BOARD OF DAVIS COUNTY COMMISSIONERS MINUTES

Board of Davis County Commissioners - Work Session Minutes
Tuesday, April 21, 2026

The Board of Davis County Commissioners met for a scheduled meeting at 8:00 AM on April 21, 2026, in room 306 of the Davis County Administration Building, 61 South Main Street, Farmington, Utah. Required legal notice of this meeting was given.

All documents from this meeting are on file in the Davis County Clerk's Office. The agenda for this meeting is incorporated into the minutes as item headers.

Following the approved Davis County policy, artificial intelligence (AI) was utilized in the preliminary creation of these minutes. The final minutes were edited and completed by Davis County Clerk's Office staff.

ROLL CALL

Chair John Crofts
Vice Chair Bob Stevenson
Commissioner Lorene Kamalu
County Clerk Brian McKenzie
County Controller Scott Parke
Chief Deputy Civil Attorney Neal Geddes
County Treasurer Matt Brady
County Assessor Andy Hansen [arrived at 8:04 AM]
Clerk's Office Solana Guest

AGENDA ITEM

1 8:04 - 8:06 AM
#2026-414. A Work Session to Discuss the State Auditor Fraud Risk Assessment - *recommended by Scott Parke, County Controller, Controller's Office*

[Listed as Item 2 on the agenda, this item was presented first in the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts].

[01:20] Scott Parke, County Controller, presented the internal Fraud Risk Assessment [see Attachment A], which is required as part of the State's annual Auditor audit. Controller Parke explained that the County will review their internal controls, then fill out the questionnaire. Based on the questionnaire, the County scored itself 370 out of 395 points, which places the County firmly in the "very low risk" category. Controller Parke emphasized that the County has adequate separation of duties, as well as mitigating controls working alongside the Treasurer and the County tax system [see Attachment A2].

[02:33] Controller Parke identified two main areas for improvement:

1. Cash Receiving and Deposits: The County currently lacks a formal policy but will be implementing one shortly.
2. Ethical Behavior Certification: The County currently utilizes conflict of interest forms but will now require all County employees—not just elected officials and department heads—to annually commit, in writing, to a statement of ethical behavior.

[03:25] Controller Parke then showed the County's answers for how they handle the "Basic Separation of Duties," and he noted that a more detailed explanation was provided for how the County is mitigating the risk of blank checks. Blank checks no longer require the same strict safeguarding because they no longer have routing and accounting numbers printed on them, and the bank requires the Treasurer to upload an approved list of checks before any will clear.

[03:50]The Commission had no further questions, and Controller Parke said that after the Commission Chair signs the assessment, it will be turned into the State Auditor's Office.

2 8:06 - 8:24 AM

#2026-405. A Work Session to Discuss Two 1347 Applications, Two Late Appeals, and One Exempt Application - *recommended by Cheri Mayer, Tax Administration Lead, Tax Administration*

[Listed as Item 1 on the agenda, this item was presented second in the meeting, due to scheduling conflicts].

[04:20] Andy Hansen, County Assessor, presented the Tax Review Committee's recommendations to the Commission for the following requests.

Two 1347 Applications:

1. The first application involved is a request to waive late fees and interest caused when a payment sent to the lock box was returned undeliverable. The issue was not caused by County error, and the Committee recommends denying the application.
2. The second application requested a late fee of $43.91 be waived after a payment was mistakenly mixed in with property payments going to other states. The issue was not caused by County error, and the Committee recommends denying the application.

[05:55] Commissioner Stevenson asked Assessor Hansen if County-caused tax issues are dwindling, and Assessor Hansen answered that the County will continue to be at fault sometimes, just not in these two particular cases. Matt Brady, County Treasurer, said that to prevent future lock box issues, the County is planning to transition its lock box services from Wells Fargo in Seattle to a local Zions Bank service in Salt Lake.

[07:57] Assessor Hansen presented two late appeals that fit within statutory guidelines for acceptance:

1. The County's factual error caused a property to be evaluated higher than it should be. The Committee recommended accepting the appeal.
2. The Committee recommends acceptance of the appeal for medical reasons.

