \$11,450,000 funds would be drawn down.

The applicant stated the RFP's are ready to go out and the hope is to start work on the roadway in the next 60 days. When the funding is in place, they are ready to proceed.

Mr. Zeenati suggested providing the funding in tranches; \$5,000,000 today then the rest as needed.

Commissioner Norton stated they do not want to be in the middle of the project and the funding is not available.

Mr. Slauch acknowledged the need for this project and the Board does not want to add further delay. The Board is tasked with determining the best way to allocate the limited funding; can the project commence with subsequent allocations rather than one lump?

The applicant acknowledged the CIB revenue dilemma indicating the decision would have to come from their Board as to whether to commence the project with a smaller amount and assurances for the remaining funds.

Mr. Slauch noted there are other projects that need to be addressed. This is not a final decision for any project.

Commissioner Taylor suggested awarding the grant funding now and the loan funding later.

CIB staff clarified that when funding is awarded as a grant and loan, loan funds are allocated first to the project then the grant funds. The remaining balance in a construction escrow is deemed to be grant funds and recaptured into the mineral lease account; interest is recaptured periodically. [There are two funds; Mineral Lease Revenue which can be allocated as a grant, 0% loan and interest-bearing loan; Bonus Revenue which can only be allocated as an interest-bearing loan.]

Commissioner Taylor asked how long the project would take?

The applicant indicated that engineering would take 2-3 months with construction beginning in the summer. The project would likely be completed in Spring 2026.

Commissioner Miles inquired as to why they have not utilized the \$1,000,000 they were planning on contributing to the project for the engineering wherein the project would be ready to receive the CIB funding.

The applicant indicated they have been going through some reorganization of the service districts. The Uintah Transportation Special Service District (UTSSD) has been re-established which has taken some time. Some projects under USSD#1 have been transferred back under UTSSD.

Commissioner Bartholomew referenced projects on today's agenda. There are two other big projects which are from Washington County and Kane County. Rather than taking funding from this applicant, the Board should converse with those other applicants with large funding requests.

Chairman Wells stated the Board is evaluating on a case by case basis and there are three projects which affect the revenue the greatest; this is an evaluation of one of the three.

Commissioner Lytle indicated that CIB is to give prioritization to producing counties; Uintah County is the top producer with the inherent impacts which should be considered before reducing their funding. If the cuts cannot come from the lower producing counties, then Uintah County may also be reduced.

Chairman Wells suggested continuing a review of the larger projects to determine how best to proceed with

allocating the available funding.

- Chairman Wells invited Kane County Human Resource SSD to the table to discuss their project.

Mr. Zeenati asked Kane County Human Resource SSD if their project could wait upon the funding.

The applicant's representative, Kurt Loveless, noted the project has a combination of funding; the \$5,000,000 from CIB and \$15 million private investment. It is possible that the private bond could occur first but public approval of the bond would require confirmation that the CIB funding was a certainty. The project has a building permit and is scheduled to commence in March.

The Board discussed delaying the funding award with possibly placing the project back on the *priority* list acknowledging the pending list is not the necessary guarantee needed for this project as it would not be funded until June.

The list of new applications submitted for the 3rd Trimester are to be reviewed on April 3, 2025. The Board could place a project on the priority list or pending list, but that is not a guarantee of funding by the Board.

There was a discussion of what was required in regard to the larger private bond.

Bill Prater, bond counsel for the Board provided insight concerning the loan process indicating the Board could approve the loan; the bond resolution could indicate the authorization of two bonds (CIB and the private bond) and the bonds do not have to be issued at the same time. He further noted it may not solve the problem as the funds are not committed and there is no assurance.

The applicant's financial advisor, Mark Anderson with Zions Public Finance, stated the District has already adopted a parameters resolution authorizing issuance up to \$20 million dollars of bonds and have held their public hearing. Kane County is ready to proceed once they have authorization.

The Board asked about the interest on the private bond.

The applicant indicated the private funding bond interest rates have been roughly 4.25% and 4.75% depending on when the bond is issued.

Mr. Zeenati suggested approval of the funding subject to funding availability.
Commissioner Lytle suggested placing the project on the pending list.

CIB staff noted that placement on the pending list or prioritization list is not funding approval; a project on the pending list can be discussed at any future meeting; projects on the Prioritization List are listed to be funded at the next funding meeting.

