

**PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD MEETING**

Department of Workforce Services  
Housing and Community Development Division, Salt Lake City,  
Utah Virtual Zoom Webinar  
March 4, 2021

**Members Present**

Jonathan Hardy	Chairman
Bruce Adams	Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments
Naghi Zeenati	State Transportation Commission
Irene Hansen	Duchesne County
Jack Lytle	Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Dean Baker	Uintah County
Mike Dalton	Five County Association of Governments
Kyle Stephens	State Board of Water Resources
Garth "Tooter" Ogden	Six County Association of Governments
Gregg Galecki	State Board of Water Quality
David Damschen	State Treasurer

**Staff and Visitors**

Keith Heaton	Housing and Community Development
Candace Powers	Housing and Community Development
Brenda Brown	Housing and Community Development
Pam Sjostrom	Housing and Community Development
Aubrey Larsen	Housing and Community Development
Jordan Katcher	Housing and Community Development
Paul Moberly	Housing and Community Development
Matthew Parker	Housing and Community Development
Brook McCarrick	Attorney General's Office
Nicole Nowers	Utah Office of State Treasurer
Skyler Davies	Division of Water Quality
Skye Sieber	Division of Drinking Water
Heather Pattee	Division of Drinking Water
Gregory Todd	Duchesne County
Kurt Mower	Roosevelt City
Nate Hall	District Environmental Engineer
Margaret Lautaimi	Department of Workforce Services
Debi Carty	Department of Workforce Services
Geri Gamber	Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments
Michael Bryant	Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments
Kent Wilson	Emery County
Kevin Yack	Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Will Wright	Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Gary Zabriskie	Five County Association of Governments
Nate Wiberg	Five County Association of Governments
Brian Carver	Bear River Association of Governments
Zach Leavitt	Six County Association of Governments
Zac Covington	Bear River Association of Governments
Bret Reynolds	Civco Engineering

Tyler Timmons  
Travis Kyhl  
Jamison Christensen  
Kendrick Thomas  
Parker Vercimak  
Michael Hawley  
Justin Atkinson  
Kelly Crane  
Jerry Taylor  
Lori Nay  
Steven Jenson  
Stella Hill  
Lisa Wells  
Kelly Chappell  
Jeff Pei  
Bert Harris  
Andy Gant  
Karla Johnson  
John Livingston  
Stan Holmes  
Noah Miterko  
Madeline Brubaker

Six County Association of Governments  
Six County Association of Governments  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Jones & DeMille Engineering  
Sunrise-Engineering  
Ensign Engineering  
Garfield County  
Gunnison City  
Gunnison City  
Gunnison City  
Town of Hanksville  
Ensign Engineering  
Town of Hanksville  
Kane County  
Kane County  
Kane County  
Kane County  
Sierra Club  
Heal Utah

Other Attendees:

14358968266  
14357228267  
12068524442  
14354482636

**WELCOME**

The Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB) Meeting was held on Thursday, March 4, 2021 via Zoom Webinar and was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Jonathan Hardy. Chairman Hardy announced his resignation as Director of Housing and Community Development Division as of March 19, 2021.

Chairman Hardy read the following statement:

*"I, Jonathan Hardy, Chairman of the Permanent Community Impact Board, have determined that the March 4, 2021 meeting of the Permanent Community Impact Board will be held electronically without an anchor location. This determination is based on the following facts:*

- 1. Utah is currently dealing with Covid 19, which has been determined to be a pandemic. Covid-19 is extremely contagious and can be deadly to those who contract it, especially those of advanced age and underlying health conditions.*
- 2. The Agency offices are in Salt Lake County, which is currently a county with a high level of transmission. This designation requires the wearing of masks and strongly recommends physical distancing.*
- 3. A vast majority of Agency staff and the members of the Board are teleworking to avoid unnecessary contact with others.*
- 4. The Board room is insufficient to allow social distancing and reasonably safe accommodation of the Commission and the Public.*
- 5. The Commission uses an electronic platform which allows interested Parties to view the meeting, hear discussions dated this 28<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2021.*

## **I. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

### **Briefing**

#### **1. Upcoming Meeting dates and Locations**

April 8, 2021 – Virtual Meeting via Zoom Webinar

June 3, 2021 – CIB Funding Meeting – TBD - In person for the Board; virtual for the public.

#### **2. Financial Review [06:29]**

Candace Powers reviewed the status of the funds for today's meeting. As a reminder, for projects over \$1,000,000, the Board requires the use of State Purchasing. The contact person at the Division of State Purchasing is Christopher Jennings.

