

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD MEETING

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

MINUTES

November 6, 2025

Members Present

Curtis Wells
Jerry Taylor
Kirt Slaugh
Bill Winfield
Dean Baker
Jack Lytle
Greg Miles
Ralph Brown
Laura Hanson
Bruce Adams
Scott Bartholomew

Chairman
Five County Association of Governments
State Treasurer
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments - SERDA
Uintah County
Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Duchesne County
Sevier County
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
State Transportation Commission
R6 Regional Council

Staff and Visitors

Candace Powers
Heather Poulsen
Paul Moberly
Jennifer Domenici
Brook McCarrick
Brittany Hardy
Russ Finlinson
Shad Jackson
Bart Jensen
Ed Long
Keith Despain
Clint Morton
Keith Heaton
Greg Williams
Kim Clausing
Buck Peck
Kevin Nunn
Kevin Yack
Nate Zilles
Jacob Sharp
Merrial Johansen
Quinn Bennion
Alan Allred
Jade Powell
Justin Atkinson
Dave Oxman
Michael Olsen
Ben Coray
Jon Stearmer
Brian Barton
Ron Winterton
Willis LeFevre
Glade Nielson
Lori Nay

Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Attorney General's Office
Department of Workforce Services
Town of Leamington
Uintah Water Conservancy District
Jones & DeMille Engineering
Vernal City
Vernal City
Vernal City
Seven County Infrastructure Coalition
J-U-B Engineers
North Tooele Fire District
North Tooele Fire District
North Tooele Fire District
Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Castle Valley Special Service District
Johansen & Tuttle Engineering
Vernal City
Myton City
SERDA
Sunrise Engineering
Mt. Pleasant City
Mt. Pleasant City
Sunrise Engineering
Seven County Infrastructure Coalition – Legal
Jones & DeMille Engineering
State Senate – Duchesne County
Uintah County
Sunrise Engineering
Gunnison City

Mike Warner
Dennis Marker
Geri Gamber
Brian Somers

Gunnison City
Gunnison City
SERDA
Utah Mining Association

Virtual Attendees

Ann Harvey
Jay Johnson
Brian Somers
Skyler Davies
Ron Winterton
Aaron Averett
Sarah Nielson
Christy Dahlberg
Michael Mowes
Bill Prater
Jesse Ralphs
Tyler Timmons
Koy Barton
Kelly Chappell
Rebecca Banner
Jess Peterson
April Gardner

MD for 'No Coal In Oakland'
Venable
Utah Mining
Division of Water Quality
Utah Legislature – Duchesne County
Sunrise Engineering
Department of Workforce Services – PIO
Wasatch Front Regional Council
Housing and Community Development
Bond Counsel
Sunrise Engineering
R6 Regional Council
Jones & DeMille Engineering
Ensign Engineering
Department of Workforce Services
R6 Regional Council
Department of Workforce Services

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS 9:01 am

The Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB) Meeting was held on Thursday, November 6, 2025 at 1385 South State Street, SLC, Utah. Chairman Curtis Wells called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. Introductions.

BRIEFING - ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. Financial Review & Review of Agenda Items [03:15]

All the applications received for the October application deadline (October 1) are being reviewed at today's meeting. Kaylee Beck, DWS Finance provided a review of the financial reality. CIB receives around \$2.7 million a month from royalties, but there were losses in revenue for coal and CIB received \$89,000. The available revenue does not support \$30.7 million in funding requests. The Board may reduce funding amounts and/or fund a minimum of \$11 million in grant requests as interest bearing loans for this trimester. New project funding requests will be submitted in February 2026. It was recommended the Board evaluate the projects based bringing value to Rural Utah.

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

There are 8 new projects and 1 pending project on today's agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES [9:24]

Chairman Wells called for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 1, 2025 meeting.

Bill Winfield made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to approve the minutes of October 1, 2025 Meeting. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.

4. NEW PROJECTS [9:46]

4.1 Vernal City - Major Roadway Rehabilitation Project (Uintah)

Vernal City presented a funding presented a funding assistance request for a \$2,380,000 Grant / \$1,020,000 Loan, 10y @ 0.5% 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.

**Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$2,380,000 Grant / \$1,020,000 Loan, 10Y @ 0.5%

TOOL MED \$1,190,000 Grant / \$2,210,000 Loan, 10Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$3,400,000 Loan, 10Y @ 4.0%

The applicant indicated the roads get used heavily, and are in critical need of repair. This is an important project for Vernal to upgrade 16 miles of the most heavily used roadways. There was a lot of damage caused in the heavy winter a couple of years ago and the public works crew has done what they can; maintenance, crack sealing etc.

Ms. Hanson noted the financial shortfall and suggested this project be postponed for a future semester to allow the financial situation to improve. This is a good project but not necessarily critical at this time.

Commissioner Lytle indicated he considers the scores that are on the review sheet which the funding tool provides; the ranking of the project.

Mayor Baker indicated he drives those roads and they are bad. He acknowledged the funding shortfall and suggested \$2 million in grant now to start and come back for \$2 million in grant in future months.

Mr. Adams suggested a loan today and they could decide how to start.

Commissioner Lytle asked if they could use their cash with a loan for the short term.

The applicant asked the board to consider funding a phase the project; the most critical piece now. \$1 million grant, and \$1 million loan. They would come back in when they would finish the project. There is currently a chip seal project; what is not accomplished this year can be continued next year. It may be a mill and an overlay project depending on winter damage. The road improvements now will save further deterioration and expense in the future.