Chairman Wells invited Washington County Special Service District #1 to the table to discuss their project.

The applicant's representative, Kevin Kunz, District Manager for Service District #1 addressed the Board.

Mr. Slauch asked if the project was ready to commence.

The applicant indicated the project will commence in March. Contractors are in place, the parameters resolution (a resolution adopted by the governing body indicating their intent to issue bonds defining the maximum amount of bonds and interest rate) has been approved by the Board. On Monday, they will have their final public hearing; the project is ready to proceed upon the approval of the funding.

Mr. Slauch asked if the applicant had other funding for Phase 3.

The applicant indicated the cost of Phase 3 is approximately \$6.5 million; the applicant will contribute \$1.5

million in applicant cash. They have done all preparatory work to get their Board approval based upon the discussion at the December 5, 2024 CIB review meeting which was for a \$5 million loan @ 4% for 30 years. The public hearing is scheduled February 10, 2025.

Mr. Slauch asked about market rate funding if CIB could not fund this project.

The applicant's financial advisor noted the applicant does not have any outstanding bonds other than their bond with CIB; a private bond issuance would be around 4.25% and 4.75%.

Mr. Slauch asked why they are not utilizing the private bonding option.

Mr. Anderson stated the call flexibility that's available with CIB funding has value; an entity does not go through the bond rating process.

Mr. Slauch acknowledged the additional effort to seek private funding but the County may be better off and CIB can free up revenue for other projects. It would be advisable to do a market rate deal; with no other debt, it should be relatively easy.

Chairman Wells thanked the applicant for their input and asked if there was additional discussion or motions.

Commissioner Miles referred to the rainbow sheet which shows county production versus CIB awards and noted that Uintah County is the top mineral producer, Kane County is #7 and Washington County is #18 with a contribution of \$170k over the last 5 years. It should be taken into consideration; is this money going to offset the impacts of mineral production.

Chairman Wells continued with discussion of the projects on the agenda.

Mr. Slauch noted that if the CIB funding is only saving Washington County the cost of issuance and effort, perhaps if that project is not funded, other projects do not have to be pushed off noting the new applications to be considered as is the Board protocol. *Placing a project on the pending or prioritization list for later funding, the revenue shortfall issue would be compounded at the next funding meeting.* His suggestion would be to deny Washington County. The revenue would still be short and a reduced funding scenario for other projects could be considered.

Chairman Wells acknowledged that Washington County could go to the private market and perhaps find the same or better rate.

Mr. Slauch was unsure if they could beat the CIB rate on a private market 30-year loan but CIB is not saving them much.

Commissioner Bartholomew referred to the points allocated through the funding tool to the Washington County project; 28 points out of 100 which supports the discussion.

The Board reviewed the various funding tool points on the larger projects; the Kane County project had 58 points and Uintah County had 68 points.

Chairman Wells reiterated the suggestion that the Board deny the Washington County project funding due to lack of available revenue.

Commissioner Miles noted that leaves a deficit of \$750,000.

Mr. Zeenati asked if the Washington County project was to be denied or postponed.

Commissioner Miles acknowledged the effort made by Washington County in seeking CIB funding and suggested it may be best to deny the project, allow the applicant to seek sure funding from another source and

proceed with their project.

The applicant's financial advisor noted that the interest rate in the private market would be higher as the term would be shorter versus a 30-year loan and indicated the CIB loan would not affect user rates. The parameters resolution has been adopted and they would need to start that over again.

Chairman Wells commenced other application discussion.

Mr. Slauch noted there needs to be another \$750,000 reduction to accommodate funding the remaining projects.

Chairman Wells acknowledged it would be less complicated to reduce the funding from one project such as Uintah Transportation and complete today's funding efforts.

Mr. Slauch suggested a reduction to the Kane County Human resource SSD funding as they are seeking a larger portion of funding from the private sector. The Board could reduce the funding by \$750,000 with a funding award of \$4,250,000 instead of the \$5,000,000 and pick up the rest in the market issuance.

Chairman Wells invited Kane County Human Resource SSD to discuss the proposed reduction.

The applicant indicated they could request an additional \$750,000 to the market issuance. The applicant proposed to reduce their CIB request to \$4,250,000 and hopefully get the authorization for that funding today.

