

The image captures the interior of a grand, domed legislative chamber. The most striking feature is the large, multi-tiered skylight at the top, which allows natural light to illuminate the space. Below the skylight, the walls are made of light-colored stone or marble. In the center, a large, semi-circular mural depicts a historical scene with several figures in a landscape. Below the mural, a stone archway contains the text "HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES". The chamber is supported by several large, classical columns with ornate capitals. In the foreground, a wide staircase with a decorative balustrade leads up to the main level. The overall atmosphere is one of historical grandeur and formal architecture.

2023 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

UTAH ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
2023 LEGISLATIVE SESSION RECAP
OF THE
65th UTAH LEGISLATURE

For more information on the legislation in this publication and Utah Code, please visit the Utah Legislature's website:

le.utah.gov

This publication is a research tool and not the counsel of an attorney. This publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. It is provided without warranty of any kind and, as with any research tool, should be double-checked against relevant statutes, case law, advice of legal counsel, e.g., your county attorney.

© Copyright 2023 Utah Association of Counties

Outside Sources: Utah Legislature, Utah League of Cities and Towns, Wasatch Front Regional Council, and the other Associations of Government across Utah.

For questions on legislation not included in this guide, please see a member of UAC staff, and review our online bill tracker. This guide may be updated.

UAC Staff

Brandy Grace

Laura Barlow

Ezekiel Lee

Katherine Rhodes

Bryan Rodgers

Melanie Stark

UAC Legislative Advocacy

Session Summary

UAC works tirelessly to represent Utah's 29 counties. Members engaging during the session were instrumental in allowing us to accomplish as much as we did.

UAC implemented a new system of Policy Steering Committees (PSCs) this year that advised the positions taken by the Legislative Policy Steering Committee. These committees met on Tuesdays during the session and are chaired by various elected officials. The Policy Steering Committees are divided into the following six policy areas: Social and Human Services, Criminal Justice and Public Safety, Revenue and Taxation, Government Operations, Natural Resources and Public Lands, and Community Development.

Our legislative team emphasized working closely with representatives from elected office throughout the session as we engaged on various issues. Each elected official used their specific knowledge regarding their respective office in their county. This institutional knowledge went together with the longstanding relationships and understanding of the legislative process from UAC's legislative team and contract lobbyists.

Bill Tracker

The UAC bill tracker has now helped UAC through two legislative sessions. This custom software has allowed members to vote on bills remotely and in-person with just a few clicks. This in-house tool has enhanced member engagement through quick summaries, real-time voting, and instant bill updates that work with the Legislature's website.

The bill tracker is accessible through:

uacnet.org/uac-legislative-advocacy

Meetings with the Governor's Office

Every Thursday afternoon during the Legislative Session, the UAC Executive Committee met with Governor Cox's senior advisors. This was a key opportunity to voice concerns and direction from the membership on key issues raised during the Legislative Policy Committee Meeting. The Governor's staff members were made aware of legislation with serious impacts to counties where a veto would be warranted.

Effective Dates:

All bills will go into effect May 3, 2023 unless otherwise noted on the bill. All appropriations are effective July 1, 2023.

Social and Human Services

Policy Steering Committee Chairs: Arlyn Bradshaw and Barbara Tidwell

Bills monitored: 13

Bills supported: 7; 3 of which passed

Bills opposed: 1; 0 of which passed

Action Items for Counties:

HB 499 Homeless Services Amendments states that first and second-class counties must create a county winter response task force to prepare and submit a winter response plan. This plan must: show that the county will meet their targeted winter response bed count by selecting temporary winter response shelters; ensure that any temporary winter response shelter planned will meet all local zoning requirements; include a detailed transportation plan, budget, revenue sources, etc.; and include a detailed county plan for a code blue event.

Code blue events are designated by the Department of Health and Human Services and happen in temperatures of 15 degrees Fahrenheit or less for two hours or longer within the next 24 to 48 hours, or other extreme weather conditions, in counties of the first through fourth class.

Applicable local homeless councils are to work with the task force and provide them with information regarding the targeted winter response bed count, funds that may be used to mitigate the winter response plan, etc.

First class counties must annually prepare and submit their winter response plan on or before August 1 of 2023, 2024, and 2025, while second class counties must prepare and submit their winter response plan on or before August 1 in 2024 and 2025.

Appropriations:

- One of the biggest wins of the Session was the funding of an additional receiving center to be located in Logan to serve the Bear River area and the funding of up to five additional mobile crisis outreach teams (MCOTs) to serve along the Wasatch Front. (\$3.2m ongoing, \$1.8m one-time.)
- Funding of \$1.16m ongoing and \$931,300 one-time was also secured to support additional slots in state university social work programs to increase the number of therapists across the state.
- \$3m in ongoing monies was appropriated to provide the Legacy Medicaid match in increase Outpatient Medicaid fee-for-service rates for Local Mental Health Authorities. This will make a huge difference to LMHA providers.
- \$1m in one-time funds was appropriated to fund an additional ACT (Assertive Community Treatment) team.

- \$1m was appropriated from the state opioid settlement funds to be used for matching funds for county programs for MAT services in jails or for jail diversion services such as receiving centers and MCOTs.

Public Safety and Criminal Justice

Policy Steering Committee Chairs: Casey Hopes (Carbon) and Kelly Sparks (Davis)

Bills monitored: 11

Bills supported: 12

Bills opposed: 5

HB 210 Justice Court Changes (Hawkins)

HB 210 creates the Justice Court Reform Task force and makes changes to eligibility and salary requirements for justice court judges. The task force will look at the structure of the court system, appeals from justice courts to district courts, qualifications of justice court judges, and procedures and practices for small claims cases. The task force will report to the legislature before November 30 of each year. The task force will be repealed July 1, 2025. HB 210 requires that all justice court judges appointed after May 3, 2023 have a law degree. A currently sitting justice court judge who does not have a law degree may continue in office until the judge resigns, retires, is not retained, or is removed. The salary for a justice court judge cannot be less than 70% or more than 90% of a district court judge's salary. UAC will have one appointee to the task force.

SB 33 Disaster Amendments (Winterton)

This bill modifies the State Disaster Recovery Restricted Account to allow for certain emergency management expenses under certain conditions, provides funding for the Response, Recovery, and Post-disaster Mitigation Restricted Account, modifies the standards and requirements for receiving a grant from funds originating from the Response, Recovery, and Post-disaster Mitigation Restricted Account and grants rulemaking authority to the Division of Emergency Management.

Government Operations

Policy Steering Committee Chairs: Jack Lytle (Daggett) and Jerry Houghton (Tooele)

Bills monitored: 28

Bills supported: 17

Bills opposed: 8

HB 351 County Recorder Modifications (Teuscher)

After a lengthy working period with industry representatives and Rep. Jordan Teuscher, HB 351 passed in its fifth substitute form.

The enrolled bill, now Utah Code, creates the new County Recorder Standards Board comprised of industry representatives, one urban recorder, one rural recorder, and an attorney appointed by the Recorders.

SB 127 Cybersecurity Amendments (Harper)

Legislative Intent: SB 171 bolsters cybersecurity throughout the state and standardizes government entities' domains and email addresses statewide.

Local Impact: All local governments must have a top-level domain (i.e., www.county.gov) and .gov email addresses by January 1, 2025. An authorized top-level domain includes .gov, .edu, or .mil. A governmental entity may operate a website that uses a top level domain that is not an authorized top level domain if a reasonable person would not mistake the website as the government entity's primary website and the governmental website is solely for internal purposes and not intended for public use, is temporary in use for a period less than one year, or is related to an event, program or informational campaign operated by the entity in partnership with another person that is not a governmental entity. Entities may seek an exemption through the State Division of Technology Services.