#### **3. Review of Agenda Items:**

There are 3 projects for funding consideration, and 2 large infrastructure projects. Projects discussed at this review meeting may be placed on the Priority List for final funding approval on June 3, 2021.

## **II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS [09:00]**

A roll call was conducted for Board attendance. All Board members were in attendance.

## **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES [12:05]**

Chairman Hardy requested a motion to approve the minutes from the February 4, 2021 meeting.

**Naghi Zeenati made and Mike Dalton seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2021 meeting. The motion carried unanimously through voice vote.**

## **IV. NEW PROJECTS [12:44]**

### **4.1 Gunnison City (Sanpete County) [15:05.6]**

Gunnison City presented a funding request of \$2,080,000 for roadway improvements. This project consists of design, engineering and geotechnical analysis and rebuilding 100 West, 400 West; curb, gutter, ADA ramps and drainage improvements on 200 East, overlay on 300 West, 400 West, Industrial Park Road and Cemetery Road, widening Cemetery Road and chip seal and double chip seal on Indian Road, 100 West and 200 West and associated storm drainage improvements to include catch basins and storm drain piping.

The applicant has requested an \$880,000 loan for 10 years at 0.0% and a \$1,200,000 grant. The applicant is contributing \$20,000 cash.

#### ***Funding Median Range:***

*\$ 1,040,000 Loan 10y @ 1.0%*

*\$ 1,040,000 Grant*

Project total \$2,100,000

Mayor Lori Nay and Kelly Chappell from Ensign Engineering represented Gunnison City.

The applicant indicated Gunnison City had a 10-year plan for roads, but need financial assistance as the existing budget cannot accommodate the necessary improvements. They established a 10-year maintenance plan but it covers only 60% of the roads for crack seal and chip seal. The road plan was finished 3 years ago and the master plan was completed 2 years ago. The funding will accommodate the scope of work provided in the application.

The Board asked if the road repairs could be done in phases.

The applicant stated there are several different rebuild strategies including new rebuild, overlay, widening, etc. Some roads will be maintained through traditional strategies; chip seal, crack seal, seal coat & slurry.

The Board requested clarity about the reference on the review sheet to cross subsidizing.

Paul Moberly stated when there is general fund and enterprise funds that are combining. It is not the preferred practice. If there is a stand-alone enterprise fund (water system) it is self-funded through user fees, but if other revenue funds are added into that enterprise fund, it is cross subsidizing. The tool as revised does not directly consider affordability. It is based on the criteria the Board set up in regard to County production, public lands, population of the County, applicant's MAGI (a form of affordability), annual budget and project type. The fiscal health calculation is independent but provides a risk assessment of the applicant's financial situation with consideration given to the applicant's request and what the tool suggests.

The Board acknowledged the applicant's maintenance plan which the applicant stated does not cover all the necessary road repairs.

The applicant indicated B&C road funds do not completely cover maintenance or road failures.

The Board noted they budgeted \$95,000 per year and B&C contributes \$150,000 per year of which 80% of the B&C revenue can be pledged and asked for an explanation of the new improvements on 200 West.

The applicant said 200 West is new homes and Gunnison would like to pave the roads that have homes. It is also an access to the highway so there is truck traffic through the town. 200 West would include a seal coat on the existing gravel road.

Commissioner Adams referred to affordability and thought that was the reason for the tool; to determine affordability of a project.

Chairman Hardy noted that in the original tool, affordability was the *only* consideration. The biggest issue with the audit was there was not consistency in funding terms for projects. The other criteria helped bring the consistency. The funding range provided by the tool is to consider affordability. There can be documented exceptions for funding packages outside the range. The tool currently uses the type of project, location in regard to production, public lands etc. The sole consideration of affordability tends to penalize a community's good financial stewardship. The tool provides a range of funding options allowing the Board to consider affordability within that range.

Commissioner Adams stated it was the first time he was aware that affordability was not considered in a project.

Chairman Hardy indicated the MAGI is an affordability consideration in the tool.

The Board referred to the Gunnison application in regard to O & M and replacement allocated and asked if that was part of the funding request for the project. The Board does not pay for operation and maintenance.

It was noted the O & M and replacement questions are on the CIB application and each applicant responds for informational purposes but O&M is not included in the funding request.

Commissioner Lytle stated MAGI is a year behind and may not reflect a current affordability. A deviation from the maximum and minimum range could be in regard to affordability. The Board is seeking to do what is best with a declining revenue source.