Chairman Wells called for a motion on the Kane County Human Resource SSD funding.

Motion #2: Naghi Zeenati made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to fund the Kane County Human Resource Special Service District's hospital outpatient building (4.7 on the February 6, 2025 Agenda) as a \$4,250,000 loan for 25 years at 3.0%. The motion carried unanimously with the chairman abstaining.

[1:09:44]

Motion #3: Greg Miles made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a motion to deny the Washington County Special Service District's request for Phase 3 of the landfill safety infrastructure project. The motion carried with Naghi Zeenati opposed and the chairman abstaining.

The Chairman called for a motion for Central Valley Town and Commissioner Lytle suggested a motion for the remaining projects on today's agenda.

Motion #4: Ralph Brown made and Jerry Taylor seconded a motion to authorize funding today for 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8, 4.10, 4.11 as placed on the Prioritization List. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.

4.3 Central Valley Town – 2025 Roadway Improvements (Sevier) [1:04:00]

The Town of Central Valley's funding assistance request was placed on the Priority List as a \$287,394 grant for the 2025 roadway improvements. This project consists of the Sevier River Road excavation and reconstruction to include removal of the existing asphalt and base course and adding 5-inch HMA and 6-inch cement treated base course, 11-inch renovation of driveways with 5-inch hot mix asphalt and 6-inch untreated base course, relocation of mailboxes and signs, adding delineators, a micro-surfacing treatment to the new pavement to preserve the roadway and extend service life, reconstruction of water valves and water meters, 24-inch corrugated metal drainage pipes, engineering and bonding. Joint Highway Committee (UDOT) \$860,606.

Approved in 4th Motion: \$287,394 grant

4.4 Castle Valley Special Service District – Consolidated Capital Projects 2025 (Emery) [1:08:16]

Castle Valley Special Service District's funding assistance request was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,800,000 grant and a \$1,640,000 loan for 6y @ 1.5% (total 3,440,000) for the 2025 consolidated capital projects in Emery County. This project consists of consolidated capital improvements in Emery County to include \$855,700 for street improvements in Elmo, Cleveland, Castle Dale, Clawson, Ferron and Emery; \$602,100 for drainage improvements in Elmo, Cleveland Castle Dale, Orangeville, Clawson, Ferron and Emery; \$1,007,400 for waterline improvements in Elmo, Huntington, Orangeville, and Ferron; \$518,600 for sewer improvements in Huntington and Orangeville plus engineering and bonding. Applicant cash \$316,000.

Approved in 4th Motion: \$1,800,000 grant and a \$1,640,000 loan for 6y @ 1.5% (total 3,440,000)

4.5. Town of Fayette (Sanpete County) [1:13:22]

The Town of Fayette's request for funding assistance was placed on the Priority List as a \$90,000 grant for water system improvements. This project consists of water system improvements to include the purchase and installation of a well pump and well back-up generator as backup for the groundwater wells east of town, 1 trailer to house the well back-up generator, locating and verifying system components such as valves, pipe sizes, etc., GIS mapping of the culinary water system and engineering.

Approved in 4th Motion: \$90,000 grant

4.6. Centerfield City (Sanpete County) [1:18:22]

Centerfield City's request for funding assistance was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,096,000 grant and a \$1,097,000 loan for 30Y @ 1.0% (total \$2,193,000) for culinary water pipeline improvements. This project consists of culinary water improvements to the chlorination building, culinary overflow pipeline, transmission piping and distribution to meet State standards including 5,700 linear feet of 18-inch HDPE transmission/distribution pipe, 1 18-inch diameter pipe bore under highway, a chlorination building overflow piping improvements, power to chlorination building/water tank, spring pipeline investigation and improvements, 9,600 feet of lateral service line, engineering, permitting and bonding.

Approved in 4th Motion: \$1,096,000 grant and a \$1,097,000 loan for 30Y @ 1.0% (total \$2,193,000)

4.7. Kane County Human Resource Special Service District (Kane County) [1:23:50]

Kane County Human Resource Special Service District's request for funding assistance was placed on the Priority List as a \$5,000,000 loan for 25y @ 3.0% (total \$5,000,000) for the Kane County Hospital Outpatient Building. This project consists of the construction of a new 36,516 square foot outpatient medical services building with a new surgical suite, physical therapy, kidney dialysis treatment center, intravenous and chemotherapy services, sleep lab, IT Department, HIM Department, and Human Resources to include sitework, mechanical, electrical, paved parking, landscaping, fencing, engineering and bonding. There will be additional shelled space of approximately 5,600 square feet for future growth.