Effective Date: January 1, 2025

SB 231 Government Records Access and Management Act Amendments (Bramble)

Legislative Intent: SB 231 clarifies what needs to be put together when a requested record does not exist, allows for a governmental entity to petition for relief against a vexatious requester, and requires a person outside of a governmental entity who makes a claim of business confidentiality for a record they provided to a governmental entity to indemnify the governmental entity in an action arising from the governmental entity's denial of access to the record.

Local Impact: Local governments now have protection from a person outside of a governmental entity who makes a claim of business confidentiality by way of indemnification of the governmental entity in an action arising from the local government denying a request to the record. The bill also allows for local governments

to petition for relief against a vexatious requester, providing for a hearing before the State Records Committee, allowing for judicial review of that decision, and permits the court to award reasonable attorney fees to a responder for a vexatious requester petition found to be without merit and waives governmental immunity for a claim of attorney fees.

HB 512 Elected Official Education (B.Wilson)

Legislative Intent: HB 512 requires the Legislature to host an annual summit to educate and train legislators and local elected officials in Utah.

Local Impact: Local elected officials will be invited to an annual summit to be hosted by the Legislature. The summit will cover legal requirements for elected officials, professional development, taxation, revenue, and budgeting in relation to state and local jurisdictions, and issues facing state or local jurisdictions and the role they play.

Effective Date: May 3, 2023



2023 Legislative Session Appropriations at a Glance

HB 66 Behavioral Health Crisis Commission Amendments

Sponsor: Eliason
Floor Sponsor: Wilson

- New Receiving Center (Bear River)
- Two New MCOTs (Wasatch Front)
- Virtual Crisis Outreach Team (for 3rd-6th Class Counties)

Ongoing	\$3,136,000
One-Time	\$1,764,000
Total	\$4,900,000

OSUMH will decide how the money is divided among programs.
Proposals will be accepted for grants.

State Hospital Appropriations

Forensic Competency Rate Increase

Ongoing	\$875,600
One-Time	\$0
Total	\$875,600

Recover Disproportionate Share Hospital Funding

Ongoing	\$1,123,400
One-Time	\$833,300
Total	\$1,956,700

Community Mental Health Medicaid Rate Increase

Representative Dunnigan RFA

- Provides Legacy Medicaid match required to increase Outpatient Medicaid FFS rates
- Directed to Local Mental Health Authorities
- 20% increase to certain codes

Ongoing	\$3,000,000
One-Time	-\$213,000
Total	\$2,787,000

H.B. 248 Mental Health Services for Adults

Sponsor: Judkins
Floor Sponsor: Bramble

- Funding for one or more ACT teams

Ongoing	\$0
One-Time	\$1,000,000
Total	\$1,000,000

DHHS – Integrated Healthcare Services will accept proposals for grants.

Behavioral Health Workforce Initiative
 Senator Vickers RFA

- Opens 175 student slots in social work programs
- For Utah State University, Weber State University, and University of Utah
- Emphasis on underserved populations
- Will help alleviate workforce shortage

Ongoing	\$1,167,800
One-Time	\$931,300
Total	\$2,099,100

S.B. 133 Postpartum Medicaid Coverage Amendments

Sponsor: Harper

Floor Sponsor: Acton

- Extends coverage for eligible for women for a year after end of pregnancy
- Does not include pregnancies that end in illegal abortions
- LMHAs and LSUAs will receive \$280,000 in FY 2024 and \$560,000 ongoing in FY 2025 to provide services

Ongoing	\$3,159,700
One-Time	-
Total	\$1,716,300

Matching Funds for Counties Using Opioid Funds in County Jails or Receiving Centers

- To encourage the use of opioid litigation settlement funds on county jails or receiving centers
- Counties will be able to apply for funds
- DHHS will report to SSA on outcomes, if funding should continue, and challenges faced

Ongoing	\$1,000,000
One-Time	\$0
Total	\$1,000,000

Natural Resources and Public Lands

Policy Steering Committee Chairs: Greg Miles (Duchesne) and Bruce Adams (San Juan)

Bills monitored: 6

Bills supported: 3

Bills opposed: 1

HB 262 Wildlife Management Area Amendments (Snider)

UAC worked closely with Rep. Casey Snider on this bill to ensure that the state would work closer with the counties on Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs). The sponsor decided to not go forward with the bill and that it would be an interim study item.

HB 307 Utah Water Ways (Musselman)

This bill establishes Utah Water Ways with \$2 million in one-time money and ongoing spending of \$1 million. Utah Water Ways is designed to promote water conservation like the Utah Clean Air Partnership, or UCAIR, that tackles air pollution through grants and public information campaigns.

HB 349 Water Reuse Projects Amendments (Snider)

Legislative Intent: HB 349 limits the approval of new water reuse projects that impact the Great Salt Lake but provides exceptions for projects already underway.

Local Impact: The director of the Division of Water Quality and the state engineer may not approve a water reuse project if the water would have been discharged into a tributary of the Great Salt Lake. This prohibition does not apply to a water right owned by the federal government, a water reuse project to supply water to the Great Salt Lake, a project subject to a water replacement plan, or water reuse project applications filed before November 1, 2023.

Appropriations

Nearly \$500 million to address statewide water conservation needs, including \$200 million for agricultural water optimization, \$40 million for water reuse and desalination, \$50 million for Wasatch Front aqueduct resilience, and \$50 million for water infrastructure projects.

Revenue and Taxation

Chairs: John Ulibarri (Weber) and Jake Parkinson (Tooele)

Bills monitored: 11

Bills supported: 15

Bills opposed: 2

SB 81 Property Tax Deferral Revisions (Fillmore)

SB 81 better clarifies the property tax deferrals that were created in SB 25 during the 2022 Session that allows the transfer of property to a surviving spouse without triggering the obligation to repay deferred property taxes.

Counties should be aware (through the treasurer) that qualifying property in their jurisdiction may defer property tax payments. SB 25 (2022) established a fund to reimburse taxing entities for the loss of revenue due to the deferred tax payment.

Effective Date: January 1, 2023

SB 75 Sand and Gravel Sales Tax Amendments (Sandall)

SB 75 seeks to provide additional resources to localities with gravel pits to help mitigate the impact the gravel pits have within their jurisdictions. The bill provides support through two key policy changes.

1. Establishes the point of sale for gravel and ready-mix concrete sales at the weigh station.
2. Reallocates the tax revenue that would traditionally be distributed based on population statewide to be reallocated only amongst localities with gravel pits based on their proportional share of gravel and ready-mix concrete production.

Community Development

Policy Steering Committee Chairs: Amelia Powers-Gardner (Utah) and Jon Lee (Rich)

Bills monitored: 14

Bills supported: 6

Bills opposed: 6

HB 364 Housing Affordability Amendments (Whyte)

HB 364 was a bill from the Commission on Housing Affordability (CHA) and the Unified Economic Opportunity Commission (UEOC). HB 364 clarifies the Moderate Income Housing Plan (MIHP) requirements and municipalities' reporting requirements to the Department of Workforce Services (DWS) and the processes that will be followed — including a 90-day cure window if a plan is found deficient or 10 days to appeal the findings. This bill was in response to the policy and administrative challenges that arose from HB 462 in 2022. HB 346 also clarifies the definitions, use, transfer, and calculations of state low-income housing tax credits.

Effective Date: May 3, 2023. The provisions related to Moderate Income Housing Plans took place immediately once signed by the governor.