[08:50] Assessor Hansen introduced a late exempt application from the Christian Life Center in Layton. The entity had renewed its current property's tax-exempt status, but failed to submit a new application for a newly acquired property, only leaving a written note about the new parcel on its renewal application. Controller Parke added that because it was a renewal, the County did not review it and see the added note until the deadline for new applications had passed. The Committee recommended denying the application because writing a note does not constitute a formal application. Assessor Hansen noted that the application for the new property has not been reviewed to determine if it would qualify for a tax-exempt status. Commissioner Stevenson asked if the County could deny the application but still review it for consideration, and Controller Parke answered that if the Commission denies the application, it would not be considered again until next year. Commissioner Crofts asked if the decision could be delayed while the application is reviewed, and Controller Parke explained that the two options are to deny or accept the application, then it would continue on for further review. Brian McKenzie, County Clerk, clarified that the acceptance or denial is with regard to the late application, not determining if the property will qualify for tax exemption.

[13:10] Commissioner Stevenson inquired if Christian Life Center's history of applications shows punctuality, to which Assessor Hansen explained that while he wasn't sure, he expected so, since they currently have a tax-exempt property. He reiterated that even if the County were to accept the late application, it would still be reviewed to see if they would qualify for tax exemption, since only certain land purposes qualify. Commissioner Kamalu expressed hesitation about picking and choosing who gets an exemption, emphasizing the need for consistency. Commissioner Stevenson brought up that the County has accepted late applications in the past, and asked why this situation is different than previous ones. Neal Geddes, Chief Deputy Attorney, explained that the County has a set of criteria for late application consideration, and this situation does not fit within them. Controller Parke said that the County should not make this decision solely based on what they've done in the past. He added that while the situation isn't the County's fault, they could be justified in accepting the late application since, as new applications are reviewed first, the note informing the County of an additional property wasn't viewed until after the deadline.

[17:00] Commissioner Stevenson said that while the Commission has tried to be consistent in its decisions, it has also chosen to show understanding. Chief Deputy Geddes noted that the Committee aims to use statutes to recommend actions and relies on the Commission to decide on any exceptions. Controller Parke calculated that, assuming it's an average house, the taxes would be about $3,500.00. Commissioner Crofts clarified that provisionally, the Commission would be justified to make either decision, and Controller Parke confirmed that to be true. Commissioner Stevenson and Commissioner Crofts both advocated for granting the exception. Commissioner Kamalu maintained her reservations, cautioning against potential bias toward a familiar organization and arguing that an experienced entity should already understand the proper application procedures. In contrast, Commissioner Crofts interpreted the written note as a good-faith effort to comply, and Commissioner Stevenson emphasized that not all organizations possess large, dedicated accounting departments to flawlessly track every administrative requirement. Commissioner Crofts echoed this support, noting that innocent administrative errors can easily occur when different personnel handle the paperwork. Controller Parke said that the Committee would accept the late exempt application, and would present the other four in Commission meeting.

3 8:24 - 8:39 AM
#2026-415. A Work Session to Discuss the 2026 Operating and Capital Budgets - *recommended by Scott Parke, County Controller, Controller's Office*

[22:35] Controller Parke reviewed the unaudited 2025 Financial Performance and the proposed 2026 budget change requests, noting that the numbers are subject to change.

2025 Financial Review [see Attachment B]:

- Revenues: The County spent $6.5 million more than it brought in, which was significantly better than the anticipated $11 million loss (resulting in a positive variance of $4.7 million).
    - Grant revenue was up $2.5 million, and fees for services increased by $1.6 million (partially due to an accounting change where $1 million in Sheriff charges to unincorporated areas are now properly recorded as revenue rather than transfers).
    - Sales tax rose by 3.8% and property tax by 2.9%, though real property tax growth was closer to 1.5% due to a spike in delinquent tax collections.
    - Interest income dropped due to the planned spending of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds.
- Expenditures:
    - Salary and benefits expenses rose by 4.2%.
    - Contracted services increased by 50% ($3.5 million) because 2025 included a full year of the Corrections medical care contract, compared to only six months in 2024.
    - Operating budgets didn't vary much between what was expected and what was actually spent.

Controller Parke noted that the County's fund balances remain healthy within minimum requirements (between 16% and 32%) across the General, Animal Care, Health, and Library Funds. He stated that the County is not "in trouble" financially this year, and that steps have been taken to ensure staying in the green moving forward.