Mr. Slauch acknowledged this community is directly impacted by the resource development which contributes to the CIB fund.

Kirt Slauch made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,000,000 grant and \$1,000,000 loan for 10 years @ 0.5%. The motion carried with Laura Hanson opposed and the chairman abstaining.

4.2 Myton City – Culinary Water Improvements – Isolation Valves (Uintah) [25:30]

Myton City presented a funding assistance request for 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.

**Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$179,299 Grant / \$45,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%

TOOL MED \$89,299 Grant / \$135,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$225,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%

The applicant indicated during a project on Main Street there were issues and they had to turn off the whole town's water to address those issues. Isolation valves will allow certain areas to be turned off; not the whole town. It takes almost more time to drain the system and fill it back up than to fix the issue. They have more of the system to replace and the isolation valves would add a cost benefit on those next 10 miles. The system is over 50 years old and the existing isolation valves are not functioning properly. The current project was funded

by DDW. They approached DDW for this project and were told they do not have funding to help right now.

Ms. Hanson asked if they could accommodate some loan.

The applicant indicated the least amount of loan would be beneficial.

Mayor Baker referred to Myton as an oilfield man camp; small houses for workers in the oil and gas field. He recommended funding as requested.

Commissioner Miles noted that Myton has the lowest MAGI in Duchesne County and they need some help. The valves will be utilized as Myton is able to improve the water system.

Dean Baker made and Greg Miles seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$224,299 grant citing a financial hardship exemption. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.

4.3 Gunnison City – Culinary Water System – Tarr Canyon Well (Sanpete) [32:42]

Gunnison City presented a funding assistance request for \$6,900,000 (a \$5,520,000 Grant / \$1,380,000 Loan, 30y @ 2.0%) for culinary water system improvements and a new well. This project consists of culinary water system improvements to include 21,200 linear feet of 16-inch waterline, 21,200 linear feet of 12-inch waterline, 24-each service assembly's, 1 pressure reducing valve, 2,250 linear feet of horizontal drilling, connection to existing tank, 785 cubic yards of base course on roadway shoulder, 283,150 square feet of chip seal, 693 cubic yards of asphalt repair, 1 river crossing bore, restoration of fences, crops and utilities; well site and equipping to include 80 linear feet of 12-inch storm drain line, trenching, bedding, 1 each 2-inch splash box, 1 each 6-inch manhole, new well house including plumbing and fittings, 500 HP 3 phase submersible pump and appurtenances, 100 linear feet of 16-inch 236 PSI waterline from well, restoration, fill and concrete flatwork, chlorinator system master meter, SCADA, fencing, electrical, generator, engineering and bonding. DFCM \$5,500,000.

**Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$4,140,000 Grant / \$2,760,000 Loan, 30Y @ 1.0%

TOOL MED \$2,070,000 Grant / \$4,830,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$6,900,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%

The applicant indicated in 2014 Gunnison lost 2 of their wells; one completely and one no longer furnishes water. They are not able to meet the State's peak state source demand standards. They have no redundant source. They have the Central Utah Correctional Facility in their community. They have found a good well source and are now looking for funding. DFCM has provided \$5.5 million to the project but anything they do forward; cost of loans and such they will not cover. They had approximately \$5.5 million in federal community project funds but with federal cuts, that is uncertain and not looking good. They are asking CIB as a source and to keep the costs down. They have increased utility fees over the last 10 years. The correctional facility has helped some. \$35 is the base rate for the first 6,000 gallons.

Ms. Hanson asked for clarification of the Community Project Grant.

The applicant indicated they applied for that grant two years in a row and did get to top priority. They did a continuation instead of funding their project. They cannot fund it for another year or so, and the DFCM funding must be spent by July of 2026. They are seeking funding from CIB to continue the project within the time limit.

Ms. Hanson asked if they applied to the Division of Drinking Water.

The applicant stated they talked with DDW but DDW has a moratorium on funding. They have spent \$2.2 million of their own funds; it is important for the future. The CIB funding situation was acknowledged and Gunnison suggested a 60% grant and 40% loan at 0.5% which they may be able to make work.

Commissioner Bartholomew indicated he lives close to Gunnison; a lot of their need is due to the prison facility.

The prison facility also wants to expand. There are strings attached which Gunnison acknowledges.

The applicant indicated the \$5.5 million that DFCM has committed on behalf of the Central Utah Correctional Facility is not a grant; it's a prepayment of impact fees that the State is going to have to pay when they expand. They're not just giving Gunnison the money - there are the strings attached to it. In the future they will not get more money out of the state when they expand. This is money to help move this project forward.

Commissioner Miles questioned their assessed value; \$13 million. Perhaps there should be another zero as the Town's property is worth more than \$13 million. An incorrect valuation would skew the debt capacity. He also asked if this project is shovel ready.

The applicant noted they have to spend the \$5.5 million from DFCM by May, easements are pretty much done, the power requirements are being assessed and expected soon.

The project engineer noted there may be an issue with the assessed valuation. He is checking into that.

Ms. Hanson noted that on the handout, the DFCM money is set to expire in July. It is uncertain whether the money needs to be obligated by July or perhaps just have a contract in place. Given the CIB financial situation, could this project funding be at a later date.

Commissioner Winfield asked if the Board could do the loan portion right now.

Ms. Hanson suggested an increase to the loan portion and reduce the grant.

