

Utah Inland Port Authority Board 2024

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Utah Inland Port Authority Board Meeting Minutes
Monday May 20, 2024
1:00 pm
Utah State Capitol, Room 445
350 State Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84103

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

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

Board Members Absent:

UIPA Staff: Ben Hart, Benn Buys, Larry Shepherd, Lynne Mayer, Stephen Smith, Diana Gardner, Mona Smith, Scott Wolford, Danny Stewart, Kaitlin Felsted, Allen Evans, Stephanie Pack, Jenna Draper, Amy Brown Coffin, Dain Maher, Danny Stewart, Max Ivory

Others in Attendance: Brook McCarrick, Tyler Hunt, Robert Johnson, Shanny Wilson, Ann Floor, Chad Reid, Cael Crosby, Pete Williams, Sarah Buck, Dallin Curriden, Kirk Mendenhall, Patrick Hogle, Carolyn Erickson, Ann Florence, Rhonda Lauritzen, Hartley Lauritzen, Joan Gregory, Ken Kraus, Chris Roybal, Deeda Seed, Nick Stokes, David Pollei, Laura Hanson, Elizabeth Weight, Rebecca Burrage, Sam Hartman, Michael Mecham, Katie Pappas, Courtney Henley, Vicki Turner, Mariana Mavor, Brian Moench, Annette McMullin, Daniel Stephens, Michael Porter, Ezra Alberg, Glenn Shober, David Yurth, Larry Jensen, Brooke Larsen, Jackie Larson, Nancy Sloper, Gary Hanneman, Jessika Clark, Tim Vandenack, Sherry Stevens, Stephanie Russell, Steve Meyer, Gordon, Odendahl, Adam Bruns, Sofia Jeremais, Daniel Strauch, Greg Kloiber, Adam Kolowich, Andy Hulka, Rachel Shilton, Joanna Endter-Wada, Ryan Aston, Allan Murphy, Nicole Nielson, Jaime Hernandez, Malin Moench, Marcus Bunn, Anthony Scire, Haily Kirlin, Isabel Quilantan, Jen Hart, Amy Wicks, Joseph Giordano, Ryan Tucker, Jesse Wilson, Mike Anderson, Leslie Loeffel, Michelle White, Amy Roskelly, Randy Giordano

1. **Welcome**

UIPA Board Chair, Abby Osborne, welcomed the board members, staff and public to this Utah Inland Port Authority Board Meeting.

2. **Approval of Minutes, April 29, 2024 Board Meeting**

Board member Moss moved to approve the minutes from the April 29, 2024 board meeting. Board member Stevenson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. **Executive Director Report**

UIPA Executive Director Ben Hart provided an executive director's report, detailing upcoming activities of the inland port in coming months including the introduction in this meeting of the proposed Castle Country project area. The port has received a resolution passed by Fillmore City for a project area there and several other central Utah communities are seeking project area creation. The port anticipates fewer new project areas created this year compared to 2023. Progress continues in existing project areas and local officials in those areas will be invited to future meetings to share their successes with the board. Board member terms of office were staggered to offset reappointment dates. Chair Abby Osborne and Vice Chair Ryan Starks were serving terms that expired this month. Both have been reappointed by Governor Cox and will continue their service on the board.

4. **Presentation: Policy Updates**

Amy Brown Coffin, Chief Risk & Compliance Officer, presented a review for the following policies, which are before the board for approval in this meeting.

BP-14 - Board Governance

BP-15 - Code of Conduct

BP-16 - Public Infrastructure Districts (PID)

5. **Presentation: Draft Castle Country Inland Port Project Area Plan**

Jenna Draper, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, presented the draft plan and budget for a proposed project area in Carbon and Emery Counties, to be known as the Castle Country project area. The draft plan and budget, including information on the logistical, economic and environmental considerations of the project area has been made publicly available on the Utah Public Meeting Notice website and the UIPA website. Carbon and Emery County Commissions, as well as Green River City have all passed resolutions supportive of this project area creation. Carbon County Economic Development Director Shenny Wilson spoke of the county's efforts to bring new industry and new jobs to the region and the support that UIPA can provide to that end. Carbon County Commissioner Larry Jensen discussed the movement away from coal production in the county which had been the primary economic driver there for 130 years. There is currently no coal production occurring in Carbon County and that economic change has led to a major shift in taxation onto residential property owners. Local officials have made it a priority to expand the tax base to new industries to relieve the burden on residents. They are finding companies interested in locating in Carbon County but the burden of building the infrastructure needed for new industry is more than the county can handle. Financial tools available in an inland port project area could help in providing the needed infrastructure. Tyler Hunt, city manager of Green River, spoke of the interest in his community to diversify their economy and provide good jobs to residents. Green River City believes UIPA can be helpful in this effort and urges the board to support the creation of this project area.