HB 406 Land Use, Development, and Management Act Modifications (Whyte)

HB 406 is a product of the Land Use Task Force interim process. It contains numerous technical and policy changes to annexation petition protests, public improvement requirements for residential road width, development agreements, temporary land use regulations, and more.

Local Impact: Local governments may need to modify land use processes in several areas to comply with new and modified provisions.

1. *Annexation*: HB 406 modifies the definition of rural real property for the purposes of annexation petition protest. It allows municipalities to reconsider a decision denying an annexation petition. The bill also allows a boundary adjustment commission to consider the preferences of the petitioner and affected property owners who have filed a timely protest in an annexation petition.
2. *Public infrastructure improvements* - HB 406 makes several significant changes to public improvement requirements. Specifically, municipalities may not require new residential roads to be constructed in excess of 32' of width unless certain criteria are met. The bill also creates a technical appeal process for determining the validity of those criteria and provides certain public improvement standard review time constraints.

3. *Private landscaping bonds* - HB 406 clarifies the prohibition on bonding requirements for private landscaping. Bonds for public landscaping may not exceed 110% of the estimated cost of the improvements.
4. *Temporary land use restrictions* - HB 406 prohibits municipalities and counties from applying temporary land use regulations to land use applications affected by a development moratorium.
5. *Development agreements* - HB 406 clarifies that development agreements cannot be required to develop land under the established regulations. It further states that if a development agreement restricts an applicant's rights under state law, the local government must disclose in writing which rights are waived. If the local government fails to notify the applicant, those provisions in conflict with state law are void.

SB 174 Local Land Use and Development Revisions (Fillmore)

SB 174 was a bill from the Commission on Housing Affordability (CHA) and the Unified Economic Opportunity Commission (UEOC). SB 174 addresses three key topics:

1. Requires subdivision review and approval to be administrative processes, rather than legislative.
2. Requires counties and municipalities who fail to submit a Moderate Income Housing Plan (MIHP) or cure the deficiencies within their MIHP within 90 days to pay a fee of \$250 per day. The fee increases to \$500 per day if the county or municipality fails to submit a sufficient plan the following year. The revenue generated by the fees will go to the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund.
3. Modifies and clarifies policy related to Internal Accessory Dwelling Units (IADUs) to include a garage if it shares a wall with the primary residence and restricts counties and municipalities from prohibiting newly constructed IADUs after October 2021.

SB 260 Transportation Funding Requirements

modifies the 0.20% local option sales tax, commonly referred to as the "5th 5th." The bill allows any county to impose the 0.20% local option sales tax if it makes sense for their communities by removing the imposition deadline. Revenue would be distributed throughout the county based upon the transit services available within its jurisdiction. Counties with transit could impose the tax and divide the funds between transit, cities/towns, and counties. Counties without transit services could impose the tax and divide the funds between cities/towns and counties for transportation purposes.

SB 175 Rural Transportation Infrastructure Fund (Owens)

This bill creates and funds the Rural Transportation Investment Fund (RTIF) providing transportation for 3rd-6th class counties and municipalities including \$43m of one-time funding and \$7.5m in ongoing funding for rural Utah. RTIF funds will be distributed based on weighted lane miles (50%) and population (50%).

SB 185 Transportation Amendments (Harper)

This bill creates the Active Transportation Investment Fund (ATIF) to create trails for active transportation throughout the state. Critically, SB 185 also includes local governments in the Road Usage Charge (RUC) program once the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) covers their administrative costs. It is not known when this will occur.

HB 265 Sentinel Landscape Amendments (V. Peterson)

Legislative Intent: HB 265 requires municipalities and counties within 5,000 feet of a specified military installation to develop a plan ensuring the land uses within that radius are compatible with military uses.

Local Impact: Municipalities and counties must work in consultation with the Department of Veteran and Military ("the department") affairs to develop a land use plan that is compatible with military operations. If a municipality or county receives a land use application other than an individual building permit, the municipality or county must notify the department of the application. The department must then review the application within 90 days to determine whether the application is compatible with the military use. Affected military installations include Camp Williams, Hill Air Force Base, Dugway Proving Ground, The Tooele Army Depot, The Utah Test and Training Range, The Nephi Readiness Center, Cedar City Alternate Flight Facility, and Little Mountain Test Facility.

Appropriations

Over \$200 million in new money for affordable housing and homelessness initiatives and more than \$2 billion toward infrastructure and transportation improvements.

\$800M one-time and up to \$1.1B for future transportation debt service

\$45M one time and \$45M ongoing for the Active Transportation Investment Fund (ATIF)/Utah Trail Network

\$60M one time for Corridor Preservation

\$200M one time for Commuter Rail Improvements

\$977K one time for a Regional Roadway Grid Network Study

\$150M one time for Cottonwood Canyons enhanced bus service and tolls

\$241M+ one time in Various Transportation Projects

\$1.58M ongoing for a shared Local Administrative Advisor

\$108M one time for The Point Backbone Infrastructure

\$40M for Rural B&C Roads

In Depth: Transportation Legislation

SB 175 Rural Transportation Infrastructure Fund (Owens)

Spreadsheet on funding can be found below. These are estimates.

Legislative Intent: SB 175 provides \$43m one-time and ~\$7.5m ongoing funding for local government owned roads in rural Utah. For the ongoing funding, SB 175 allocates \$2 of every vehicle registration in 2024 into a special revenue fund for transportation improvements in rural municipalities and counties. In 2025 on, that amount shall be deposited with a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment. To qualify, a county must be a 3rd class county or smaller (population <175,000). Counties must have also imposed one of the local option sales tax transportation quarters and cannot have imposed the 5th 5th before January 1, 2023 (i.e., Summit County). Previous versions of this bill would have re-allocated revenue from urban areas to rural areas but the final version creates the new revenue stream.

Local Impact: The RTIF will be distributed to eligible counties and municipalities within those counties per the class B&C road fund distribution formula (50% population, 50% weighted lane miles) beginning on January 1, 2024 so long as the county has imposed one of the local option sales taxes for transportation.

Effective Date: July 1, 2023. Diversion of vehicle registration revenue to the Rural Transportation Infrastructure Fund begins January 1, 2024.

SB260, Transportation Funding Requirements (Sen. Kirk Cullimore/Rep. Val Peterson)

This bill modifies the .20% local option transportation sales tax, also known as the "5th 5th." SB136 in 2018 created this new county-imposed sales tax option specifically for public transit capital expenses and service delivery. Therefore, it is only eligible to be imposed in counties that have or are planning to have transit service; to date, the 5th 5th has only been imposed in one County (Summit). The statutory authorization for imposition expires June 30, 2023.

SB 260 would allow (but not require) any county to impose the .20% local option sales tax, if and when the timing makes sense for their communities, with distribution of revenues dependent upon the class of county and presence of transit. SB260 would (1) eliminate the imposition deadline, (2) allow counties *with* transit service to impose the .20% to divide the funds between transit, cities, and counties, (3) allow counties *without* transit service to impose the .20% and divide the funds between cities and counties for transportation purposes.

Allows **Salt Lake County** to impose .20% and divide the revenue:

- .05% to cities and towns for transportation purposes
- .05% to the county for transportation purposes
- .10% for transit (to the County of the First Class Highway Projects Fund (CFCHPF)
 - The CFCHPF transit funds can be used to provide funding or loans for public transit projects, operations, and supporting infrastructure in Salt Lake County.
 - Three years after the tax is imposed, the .10% for transit would then be split with .05% to CFCHPF, and .05% to the state Transit Transportation Investment Fund (TTIF). These TTIF funds must be used in the county where the revenue was generated, for transit projects, operations, or maintenance. No local match is required.