Mr. Slauch suggested awarding the loan and not the grant. He acknowledged dealing with the federal government is slow. He noted this project has been in the works for several years and the federal government may come through. If they take the federal funds it is additional funds in the State. It is easier to come to CIB wherein the federal funds get distributed to others states. He encouraged Gunnison to seek the federal options and drinking water. CIB funding is very low.

Mr. Adams suggested the 40% loan at this time.

Commissioner Bartholomew asked if they could take the entire funding as a loan at 0.5%.

The applicant noted it could increase the utility rates up to \$25.

Commissioner Bartholomew indicated that Gunnison arrived after the funding discussion; CIB has seriously depleted funds and need to shift grants to loans and reduce some requests.

The applicant asked for the loan interest rate to be 0.5% then come back at a later date for discussion for grant. The increased the rates by \$9.00 for irrigation heaters.

Mr. Adams suggested what the funding tool suggested; a \$2,760,000 loan for 3 years @ 1.0% now and they can come back.

Jerry Taylor made and Jack Lytle seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$2,760,000 loan for 30 years @ 1.0%. The motion carried with Greg Miles opposed and the chairman abstaining.

The applicant will provide a reduced scope of work as to what this phase will accomplish prior to the funding meeting.

4.4 Castle Valley Special Service District – Consolidated Capital Projects 2026 (Emery) [54:30]

Castle Valley Special Service District presented a funding assistance request for a \$1,588,000 Grant / \$1,662,000 Loan, 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.

**Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$2,600,000 Grant / \$650,000 Loan, 30Y @ 0.5%

TOOL MED \$1,300,000 Grant / \$1,950,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$3,250,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%

The applicant indicated this is their annual submission for a variety of towns and projects.

Mr. Adams spoke for Emery and stated they were a high coal producer. They have a *bond election* for a large amount and slowly use that funding to pay back the loans and do the projects.

Mr. Slauch indicated that AI is going to need a lot of energy and coal will make a comeback. He asked if the applicant could take a bit more loan with a lower interest rate.

The applicant indicated their financial advisor is not here but they might be able to structure it within the GO bond. \$1,950,000 loan and \$1,300,000 is what the funding tool median indicates.

The board discussed the funding tool median recommendation.

It was noted that Castle Valley Special Service District has requested and pays their loans in 6 years which is an advantage to the Board to keep the fund revolving.

Greg Miles made and Jerry Taylor seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,300,000 Grant and a \$1,950,000 loan for 6Y @ 0.5%.

Ms. Hanson viewed the return to CIB in the applicant's requested funding package and the median tool package.

After further discussion a substitute motion was made to fund as requested.

Jack Lytle made and Bill Winfield seconded a substitute motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,588,000 grant and a \$1,662,000 loan for 6y @ 1.5%. The motion carried with Greg Miles opposed and the chairman abstaining.

4.5 Mt. Pleasant – City Roadway and Drainage Improvements 2026 (Sanpete) [1:08:52]

Mt. Pleasant City presented a funding assistance request for a \$3,660,000 Grant / \$2,440,000 Loan, 7y @ 0.5% (total \$6,100,000) for the 2026 roadway and drainage improvements. This project consists of city roadway and drainage improvements to include 26,525 square yards of chip seal, 40,569 square yards of thin lift overlay, 4,851 square yards of GSB88 sand, 5,886 square yards of rebuild material, 7,214 square yards of milling and overlay, drainage system improvements, engineering and bonding.

**Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$3,660,000 Grant / \$2,440,000 Loan, 10Y @ 1.0%

TOOL MED \$1,830,000 Grant / \$4,270,000 Loan, 10Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$6,100,000 Loan, 10Y @ 4.0%

The applicant indicated this is a 30-40-year problem they have trying to get ahead of. In 2015 they had to take a scaled back proposal and may have to do something similar today. They have pursued other funding sources. They have done the sewer master plan and water master plan to avoid having to tear up a newly paved road. They would take a 1.0% interest as the 0.5% is outside the funding tool. They are seeking a 7 year term; this was a path so eventually in 20 years they could do all the roads in town. They could cut the project in half and come back in a few years.

Ms. Hanson suggested authorizing half the funding at a 1% interest loan and perhaps coming back for more at a later date; a \$2.44 million loan at 1% and come back later for a possible grant. Would it be 7 years or 10 years?

Commissioner Bartholomew stated that the Board may not be able to promise all grant later as that might not be possible.

Treasurer Slaugh suggested funding them at half of the requested amount.

The applicant expressed a preference for a 7-year term which fits in their 20-year plan for roads.

Chairman Wells clarified that would be a \$1,800,000 grant and a \$1,300,000 loan for 7 years @ 1.0%.

Laura Hanson made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,800,000 grant and a \$1,300,000 loan for 7y @ 1.0%.

Commissioner Miles commended them for their planning. They have been very calculated in what they do and when.

Ms. Hanson thanked them for coming with solutions to help the Board solve the funding challenge.

The Chairman called the question.

Laura Hanson made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,800,000 grant and a \$1,300,000 loan for 7y @ 1.0%. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.

The Board discussed funding balances resulting in the reduced funding packages.

Break @ 10:21 am - 10:51 am [1:26:10]

4.6 Town of Leamington – Water System Improvements – Back-up Well (Millard) [1:20:18]

The Town of Leamington presented a funding assistance request for a \$1,906,000 Grant for water system improvements to include a back-up well. 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.

**Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$1,143,000 Grant / \$763,000 Loan, 30Y @ 1.0%

TOOL MED \$571,000 Grant / \$1,335,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$1,906,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%

The applicant indicated that when the last water project went out to bid, the bids came in high. It was noted that that CIB funds were low so they downsized the project, omitted the back up well. This request is to now do the back up well and the meters for remote reading.