This presentation was informational only. Action from the board on this project area creation is anticipated at the June 2024 meeting.

6. Presentation: Northwest Quadrant Business Incentive Consideration

Stephen Smith, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, shared information about a proposed incentive for NextEra Energy Resources, Dominguez Grid, LLC, a battery energy storage company looking to build and operate a 200 MW facility adjacent to the Rocky Mountain Power Terminal Substation. This \$314m battery storage facility would provide additional power during peak demand, reducing the need for additional energy production during those times. The incentive would be an annual property tax rebate of 20% of the assessed property value for up to 25 years. Glenn Shober of NextEra Energy Resources detailed the plan for this utility-scale storage system. His company has similar projects in 38 states where the limited capacity on the power grid demands this type of solution. The feature of this project to store power during off-peak times and release it when needed reduces the need for costly and often less environmentally friendly power generation, with savings to the power producer that are ultimately passed to consumers.

7. Presentation: Resolution 2024-08, Amendment to Twenty Wells Inland Port Project Area Plan

Stephanie Pack, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, presented information on an amendment to the Twenty Wells project area at the request of Grantsville City to include a parcel of land they call the Broken Arrow zone. This area is roughly 145 acres of rail-served industrial land. The focus of recruitment for this land would be light industrial, advanced manufacturing, and air-cooled data centers. A wetlands delineation study will be conducted and areas identified will qualify for enhancement and protection under UIPA policy.

8. Presentation: Resolution 2024-09, Adopting the West Weber County Inland Port Project Area Plan

Stephanie Pack, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, led a presentation on the proposed creation of a project area in West Weber County. The West Weber Project Area promotes the required statutory goals and objectives to be considered as a UIPA project area. Stephanie Russell, Weber County Economic Development Director spoke to how the project area creation fit with the existing development strategy for the region which is driven by the West Weber General Plan and how UIPA becomes another stakeholder and partner in the county achieving its goals there. The county envisions the area being an industrial, advanced manufacturing, and renewable energy hub. Mona Smith, Environmental and Sustainability Director, detailed the wetlands strategy for the area. UIPA recognizes the extent of ecological sensitivity throughout this project area considering its proximity to the Great Salt Lake and adjacent waterfowl management areas. The Port will coordinate with landowners in the project area to ensure that an updated wetland delineation study along with a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) is completed. If an updated wetland characterization determines there is existing wetlands on a property, then the Port will establish a development agreement outlining wetland protections prior to issuing any expenditures benefiting the landowner. Additionally, the Port will actively work with landowners, Weber County, and the State of Utah, to create additional conservation easements that will protect existing wetlands as well as set-back areas for buffer zones around wetlands, ecologically sensitive areas, and a minimum 600 ft buffer on property abutting lands owned and managed by the State for wildlife preservation. Board member Ferry talked about the need to ensure that development occurs in an environmentally sustainable way. He noted that under current commercial zoning, property owners could develop their lands immediately right on the fence line with the waterfowl management areas. He said having a wetlands strategy that is more stringent than what is required by the Army Corps of Engineers and will provide 3% of tax differential towards wetlands protection will be a long-term benefit to the ecosystem.

9. **Presentation: Development Agreements**

Benn Buys, Deputy Director and Chief Financial Officer, presented two development agreements for BZI Innovation Park, LLC within the Iron Springs Inland Port Project Area and PCC Land LLC in the West Weber County Inland Port Project Area. These agreements define relationships on how differential funds will be spent and require that these tax monies be spent on public infrastructure – road, sewer, water, and other projects that are the responsibility of local governments.

10. **Public Comment**

Board Chair Osborne opened up the public comment period and invited those in the room to submit comment cards for an opportunity to speak. She reminded all that the port welcomes written public comment anytime via the UIPA website at <https://inlandportauthority.utah.gov/contact/>.

Comments made included a request that health studies in the original interlocal agreement with Salt Lake City be completed, concern for air quality, environmental protection, the opportunity for responsible job creation in the West Weber project area, opposition to project area creation, request to slow down on project area creation, and requested inclusion of broader definition of wetlands and guidelines for contiguous water bodies.

11. **Approval of Policies BP-14 - Board Governance, BP-15 - Code of Conduct, and BP-16 - Public Infrastructure Districts (PID)**

Board member Starks moved to approve policies BP-14, BP-15, and BP-16 as presented. Board member Freedman seconded the motion.

