

Utah Inland Port Authority Board 2025

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

Utah Inland Port Authority Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, January 6, 2025 - 10:00 am
Utah State Capitol, Room 445
350 State Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84103

Board Members Present in Person: Abby Osborne, Ryan Starks, Jerry Stevenson, Jefferson Moss, Jonathan Freedman

Board Members Present Electronically: none

Non-Voting Board Members Present in Person: Victoria Petro, Bill Wyatt, Joel Ferry

Non-Voting Board Members Present Electronically: none

Board Members Absent: none

UIPA Staff: Ben Hart, Ariane Gibson, Larry Shepherd, Kaitlin Felsted, Jenna Draper, Amy Brown Coffin, Nick Archambault, Carol Watson, Lynne Mayer, Stephanie Pack, Danny Stewart, Diana Gardner, Allen Evans, Stephen Smith, Sebastian Abril, Lindsay Pedersen, Mona Smith, Scott Wolford

Others in Attendance: Shawn Webb, Andy Pierucci, Carolyn Erickson, Jared Stewart, Seth Martindale, Sydney August, David Johnson, Joan Gregory, Sachet Sullivan, Heather Dove, Elizabeth Weight, Katie Pappas, Jackie Allred, Gordon Odendahl, Lane Wilkes, Ann Florence, David Bennett, Benn Buys, Jim Shank, Paul Larsen, Spencer Layton, Dan Strauch, Deeda Seed, Brett Behling, Ashlee Larsen, Stan Holmes, Tussy King, Andy Hulka, Sherry Stevens, MaryBeth Bingham, Edward Castro Bennett, Lynn Carrol

1. **Welcome**

Board Vice Chair Ryan Starks welcomed the board members, staff and public to this Utah Inland Port Authority Board Meeting.

2. **Approval of Minutes, December 11, 2024 Board Meeting**

Board Member Stevenson moved to approve the minutes from the December 11, 2024 board meeting. Board member Freedman seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously by the board members in attendance (board members Abby Osborne and Jefferson Moss had not arrived when this vote was taken).

3. Executive Director Report

Executive Director Ben Hart provided his report. He began by noting that the board does not plan to meet during the Utah Legislative Session and the next meeting is scheduled for late March. He discussed the continuing negotiations on the purchase of the former SLC landfill, saying that UIPA is optimistic to close that purchase in the near future. He thanked the current owners and other stakeholders for their efforts toward the property purchase and ultimate remediation. He outlined the need to amend a previous decision of the board relative to the allocation of funding within the UIPA/Salt Lake City interlocal agreement. This will move the \$2.5 million from the interlocal bond funds that had been approved for wetland protection to use for landfill remediation, while allowing for the \$2.5 million for wetland protection to come from general tax differential funds. This action is simply changing the funds that these monies will come from and board action is needed to remain statutorily compliant. The exact amounts and details will be in the board motion later in the meeting.

Stephanie Pack provided an update on activities in the Tooele Valley Project Area. The project area was created just over a year ago. In that year, a public infrastructure district was created in March of 2024, a short-term AIB loan was approved in April 2024 to help fund necessary infrastructure within the project area, and the Surface Transportation Board approved the Savage Tooele Railroad which will provide 11 miles of new rail serving the region. She discussed business recruitment efforts in the project area, infrastructure improvements, marketing, and sustainability efforts.

4. Presentation: Policy Updates

Amy Brown Coffin, Chief Risk & Compliance Officer, discussed changes to to BP-07 - Procurement policy, and mentioned that for the annual review of BP-10 - Records Retention policy there are currently no recommended changes.

Ariane Gibson, Chief Financial Officer, discussed changes to BP-11 - Personnel policy relative to UIPA's separation from state payroll and state human resources, and changes to leave policies.

5. Presentation: Budget Update

Ariane Gibson presented the quarterly budget update, reviewing revenues and expenses during the current fiscal year.