Mr. Zeenati asked for clarity concerning why the tool suggests more loan but financial indicators show a lot of debt stating he will be inclined to give the applicant what they request.

Mr. Moberly referred to when the application as to what the applicant could afford as an annual payment and the tool was largely based around that factor. There was direction to remove that as a factor in the tool's calculation wherein the financial assessment was created to provide the Board an objective view of the applicant's financial situation. The Board has those indicators to discuss finances with the applicant and may adjust the funding accordingly. The tool provides a common framework and a consistent range for similar applicants and projects.

Ms. Brown indicated the financial information is from their most recent audited financial report the applicant files with the State. The review sheet financials come from the state website that the applicant has certified as accurate information. The applicant does not receive the review sheet, but applicants have asked for a review with the tool to determine what their payment would be with various scenarios. *It should be noted that the regional planners have been given a simplified tool to use in working with applicants.*

Commissioner Ogden thanked Paul for his work on the funding tool noting there is more work to be done. The Gunnison roads are heavily traveled by coal trucks, there is a major expansion on Cemetery Road and the City is growing rapidly.

**Tooter Ogden made and Kyle Stephens seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for final approval on June 3, 2021 funding meeting as an \$880,000 loan for 10 years at 0.0% and a \$1,200,000 grant (total \$2,080,000).**

The Board discussed the interest rate and a substitute motion was made.

**Gregg Galecki made and Dean Baker seconded a substitute motion to place this project on the Priority List for final approval on June 3, 2021 funding meeting as an \$880,000 loan for 10 years at 1.0% and a \$1,200,000 grant (total \$2,080,000). The motion carried unanimously through roll call vote.**

#### 4.2 Kane County Municipal Building Authority (Kane County) [46:20]

Kane County Municipal Building Authority presented a funding request of \$1,414,266 for a new road maintenance facility. This project consists of the purchase and installation of a 6800 square foot metal building to serve as a road maintenance facility to include concrete work, utilities, finish and an hydraulic truck lift; the purchase and installation of a 720 square foot metal building and associated concrete work, runoff containment and evaporation pond for salt runoff to serve as a salt shed; the installation of an 807 square foot sander storage rack, utilities and appurtenances, two 4000 gallon fuel tanks and 1500 linear feet of 6-foot chain link fencing and gate along US-89 on 2.52 acres of property purchased from the Western Kane County Special Service District. The applicant has requested a \$ 1,314,000 Loan 20y @ 0.5% and a \$100,266 Grant (total \$1,414,266).

Median Proposed:

\$ 1,330,000 Loan 30y @ 1.0%

\$ 84,266 Grant

**Total Project: \$1,414,266**

Andy Gant and Burton Harris represented Kane County Municipal Building Authority.

The applicant indicated Kane County does not have a road maintenance facility at the landfill location. The landfill is operated by the Special Service District which has been used for several years to store road maintenance equipment. The SSD is donating the land to the County to use for a road maintenance facility. This is the area with the majority of the snow in Kane County and a road maintenance facility would allow the plows and equipment to be protected and ready for use. There is an increased amount of residential growth in this area as well. Kane County has one maintenance shed which is in Kanab.

The Board asked for clarity regarding the funding tool as to what is considered essential and what is non-essential in building classifications and how the tool varies on those considerations.

Non-essential buildings are a 1 and include recreation culture, tourism. Essential buildings are a 2 and include health safety and welfare. There is 12% less loan for essential buildings. The staff has designated secondary buildings to be sheds and garages. There will be more discussion of the funding tool at the policy retreat.

The Board acknowledged the applicant's need for a covered location for the large equipment and a centralized location.

**Naghi Zeenati made and Tooter Ogden seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for final approval on June 3, 2021 funding meeting as a \$100,266 grant and an \$1,314,000 loan for 20 years at 1.0% (total \$1,414,266).**

The Board noted the engineering appears to have duplicate numbers in the estimate.

The applicant indicated they will follow up on the details of the estimate as this develops.

Chairman Hardy indicated projects over \$1,000,000 must go through State Purchasing and State Purchasing will help with the review.