Approved in 2nd Motion: \$4,250,000 loan for 25 years @ 3.0%

Motion #2: Naghi Zeenati made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to fund the Kane County Human Resource Special Service District's hospital outpatient building as a \$4,250,000 loan for 25 years at 3.0%. The motion carried unanimously with the chairman abstaining.

4.8. Flaming Gorge Fire and EMS District (Daggett County) [1:46:19]

Flaming Gorge Fire and EMS District's request for funding assistance was placed on the Priority List as a \$200,000 grant for a new Paramedic Emergency Response Vehicle. This project consists of the purchase of a 2024 Ford Super Duty F-250 SRW (X2B) XL 4WD Super Cab truck with a 6.75-foot box; associated EMS critical equipment and bonding. Applicant cash \$10,398.

Approved in 4th Motion: \$200,000 grant

4.9. Washington County Special Service District #1 (Washington County) [2:04:29]

Washington County Special Service District #1's request for funding assistance was placed on the Priority List as a \$5,000,000 loan for 30 years @ 4.0% for the 2024 landfill safety infrastructure phase 3. This project consists of a new public convenience center drop off on the West to include a 37,000 square feet of concrete drop-off pad, 10 bays for roll-off containers, a 14-foot vertical separation between drop-off area and roll-off container area, drainage improvements, utility connections and asphalt drive lanes. The eastern improvements will include demolition of existing scale house and scales, construction of a new container storage building with 1,250 square feet of indoor driver/technician convenience area, 4,500 square feet of covered container storage, rerouting of power poles and power, installation of a new access road into the landfill, utilities, engineering and bonding. Applicant Cash \$1,500,000.

Denied in Motion #3: \$5,000,000 loan for 30 years @ 4.0%

Motion #3: Greg Miles made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a motion to deny the Washington County Special Service District's request for Phase 3 of the landfill safety infrastructure project. The motion carried with Naghi Zeenati opposed and the chairman abstaining.

4.10. Mona City (Juab County) [2:17:45]

Mona City's request for funding assistance was placed on the Priority List as a \$261,410 grant for water system improvements. This project consists of installing 1,100 linear feet of 8-inch PVC waterline in 200 North Street between Main Street and 200 West, 2 waterline connections, 10-meter service connections, 5 8-inch gate valves, 500 linear feet of 1-inch poly service line, 80 linear feet of highway crossing, engineering and bonding. Applicant cash \$100,000.

Approved in 4th Motion: \$261,410 grant

4.11. Town of Kingston (Piute County) [2:26:37]

The Town of Kingston's request for funding assistance was placed on the Priority List as a \$367,000 grant and a \$100,000 loan for 30y @ 0.0% (total \$467,000) for the Kingston Spring redevelopment This project consists of the redevelopment of Kingston Spring to include excavation, 520 linear feet of pipe bedding, 120 cubic yards of structural backfill, 520 linear feet of 4-inch PVC pipe, reseeding, 5,500 square feet of geotextile fabric, 4,500 square feet of liner for cut off wall, 10,000 square feet of surface liner, 1 2-inch air vent, 260 cubic yards of 1.5-inch drain gravel, 275 linear feet of 4-inch collection pipe and fittings, 25 tons of bentonite, 450 linear feet of drainage channel, a spring collection box, 2 collection pipe cleanout, spring exploration, 1 4-inch gate valve, 1 radio read meter system, 75 1-inch meters, engineering, permitting and bonding. Federal grant \$99,000.

Approved in 4th Motion: \$367,000 grant and a \$100,000 loan for 30y @ 0.0% (total \$467,000)

10:15 am BREAK [1:16:40]

7. Supplemental Requests

8. Request for Special Consideration – (Requires a vote of the Board to Consider) [58:40]

5. Large Infrastructure Projects N/A

6. Pending Projects N/A

Chairman Wells called the meeting to order with a welcome and introduction of Cody Christensen as the Regional Planner at Five County AOG to assist with CIB projects.