[27:18] Controller Parke detailed the yet unapproved changes to the 2026 Budget [see Attachment C]:

- Code Blue Expenses: The Health Department billed the County $22,000.00, which will be covered by incoming additional State grant money.
- Justice Court Judges Pay: A statutory calculation error requires a $1,700.00 adjustment, easily covered by the Contingency Fund.
- Golf Course New Spending: There is an unexpected asphalt repair costing $150,000.00 that had been previously discussed with the Commissioners.
- Health Department New Spending: There had also been previous discussion regarding server upgrades, costing $50,000.00.
- South Davis Metro Fire District Opioid Grant Request: The fire district requested the use of $37,000.00 in opioid settlement funds to purchase secure lock boxes for narcotics in their ambulances, replacing insecure briefcases. Controller Parke noted that the County had only allocated $29,500.00 total for local grants and currently lacks a formal application process. Commissioner Kamalu stressed the importance of creating a formal, written application and evaluation process for fairness. Commissioner Stevenson pushed to support the fire district due to their persistence for this need over the past two years, adding that he believes a grant of $25,000.00 would be sufficient for them. Commissioner Crofts expressed support for providing them with the full amount they requested. Commissioner Kamalu agreed with the lowered amount, pointing out that the fire district could raise the rest of the money, and the County could create an official grant application process. The Commission agreed to the compromise: they will grant the fire district $25,000.00, leaving roughly $4,500.00 in the fund for the year, and will work on creating a formal grant application process for future cycles. Controller Parke

confirmed the opioid fund is designed as a quasi-endowment, projected to have roughly $7.5 million by 2045.

- Tourism Rollover: Tourism requested to roll over $41,500.00 of approved 2025 budget funds into 2026 to finish delayed projects.

Controller Parke stated he will schedule a public hearing to formalize these budget amendments.

4 8:45- 9:27 AM
#2026-440. A Closed Session for Reasons Permitted Under Utah Code Annotated § 52-4-205(1)(a), Except as Provided in Subsection (3), Discussion of the Character, Professional Competence, or Physical or Mental Health of an Individual - *recommended by Lorene Kamalu, Davis County Commissioner, Commissioners' Office*

Commissioner Crofts excused those not involved in Item 4.

VOTING:
Motion to Enter into a Closed Session: Bob Stevenson. Second: Lorene Kamalu. All present voted aye.

[See Page 5 for the Closed Meeting Declaration]

Upon returning from the Closed Session, Commissioner Crofts said no actions were taken.

MEETING ADJOURNED
The meeting adjourned at 09:27 AM.

ATTACHMENTS
All publicly distributed materials associated with this meeting are noted as the following attachments:

1. A1-4: Fraud-Risk-Assessment-Questionnaire Completed
2. B1-2: FY 2025 General Fund Financial Report
3. C1: Potential Budget Changes

Minutes Prepared by:	Minutes Approved on:
Solana Guest	05/05/2026
Deputy Clerk	

Brian McKenzie (May 7, 2026 13:06:06 MDT)	John Crofts John Crofts (May 6, 2026 21:22:16 MDT)
Brian McKenzie	John V. Crofts
Davis County Clerk	Commission Chair

DAVIS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Closed Meeting Declaration **Affidavit of Vice Chair**

I, Bob J Stevenson, being first duly sworn upon oath deposes and states as follows:

1. I am the current Vice Chair of the Davis County Commission.
2. The sole purpose for closing the Davis County Work Session on April 21, 2026, was to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual as described in Utah Code Section 52-4-205(1)(a).

Dated this 21st day of April, 2026.

Davis County

Bob J Stevenson, Vice Chair
Board of Davis County Commissioners

Subscribed and sworn to before me, Brian McKenzie, the Davis County Clerk, on this 21st day of April, 2026, by Bob J Stevenson.

Brian McKenzie
Davis County Clerk

Office of the
State Auditor

Questionnaire

Revised December 2020

Fraud Risk Assessment

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Reference the *Fraud Risk Assessment Implementation Guide* to determine which of the following recommended measures have been implemented.
- Indicate successful implementation by marking “Yes” on each of the questions in the table. Partial points may not be earned on any individual question.
- Total the points of the questions marked “Yes” and enter the total on the “Total Points Earned” line.
- Based on the points earned, circle/highlight the risk level on the “Risk Level” line.
- Enter on the lines indicated the entity name, fiscal year for which the Fraud Risk Assessment was completed, and date the Fraud Risk Assessment was completed.
- Print CAO and CFO names on the lines indicated, then have the CAO and CFO provide required signatures on the lines indicated.