**Naghi Zeenati made and Tooter Ogden seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for final approval on June 3, 2021 funding meeting as a \$100,266 grant and an \$1,314,000 loan for 20 years at 1.0% (total \$1,414,266). The motion carried unanimously through roll call vote.**

#### 4.3 Town of Hanksville (Wayne County) [01:07:28]

The Town Hanksville presented a funding request of \$500,000 for sewer improvements to include nutrient removal. This project consists of design, engineering and geotechnical analysis and rebuilding 100 West, 300 West, 400 West and Industrial Park Roadways; sidewalk, curb, gutter, ADA ramps and drainage improvements on 200 East, overlay on 400 West and Cemetery Road, widening Cemetery Road and chip seal and double chip seal on Indian Road and 200 West and associated storm drainage improvements to include catch basins and storm drain piping. The applicant has requested a \$500,000 grant.

*Median Proposed:*

*\$ 320,000 Loan 10y @ 1.0%*

*\$ 180,000 Grant*

*Applicant Cash: \$100,000*

*Project Total: \$600,000*

Jeff Peay represented the Town of Hanksville

The applicant is requesting a grant, their applicant cash is from the B&C road funding and a loan could not be accommodated for this project.

The Board referred to the fluctuations in the annual B & C road funds and asked how Hanksville plans to maintain the roads with an uncertain amount of B & C revenues. Leaving the roads gravel until the B & C road funds are certified was recommended to know there is funding to maintain the improved roads.

The applicant indicated their maintenance included crack sealing and seal coating in 2012 and the County did a chip seal in 1998.

The Board referred to the new road in this project which will require a larger maintenance fund. The Board asked why the B & C revenue source is fluctuating, if putting a chip seal on the gravel would change the revenue and what is the property tax rate in Hanksville?

The applicant indicated the chip seal in the project is to maintain an existing roadway and the new asphalt road is on 100 East. Most of this project is to upgrade the roads, not for operation and maintenance and the B & C road fund revenue is normally around \$14,000 to \$15,000 per year. The fluctuation may be due to the reporting of the existing roads.

The Board noted there are only 270 residents in the Town so there is little revenue to work with. Small towns come to the Board because there is not enough B&C road revenue. The Board suggested funding the improvements to existing roads and omitting the \$49,000 for the new 100 East roadway at this time.

**Tooter Ogden made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to omit the new road and approve a \$451,000 grant to maintain the existing roads.**

The Board suggested the applicant keep their \$100,000 applicant cash and a substitute motion was made.

**Gregg Galecki made and Dean Baker seconded a substitute motion to fund the improvements to existing roads, excluding 100 East improvements and applicant cash as a \$350,000 grant and a \$200,000 loan for 10 years at 0.5%. The motion passed with David Damschen, Gregg Galecki, Dean Baker, Kyle Stephens, Mike Dalton and Irene Hansen in favor and Tooter Ogden, Jack Lytle, Bruce Adams and Naghi Zeenati opposed.**

*Break.*

## **5. NEW LARGE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS** [1:20:34]

### **5.1 Six County Association of Governments**

The Six County Association of Governments presented a funding request of \$8,581,000 for a new administration building and warehouse. This project consists of the construction of a new 15,560 square foot main floor building with a basement for future expansion to include 34 office spaces, 2 small conference rooms, 1 large conference room, a reception area, and other key facilities and finishing 5,000 square feet of office space in the basement and a 3,000 square foot Weatherization Program warehouse at 80 East 600 North in Richfield City. The applicant is requesting an \$8,581,000 grant.

***Median Proposed:***

***\$ 5,664,000 Loan 30y @ 1.5%***

***\$ 2,917,000 Grant***

***Applicant Cash: \$100,000***

***CDBG (land): \$325,000 (contingent on CIB funding)***

*Project Total: \$9,006,000*

Travis Kyhl represented the Six County Association of Governments.

The applicant acknowledged the large request stating there are no other funding options for this project. The AOG administers over 65 state and federal contracts with 80 employees running programs to include heat assistance, weatherization, meals on wheels, veteran's programs, in home case management, rental assistance and others. The AOG is currently in the basement of the Sevier County Administration Building but they have outgrown the space with issues such as client privacy and cramped staff accommodations. Sevier County could utilize the space currently occupied by the AOG. The AOG has spoken to legislators prior to the legislative session, but it was expressed to be a huge ask and encouraged the AOG to approach CIB. The AOG does not have revenue to pledge to a loan or improvements. This will be a one-time request noting they have not requested CIB funds previously. They have saved \$100,000 for the project over 10 years further noting it to be a regional project serving 6 counties, 49 communities and will be located in Richfield City.

Commissioner Adams stated the AOG does not have revenues that could be allocated to a building fund.