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

12. **Approval of Northwest Quadrant Business Incentive**

Board member Starks moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board approve an annual Project Area Incentive/Property Tax Differential Rebate equivalent to 20% 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 following:

- Completion of contract agreement (including daily water usage requirements)
- Submission of full Corporate Stewardship Plan
- Final approval by the UIPA Board

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

13. **Adoption of Resolution 2024-08, Amendment to Twenty Wells Inland Port Project Area Plan**

Board member Stevenson moved to adopt Resolution 2024-08, Amendment to Twenty Wells Inland Port Project Area Plan. Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

14. Adoption of Resolution 2024-09, Adopting the West Weber County Inland Port Project Area Plan

Board member Freedman moved to adopt Resolution 2024-09, Adopting the West Weber County Inland Port Project Area Plan. Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

15. Approval of Development Agreements

Board member Moss moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board authorizes staff to finalize and execute a development agreement for BZI Innovation Park, LLC for Iron Springs Inland Port Project Area. Board member Starks seconded the motion.

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

Board member Stevenson moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board authorizes staff to finalize and execute a development agreement for PCC Land LLC for the West Weber County Inland Port Project Area. Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

16. Adjourn

Board Chair Osborne adjourned the meeting.

Board Chair, Abby Osborne

Written Public Comments submitted during and after the meeting:

Cael Crosby – Orem, UT – 5/20/2024

I am a Utah Valley University student and I am concerned about the approval of the inland port being approved today. Environmentally, this could extremely impact the air quality and my health as an asthmatic Utahn, my condition could become much worsened if this project is too far reaching and mismanaged. I join with the concerns of Utah Physicians for a Health Environment, not the financial interest of developers.

Hartley Lauritzen, age 10 – Hooper, UT – 5/20/2024

Help Hooper's Marshlands

The Inland Port Authority wants to build an inland port next to Hooper's marshlands. As a Hooper resident, I say no. So, help Hooper by saying no to the inland port. Did you know they want to build it next to the bird refuge and every time a car drives by the birds leave their spot? They would have big trucks with blinding lights. So why should you care? Think about your favorite animal or insect, and then imagine stripping it from its home, and nobody ever sees it again. You have a voice, too. So, stop the inland port and save Hooper's marshlands.

Nancy Sloper – Ogden, UT – 5/20/2024

I spend a lot of time reading on local current events and was unaware of what was going on w/UIPA & Weber County until recently. There has been no effort in my opinion to educate the public, I believe in hopes to just push this through. I read the entire Weber County plan (214 pages) and no references were made to it. It did reflect however that the populace wanted to maintain the wetlands & current situation.

Michael Mecham – Washington Terrace, UT – 5/20/2024

The approval of the inland port is a hyper disaster for our state. The approval has been pushed by land developers but boycotts the popular voice of the residents of SLC and Weber County. Most residents do not want a polluting port in their community.

Stan Holmes – Salt Lake City, UT – 5/17/2024

Public Comment Questions to the UIPA Board

The following 17 comments/questions [designated with "Q"] are hereby submitted on May 17, 2024 to UIPA in advance of the UIPA Board's May 20, 2024 meeting.

* These comments/questions are relevant to UIPA's organization, mission, and all project areas:

1. Savage Industries and its business arms figure prominently in several UIPA project area parcels: Iron Springs, Tooele, and now Castle Country.

... Q.1.a. What is Savage's role as a principal within UIPA's organization and decisionmaking structure?

... Q.1.b. Is Jeff Hymas the point of contact for all UIPA-related Savage operations in Utah?

... Q.1.c. What other properties owned by Savage and its Utah affiliates are under consideration for possible UIPA project area designation?

2. In the recent UIPA loan bank requests, photos for the two Savage 'asks' for \$7.4 million featured coal and oil rail cars. The Carbon County parcels of the proposed Castle Country project area(s) appear to have been sited either adjacent, or close, to Savage fossil fuel transload and storage facilities.

... Q.2.a. What is UIPA's position relative to Utah's fossil fuel industries' operations: extraction,

production, transport, consumption, and export ...all of which Savage is involved with?
... Q.2.b. What policies are guiding UIPA's interactions with fossil fuel entities like Savage?
... Q.2.c. To what extent does UIPA take an all-of-the-above, "common carrier" approach to entities that propose to do conduct business at and through project areas: i.e. if businesses will pay and commodities are legal, that is good enough for UIPA?
... Q.2.d. To what extent does UIPA vet upstream and downstream environmental impacts of servicing the fossil fuel industry through entities like Savage?

3. UIPA activities have in the past been pitched to county officials by entities claiming UIPA affiliation while not officially tied to UIPA's organization.
... Q.3.a. When will UIPA provide evidence that it has no relationship with Utah Satellite Ports LLC, the Utah Satellite Ports Coalition, Sage Government Solutions, and principals Greg Hughes, Jeff Hartley, and Greg Hartley?
... Q.3.b. Which are the lobbying and promotional resource entities subcontracted to UIPA?