Utah State Capitol, Suite 260 • Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-2310 • Tel: (801) 538-1025 • auditor.utah.gov

Fraud Risk Assessment

Continued

*Total Points Earned: 370 /395 *Risk Level:

Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
> 355	316-355	276-315	200-275	< 200

	Yes	Pts
1. Does the entity have adequate basic separation of duties or mitigating controls as outlined in the attached Basic Separation of Duties Questionnaire?	X	200
2. Does the entity have governing body adopted written policies in the following areas:		
a. Conflict of interest?	X	5
b. Procurement?	X	5
c. Ethical behavior?	X	5
d. Reporting fraud and abuse?	X	5
e. Travel?	X	5
f. Credit/Purchasing cards (where applicable)?	X	5
g. Personal use of entity assets?	X	5
h. IT and computer security?	X	5
i. Cash receipting and deposits?		5
3. Does the entity have a licensed or certified (CPA, CGFM, CMA, CIA, CFE, CGAP, CPFO) expert as part of its management team?	X	20
a. Do any members of the management team have at least a bachelor's degree in accounting?	X	10
4. Are employees and elected officials required to annually commit in writing to abide by a statement of ethical behavior?		20
5. Have all governing body members completed entity specific (District Board Member Training for local/special service districts & interlocal entities, Introductory Training for Municipal Officials for cities & towns, etc.) online training (training.auditor.utah.gov) within four years of term appointment/election date?	X	20
6. Regardless of license or formal education, does at least one member of the management team receive at least 40 hours of formal training related to accounting, budgeting, or other financial areas each year?	X	20
7. Does the entity have or promote a fraud hotline?	X	20
8. Does the entity have a formal internal audit function?	X	20
9. Does the entity have a formal audit committee?	X	20

*Entity Name: Davis County

*Completed for Fiscal Year Ending: 12/31/2026 *Completion Date: 04/13/2026

*CAO Name: John Crofts, Commission Chair *CFO Name: Scott Parke, Controller

*CAO Signature: ______________________ *CFO Signature: ______________________

*Required

Basic Separation of Duties

See the following page for instructions and definitions.

	Yes	No	MC*	N/A
1. Does the entity have a board chair, clerk, and treasurer who are three separate people?	X			
2. Are all the people who are able to receive cash or check payments different from all of the people who are able to make general ledger entries?	X			
3. Are all the people who are able to collect cash or check payments different from all the people who are able to adjust customer accounts? If no customer accounts, check "N/A".	X			
4. Are all the people who have access to blank checks different from those who are authorized signers?			X	
5. Does someone other than the clerk and treasurer reconcile all bank accounts OR are original bank statements reviewed by a person other than the clerk to detect unauthorized disbursements?	X			
6. Does someone other than the clerk review periodic reports of all general ledger accounts to identify unauthorized payments recorded in those accounts?	X			
7. Are original credit/purchase card statements received directly from the card company by someone other than the card holder? If no credit/purchase cards, check "N/A".	X			
8. Does someone other than the credit/purchase card holder ensure that all card purchases are supported with receipts or other supporting documentation? If no credit/purchase cards, check "N/A".	X			
9. Does someone who is not a subordinate of the credit/purchase card holder review all card purchases for appropriateness (including the chief administrative officer and board members if they have a card)? If no credit/purchase cards, check "N/A".	X			
10. Does the person who authorizes payment for goods or services, who is not the clerk, verify the receipt of goods or services?	X			
11. Does someone authorize payroll payments who is separate from the person who prepares payroll payments? If no W-2 employees, check "N/A".	X			
12. Does someone review all payroll payments who is separate from the person who prepares payroll payments? If no W-2 employees, check "N/A".	X			

* MC = Mitigating Control

Davis County

Controller

Davis County Administration Building - P.O. Box 618 - Farmington Utah 84025
Telephone: (801) 451-3491 – Fax: (801) 451-3432

Scott Parke, CPA, MBA
Controller

Risk Being Mitigated:

The Treasurer has access to signature authority and physical check stock, which could potentially allow for the bypass of standard procurement workflows.

Control Description:

- Non-Negotiable Stock: The County utilizes blank security check stock that does not contain pre-printed routing or account numbers.
- System-Restricted Encoding: The MICR encoding and signature can only be applied to the paper by the accounting software, which requires a "ready to pay" status from the Payables Department.
- Independent Bank Reconciliation: The bank reconciliation is performed monthly by an individual outside of the Treasurer's office and would verify that every cleared check corresponds to a system-approved transaction.