Allows **Weber, Davis, and Utah Counties** to impose .20% and divide the revenue:

- .05% to cities and towns for transportation purposes
- .05% to the county for transportation purposes
- .10% for transit (to the transit provider)
 - Three years after the tax is imposed, the .10% for transit would then be split with .05% to transit, and .05% to the state Transit Transportation Investment Fund (TTIF). These TTIF funds must be used in the county where the revenue was generated, for transit projects, operations, or maintenance. No local match is required.

Allows a county whose boundary is partially within a transit area (**Cache, Box Elder, Tooele, Duchesne, Uintah, Iron, and Washington Counties**) to impose the .20% and distribute:

- **for the area with transit:** .05% for transit, .075% to the cities and towns, and .075% to the county for transportation purposes
- **for the area without transit:** .08% to cities and towns and .12% to the county for transportation purposes

Allows a **county without transit** to impose the .20% and distribute .08% to cities and towns, and .12% to the county, for transportation purposes.

Provisions related to the city/town/unincorporated .05%:

- The funds are distributed by the standard 50/50 population/point-of-sale local sales tax distribution formula:

- 50% based on the percentage that the population of each area, city, or town bears to the total population of all counties that have imposed this local option
 - 50% based on the location of the transaction
- Eligibility for a city, metro township, town, or unincorporated counties to receive their .05% funds depends on their compliance with moderate income housing planning (MIHP) requirements (this provision only applies to cities that are required to comply with MIHP reporting per [10-9a-408\(1\)\(e\)](#)). This provision creates an incentive for municipalities to plan for moderate income housing.

Transportation provisions:

- Transit funding must be used for capital expenses and service delivery expenses.
- Local transportation funds can be used broadly for any transportation purposes as described in [59-12-2212.2](#).

Process provisions:

- Eliminates the imposition deadline of June 30, 2023.
- The .20% can be imposed by action of the county legislative body (same as current law).
- SB260 does not impact any local option transportation sales taxes that are already in place.

SB 185 Transportation Amendments (Harper)

Legislative Intent: SB 185 was one of the annual transportation interim committee bills.

1. Creates the Active Transportation Investment Fund (ATIF) that may be used to implement and maintain paved pedestrian and non-motorized trails that are a part of an approved active transportation plan.
2. Modifies Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) involvement in project planning for large public transit districts.
3. Enables revenue (more than the cost of agency administration) from the Road Usage Charge (RUC) program to be invested into the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) and shared with local governments according to the Class B & C road funding distribution formula. For the first time, local governments will now participate in the revenue stream from the RUC. State law requires UDOT to implement the full RUC program by 2030 as a supplement to the motor fuel tax.
4. Creates a fund within the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) Fund for loans to publicly owned infrastructure projects in greenfield areas located within one mile of an existing municipal or county water supply, wastewater distribution facility, or wastewater facility.
5. Coordinates with the vertiport provisions contained in [SB 161](#) and [SB 24](#).

Local Impact: Local governments may see small amounts of additional Class B&C revenue from the RUC program once UDOT covers their administrative costs. It is unsure when this will occur.

HB 301 Transportation Tax Amendments (Schultz)

Legislative Intent: HB 301 aligns and updates transportation revenue with changing consumer behavior through 3 key changes to transportation related taxes and fees.

1. Increases vehicle registration by \$7 for yearly registration and \$5 for a six-month registration.
2. Implements the Electric Vehicle Charging Tax to be levied on retail charging stations at 12.5%.
3. Temporarily reduces the motor fuel tax by decreasing the rate to 14.2% and maximum rack price and gradually increases the maximum rack price over time.

County Impact: The provisions related to the motor fuel tax in HB 301 may result in a short-term reduction of B&C road allocations; however, that loss will be partially absorbed by the increased registration fee and implementation of the Electric Vehicle Charging Tax. Before HB 301, the motor fuel tax was close to hitting the state cap. HB 301 elongates the time frame before the motor fuel tax will hit the state cap and the bill also slightly increases the cap from \$0.40/gallon to \$0.42/gallon. Over time, HB

301 will result in an increase of B&C road allocations as the maximum rack price for the motor fuel tax increases.

Effective Date: January 1, 2024. Provisions related to the motor fuel tax shall be effective July 1, 2023

Local Option (Transportation) Sales Taxes												
Utah State law authorizes the imposition of local option sales taxes for transportation. These local options provide funding for city and county roads, active transportation needs, and public transit.												
COUNTY	Quarter 1		Quarter 2		Quarter 3		Quarter 4	5th 5th (0.20%)				
UTAH CODE SECTION:	59-12-2213	59-12-2215	59-12-2214	59-12-2216	59-12-2217	59-12-2218	59-12-2219	59-12-2220	SB260			
USE:	TRANSIT	ROAD, TRANSIT, AIRPORT, or TRAIL	TRANSIT or AIRPORT	ROAD, TRANSIT, AIRPORT, or TRAIL	TRANSIT	ROAD, TRANSIT, or TRAIL						
RATE:	0.25%	0.30%	0.25%	0.30%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	0.20%	0.20%			
ENTITY:	county, city, town	city, town	county, city, town	county	county	2nd county or city, town	county	county	county			
% ALLOCATION:	100% Transit	Varies	100% Transit	Varies	COG>>Legislative Body	MPO	40% Transit, 40% City, 20% County	100% Transit	Varies by counties with or without transit			
TAX CODE:	MT. Mass Transit	HT	MA. Additional Mass Transit	MF. Mass Transit Fixed Guideway	CT. County Option Transportation	HH. Co Airport, Highway, Transit	AT. Transportation Infrastructure	CP. County Public Transit				Imposition Totals
Beaver							0.25					0.25
Box Elder	*	*	*									
Cache	*				0.25		0.25					0.50
Carbon		*					0.25					0.25
Daggett							0.25					0.25
Davis	0.30^		0.25		0.25		0.25					1.05
Duchesne		*					0.25					0.25
Emery		*					0.25					0.25
Garfield												
Grand		*					0.25					0.25
Iron		*										
Juab	*	*										
Kane												
Millard							0.25					0.25
Morgan		*			0.25		0.25					0.50
Piute												
Rich							0.25					0.25
Salt Lake	0.30		0.25		0.25		0.25					1.05
San Juan		*					0.25					0.25
Sanpete		*					0.25					0.25
Sevier		*					0.25					0.25
Summit	*		0.25		0.25		0.25	0.20				0.95
Tooele	*				0.25		0.25					0.50
Uintah		*					0.25					0.25
Utah	0.25					0.25	0.25					0.75
Wasatch	*	*		0.30	0.25							0.55
Washington		*					0.25					0.25
Wayne												
Weber	0.30^		0.25		0.25		0.25					1.05
County Totals	4	0	4	1	8	1	21	1				
Source:	https://tax.utah.gov/sales/rates											
Notes:	0.30^ is the 0.25 (59-12-2213) plus 0.05 supplemental tax (59-12-2203) totalling 0.30.											
	* Cities and towns imposed.											
SB260 Allocation:												
	Salt Lake County: .05% cities/towns for any transportation purpose; .05% county for any transpo purpose; .10% transit to CFCHPF for transit projects or operations and supporting infrastructure (after 3yrs half to TTIF w/no match req).											
	Davis/Utah/Weber: .05% cities/towns for any transportation purpose; .05% county for any transpo purpose; .10% transit provider for transit projects, operations, maintenance (after 3yrs half to TTIF w/no match req).											
	Counties partially in Transit Area (BoxElder/Cache/Duschene/Iron/Summit/Tooele/Uintah/Wasatch) - With Transit: .05% transit, .075% cities/towns for transpo, .075% county for transpo; Without Transit: .08% cities/towns for transpo, .12% county for transpo.											
	Counties without Transit: .08% cities/towns, .12% county for transpo purposes.											