Commissioner Lytle noted the report from DDW which referenced deficiencies that need to be taken care of on the water system and asked if those items had been taken care of.

The applicant indicated they have completed the source protection plan and vented the chlorine facility.

Commissioner Lytle also stated on drinking water projects, the Board includes compliance with the DDW requirements in the approval of funding.

Commissioner Bartholomew asked if Leamington could accommodate some loan.

The applicant stated they currently have loan payments of \$58,000 per year. They have a water fund budget of \$70,000, they are required to do a mandatory daily chlorine check which costs \$12,000. Having had no chlorine issues for 2 years, they want to make it weekly, but it is still required daily. Leamington has 3 existing loans and are trying to maintain a \$400,000 rainy day fund. Springs supply a lot of their water and one of the springs was taken out due to groundwater intrusion which will require a treatment plant to put back on line. They do not think they can accommodate any loan funding.

Treasurer Slaugh asked about their water rates.

The applicant indicated the in-town water rate is \$33 a month for 20,000 gallons of water; the out of town rate is \$66 a month. There are about 130 water connections. A loan would require double those rates.

Treasurer Slaugh stated \$33 per month for 20,000 gallons is quite low. In fairness to other rural communities that have gone through similar water issues acknowledging it is expensive to maintain water connections and systems, low rates do not incentivize conserving water.

Commissioner Miles suggested they consider a graduating rate per 1000 gallons of water. They are over the state standard for what customers are using.

Commissioner Lytle asked what is the annual budget for operations of the water system.

The applicant indicated the water system budget is \$70,000 per year and they have \$150,000 for water in the rainy day fund.

Scott Bartholomew made and Greg Miles seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,143,000 grant and a \$763,000 loan, for 30 years @ 1.0%.

Treasurer Slaugh stated they need to make some adjustments to their water schedule. Not every connection should use 20,000 gallons at \$33 a month then seek the funds for the infrastructure to keep it flowing. He suggested giving a portion of the funding today and come back with evidence that the water schedule has been adjusted. It is of concern to provide this much in funding for small water infrastructure when they have not addressed the conservation issue.

Commissioner Bartholomew noted that the funding package will require addressing the rate structure as it includes loan funding.

Commissioner Winfield indicated that a \$763,000 loan for 30 years at 1% will necessitate a rate change.

Commissioner Miles stated that the ERC reserve is the determination of the Division of Drinking Water. There should be a block rate to capture enough revenue to pay for infrastructure projects. They have not capitalized on the water that is going out.

Treasurer Slaugh noted that applicants should make changes to their rate structures prior to coming to CIB.

After further discussion of options, it was determined that the minimum funding tool recommendation would be the motion. Water rates will need to be addressed.

The Chairman called the question.

Scott Bartholomew made and Greg Miles seconded a motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$1,143,000 grant and a \$763,000 loan,

for 30 years @ 1.0%. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.

4.7 North Tooele Fire District – Lake Point Fire Station (Tooele) [1:39:50]

The North Tooele Fire District presented a funding assistance request for a \$3,501,000 grant for a new fire station. 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.

**Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$1,750,000 Grant / \$1,751,000 Loan, 30Y @ 1.0%

TOOL MED \$875,000 Grant / \$2,626,000 Loan, 30Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$3,501,000 Loan, 30Y @ 4.0%

The applicant stated they have applied for federal funding, at the county level and state legislature. They have been successful in some areas but not funding large scale projects like fire stations and apparatus. Their I80 transportation corridor is utilized by the mineral producers through Tooele County which they protect and respond in the event of an incident. They collect taxes from Stansbury, Lake Point, Erda and Pine Canyon. They do not get taxes from Tooele County. They need to remodel the fire station in Lake Point; Lake Point is, very close to I-80 and would give a quicker response to any incidences that are out along the I-80 corridor and along the railways and want to purchase the fire apparatus.

Commissioner Miles noted they do indicate any debt.

The applicant stated they do have a loan on a fire truck currently this year which was not indicated on the application.

Commissioner Miles also noted in the minutes that when asked how much the addition would cost; *“he inquired whether the proposed funding would lead to increased taxes. Kim reiterated that the district is seeking grant funding only, with no anticipated tax increases.”* It is uncertain if the public has been well informed about the possibilities of a loan. Also, these are mineral lease funds and priority is given to counties that have direct impacts; not indirect impacts.

The applicant stated that at the time of the public hearing they didn't know that there was the hybrid or a probability of a loan.

Greg Miles made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a motion to deny this project as presented.

Treasurer Slauch suggested part loan and part grant and asked what that would do for the fire department. Strictly not being a mineral producing county has not been a cutoff.

Chairman Wells stated the Board is seeking to be consistent and striving to make good decisions with the limited funds currently available.

Commissioner Lytle referred to the funding tool scoring wherein Tooele had the lowest ranked score of the applications submitted. Historically the Board has struggled with the issue of being impacted by mineral revenue development. If the project were denied today, it does not prohibit a more informed application to give the Board clarification.

The concurred with that possibility.

Commissioner Taylor suggested Tooele have a new public hearing and explain CIB's process and there is a good chance that the funding would be a loan and come back with a new application.

Commissioner Brown noted they do not have any debt and suggested the funding for both the building and the fire truck be as a loan at 2.5%. They would need a public hearing to disclose the offered funding.