Adopted Budget Form for:	Name: Utah Inland Port Authority
Utah Inland Port Authority	Fiscal Year Ended: 30-Jun-25

Part I Revenues			
Source of Revenue (a)	Prior Year Actual Revenue (b)	Current Year Estimate (c)	Ensuing Year Approved Budget Appropriation (d)
Taxes			
Property Tax Differential - Current	15,638,136	25,908,409	30,000,000
Sales Tax	877,699	888,000	900,000
Intergovernmental Revenue			
Legislative Appropriation	3,198,400	3,183,200	3,183,200
Other (specify):			
Miscellaneous Revenue			
Interest Earnings	1,038,084	805,000	750,000
Other (Specify): Lease Rent	789,998	501,523	
Contributions and Transfers			
Transfer from UDOT for Infrastructure Fund	6,500,000		
Beginning Balance	15,060,398	22,852,110	22,241,290
TOTAL REVENUES	43,102,715	54,138,242	57,074,490

Part II Expenses			
Expenditure (a)	Prior Year Actual Exp. (b)	Current Year Estimate (c)	Ensuing Year Approved Budget Appropriation (d)
Operating Expenses			
Personnel	2,817,501	2,973,000	3,305,000
Travel	67,845	48,000	70,000
Office Lease	205,581	283,000	330,000
Legal fees	500,081	465,000	300,000
General and Administrative Expenses	616,534	224,000	300,000
Technology & Licenses	348,701	324,000	400,000
Professional Services	1,548,914	1,501,000	2,000,000
Other (Specify): Office Build Out		100,000	
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE	6,105,157	5,918,000	6,705,000
Inland Port Development Activities			
Salt Lake City Differential Allocation			8,175,079
Acquisition of Property	2,970,573	4,230,000	3,500,000
Publicly Owned Infrastructure and Improvements	3,563,414	6,100,000	1,900,000

company potentially locating in the Northwest Quadrant. The project has expected capital expenditures of \$42 million. The proposed incentive is an annual tax rebate of 10% of the assessed property value for no more than 25 years. Shawn Webb from AeroVironment provided some background on the company and this project. The aerospace manufacturing project they are considering locating in the Northwest Quadrant is expected to employ over 500 people.

8. **Presentation: Resolution 2025-01 Amendment to Castle Country Project Area Plan**

Jenna Draper, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, discussed the proposed amendment to the Castle Country Project Area Plan to include an industrial park adjacent to the San Rafael Energy Research Center working on research and development of reliable alternative energy sources. An additional parcel recommended for inclusion in the project area by Emery County is projected to create 1,100 jobs. Part of this area is the inactive Fossil Rock mine formerly operated by Rocky Mountain Power. The third site being added to the project area is located in Green River City where Project Greenfield will use algae to clean water and remove carbon dioxide from the air utilizing solar power and providing only clean water and biochar as outputs.

9. **Presentation: Amendment to Skyline Corridor Project Area Plan**

Jenna Draper, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, discussed the proposed amendment to the Skyline Corridor Project Area Plan to include a parcel in Salina City for housing development and some parcels in Manti City focussed on light manufacturing and other needed services.

10. **Public Comment**

Board Vice Chair Starks opened up the public comment period and invited those in the room to submit comment cards for an opportunity to speak.

One comment was made, sharing concern about industrial development near the Great Salt Lake and waterfowl habitat.

11. **Policy Updates**

Board member Stevenson moved to approve BP-07 Procurement and BP-11 Personnel as presented. Board member Freedman seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a unanimous vote of all board members present (Board member Moss had departed the meeting prior to this and subsequent votes).

12. **Approval of Authority Infrastructure Bank Loan**

Board member Freedman moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board approve an infrastructure loan from the Inland Port Authority Revolving Loan Fund of \$10 million to Savage Tooele Rail with terms of the loan being 10 years at 3.45 percent interest rate, payable in 10 annual payments.

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a unanimous vote of all board members present.

13. Approval of Business Incentives

Board member Stevenson moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board approve for Project Charm an annual Project Area Incentive/Property Tax Differential Rebate equivalent to 30% of the assessed property tax, post completion of the development. This rebate will be provided yearly for no more than 25 years, provided continued operation within the Project Area during that time. Incentive approval is subject to the completion of contract agreement.

Board Chair Osborne seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a unanimous vote of all board members present.

Board member Freedman moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board approve for Project Bold Horizon an annual Project Area Incentive/Property Tax Differential Rebate equivalent to 10% of the assessed property tax, post completion of the development. This rebate will be provided yearly for no more than 25 years, provided continued operation within the Project Area during that time.

Incentive approval is subject to the completion of contract agreement, review of facility daily water usage, and submission of Corporate Stewardship plan.

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a unanimous vote of all board members present.