9. Board Member Discussion and/or Action Items [1:46:06]

9.1 R6 Regional Council CIB One List Pilot: Software has been developed to track and compile the regional CIP. R6 will review the developed platform. CIB approved funding for this development as a \$30,000 grant on 9-5-24.

Chairman Wells invited the R6 Regional Council representatives for an update and discussion of the One List Pilot software development. (Utah Portal Project): Travis Khyl and Shay Morrison.

Mr. Khyl noted that CIB funding initiated the pilot to see if this type of application could be accomplished. It has

been requested by many to have a method to know what projects are around the state which may seek funding. R6 and Jones and DeMille have created the basic Utah Project Portal; there was an RFP out of R6 and Jones and DeMille engineering was chosen to build a portal. It is built from the ground up just for Utah and has been reviewed by a few interested entities. R6 subsequently received a small funding commitment from GOPB to continue with the development [*and are requesting additional funding from CIB*]. The portal will be an online tool which is currently hosted online at <https://utahprojects.org>. The test portal has been populated with make-believe projects to test and demonstrate the portal, but the final portal will have verifiable, real projects. There will be a keeper of the gate to make certain the projects listed are real and will happen. Mr. Khyl indicated the AOG's have received additional funding for additional staff to work with the communities; when a project is to be placed on the CIB one-year list, it must be approved by the AOG. The project is to include an engineer's estimate.

The Board reviewed the current iteration of the portal.

Mr. Khyl stated that projects entered into the portal will be vetted by the AOG and verified to begin within the next 12 months. It will also show the intended sources of funding and also projects funded in the last five years.

Commissioner Winfield asked who puts the data in for the counties and communities.

Mr. Khyl stated that each community would log into the system and enter the information, then submit the information and an email would be sent to the related AOG. The AOG will review the information for accuracy or eligibility and can click 'Approve'. Any administrator can add projects; this includes the AOG Planners.

It was noted that the CIB has a rule requiring an application list so would this take the place of the CIB application list?

Mr. Khyl stated if this portal could be implemented statewide, the CIB policy could reflect it's use as the standard. He suggested perhaps a trimester search to forecast what might be coming in by way of funding requests; he proposed that the entity indicate when they plan on making an application.

Commissioner Lytle asked if CIB would own the portal when it is completed.

Mr. Khyl indicated all funding agencies are interested in using the portal wherein the dashboard could look different for each agency. GOPB would like to host the portal - the front page. Each funding source would possibly pay for changes or modifications. The recommendation being proposed is for R6 to own the portal as a government entity. R6 already has a contract with Jones and DeMille to do the work. GOPB has contracted with R6 for additional funds. They are open to suggestions.

Commissioner Winfield asked if there was an incentive to require entities to use the portal; if they choose to disregard it, the data is incomplete.

Mr. Khyl referenced the CIB application list which is a requirement; the portal could supplant the existing CIB application list if CIB adopted this as the required tool. It can be opened once a year as the current CIB application list is, or each trimester. A project would have to be on the list. Or, the threshold that has been proposed is that if an entity is going to seek State funds, the project is required to be on the portal listing; then the data would be valuable no matter the funding being sought, all funding sources could see where an entity has received or is seeking funding.

Shay Morrison, community advisor at R6, noted that he is frequently in city council meetings and noted this is not a 'hard sell' to communities. The communities are currently using paper or other spreadsheet tools. He referred to Mona as an example showing Mona on the portal. He doesn't think it requires a mandate to force people to use it.

Mr. Khyl indicated that the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) is something R6 encourages. This is a simple way for an entity to track the projects. He noted that what is in the portal for Mona is their capital improvements plan; a one year and a 2-5-year listing.

Commissioner Lytle asked what problems have been noted in terms of the input and how communities feel about the portal.

Mr. Khyl stated the feedback has been extremely positive. Mr. Khyl and Mr. Morrison see the portal as a benefit. Entering the previous 5 years of projects will be a lot of work but will be an asset inventory to refer to. If other funding agencies want to customize their view, it can be done; it was built from the ground up so changes can be accommodated relatively easily.

Commissioner Taylor asked if mayors from other towns or other communities can view everything?

Mr. Khyl indicated the public facing website and searchability is public but the public would not be able to enter projects.

Commissioner Bartholomew asked if a mayor could enter information without the AOG's knowledge?