Chairman Well acknowledged the substitute motion by Commissioner Brown which was seconded by Mayor Baker. Discussion?

Commissioner Miles stated the Board should be prioritizing mineral producing counties. The Board made Vernal reduce their project and several others received reduced funding.

Treasurer Slaugh indicated that Millard County is in the same mineral producing category as Tooele.

Chairman Wells stated the Tooele public hearing was insufficient. The Board may require Tooele to reapply after a new public hearing including potential loan funding, or offer a loan which would connote a new public hearing.

Treasurer Slaugh asked the applicant their preference.

The applicant indicated they would prefer a CIB decision to discuss with their Board.

The Chairman stated there is a motion on the floor to fund the projects as a loan at 2.5%.

Commissioner Bartholomew asked if the funding was combined for the fire station and the fire truck.

Commissioner Brown indicated they would be combined in the motion.

Chairman Wells stated the motion is to combine the projects and place on the priority list as a loan at 2.5%.

The term for the fire station is 30 years and the term for the fire truck is 15 years.

Ralph Brown made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a substitute motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$3,501,000 loan for 30 years @ 2.5% for the Lakepoint Fire Station and a \$1,500,000 loan, for 15 years @ 2.5% for the Lake Point Fire Apparatus truck. The motion carried with Greg Miles opposed and the chairman abstaining.

4.8 North Tooele Fire District – Fire Apparatus Truck (Tooele) [2:30:54]

The North Tooele Fire District presented a funding assistance request for a \$1,500,000 grant for 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.

**Proposed funding tool loan/grant scenario:*

TOOL MIN \$750,000 Grant / \$750,000 Loan, 15Y @ 1.0%

TOOL MED \$375,000 Grant / \$1,125,000 Loan, 15Y @ 2.5%

TOOL MAX \$ Grant / \$1,500,000 Loan, 15Y @ 4.0%

Ralph Brown made and Scott Bartholomew seconded a substitute motion to place this project on the Priority List for possible funding at the January 8, 2026 CIB Funding Meeting as a \$3,501,000 loan for 30 years @ 2.5% for the Lakepoint Fire Station and a \$1,500,000 loan, for 15 years @ 2.5% for the Lake Point Fire Apparatus truck. The motion carried with Greg Miles opposed and the chairman abstaining.

The applicant is to have an additional public hearing prior to the funding meeting.

5. Infrastructure Projects N/A

6. Pending Projects [2:04:27]

6.1 Uintah Water Conservancy District – Engineering – Jensen Unit Pumping Plant - Phase I (Uintah)

At the September 4, 2025 CIB Meeting, this project was placed on the Priority List as a \$1,400,000 grant and \$2,600,000 loan for 30 years @ 1.0%.

The entity requested the application be placed on the pending list.

Uintah Special Service District #1 requested time on the November 6, 2025 CIB meeting to discuss project funding.

This project consists of feasibility study, environmental impact statement and preconstruction design engineering in preparation for the construction of at the Jensen Unit Pump Station on the Green River. The feasibility components include assembling existing studies, identifying and evaluating alternatives for utilizing BOR & UWCD water rights, an evaluation and update of existing cost estimates for the installation, operation and maintenance of the facility, alternative analysis of economic benefit, evaluation of water rights and culinary water demands for Ashley Valley, public outreach and 36-inch HDPE pipeline for the Burton/Burns to Sunshine road crossing.

The environmental impact statement (EIS) scope includes plan of development, notice of intent, scoping, preliminary design and alternatives, right-of-way application, baseline environment field surveys and analyses, preparation of draft EIS, final EIS and record of decision. Studies and plans require 50% cash match. The preconstruction design engineering includes topographic survey, pipeline routing and connection to existing pipelines, preliminary design, pipeline and pump station hydraulics, utility and site designs, pump station structural design, design review, cost estimates, specifications and contractor and material procurement and construction permitting and water rights for use of 12,000 Acre Feet of Green River Water. Design funding must be with the actual project.

The applicant stated in their Board meeting which included 8 different entities that work with water it was suggested not to take a loan. The request has been amended with a reduced scope \$1,570,000 as a grant and NO loan to do an 18-month project to get them to a draft. This project is developing the Green River. They have applied for a federal grant; this will get the process started to make sure the water is captured for the Uintah Conservancy District. They would then return in 18 months for the additional funding.

Treasurer Slaugh asked what part will be completed with the reduced funding.

The applicant indicated it will get the draft EIS document. Timing is critical for this project.

Commissioner Winfield stated if CIB is able to do this financially, he would make a motion to approve the reduced request of \$1,570,000 grant to allow Uintah Water Conservancy to move forward. In Grand County they are dealing with water issues out of the Colorado River and it is critical to move forward.

Treasurer Slaugh indicated there will be more water development and is a strategic development. He seconded the motion made by Commissioner Winfield.

Bill Winfield made and Kirt Slaugh seconded a motion to fund the reduced scope and funding request as a \$1,570,000 grant.

Ms. Hanson questioned if this was a study for which the Board has required a 50% cash match.

The applicant indicated this project was part of the Central Utah Project back in the '70's and is now ready to move forward as part of the engineering/permitting process required before construction. Not so much a planning effort; it is the design and permitting for the construction project.

Commissioner Lytle acknowledged this is not a typical plan for which a match would be required. It is similar to the railroad project. The NEPA is planning but not in the sense of municipal, countywide planning. It does not fit the Board rule. It is a federal requirement, not general, water or master planning. It is project preparation.