14. Approval of Amendment to Interlocal Tax Differential Allocation

Board Chair Osborne moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board amend its June 24th, 2024 decision regarding funds allocated under the direction of its interlocal agreement with Salt Lake City, and that the following amounts shall be funded at the following levels:

\$4,994,079 for landfill remediation

\$2,600,000 air cargo development for SLC airport

\$400,000 baseline & preferred studies

\$150,000 train crossing safety signage

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a unanimous vote of all board members present.

15. Adoption of Resolution 2025-1, Amendment to Castle Country Project Area Plan

Board Chair Osborne moved to adopt Resolution 2025-1, A Resolution of the Utah Inland Port Authority Board Adopting Amendments to the Castle Country Inland Port Project Area Plan.

Board member Freedman seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a unanimous vote of all board members present.

16. Closed Session

At 11:15 am the board voted to move into a closed session meeting held at the Utah State Capitol, 350 State Street, Room 445, Salt Lake City, UT 84103, and via electronic meeting, for the purpose of a “strategy session to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property” as allowed and described in Section 52-4-204 of Utah Code and sections 52-4-205 of the Open and Public meetings act. Board member Stevenson made a motion to move into closed session. Board Chair Osborne seconded the motion.

Vote:

Jonathan Freedman - yes

Jerry Stevenson - yes

Abby Osborne - yes

Ryan Starks - yes

Jefferson Moss - absent

Closed session ended at 12:05 pm.

17. **Adjourn**

Board Vice Chair Starks adjourned the meeting at 12:05 pm.



Board Chair Abby Osborne

Written Public Comments submitted during and after the meeting:

Joan Gregory - Emigration Canyon - 1/7/2025

Fast tracking massive industrial development next to Great Salt Lake

I am concerned, the people are concerned that the Savage Project and the other industrial development being subsidized in Tooele County will induce significant new vehicle traffic - the Romney Group estimated 50,000 new daily vehicle trips from their project alone. If you add up all the subsidies that Savage Industries is getting to build this rail line - that is going to create so much NEW truck traffic - it's tens of millions of dollars. Tax dollars are subsidizing public harm.

The bottom line is that UIPA is fast tracking massive industrial development next to Great Salt Lake in an area that already has inadequate water resources and that fails to meet air quality standards for healthy air.

Also, the Brigham City project - which will negatively impact the environment - is next to a critically important area for migratory birds.

You are continuing to subsidize industry with tax dollars at the expense of public health and well-being.

You talk about partnerships. What about partnerships with the people? The people need water, their wells are drying up. The people need clean water to drink. The people need clean air to breathe. Thank you for listening to my comment.

Mark Baranowski - Emigration Canyon - 1/30/2025

Thank you finding a way to turn the stinky Great Salt Lake into profit for developers! Please get rid of all the nuisance birds and mosquitos while you're at it. And please finish paving over the wetlands as quickly as possible so that semi-trucks and warehouses can make use of this wasted land.

Katie Pappas - Salt Lake City - 2/20/2025

accuracy and transparency

As you know, many concerns have been raised around the Castle Country Inland Port Project Area by myself and others. While UIPA has always maintained that they prioritize sustainable development, this project area is a potential carbon bomb and health nightmare for eastern Utah residents.

My concern today is with accuracy and transparency. This project area plan, like all others, was put together with information from many sources and contains inaccuracies and the omission of known projects. Even UIPA staff acknowledge the information is not fact-checked. The public must rely on the media to learn about projects UIPA knows about at the time of approval but neglects to include in their written plans.

I recently came across a problem that brings into question the validity of the board's approval of the Castle Country Project Area Plan Amendment 1. The most recent version of the Castle Country Project Area Plan posted on the UIPA website, includes a map on page 36 that shows an area east of the Green River included in the project area boundaries. Maps on pages 54, 70, 93 and 99 of the same version do not include it. This area was not included in the plan version that was on the public notice website, the agenda, or on the map shown at the UIPA board meeting presentation of the amended project area prior to approval.

How can an area suddenly appear in a plan when it wasn't there when the plan was approved by the board?

What does UIPA have planned for this "new" area?

With all the misinformation and omissions, does the board really know what they are approving? Reading through this plan (and other UIPA project area plans), with their scant information, many questions come to mind, yet they are rarely asked, except by the public.

I question the purpose of a board that provides a rubber stamp for whatever UIPA wants to do.