County	Jurisdiction	Weighted Lane Miles	Amount of Total Fund	% of total	SB175 Revenue 1st year	Subsequent Years (Annual)
Beaver	Unincorporated Area	2,278.25	\$ 1,879,741.79	2.4291%	\$ 1,093,110.52	\$ 157,893.74
Beaver	Beaver	208.9	\$ 278,475.73	0.3599%	\$ 161,939.66	\$ 23,391.28
Beaver	Milford	75.73	\$ 105,674.05	0.1366%	\$ 61,451.75	\$ 8,876.36
Beaver	Minersville	50.2	\$ 65,714.88	0.0849%	\$ 38,214.62	\$ 5,519.89
Beaver County	Beaver County	2,613.08	\$ 2,329,606.45	3.0105%	\$ 1,354,716.56	\$ 195,681.28
						\$ -
Box Elder	Unincorporated Area	3,569.02	\$ 3,204,945.19	4.1417%	\$ 1,863,744.98	\$ 269,207.61
Box Elder	Bear River	35.04	\$ 55,348.94	0.0715%	\$ 32,186.61	\$ 4,649.18
Box Elder	Brigham City	476.28	\$ 988,430.42	1.2773%	\$ 574,793.68	\$ 83,025.75
Box Elder	Corinne	62.26	\$ 75,517.08	0.0976%	\$ 43,914.82	\$ 6,343.25
Box Elder	Deweyville	2.8	\$ 15,196.88	0.0196%	\$ 8,837.31	\$ 1,276.50
Box Elder	Elwood	91.55	\$ 110,288.05	0.1425%	\$ 64,134.89	\$ 9,263.93
Box Elder	Fielding	25.69	\$ 37,633.44	0.0486%	\$ 21,884.66	\$ 3,161.12
Box Elder	Garland	65.45	\$ 132,592.97	0.1713%	\$ 77,105.68	\$ 11,137.49
Box Elder	Honeyville	91.94	\$ 124,161.05	0.1604%	\$ 72,202.34	\$ 10,429.23
Box Elder	Howell	68.8	\$ 62,940.75	0.0813%	\$ 36,601.41	\$ 5,286.87
Box Elder	Mantua	53.91	\$ 77,922.85	0.1007%	\$ 45,313.82	\$ 6,545.33
Box Elder	Perry	144.41	\$ 288,688.99	0.3731%	\$ 167,878.89	\$ 24,249.17
Box Elder	Plymouth	43.15	\$ 48,015.90	0.0620%	\$ 27,922.28	\$ 4,033.22
Box Elder	Portage	32.87	\$ 35,055.55	0.0453%	\$ 20,385.56	\$ 2,944.58
Box Elder	Snowville	31.9	\$ 30,781.73	0.0398%	\$ 17,900.24	\$ 2,585.59
Box Elder	Tremonton	192.95	\$ 463,985.89	0.5996%	\$ 269,817.83	\$ 38,973.69
Box Elder	Willard	69.64	\$ 118,007.57	0.1525%	\$ 68,623.96	\$ 9,912.35
Box Elder County	Box Elder County	5,057.66	\$ 5,869,513.25	7.5850%	\$ 3,413,248.96	\$ 493,024.85
						\$ -
Cache	Unincorporated Area	1,805.79	\$ 2,035,827.66	2.6308%	\$ 1,183,877.84	\$ 171,004.58
Cache	Amalga	45.13	\$ 50,002.39	0.0646%	\$ 29,077.47	\$ 4,200.08
Cache	Clarkston	37.5	\$ 51,278.85	0.0663%	\$ 29,819.76	\$ 4,307.30
Cache	Cornish	33.27	\$ 34,537.25	0.0446%	\$ 20,084.16	\$ 2,901.05
Cache	Hyde Park	204.68	\$ 304,332.82	0.3933%	\$ 176,976.12	\$ 25,563.22
Cache	Hyrum	227.82	\$ 449,686.24	0.5811%	\$ 261,502.28	\$ 37,772.55
Cache	Lewiston	193.12	\$ 210,245.08	0.2717%	\$ 122,262.06	\$ 17,660.08
Cache	Logan	758.4	\$ 2,096,653.13	2.7094%	\$ 1,219,249.16	\$ 176,113.77
Cache	Mendon	50.98	\$ 78,553.52	0.1015%	\$ 45,680.57	\$ 6,598.30

County	Jurisdiction	Weighted Lane Miles	Amount of Total Fund	% of total	SB175 Revenue 1st year	Subsequent Years (Annual)
Cache	Millville	79.18	\$ 124,332.40	0.1607%	\$ 72,301.98	\$ 10,443.62
Cache	Newton	44.9	\$ 58,336.79	0.0754%	\$ 33,924.11	\$ 4,900.15
Cache	Nibley	163.93	\$ 338,298.73	0.4372%	\$ 196,728.03	\$ 28,416.27
Cache	North Logan	249.09	\$ 509,026.92	0.6578%	\$ 296,010.17	\$ 42,757.02
Cache	Paradise	61.57	\$ 77,075.93	0.0996%	\$ 44,821.32	\$ 6,474.19
Cache	Providence	202.81	\$ 391,501.13	0.5059%	\$ 227,666.38	\$ 32,885.14
Cache	Richmond	100	\$ 162,483.80	0.2100%	\$ 94,487.85	\$ 13,648.24
Cache	River Heights	41.75	\$ 93,695.48	0.1211%	\$ 54,485.95	\$ 7,870.19
Cache	Smithfield	296	\$ 615,960.50	0.7960%	\$ 358,194.36	\$ 51,739.19
Cache	Trenton	49.82	\$ 54,572.62	0.0705%	\$ 31,735.16	\$ 4,583.97
Cache	Wellsville	137.9	\$ 225,099.75	0.2909%	\$ 130,900.38	\$ 18,907.83
Cache County	Cache County	4,783.64	\$ 7,961,500.98	10.2884%	\$ 4,629,785.09	\$ 668,746.74
						\$ -
Carbon	Unincorporated Area	2,063.28	\$ 1,879,592.14	2.4289%	\$ 1,093,023.50	\$ 157,881.17
Carbon	East Carbon	56.03	\$ 107,090.85	0.1384%	\$ 62,275.65	\$ 8,995.37
Carbon	Helper	95.9	\$ 142,230.99	0.1838%	\$ 82,710.40	\$ 11,947.06
Carbon	Price	260.5	\$ 463,216.14	0.5986%	\$ 269,370.21	\$ 38,909.03
Carbon	Scotfield	11.05	\$ 9,733.82	0.0126%	\$ 5,660.43	\$ 817.62
Carbon	Sunnyside	17.5	\$ 98,093.53	0.1268%	\$ 57,043.51	\$ 8,239.62
Carbon	Wellington	60.48	\$ 2,699,957.47	3.4891%	\$ 1,570,083.69	\$ 226,789.87
Carbon County	Carbon County	2,564.74		0.0000%	\$ -	\$ -
						\$ -
Daggett	Unincorporated Area	684.74	\$ 568,339.27	0.7344%	\$ 330,501.58	\$ 47,739.12
Daggett	Dutch John	48.01	\$ 43,143.33	0.0558%	\$ 25,088.78	\$ 3,623.93
Daggett	Manila	28.01	\$ 32,203.90	0.0416%	\$ 18,727.26	\$ 2,705.05
Daggett County	Daggett County	760.76	\$ 643,686.50	0.8318%	\$ 374,317.63	\$ 54,068.10
						\$ -
Duchesne	Unincorporated Area	3,662.40	\$ 3,276,299.78	4.2339%	\$ 1,905,239.22	\$ 275,201.22
Duchesne	Altamont	14.47	\$ 19,033.21	0.0246%	\$ 11,068.22	\$ 1,598.74
Duchesne	Duchesne	101.3	\$ 130,837.69	0.1691%	\$ 76,084.95	\$ 10,990.05
Duchesne	Myton	50.62	\$ 58,105.33	0.0751%	\$ 33,789.51	\$ 4,880.71
Duchesne	Roosevelt	240.5	\$ 402,507.13	0.5201%	\$ 234,066.61	\$ 33,809.62
Duchesne	Tabiona	9.94	\$ 12,465.72	0.0161%	\$ 7,249.09	\$ 1,047.09
Duchesne County	Duchesne County	4,079.23	\$ 3,899,248.86	5.0389%	\$ 2,267,497.58	\$ 327,527.43
						\$ -