Mr. Morrison showed the Board how an entity would enter a new project and where it would be approved by the AOG and Mr. Khyl expressed appreciation for the way Jones and DeMille built the portal; an entity states the cost of the project then must select revenue sources for the total cost. It cannot be submitted without all the information being entered.

Commissioner Lytle asked who enters the base data for a community such as annual budget etc.

Mr. Morrison stated he establishes an administrator within the entity. Perhaps long term it could be enabled to pull data from other sources like census, etc.

Commissioner Miles noted the onus is strongly on the AOG and overtime the data would have to be maintained as the data changes.

Mr. Khyl acknowledged the AOG's will keep the information current and will be relied on heavily. Smaller communities have limited staff and do not have the capacity for upkeep of the portal; the community advisors will take on that task.

Commissioner Bartholomew suggested a line item referencing if they have applied for other funding.

Mr. Khyl noted a question could be added to indicate if they have applied for other funding.

Mr. Zeenati asked several questions. He noted that Jones and DeMille helped to create the portal.

*Is the portal licensed and/or trademarked by Jones and DeMille or is it open for all the State to use?

*Will there be an administrator person with password protection to preserve the integrity of the portal?

He suggested it would be a good education tool for legislators to review and understand the funding of projects by CIB, UDOT or other agencies.

*Who will be the contact person for the portal in the Governor's Office.

He suggested a method in the portal for noting a delay in the commencement of a project.

Mr. Khyl stated that when CIB provided the funding, CIB indicated it would be open and could transfer to someone else which is the way it has been built.

*It will be a public facing portal where legislators and public can view the funding and projects.

*GOPB is going to be the lead contact at the Governor's Office; Laura Hanson is with GOPB and has expressed her excitement with the portal.

*There is a way to search the portal for projects approved but not completed; dates when funded etc.

*The portal can be accessed with most technology. He indicated that the portal would show what projects have been funded to an entity.

Commissioner Lytle asked if the portal would delineate in the funding sources any legislative appropriations stating those would come through an agency.

Mr. Khyl indicated the portal could include the data concerning legislative appropriations which would be manually entered.

Mr. Slauch asked about the portal's 'start date'; what does that represent?

Mr. Khyl stated it will be decided by what CIB would prefer; an application date, RFP for engineering,

commencement of construction ...

Mr. Slauch suggested including several dates to determine the status of a project and determine what is meant by 'shovel ready'; ready to be engineered or ready to start construction. The information could assist with decisions in funding; multiple dates to hone in the status of a project.

Chairman Wells stated all applicants indicate the project is ready, but how long does it take for the use of the funding as it would be helpful to track that.

Mr. Khyl indicated the portal could track when the project was funded, when the funding was utilized and when the project was completed.

Commissioner Lytle noted the definition of 'shovel ready' is different for different entities. For some communities, they need the funding to become shovel ready which should be taken into consideration.

Though the previous projects are noted on the project yellow review sheet, Mr. Khyl indicated the portal could be shown at a Board meeting with prior funding from every state funding source.

Commissioner Winfield expressed a concern with the engineers estimate included with a funding request. If there is a delay in beginning the project from when it is funded and when the project finally goes out to bid, the cost of the project is considerably more than anticipated. And if an estimate is not calculated correctly by a professional, it could be inaccurate.

Mr. Khyl indicated their AOG has discussed the estimate issue; if it is correct today, it will likely not be correct in 3 months. Costs increase, so the AOG's should review the projects on the one-year list; the engineers estimate may be 10 months old by the time the application is made. The AOG should contact the applicant to advise them to update the estimate.

Mr. Zeenati about how far back the previous project list would go.

Mr. Khyl indicated it would include projects in the last 5 years.

Commissioner Taylor expressed appreciation for the portal even in its infant stages and asked what the Board could do to assist with the portal project.

Mr. Khyl thanked Commissioner Taylor and segued into the amount of the supplemental funding to the original CIB \$30,000 grant authorized in September to commence the portal project Jones and DeMille has prepared pricing for the build out for the Phase 1 roll out to the State; all 255 communities and 7 associations of government logged in, CIB modifications which is a total of \$100,000. GOPB has committed a \$50,000 grant in anticipation of CIB committing \$50,000 to implement the statewide portal. The public can view the portal, and if other programs want to utilize the portal with their changes, they would be asked to pay for those changes to the system.