Treasurer Slaugh clarified it is a very expensive process and is different than doing quick engineering studies.

Brook McCarrick, legal counsel to the Board indicated the statutory definition of planning includes activities necessary to obtain a permit for land use approval, including review to determine the need, cost, or feasibility of obtaining a permit or land use approval.

It was noted that it is at the Board's discretion. The rule says 'normally'. *(50% cash match was established as*

there is not revenue source to pay a loan for planning so for most general, water and municipal planning, CIB would only fund half.)

The Chairman called the question.

Bill Winfield made and Kirt Slaugh seconded a motion to fund the reduced scope and funding request as a \$1,570,000 grant. The motion carried with the chairman abstaining.

The Board requested a clarification of the policy requiring 50% cash match for planning.

Break 11:55

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| 7. Supplemental Requests | N/A |
| 8. Special Consideration | N/A |

9. Board Member Discussion and/or Action Items [2:24:13]

9.1 Throughput Infrastructure Project Discussion – Two Ocean Port Applications ([35A-8-302 - 35A-8-309 statute](#))

- a. SERDA (South Eastern Regional Development Agency) Application – Phase I \$2,407,200; Phase II \$50,582,800 grant/loan (Carbon, Emery, Grand, San Juan)**
- b. SCIC – (Seven County Infrastructure Coalition) Application – Phase I - \$1,100,000 Grant (Uintah, Duchesne, Daggett, Carbon, Emery, Sevier)**

Brian Somers, President of the Utah Mining Association and Keith Heaton, Executive Director of the Seven County Infrastructure Coalition and Geri Gamber, Executive Director of SERDA participated in a discussion of the Throughput applications submitted by SCIC and SERDA.

Mr. Somers referred to the legislative accommodation for the Throughput Fund.(Amounts transferred to the fund by statute 35A-8-308 to include any voluntary contributions received; appropriations made to the fund by the Legislature; the amounts received from the repayment of loans made by the impact board under Section 35A-8-309; and interest or other earnings deposited). *The first throughput infrastructure project funded by the impact board shall be a bulk commodities ocean terminal project financed through a mixture of grant and loans, of which no less than 20% of the project costs funded by the impact board is grants.*

There are some different options in terms of port locations.

Keith Heaton stated that 10 years ago, a few members of the CIB went to Oakland and met with Phil Tagami, the developer of the Oakland Port. He noted it is good to finally be here today. He acknowledged the two applications, and that it only makes sense to have one application. SCIC and SERDA will work together.

Mr. Somers shared a presentation. He acknowledged that CIB has been involved with this for a long time. The original bill was passed back in March 2016 creating the Throughput Infrastructure Fund. *(SB0113 - Mineral lease funds moved to Transportation Investment Fund of 2005; Transportation Investment Funds moved to Throughput; there wasn't loss to the CIB because this fund was created.)*

In 2019, Senator Oakland introduced SB248; added 1st project restriction which required the first project to be a bulk commodities ocean terminal project. In the 2025 legislative session, Senator Stevenson, Senator Watkins and Representative Snyder made some further changes to the fund. It allowed the interest on the fund be used for certain types of mining projects and be put out as loan, the language was also changed that the first project to be funded is a bulk commodities port, as opposed to just considered. *“The first throughput infrastructure project funded by the impact board shall be a bulk commodities ocean terminal project financed through a mixture of grant and loans, of which no less than 20% of the project costs funded by the impact board is grants.”* This project has been pursued for 10 years; there was a lot of opposition in Oakland during that time, there have been discussions of other potential port projects; the Port of Ensenada in Baja, California, the Millennium Bulk Terminal, the Port of Eureka, California and none of those were deemed to be suitable at the

time. Now one of the ports in California that is currently shipping coal to Japan will close after 2026 as a result of a legal settlement. The remaining port is a river port; the port of Stockton and is not be economical. Utah is going to lose the ability to export coal after 2026.

The application submitted from SERDA is for the Port of Guamas in Mexico. The process was started a few years ago with SERDA as it was the only port that was feasible. It's already a deep-water port with rail infrastructure to the port. It would require some internal improvements to include constructing coal handling equipment noting the equipment and internal infrastructure of the port is quite antiquated and inefficient. There have been new developments and Keith Heaton will discuss the Port of Longview then the Port of Oakland.

Mr. Heaton stated the Port of Longview has been in existence for a long time. SCIC was approached over the summer by an individual who'd worked for 20 years on the Millennium Project which dissolved in the COVID era. Funding and political opposition from the state of Washington were issues. SCIC is working with the private developer coming in now on the ground floor. The state of Utah would have incredible flexibility on how this property was developed and used. One issue is they wanted to put 44 million tons a year of coal through that port; Utah is looking at about a quarter of that so that would significantly cut down on greenhouse gases transported through the state of Washington. Longview is the preference, but they have had multiple conversations with Oakland. The Oakland Port is also viable and there is interest from a lot of different western states and coal producers.

Mr. Somers indicated the Port of Longview did get a \$40 million grant from the Department of Energy recently to improve the rail infrastructure so there is support from the federal government. Oakland is the oversized bulk terminal that's been in discussion for a very long time. The port developers have won 3 different federal lawsuits and a state lawsuit they recently prevailed in. The California Supreme Court declined to take up the appeal from the city of Oakland, and so that state lawsuit is dead. Oakland is in a much better position: the developers do believe that there's a path forward. California is a challenge as with Washington; they don't like fossil fuels and don't want them exported out of their ports.