County	Jurisdiction	Weighted Lane Miles	Amount of Total Fund	% of total	SB175 Revenue 1st year	Subsequent Years (Annual)
Emery	Unincorporated Area	2,811.24	\$ 2,317,794.74	2.9952%	\$ 1,347,847.79	\$ 194,689.13
Emery	Castle Dale	71.14	\$ 103,492.23	0.1337%	\$ 60,182.97	\$ 8,693.10
Emery	Clawson	14.53	\$ 16,737.19	0.0216%	\$ 9,733.04	\$ 1,405.88
Emery	Cleveland	29.96	\$ 39,550.56	0.0511%	\$ 22,999.51	\$ 3,322.15
Emery	Elmo	30.45	\$ 37,016.26	0.0478%	\$ 21,525.76	\$ 3,109.28
Emery	Emery	47.48	\$ 47,835.18	0.0618%	\$ 27,817.19	\$ 4,018.04
Emery	Ferron	80.8	\$ 110,605.59	0.1429%	\$ 64,319.54	\$ 9,290.60
Emery	Green River	79.47	\$ 90,353.78	0.1168%	\$ 52,542.68	\$ 7,589.50
Emery	Huntington	93.05	\$ 134,199.94	0.1734%	\$ 78,040.17	\$ 11,272.47
Emery	Orangeville	60.59	\$ 86,666.07	0.1120%	\$ 50,398.20	\$ 7,279.74
Emery County	Emery County	3,318.71	\$ 2,984,251.53	3.8565%	\$ 1,735,406.84	\$ 250,669.88
						\$ -
Garfield	Unincorporated Area	1,977.31	\$ 2,740,809.10	3.5419%	\$ 1,593,839.80	\$ 230,221.30
Garfield	Antimony	24.19	\$ 23,197.62	0.0300%	\$ 13,489.92	\$ 1,948.54
Garfield	Boulder	32.65	\$ 33,416.16	0.0432%	\$ 19,432.22	\$ 2,806.88
Garfield	Bryce Canyon	9.3	\$ 17,523.32	0.0226%	\$ 10,190.19	\$ 1,471.92
Garfield	Cannonville	7.72	\$ 11,972.08	0.0155%	\$ 6,962.02	\$ 1,005.63
Garfield	Escalante	92.5	\$ 99,070.42	0.1280%	\$ 57,611.59	\$ 8,321.67
Garfield	Hatch	18.22	\$ 18,804.03	0.0243%	\$ 10,934.95	\$ 1,579.49
Garfield	Henrieville	9.06	\$ 14,157.68	0.0183%	\$ 8,233.00	\$ 1,189.21
Garfield	Panguitch	109.56	\$ 141,574.30	0.1830%	\$ 82,328.52	\$ 11,891.90
Garfield	Tropic	89.2	\$ 87,119.13	0.1126%	\$ 50,661.66	\$ 7,317.80
Garfield County	Garfield County	2,369.71	\$ 3,187,643.83	4.1193%	\$ 1,853,683.86	\$ 267,754.34
						\$ -
Grand	Unincorporated Area	3,584.99	\$ 3,018,378.53	3.9006%	\$ 1,755,252.43	\$ 253,536.46
Grand	Castle Valley	46.26	\$ 48,085.13	0.0621%	\$ 27,962.54	\$ 4,039.03
Grand	Moab	135.35	\$ 273,086.80	0.3529%	\$ 158,805.88	\$ 22,938.63
Grand County	Grand County	3,766.60	\$ 3,339,550.45	4.3156%	\$ 1,942,020.85	\$ 280,514.12
						\$ -
Iron	Unincorporated Area	2,766.22	\$ 2,559,946.74	3.3081%	\$ 1,488,664.42	\$ 215,029.31
Iron	Brian Head	84.42	\$ 72,869.13	0.0942%	\$ 42,374.98	\$ 6,120.83
Iron	Cedar City	807.91	\$ 1,751,175.28	2.2630%	\$ 1,018,346.32	\$ 147,094.47
Iron	Cedar Highlands	0				
Iron	Enoch	218.01	\$ 407,121.80	0.5261%	\$ 236,750.14	\$ 34,197.24
Iron	Kanarrville	23.83	\$ 32,963.63	0.0426%	\$ 19,169.06	\$ 2,768.86

County	Jurisdiction	Weighted Lane Miles	Amount of Total Fund	% of total	SB175 Revenue 1st year	Subsequent Years (Annual)
Iron	Paragonah	46	\$ 53,805.77	0.0695%	\$ 31,289.22	\$ 4,519.55
Iron	Parowan	155.26	\$ 218,423.67	0.2823%	\$ 127,018.09	\$ 18,347.06
Iron County	Iron County	4,101.65	\$ 5,096,306.02	6.5858%	\$ 2,963,612.23	\$ 428,077.32
						\$ -
Juab	Unincorporated Area	3,279.00	\$ 2,700,417.33	3.4897%	\$ 1,570,351.11	\$ 226,828.49
Juab	Eureka	44.5	\$ 55,414.85	0.0716%	\$ 32,224.93	\$ 4,654.71
Juab	Levan	56.59	\$ 71,163.61	0.0920%	\$ 41,383.18	\$ 5,977.57
Juab	Mona	86.25	\$ 121,633.09	0.1572%	\$ 70,732.27	\$ 10,216.88
Juab	Nephi	225.2	\$ 372,655.10	0.4816%	\$ 216,707.00	\$ 31,302.12
Juab	Rocky Ridge	30.64	\$ 49,859.17	0.0644%	\$ 28,994.19	\$ 4,188.05
Juab	Santaquin (Part 2)	1.3	\$ 1,511.87	0.0020%	\$ 879.19	\$ 126.99
Juab County	Juab County	3,723.48	\$ 3,372,655.03	4.3584%	\$ 1,961,271.88	\$ 283,294.83
						\$ -
Kane	Unincorporated Area	1,793.84	\$ 1,594,765.29	2.0609%	\$ 927,390.52	\$ 133,956.41
Kane	Alton	21.72	\$ 21,174.14	0.0274%	\$ 12,313.22	\$ 1,778.58
Kane	Big Water	59.56	\$ 61,874.34	0.0800%	\$ 35,981.27	\$ 5,197.29
Kane	Glendale	20	\$ 25,736.86	0.0333%	\$ 14,966.54	\$ 2,161.83
Kane	Kanab	220.93	\$ 324,548.21	0.4194%	\$ 188,731.81	\$ 27,261.26
Kane	Orderville	18.09	\$ 32,916.63	0.0425%	\$ 19,141.73	\$ 2,764.92
Kane County	Kane County	2,134.14	\$ 2,061,015.48	2.6634%	\$ 1,198,525.10	\$ 173,120.29
						\$ -
Millard	Unincorporated Area	5,286.53	\$ 4,381,336.48	5.6619%	\$ 2,547,841.97	\$ 368,021.62
Millard	Delta	178.03	\$ 255,495.94	0.3302%	\$ 148,576.42	\$ 21,461.04
Millard	Fillmore	147.02	\$ 198,633.84	0.2567%	\$ 115,509.88	\$ 16,684.76
Millard	Hinckley	55.84	\$ 63,999.66	0.0827%	\$ 37,217.19	\$ 5,375.82
Millard	Holden	32.26	\$ 39,568.76	0.0511%	\$ 23,010.09	\$ 3,323.68
Millard	Kanosh	37.71	\$ 46,073.97	0.0595%	\$ 26,793.01	\$ 3,870.10
Millard	Leamington	12.27	\$ 17,805.63	0.0230%	\$ 10,354.36	\$ 1,495.63
Millard	Lynndyl	24.4	\$ 23,221.67	0.0300%	\$ 13,503.90	\$ 1,950.56
Millard	Meadow	24.55	\$ 29,728.32	0.0384%	\$ 17,287.66	\$ 2,497.11
Millard	Oak City	27.2	\$ 40,282.35	0.0521%	\$ 23,425.06	\$ 3,383.62
Millard	Scipio	69.4	\$ 66,959.19	0.0865%	\$ 38,938.22	\$ 5,624.41
Millard County	Millard County	5,895.21	\$ 5,163,105.83	6.6721%	\$ 3,002,457.76	\$ 433,688.34
						\$ -

