WEBER COUNTY GOVERNMENT RECORDS ACCESS AND MANAGEMENT ACT APPEALS BOARD

SHAUNA MILLER, Appellant, vs. WEBER COUNTY, Appellee.	**DECISION AND ORDER** Appeal re: GRAMA request #26-1348

Appellant Shauna Miller appealed the denial of Weber County record request #26-1348 under Utah's Government Records Access and Management Act ("GRAMA"). A hearing to consider the appeal was held on October 12, 2026. Having considered the arguments, evidence presented, and all applicable statutes and ordinances, the Weber County GRAMA Appeals Board ("Appeals Board") now orders as follows:

I. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The Appellant seeks unredacted copies of conflict of interest disclosure forms submitted by county commissioner Gage Froerer in 2025 and 2026.
2. The County denied the request for those two unredacted forms, based on a determination that Utah Code Ann. § 20A-11-1604(7)(a) and Utah Code Ann. § 63A-19-408(1) required redaction of information regarding current and previous employment and information regarding other individuals in Commissioner Froerer's household.
3. Section 63A-19-408 was renumbered from 63G-2-303 as of May 6, 2026, but it appears that the Legislature has not yet updated § 20A-11-1604(7)(a) to reflect that numbering change; § 20A-11-1604(7)(a) still refers to § 63G-2-303, which no longer exists. The

applicable portions of § 63A-19-408 have remained the same at all times relevant to this appeal.

4. The current language of Utah Code Ann. § 20A-11-1604(7) was added by the Legislature in 2025, through HB 504. The same bill also amended § 20A-11-1604(6). The amendments took effect on May 7, 2025.

5. As a result of the amendments that took effect on May 7, 2025, the relevant portions of Utah Code Ann. § 20A-11-1604(6) and (7) are as follows:

> (6) A conflict of interest disclosure described in Subsection (3), (4), or (5) shall include:
>
> . . .
>
> (b) subject to Subsection (7):
>
> (i) the name and address of each of the regulated officeholder's current employers and each of the regulated officeholder's employers during the preceding year; and
>
> (ii) for each employer described in this Subsection (6)(b), a brief description of the employment, including the regulated officeholder's occupation and, as applicable, job title;
>
> . . .
>
> (h) subject to Subsection (7):
>
> (i) the name of the regulated officeholder's spouse; and
>
> (ii) the name of each of the regulated officeholder's spouse's current employers and each of the regulated officeholder's spouse's employers during the preceding year, if the regulated officeholder believes the employment may constitute a conflict of interest;
>
> . . .
>
> (7)
>
> (a) In making the disclosure described in Subsection (6)(b) or (h), if a regulated officeholder or regulated officeholder's spouse is an at-risk government employee, as that term is defined in Subsection 63G-2-303(1)(a), the regulated officeholder may request the filing officer to redact from the conflict of interest disclosure:
>
> (i) the regulated officeholder's employment information under Subsection (6)(b); and
>
> (ii) the regulated officeholder's spouse's name and employment information under Subsection (6)(h).
>
> (b) A filing officer who receives a redaction request under Subsection (7)(a) shall redact the disclosures made under Subsection (6)(b) or (h) before the filing officer makes the conflict of interest disclosure available for public inspection.

6. The relevant portion of Utah Code Ann. § 63A-19-408(1) (formerly found in § 63G-2-303(1)) is as follows:

> (1) As used in this section:
> (a) "At-risk government employee" means a current or former:
> . . .
> (ix) state, federal, or local government employee who, because of the unique nature of the employee's regular work assignments or because of one or more recent credible threats directed to or against the employee, would be at immediate and substantial risk of physical harm if the employee's personal information is disclosed.

7. Commissioner Froerer's 2026 conflict of interest disclosure form gave him the option to fill in a box stating that he was "an at-risk government employee . . . as that term is defined in Subsection 63G-2-303(1)(a)" and that he requested the redaction of information pursuant to § 20A-11-1604(7)(a). Commissioner Froerer filled in the box, making the request for that information to be redacted.

8. The Appeals Board concludes that § 20A-11-1604(7)(b) required the filing officer (the County's election office) to redact the redacted portions of Commissioner Froerer's 2026 conflict of interest disclosure, because that subsection of state law uses mandatory language triggered by receipt of a redaction request.

9. Therefore, the Appeals Board upholds the denial of the request for the redacted portions of Commissioner Froerer's 2026 conflict of interest disclosure.

10. Commissioner Froerer's 2025 conflict of interest disclosure form, which was dated January 24, 2025, did not give him the option to request redaction based on the assertion that he was an at-risk government employee.

11. The Appeals Board concludes that at the time Commissioner Froerer submitted his 2025 conflict of interest disclosure form, state law did not yet allow him to request redactions based on at-risk government employee status.
12. The Appeals Board concludes that there was no legal basis for the County to apply new § 20A-11-1604(7) retroactively, so it should not have redacted portions of Commissioner Froerer's 2025 conflict of interest disclosure.
13. Therefore, the Appeals Board reverses the denial of, and grants the request for, the redacted portions of Commissioner Froerer's 2025 conflict of interest disclosure.

II. ORDER

1. The appeal is denied as to the redacted portions of Gage Froerer's 2026 conflict of interest disclosure.
2. The County's decision to deny access to Commissioner Froerer's 2026 conflict of interest disclosure is upheld.
3. The appeal is granted as to the redacted portions of Gage Froerer's 2025 conflict of interest disclosure.
4. The County's decision to deny access to Commissioner Froerer's 2025 conflict of interest disclosure is reversed, and the County is ordered to provide an unredacted copy of that record to the Appellant promptly after the period to appeal this order has expired.

Dated this 13 day of October, 2026.



Tanya Strong
Chair

(See below for appeal rights information.)

APPEAL RIGHTS INFORMATION

A requester has a right under Utah Code section 63A-12-204 to request the government records ombudsman to mediate the dispute between the requester and the governmental entity concerning the access denial or the fee waiver denial.

Any aggrieved party may appeal to the director of the Utah Government Records Office, as provided in Utah Code section 63G-2-403, or by filing a petition for judicial review with the district court, in accordance with Utah Code sections 63G-2-402 and 63G-2-701(6). In part, section 701(6) states:

> (b) The contents of a petition for judicial review under Subsection (6)(a)(ii) and the conduct of the proceeding shall be in accordance with Sections 63G-2-402 and 63G-2-404.
> (c) A person who appeals an appeals board decision to the director of the Government Records Office does not lose or waive the right to seek judicial review of the decision of the director of the Government Records Office.

In most cases, the appeal deadline is 30 days after the date of this order, regardless of which appeal method is chosen. This time limit is suspended, however, if a requester seeks mediation under Utah Code section 63A-12-204. See Utah Code sections 63G-2-403 and 63G-2-404 for information about deadlines, filing requirements, and other procedures for appeals.

The contact information for the director of the Utah Government Records Office and for the government records ombudsman is below:

Lonny Pehrson
Director, Government Records Office
346 S. Rio Grande
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1106
(385) 386-1955
governmentrecordsoffice@utah.gov

Monica Minaya
Utah Government Records Ombudsman
346 S. Rio Grande
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1106
(385) 227-1226
mminaya@utah.gov