Mr. Somers noted the administration has also gotten involved with the Port of Guaymas. President Trump and President Sheinbaum have discussed shipping American coal out of the Port of Guaymas to Asian markets. In a call with the Department of Commerce, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Department of State and the Department of Energy, there was talk about the feasibility of the Port of Guaymas and how the federal government would participate. There hasn't been any follow-up but there is interest from the administration of the US and Mexico. The Port of Guaymas remains an option for shipping coal. Montana and Wyoming are interested in partnering with Utah in developing port capacity here and in Mexico for shipping coal. Wyoming and Montana are Powder River Basin Coal; Montana does have some coal similar to Utah at their eastern end. Powder River Basin coal is more plentiful but lower quality and price. There are efficiencies in terms of the tonnage that would be shipped but also slightly different calculations in terms of distance and price and those conversations are ongoing. The Throughput funding was established 10 years ago and there have been attempts to take the funds for other things. It is important to get these funds obligated. The application SERDA provided contemplated doing a feasibility study regarding Guaymas, Oakland and Houston; Longview will be substituted for Houston given the progress with Longview. The recommendation would be to move forward working with the Seven County Infrastructure Coalition. The state has gotten more involved in this over the last few months through GOPB, the governor's Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Entergy Development and others to make sure the feasibility study is independent and not conducted by the potential port developers or others with a financial interest. All three of these projects may be invested in or throughput purchased. The feasibility study will help determine that and Guaymas may still be a great opportunity.

Mr. Heaton noted the SCIC application was only for the study but if it is the board's preference, SCIC is not opposed to obligate the entire amount to develop a port project, beginning with the study to determine where and how much in a partnership. It is at the board's discretion on how to move forward noting that working together is far more successful than working against one another.

Chairman Wells stated that there is a Phase 1 request from SERDA and SCIC, but now the groups are working together so would the Phase 1 feasibility study be to BOTH?

Mr. Somers stated the Phase 1 request that SERDA contemplates is both a feasibility study and engineering so the SERDA request is a bit higher than SCIC. Based on the results of that study, the engineering phase can be adjusted. They would work with Seven County and with the state agencies to make sure that that feasibility study is being conducted to provide what is needed to understand and move forward.

Mr. Adams asked if the interest in the Throughput had been spent and what is the balance of the fund.

Mr. Somers indicated the interest was allowed to be loaned out for a mining project.

Chairman Wells clarified that there was a bill from Senator Stevenson where they mandated that CIB finance a fluorspar and gallium mine to support the Department of Defense with some of the interest money. The funding was a loan.

Ms. Hanson asked since there are two applications, are they being withdrawn and a new joint application will be submitted?

Mr. Somers indicated that can be done.

Ms. Hanson suggested a new application.

Mr. Somers stated it is important to get this funding obligated. The SERDA application contemplates the entire project with the bulk of the fund being obligated; SCIC is only for the feasibility study. The only change SERDA would make would be switching out Houston with Longview. The coordination could be worked out with Seven County Infrastructure Coalition.

Ms. Hanson asked if SERDA was to be the lead applicant.

Mr. Somers stated that is correct.

Ms. Hanson noted the statute says up to 2% can be funded for study; that is approximately \$1.08 million. SERDA is asking \$2.4 million. That would need to be scaled down. ***(35A-8-309 (i) grant up to 2% of the money in the Throughput Infrastructure Fund to the interlocal agency to pay or reimburse costs incurred by the interlocal agency preliminary to its acquisition of the throughput infrastructure project. 2% of \$55,165,326.38 = \$1,103,306.53)***

Mr. Somers stated perhaps that needs to be adjusted; the SERDA Phase 1 included engineering which is construction planning.

Ms. Gamber thought the 2% is for the admin cost that you can take on this application. That's the way we understand it.

Of note: 35A-8-309 (6) (a) ...may not exceed 2% for the administration of the Throughput Infrastructure Fund. (8)(i) ... grant up to 2% of the money in the Throughput Infrastructure Fund to the interlocal agency to pay or reimburse costs incurred by the interlocal agency preliminary to its acquisition of the throughput infrastructure project

Chairman Wells suggested funding the Phase 1 to SERDA today with an agreement to work with SCIC, amend the application to replace Houston with Longview, then obligating Phase 2 in the same motion.

Commissioner Brown indicated the SERDA application Phase 2 says grant/loan.

Mr. Somers noted that is at the discretion of the Board; at least 20% needs to be a grant.

Commissioner Lytle disclosed he is a member of Seven County Infrastructure Coalition but he has no personal interest in the project. He asked what would be the relationship between SERDA and Seven County as this comes forward; what has been agreed to do or not do? He supports the idea of working together but would like to know the relationship.

Ms. Gamber stated SERDA is committed to be partners with Seven County.

Mr. Somers stated there is not a formal agreement between SCIC and SERDA at this time, but if that is what the Board wants, it could be accommodated.

Mr. Heaton appreciated the flexibility; SCIC and SERDA were not aware each were applying. When SCIC became aware, they contacted SERDA. He indicated that SCIC was designed for this specific project. What's important to SCIC is that this project is expedited. This project is going to take a long time but if it is not started today, the opportunity may be missed.

Chairman Wells concurred with obligating the funds; there is support from everyone to proceed.

Ms. Hanson suggested a single application at the funding meeting which could be moved to January, before the session with an MOU between all parties; a full proposal.

Commissioner Brown and Commissioner Lytle suggested it could be put on the Priority List with authorization at the funding meeting or CIB could suspend and fund it today.