County	Jurisdiction	Weighted Lane Miles	Amount of Total Fund	% of total	SB175 Revenue 1st year	Subsequent Years (Annual)
Morgan	Unincorporated Area	418.69	\$ 592,380.04	0.7655%	\$ 344,481.81	\$ 49,758.48
Morgan	Morgan	113.2	\$ 217,573.36	0.2812%	\$ 126,523.62	\$ 18,275.63
Morgan County	Morgan County	531.89	\$ 809,953.39	1.0467%	\$ 471,005.42	\$ 68,034.12
						\$ -
Piute	Unincorporated Area	720.44	\$ 588,334.21	0.7603%	\$ 342,129.07	\$ 49,418.64
Piute	Circleville	68.44	\$ 71,958.01	0.0930%	\$ 41,845.14	\$ 6,044.30
Piute	Junction	56.96	\$ 52,491.97	0.0678%	\$ 30,525.22	\$ 4,409.20
Piute	Kingston	19.36	\$ 19,779.49	0.0256%	\$ 11,502.20	\$ 1,661.43
Piute	Marysvale	65.66	\$ 64,067.43	0.0828%	\$ 37,256.60	\$ 5,381.51
Piute County	Piute County	930.86	\$ 796,631.11	1.0295%	\$ 463,258.23	\$ 66,915.08
						\$ -
Rich	Unincorporated Area	786.96	\$ 665,731.43	0.8603%	\$ 387,137.23	\$ 55,919.82
Rich	Garden City	55.85	\$ 63,854.27	0.0825%	\$ 37,132.64	\$ 5,363.60
Rich	Laketown	22.49	\$ 27,488.20	0.0355%	\$ 15,984.98	\$ 2,308.94
Rich	Randolph	33.32	\$ 39,763.70	0.0514%	\$ 23,123.45	\$ 3,340.05
Rich	Woodruff	14.03	\$ 16,589.87	0.0214%	\$ 9,647.37	\$ 1,393.51
Rich County	Rich County	912.65	\$ 813,427.47	1.0512%	\$ 473,025.67	\$ 68,325.93
						\$ -
San Juan	Unincorporated Area	4,655.18	\$ 4,040,040.01	5.2208%	\$ 2,349,370.69	\$ 339,353.54
San Juan	Blanding	125.84	\$ 204,686.82	0.2645%	\$ 119,029.81	\$ 17,193.20
San Juan	Bluff	58.6	\$ 54,761.80	0.0708%	\$ 31,845.17	\$ 4,599.86
San Juan	Monticello	84.5	\$ 124,152.26	0.1604%	\$ 72,197.23	\$ 10,428.49
San Juan County	San Juan County	4,924.12	\$ 4,423,640.89	5.7165%	\$ 2,572,442.90	\$ 371,575.09
						\$ -
Sanpete	Unincorporated Area	1,626.80	\$ 1,456,430.85	1.8821%	\$ 846,946.05	\$ 122,336.65
Sanpete	Centerfield	62.6	\$ 92,043.80	0.1189%	\$ 53,525.46	\$ 7,731.46
Sanpete	Ephraim	129.8	\$ 277,986.92	0.3592%	\$ 161,655.41	\$ 23,350.23
Sanpete	Fairview	58.74	\$ 84,741.36	0.1095%	\$ 49,278.93	\$ 7,118.07
Sanpete	Fayette	26.9	\$ 29,344.02	0.0379%	\$ 17,064.18	\$ 2,464.83
Sanpete	Fountain Green	69.23	\$ 93,025.84	0.1202%	\$ 54,096.54	\$ 7,813.94
Sanpete	Gunnison	86.13	\$ 176,806.53	0.2285%	\$ 102,816.82	\$ 14,851.32
Sanpete	Manti	148.35	\$ 225,961.16	0.2920%	\$ 131,401.30	\$ 18,980.19
Sanpete	Mayfield	35.79	\$ 46,142.88	0.0596%	\$ 26,833.08	\$ 3,875.89
Sanpete	Moroni	58	\$ 94,680.92	0.1224%	\$ 55,059.00	\$ 7,952.97