The applicant affirmed that the AOG assesses counties, not cities, but none of the funds can be allocated to a building fund.

Chairman Hardy indicated the funding for this project would be allocated from the large infrastructure fund.

Commissioner Adams indicated it was his understanding the mineral lease act was not set up to create an ongoing savings account by the CIB. He noted that both buildings represent a large request but are very important. The two AOG's represent 10 counties of the 29 in the State of Utah.

Commissioner Lytle asked about the source of the \$325,000 federal grant referred to on the application and asked if they had made other applications for funding.

The applicant indicated it is a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) which was awarded March 3, 2021 for the land acquisition. There were no other applications made.

Commissioner Hansen noted she has worked with the Uintah Basin AOG for 20 years. They have accommodated millions of dollars of federal funds to the benefit of the communities in the Basin. The request is large but in regard to the Six County AOG, they serve 49 communities concurring that AOG's provide great dividends to the State.

Commissioner Ogden indicated they have tried to find other buildings but Sevier County does not have a vacant building to consider. The AOG has been in the Sevier County Admin Building basement for several years and it has safety issues getting people down to the AOG offices in the basement. As stated, outreach has been made to legislators in regard to the need. He expressed support for the project.

Mayor Baker agreed that the AOG does tremendous work and provides great support for communities. Uintah Basin AOG represents 3 counties and is smaller and their smaller building was built in 2001 with 35% of the funding from CIB as a 20-year loan at 0% and 24% grant with a \$404,000 grant from CDBG. In 2003, additional funding was awarded as a \$100,000 grant and \$210,000 loan for 25 years. The AOG's are funded through administration fees through the various funding sources processed through the AOG. The AOG buildings are important, but there should be some loan... even 10%.

Mr. Zeenati noted the funding tool indicated a loan but the applicant has indicated they do not have revenue to accommodate a loan payment. Has the AOG considered another entity building the building and they lease it from that entity similar to their lease from Sevier County?

Mr. Moberly explained the funding tool calculations are based on information from the Counties in the AOG such as the production, population etc. to calculate a funding scenario. Some of the normal metrics are not available for multiple counties noting the AOG is a different entity than the typical applicant.

Chairman Hardy stated there are different ways this can be structured, similar to an MBA structure. They could lease a portion of the building to other entities.

The applicant indicated the AOG pays approximately \$48,000 rent for the space in the Sevier County building through administrative costs from the programs in the AOG. The O&M on the new building will be approximately \$50,000. Though some programs might accommodate a little more, most programs cannot allow administrative or rental expenses and a loan payment would mean less services provided to the beneficiaries of those programs.

Mr. Galecki acknowledged the valuable work through the AOG and the need for a new building, but the financing options are an issue. The Legislature said to go to CIB first. Is that because CIB is easier? Funding this project with all grant is troubling with a budget showing \$200,000 for furnishings. The weatherization shed is \$150.00 per square foot. Six County AOG is in Sevier County because it is centrally located. In the 6 counties there is not a building that can be repurposed? When counties really want a project, they find a way.

The applicant stated the admin building is in Richfield but there are branch offices in Fillmore and Manti as well as 12 senior centers throughout the 6 counties. There is an old hotel that needs remodeling, but nothing that was cost effective. An assessment fee was considered but that option was discarded.

Chairman Hardy indicated that the State is in consolidation mode with its buildings as there is movement to telework. What are the options for having staff telework and provide services? The Division of Facilities and Construction indicated that if the Richfield Regional Center is funded, there will be a few buildings to dispose of in Richfield.

The applicant stated there are no state buildings that are large enough to accommodate the AOG. They were to be part of the conversations concerning the Richfield Center but it didn't occur. As for teleworking, only 8-10% of staff do not see clients as the majority of work is human service work through the AOG with clients coming into the office. The new facility is sized to meet the needs of today.

Commissioner Lytle stated there is a county assessment that each county pays in the Uintah Basin and asked about the assessment for Six County AOG. Would a loan connote an increase to the County assessment?

The applicant indicated there is an assessment based on population. The majority of that funding is a match requirement to a federal or state program with some funds attributed to staff salary. There would need to be an increased assessment if the funding was as a loan. The building has been sized according to need and they will make the building fit the available budget.

Commissioner Dalton suggested that some of the contracts the AOG administers could accommodate a lease payment to cover some of the debt repayment.

Chairman Hardy indicated the large infrastructure fund is built or diminished by the actions of the Board. It was created when oil was above \$100.00 per barrel and revenues were significant. The funds were set aside for leaner times such as now and for projects over \$5,000,000.