Mr. Slaugh agreed with Ms. Hanson so CIB could know who's driving the project and what salaries are getting funded in addition to feasibility studies. CIB needs to understand exactly what is being funded including the purpose. As stewards of the money, CIB needs to understand what is being funded.

Ms. Gamber concurred and indicated she would also have to talk to the SERDA board.

Mr. Slaugh asked if it the intent to have more than one deep water port or to study all of them and decide?

Mr. Somers indicated they would study the pros and cons of each port; there is not a clear understanding of what Wyoming and Montana bring in terms of tonnage and price points. What are the actual investments in each port; Port infrastructure, ownership, pre-bought throughput capacity, ongoing leases...? It is possible that some ports may have more funding such as Oakland. Utah may only be buying throughput capacity. The feasibility study may determine what is possible.

Mr. Slaugh again noted that before allocating all the money, CIB needs to understand what is actually being acquired. Throughput? Infrastructure? If it's infrastructure then who retains the ownership of that infrastructure within Utah? He noted the reality of a port is getting closer and there were times where he thought it was dead. There are 3 very viable options now so it would be difficult to wrestle that money away from CIB.

Chairman Wells indicated he was defending the fund for CIB working with Brian Somers last year and feels strongly that if Phase 2 is not obligated before the session, CIB will again be playing defense.

Mr. Slaugh acknowledged and affirmed.

Chairman Wells noted there was an amendment to take the throughput from the CIB and send it over to GOEO at one point. CIB needs a more transparent application for the Phase 1 in engineering. And if possible, to obligate the Phase 2 funds which should accomplish what is needed.

Commissioner Winfield indicated that to push this forward, he too requests solid information about Wyoming and Montana and the kind of money that they're willing to put up rather than Utah carry the load; a clear MOU between the partnering applicants so that it's clear to the partners on how this is going to move forward.

Commission Miles disclosed he is one of the co-chairs of the Seven County Infrastructure Coalition and he signed the SCIC application though he does not have any personal interest in it other than to see the success for the state of Utah. It's a huge opportunity and he thinks Seven County Infrastructure Coalition, as Director Heaton stated, was built for this project. SCIC has weathered and won a *little* case in the Supreme Court concerning another infrastructure project. There is no sense in paying twice for administrative fees; putting SCIC as the lead and including SERDA and Brian to be a part of the sub-committee makes a lot of sense.

Commissioner Bartholomew reminded the Board of the feelings he expressed in June; he is happy to see them join forces and looking at other places for the opportunity -potentially, to keep the coal industry going. Sanpete County is very dependent on it.

Commissioner Lytle stated any agency should be invited to be involved if they have the inclination or desire in whatever form. SCIC has experienced personnel so SCIC as the lead makes sense to him. Saying we'll work together without clarifying documentation makes it difficult to approve.

Mr. Somers indicated neither applicant knew the other was applying noting one of the challenges is that there's not perfect overlap, either with the AOG or SCIC in terms of the producing counties. An MOU can work a lot of that out as to how does this work between the two organizations. SERDA has put in a lot of work for a number of years. In his opinion they should not take a backseat to any other entity in the state. Having an MOU that works out who's going to be doing what so there isn't duplication of payments or effort could be determined and that all the different counties are being represented.

Commissioner Lytle indicated it would be preferable to work from one document that establishes the lead etc.

Mr. Somers indicated they are open to providing that but to Chairman Wells' point, there needs to be some formal obligation of the funds before the session.

Chairman Wells indicated agreement to have a single application provided at the next CIB meeting. Then the Boards' action would be to proceed with Phase 1 and obligate Phase 2. He is very much in support of having a single application with transparency concerning who's all involved and who is taking the lead.

Commissioner Winfield was not totally in support of Seven County taking the lead. There needs to be a solid MOU between the two of them spelled out noting it is uncertain that either one is a better option; definitely the idea of working together and co-ownership in this is what he would be looking for.

Ms. Hanson indicated it seems there is still a little politicking to be worked out in terms of who's the lead, which makes it uncomfortable to vote on anything today. There should be a new application with those details worked out. A new application should include a more detailed budget that says how the 2% authorized by statute will be spent. This will give CIB a lot more clarity, and make sure that everyone has good understanding of roles and responsibilities.

Mr. Adams appreciated that two organizations were willing to work together noting he supports having SERDA be the lead and including SCIC.

Chairman Wells indicated there are differing opinions on who the lead entity could be, but CIB has established that everyone's going to work together. He appreciated the comments that this does affect more than one association of governments. It's important to consider some of the leadership on the issue as well. This project has gone through different phases and has at times not been supported recognizing the leadership that is making sure it's moving forward. There are some details to work out, but it's clear on how to proceed in terms of just the process and the timing. CIB will decide whether it is done in December or bump the funding meeting up to January. The Board will determine the next meeting.

Mr. Slauch indicated that if the federal government is looking at this as a strategic opportunity to increase the trade opportunity in Mexico, then perhaps there needs to be a push on the federal government to step up in terms of federal money. The \$50 million should not be viewed by the federal government that they don't have to contribute. If the federal government is really trying to push Mexico, they should help with the funding.

Chairman Wells thanked Brian Somers for his leadership for the State of Utah. The involvement with the Trump administration on these projects is very encouraging and how all these connect with energy demand etc.

9.2. CIB Board Funding Meeting – January 8, 2026 in Price, Utah

Meeting Adjourned 1:03 PM.

Submitted by;
Candace Powers