County	Jurisdiction	Weighted Lane Miles	Amount of Total Fund	% of total	SB175 Revenue 1st year	Subsequent Years (Annual)
Sanpete	Mt. Pleasant	168	\$ 248,704.03	0.3214%	\$ 144,626.77	\$ 20,890.53
Sanpete	Spring City	93.23	\$ 104,681.23	0.1353%	\$ 60,874.40	\$ 8,792.97
Sanpete	Sterling	8.77	\$ 15,579.20	0.0201%	\$ 9,059.64	\$ 1,308.61
Sanpete	Wales	21.42	\$ 27,766.16	0.0359%	\$ 16,146.62	\$ 2,332.29
Sanpete County	Sanpete County	2,593.76	\$ 2,973,894.90	3.8431%	\$ 1,729,384.23	\$ 249,799.94
						\$ -
Sevier	Unincorporated Area	2,138.00	\$ 1,820,395.25	2.3524%	\$ 1,058,599.23	\$ 152,908.78
Sevier	Annabella	48.84	\$ 65,179.09	0.0842%	\$ 37,903.05	\$ 5,474.89
Sevier	Aurora	40.1	\$ 62,683.47	0.0810%	\$ 36,451.79	\$ 5,265.26
Sevier	Central Valley	48.93	\$ 59,342.39	0.0767%	\$ 34,508.88	\$ 4,984.62
Sevier	Elsinore	65.34	\$ 72,381.74	0.0935%	\$ 42,091.55	\$ 6,079.89
Sevier	Glenwood	34.1	\$ 42,112.49	0.0544%	\$ 24,489.32	\$ 3,537.35
Sevier	Joseph	26.41	\$ 30,198.86	0.0390%	\$ 17,561.29	\$ 2,536.63
Sevier	Koosharem	40.5	\$ 40,210.51	0.0520%	\$ 23,383.28	\$ 3,377.59
Sevier	Monroe	124.49	\$ 177,847.80	0.2298%	\$ 103,422.34	\$ 14,938.78
Sevier	Redmond	38	\$ 54,165.14	0.0700%	\$ 31,498.20	\$ 4,549.74
Sevier	Richfield	272.02	\$ 470,931.19	0.6086%	\$ 273,856.68	\$ 39,557.08
Sevier	Salina	94.91	\$ 151,816.64	0.1962%	\$ 88,284.66	\$ 12,752.23
Sevier	Sigurd	22.5	\$ 30,651.15	0.0396%	\$ 17,824.31	\$ 2,574.62
Sevier County	Sevier County	2,994.14	\$ 3,077,915.72	3.9775%	\$ 1,789,874.59	\$ 258,537.44
						\$ -
Tooele	Unincorporated Area	3,670.26	\$ 3,672,966.26	4.7465%	\$ 2,135,909.36	\$ 308,520.24
Tooele	Erda	209.44		0.0000%	\$ -	\$ -
Tooele	Grantsville	307.56	\$ 642,719.72	0.8306%	\$ 373,755.42	\$ 53,986.89
Tooele	Rush Valley	48.5	\$ 52,676.63	0.0681%	\$ 30,632.60	\$ 4,424.71
Tooele	Stockton	36.06	\$ 48,232.81	0.0623%	\$ 28,048.42	\$ 4,051.44
Tooele	Tooele	736.5	\$ 1,702,470.85	2.2001%	\$ 990,023.64	\$ 143,003.41
Tooele	Vernon	46.2	\$ 45,359.25	0.0586%	\$ 26,377.39	\$ 3,810.07
Tooele	Wendover	57	\$ 80,417.10	0.1039%	\$ 46,764.28	\$ 6,754.84
Tooele County	Tooele County	5,111.52	\$ 6,244,842.62	8.0700%	\$ 3,631,511.11	\$ 524,551.60
						\$ -
Uintah	Unincorporated Area	4,822.99	\$ 4,579,033.36	5.9173%	\$ 2,662,806.98	\$ 384,627.68
Uintah	Ballard	109.43	\$ 123,368.24	0.1594%	\$ 71,741.30	\$ 10,362.63
Uintah	Naples	99.86	\$ 151,097.95	0.1953%	\$ 87,866.73	\$ 12,691.86
Uintah	Vernal	242.47	\$ 506,647.12	0.6547%	\$ 294,626.26	\$ 42,557.13
Uintah County	Uintah County	5,274.75	\$ 5,360,146.67	6.9268%	\$ 3,117,041.27	\$ 450,239.29

County	Jurisdiction	Weighted Lane Miles	Amount of Total Fund	% of total	SB175 Revenue 1st year	Subsequent Years (Annual)
						\$ -
Wasatch	Unincorporated Area	1,119.10	\$ 1,184,600.05	1.5308%	\$ 688,870.56	\$ 99,503.53
Wasatch	Charleston	37.45	\$ 43,659.11	0.0564%	\$ 25,388.72	\$ 3,667.26
Wasatch	Daniel	52.7	\$ 70,836.74	0.0915%	\$ 41,193.10	\$ 5,950.11
Wasatch	Heber	379.01	\$ 818,629.93	1.0579%	\$ 476,051.02	\$ 68,762.92
Wasatch	Hideout	43.63	\$ 65,536.66	0.0847%	\$ 38,110.99	\$ 5,504.92
Wasatch	Independence	43.68	\$ 39,023.46	0.0504%	\$ 22,692.99	\$ 3,277.88
Wasatch	Interlaken	17.85	\$ 19,914.14	0.0257%	\$ 11,580.50	\$ 1,672.74
Wasatch	Midway	161.42	\$ 317,159.34	0.4099%	\$ 184,435.02	\$ 26,640.61
Wasatch	Park City (part 2)	5	\$ 4,578.96	0.0059%	\$ 2,662.76	\$ 384.62
Wasatch	Wallsburg	17.86	\$ 23,415.25	0.0303%	\$ 13,616.47	\$ 1,966.82
Wasatch County	Wasatch County	1,877.70	\$ 2,587,353.65	3.3436%	\$ 1,504,602.13	\$ 217,331.42
						\$ -
Wayne	Unincorporated Area	1,829.04	\$ 1,510,682.95	1.9522%	\$ 878,494.82	\$ 126,893.70
Wayne	Bicknell	39.2	\$ 41,664.35	0.0538%	\$ 24,228.72	\$ 3,499.70
Wayne	Hanksville	14.7	\$ 16,758.61	0.0217%	\$ 9,745.49	\$ 1,407.68
Wayne	Loa	47.55	\$ 54,298.02	0.0702%	\$ 31,575.47	\$ 4,560.90
Wayne	Lyman	23.52	\$ 25,093.95	0.0324%	\$ 14,592.67	\$ 2,107.83
Wayne	Torrey	39.2	\$ 38,845.19	0.0502%	\$ 22,589.32	\$ 3,262.90
Wayne County	Wayne County	1,993.21	\$ 1,687,343.08	2.1805%	\$ 981,226.51	\$ 141,732.72
						\$ -
			\$ 77,383,191.18	100.0000%	\$ 45,000,000.00	\$ 6,500,000.01

Interim

The work of the 2023 Legislative Session leads us to 2023 interim in preparation of the 2024 Legislative Session. Below is a list of interim items pertinent to counties. Policy Steering Committees will continue to be active during interim.

Please cross-reference the list below with the complete list of interim study items that the legislature will consider:

<https://le.utah.gov/interim/2023/pdf/00002359.pdf>

Interim Items for Counties

Committee (Senate and House Committee Chairs)

Item

Business and Labor (Bramble and Maloy)

ESG Overview

Economic Development and Workforce
Services (Winterton and Stenquist)

Rural Motion Picture Incentive
Program

Homeless Services

Housing Affordability

Outdoor Recreation Funding

Rural Emergency Services

Government Operations (Thatcher and
Musselman)

Election Laws and
Administration

County Recorders

Health and Human Services (Kennedy
and Ivory)

Contingency Planning for
Continuity of Health and Human
Services
Human Services

Judiciary (Weiler and Hawkins)

Mental Health and Criminal
Justice

Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
(Grover and Wilcox)

Correctional Facilities
Corrections Housing and
Security Audit
Criminal Justice and Resource
Infrastructure
Public Safety Workforce
Substance Use and Criminal
Justice
School Safety and Security

Natural Resources, Agriculture, and
Environment (Sandall and Brooks)

Wildlife Management
Water Issues
Mining Regulatory Processes
and Operations
Land Issues
Boards and Commissions

Political Subdivisions (McKell and
Dunnigan)

Limited-Use Infrastructure
Districts
Tax Increment Financing Audit
Recommendations

Metro Townships
Growth in Public Treasurer's
Investment Fund
General Aviation Long-term
Leases
State Land Authorities
Report from the County
Recorder Standards Board

Public Utilities, Energy, and Technology
(Hinkins and Albrecht)

Utility Issues
Energy Production
Grid Resilience
Intermountain Power Agency
and Intermountain Power Plant
Audit
Cybersecurity Audit

Revenue and Taxation (McCay and
Eliason)

Sales and Use Tax
Property Tax

Retirement and Independent Entities
(Harper and Acton)

Post-retirement Employment
Update from PEHP
Utah Communications Authority

Transportation (Harper and
Christofferson)

Active Transportation
Transportation Funding

Electrification of the
Transportation System (Road
Usage Charge Program)
Railroads