The applicant stated there are few AOG program contracts that allow admin or rental fees. It is the AOG's concern as public service providers to limit those costs because it reduces funds available for services.

The Board reviewed several loan scenarios.

Mr. Galecki suggested placing the project on pending list while consideration is given to possible telecommuting, dividing programs among smaller buildings and/or up to 24% loan for the project.

Commissioner Adams stated there is sufficient funding in the large infrastructure account and the cost of construction is increasing.

**Bruce Adams made and Tooter Ogden seconded a motion to suspend the rules and fund the project today as a \$8,581,000 grant.**

**Gregg Galecki made a substitute motion to place this project on the pending list to further evaluate the options of telecommuting, programs divided in smaller existing buildings and consideration of an 18% loan. The motion failed due to lack of second.**

The Chairman called the question on the original motion.

**Bruce Adams made and Tooter Ogden seconded a motion to suspend the rules and authorize funding as a \$8,581,000 grant. The motion carried with Gregg Galecki opposed.**

#### 5.2 Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (Carbon County)

The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments presented a funding request of \$6,936,000 for a new Administration Building, Food Bank and Weatherization Office. This project consists of the construction of a new 14,250 square foot administrative office building and a 10,830 square foot warehouse and garage to be utilized by SEUALG, Weatherization and the Carbon County Food Bank near 400 South Fairgrounds Road, Price, Utah. This project will include site design, survey, weatherization transit hub, concrete, concrete finishing, asphalt, drainage, parking, curb and gutter, pavement marking, signage, landscaping, fencing, utilities, storm water retention, equipment and appliances. The applicant is requesting a \$ 6,936,000 grant.

#### *Funding Median Range:*

*\$ 3,954,000 Loan 30y @ 1.0%*

*\$ 2,982,000 Grant*

*Local In-kind (donated land): \$189,000*

*CDBG (parking lot): \$300,000*

*Project Total: \$7,425,000*

Geri Gamber, Commissioner Kent Wilson, Commissioner Tony Martinez, Mayor Mike Korianos and Mayor Danny Van Wagoner represented Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments.

The applicant indicated they don't pay rent but do pay utilities and use \$20,000 for maintenance. Some program grants do not allow maintenance of buildings and are allocated from other sources. \$100,000 comes in the form of county dues annually with \$60,000 as a matching component and \$20,000 for IT. Historically it was possible to save funding but with the change in OMB rules, that is no longer an option.

There is an annual utility cost of \$50,000 in the current building which is shared with a business technical assistance center. There are safety issues and overcrowding in the current location. They considered an existing building, but the cost was over 50 percent of a new building.

The Board acknowledged the similarity of the two building projects and prior discussion.

**Naghi Zeenati made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to suspend the rules and authorize funding as a \$6,936,000 grant.**

Mr. Galecki asked about the consideration of existing buildings.

The applicant indicated they considered a building in Castle Dale but the costs to fix that building were quite high. There are no other buildings in Price to accommodate the necessary space. The cost per square foot on the weatherization building is \$150.00 and \$240.00 for the admin building.

Commissioner Ogden acknowledged these projects are unique to the Board, but the regional impact to the citizens is significant.

Commissioner Dalton clarified that the operation and maintenance will be accommodated from the funds paid by the Counties.

The Chairman called the question.

**Naghi Zeenati made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to suspend the rules and authorize funding as a \$6,936,000 grant. The motion carried with Gregg Galecki opposed.**

Commissioner Dalton indicated it may be his last meeting and expressed appreciation for the Board and Chairman Hardy.

The Board members all expressed appreciation to Commissioner Dalton *and* Chairman Hardy.

## **IX. Board Member Discussion and/or Action Items**

### **9.1 CIB Board Meetings**

CIB Review Meeting, April 8, 2021 – Zoom Webinar

CIB Funding Meeting, June 3, 2021

CIB Annual Policy Sessions, June 3-4, 2021

### **9.2 CIB Board Discussion – 2021 Utah Legislative Session [2:45:22]**

SB 176 – Mineral Lease Funds Amendments

*This bill modifies provisions related to the expenditure of federal mineral lease revenues and clarifies the purposes of planning, provision of public services and construction and maintenance of public facilities.*

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The next Permanent Community Impact Board Funding Meeting will be held April 8, 2021 via Zoom Webinar at 8:30 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 11:27 a.m.

Submitted by:  
Candace Powers