Chairman Wells stated it is good to determine the logistics going forward. The CIB policy retreat is in June and a continuing discussion can be at the April 3, 2025 CIB meeting.

Commissioner Lytle recommended CIB's supplemental funding should be \$20,000 as CIB has already contributed \$30,000.

The Board discussed supplemental funding.

Chairman Wells asked about the anticipated roll out for the portal assuming the funding is finalized.

Mr. Khyl stated if the Board contributes \$50,000, the portal would be ready in June with all 250 entities built into it. There could be a work meeting prior to or during the April 3, 2025 Board meeting.

Chairman Wells stated the public project portal could be adopted at the June CIB policy sessions.

Mr. Zeenati asked if they had approached DEQ. Mr. Khyl indicated they have shown it to DEQ and many others. It has been well received and many want to use it. CIB funded it so CIB will be the first to tweak it and

use it. If others want it customized and used, they would pay for their customizations.

Mr. Khyl stated they have done research on software costs and this is very inexpensive comparatively.

Chairman Wells noted there may be a discussion at the April 3, 2025 meeting and he nominated Jack Lytle, Kirt Slauch, Laura Hanson and Jerry Taylor to the executive review group.

The Board could approve funding today as it is on the agenda as a 'discussion and action item'.

Commissioner Lytle again referred to the administration of the portal and each of the AOG's are going to be tied in. It's going to be a GOPB program, is that correct?

Mr. Khyl stated GOPB would be needed to push it statewide.

Commissioner Lytle clarified in the chain of authority, GOPB is at the top; *Would there be an annual cost to use the portal? *Would funding come from the annual planning funding the CIB awards to the AOG's?

Mr. Khyl stated CIB would not pay an annual cost and it will not be paid for from the annual RPP funding. *The State will accommodate the cost; GOPB, Legislature, Governor's Office, Water Resources – they are going to pay ongoing costs as a line item in the budget. It is hoped to tie this in to the various other lists currently being used; the State's GIS system may have a map button. He stated six months from now, it will be an incredible tool.

Mr. Slauch asked if Jones and DeMille as the developer will continue the development and what database platform was used?

Mr. Khyl stated that the necessary procurement process was used to select Jones and DeMille with the intent that Jones and DeMille would operate it ongoing and make the changes as requested. The platform is not based on another platform; it was built from the ground up.

It was suggested the Board could approve the funding at this time, and appropriate the funding when the January revenue is deposited.

Mr. Zeenati clarified and it was verified this project is eligible for use of mineral lease dollars as planning and the entity is also eligible.

Jerry Taylor made and Kirt Slauch seconded a motion to fund R6 for the Utah Project Portal Phase 1 as a \$50,000 grant matching a GOPB \$50,000 grant to be appropriated after the January mineral lease revenue deposit. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.

Mr. Khyl thanked the Board and stated there will be an invite for a discussion with the executive group.

Commissioner Winfield asked how a Board member could ask questions and provide input.

Chairman Wells recommended having an open discussion and keeping all in the loop.
Mr. Zeenati suggested sending questions to staff.

Chairman Wells indicated they don't need to be on the April Agenda but the working group should provide input in the development. It can be a zoom video conference. It will likely take a lot of collaboration.

Commissioner Lytle requested that Paul Moberly be included.

9.2 CIB Policy Retreat Location – June 5-6, 2025

Chairman Wells indicated the two finalists for the location include Sevier County in Richfield or Kane County in Kanab.

Mr. Zeenati noted there have been large projects funded in Kane County; representing a lot of funding.

Commissioner Ralph Brown stated that going to Sevier County includes going to the R6 building (funded by CIB). The Board has been invited to go to Koosharem by the Mayor and visit their community center, then a bus to Fish Lake for dinner.

Commissioner Taylor inquired what Kane County would offer; it was unknown.
Mr. Zeenati recommended Kanab but the Board acknowledged the offer by Commissioner Brown.

Naghi Zeenati made and Bill Winfield seconded a motion to have the 2025 CIB Policy Retreat in Richfield Utah. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.

The Policy Retreat for 2025 will be held June 5-6, 2025 in Sevier County – Richfield, Utah.

9.3 CIB Board Meeting – April 3, 2025

Meeting Adjourned 11:40 AM.

Submitted by;
Candace Powers