2025 Financial Performance: Year-over-Year Analysis

General Fund | 2024 Actual vs. 2025 Actual

Preliminary and unaudited

Net Fiscal Impact (Deficit)

($6,468,928)

The deficit increased by **$1,895,368** compared to 2024 ($4,573,560).

Revenue Comparison

Category	2024 Actual	2025 Actual	Variance	% Change
Grants*	$9,573,756	$12,067,370	+$2,493,614	26.0%
Fees for Service**	$6,871,198	$8,491,016	+$1,619,818	23.6%
Sales Taxes	$25,052,573	$25,995,781	+$943,208	3.8%
Property Taxes	$40,001,950	$41,185,102	+$1,183,152	2.9%
Interest Income	$1,385,427	$521,400	($864,027)	-62.4%

Expenditure Comparison

Category	2024 Actual	2025 Actual	Variance	% Change
Salaries & Benefits	$66,018,256	$68,766,495	($2,748,239)	4.2%
General & Contract***	$6,984,936	$10,458,420	($3,473,484)	49.7%
Operating Supplies*	$5,491,093	$5,333,178	+$157,915	-2.9%

Footnotes

** Excludes $19.85M Davis Behavioral Health accounting wash to maintain an accurate comparison.*
*** Includes $1,038,909 reclassification of Municipal Services payments previously recorded as Transfers.*
**** The category increase was primarily driven by a $2.6M increase in the Medical Care contract within Corrections.*

2025 Budget Performance: Variance Analysis

General Fund | 2025 Revised Budget vs. 2025 Actual

Preliminary and unaudited

Net Fiscal Performance (Improvement)

+$4,728,798

The General Fund performed **$4.73M better** than the budgeted deficit of $11.2M.

Revenue Variance

Category	Revised Budget	Actual	Variance	% Change
Sales Tax	$24,700,000	$25,995,781	+$1,295,781	5.2%
Fees for Service***	$7,290,857	$8,491,016	+$1,200,160	16.5%
Grants*	$11,393,820	$12,067,370	+$673,550	5.9%
Interest Income	$1,330,000	$521,400	($808,600)	-60.8%
Opioid Transfer	$990,358	$0	($990,358)	-100.0%

Expenditure Variance

Category	Revised Budget	Actual	Variance	% Change
Payroll (Salary/Benefits)	$69,881,429	$68,766,495	$1,114,934	-1.6%
Operating Supplies*	$7,115,317	$5,333,178	$1,782,140	-25.0%
General & Contract	$11,142,420	$10,458,420	$684,000	-6.1%

Footnotes

** Excludes $19.85M Davis Behavioral Health accounting wash to maintain an accurate comparison.*
*** The County opted not to utilize the $1M budgeted Opioid funding transfer in 2025, preserving those funds for future use.*
**** Include reclassification of law enforcement charges to the municipal services fund of $1M.*

Davis County

Summary of Adjustments to the 2026 Operating and Capital Budgets

Hearing	Yes

Description	Revenues	Expenditures
GENERAL FUND		
New Spending		
Rent Expense - Charged to Health Department	$ 22,000.00	$ 22,000.00
Code Blue Expenses	$ 13,000.00	$ 13,000.00
Justice Court Judges Pay		$ 1,758.54
GENERAL FUND Total	**$ 35,000.00**	**$ 36,758.54**
GOLF COURSE		
New Spending		
Unexpected asphalt thickness		$ 150,000.00
GOLF COURSE Total		**$ 150,000.00**
HEALTH		
New Spending		
IS Server, Firewall Upgrades		$ 50,000.00
HEALTH Total		**$ 50,000.00**
OPIOID		
New Spending		
Request for Opioid Spending		$ 7,500.00
OPIOID Total		**$ 7,500.00**
TOURISM		
New Spending		
New Staff needed to keep up with demand for services at WSP	$ 171,287.00	$ 171,287.00
Rollover		
Carryforward of 2025 approved project funds not fully expended by 12/31/2025		$ 41,587.00
TOURISM Total	**$ 171,287.00**	**$ 212,874.00**
Grand Total	**$ 206,287.00**	**$ 457,132.54**