4. The federal Surface Transportation Board (STB) has approved an environmentally controversial Savage rail spur permit in Tooele County. This comes after a another environmentally controversial STB permit for the proposed Uinta Basin Railway was sidelined by federal court action. The STB has also approved the permit for a shorter rail line connecting the initially proposed Inland Port satellite port area near Salina with the Union Pacific line at the Levan coal loadout.
... Q.4.a. What is UIPA's interest in the Salina-to-Levan rail line?
... Q.4.b. What does UIPA anticipate its legal budget may have to be increased to fight for the Savage Tooele spur and other rail connections?

* These comments/questions are relevant to the proposed Castle Country project area(s):

5. The Draft Project Area Plan and Budget for UIPA's proposed Castle Country does not make clear why geographically distinct areas spanning two counties are included in the same project area proposal instead of two separate project area proposals.
... Q.5. Please explain why two close Carbon County sites and one distant Emery County site are combined in one project area.

6. The Castle Country Draft Project Area Plan and Budget makes no reference to the region's established development and multi-county organizations: the Southeast Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) and the South Eastern Regional Development Agency (SERDA).
... Q.6.a. To what extent were SEUALG and SERDA involved in UIPA's planning and, if not why not?
... Q.6.b. What will UIPA's relationship be with SEUALG, SERDA, and the Coal Country Strike Team moving forward?

7. Some of UIPA's Carbon County project area sites lie along or are in the vicinity of Ridge Road. The Utah Trust Lands Administration (TLA, aka. SITLA) is interested in development of a Ridge Road Industrial Park. See...

<https://trustlands.utah.gov/projects/ridge-road-industrial-park/>

... Q.7.a. What is UIPA's relationship with TLA/SITLA regarding development of Ridge Road?

... Q.7.b. What are the "foundational components" [p. 16] of the area that would be served by UIPA projects along Ridge Road?

8. The proposed Uinta Basin Railway is on "hold" for at least two years. Meanwhile, Uinta Basin oil production is rapidly expanding and Price-Wellington area fossil fuel operators, like Savage, are applying for permits to handle more crude. Political pressure will likely increase to build a "hydrocarbon highway" for oil trucks to pass through archaeologically sensitive Gate and Nine-Mile canyons. One of UIPA's Castle Country parcels is close to Savage's storage facility on Soldier Creek - Nine Mile Canyon road.

... Q.8. What will be UIPA's policy and actions if partner Savage actively engages in the development of a hydrocarbon highway through Gate and Nine Mile Canyons and/or the handling of crude oil so obtained?

Thanks in advance for providing complete answers to the 17 questions submitted as comments above.

Stan Holmes
Salt Lake City

Katie Pappas - Salt Lake City and Green River, UT - 5/18/2024

Comments and Questions

Concerns about the Castle Country Project Area Plan

As I read through yet another Inland Port Project Area Plan the same concerns emerge.

Project areas are being pushed and approved so quickly many locals are unaware they are happening until they have been approved. This situation has been repeated in every project area. As few as five local authorities, often desperate for any economic gain, are making this decision. Local residents are a great resource and that should be utilized.

How can you create the most benefit for the community without consulting local residents?

As a Green River area property owner, my input was not solicited.

Would you please specifically identify how outreach was conducted to seek widespread public input?

Written into these plans is the option for UIPA to extend the 25 year tax differential contract by another 15 years at their discretion.

Do communities understand that's a possibility?

How has UIPA calculated and made public how municipal revenues would be affected and community services impacted during the 15 additional years?

The Project Area plans include a desktop environmental review of the area. They don't always reflect what's actually there at this time.

Would you consider doing a true environmental study that includes boots-on-the-ground field data collection and analysis, preferably by a third party?

How would you use information gathered to plan port development?

Specific to Castle Country

Current poverty rates, including child poverty rates, are mentioned several times in the Castle Country plan. Yet a high-paying job (as defined by state statute) and cited in the plan is average county wage or higher. These companies stand to make a lot of money.

What other community benefits could be included in the plan?

As an example, Green River could really use some help funding their museum.

At a May 14 Green River City Council meeting, concern was expressed about a lack of available housing for people moving there to work at the port and potential inability of the city to absorb a lot of people. One commenter said she thought they could handle 5 more families.

How does UIPA plan to address the potential housing crisis?

How would you prevent new housing from being bought up for short term rentals?

The main port area on the west side of Green River includes the rail line that parallels highway 6.

Would a trans-loading facility be built to accommodate transfer of goods heading east or south?

How would the Castle Country project land near Green River affect the transportation of fossil fuels through the area?

What is planned for the site east of this one and why was it included in the plan?

FYI, on page 5 of the project area plan there are footnotes that don't lead to any references.

There is no footnotes page.

Katie Pappas

Salt Lake City/Green River

Anna Neumann - Roy, UT- 5/20/2024

Weber County Inland Port Concerns

Hello, I'm writing to express my concerns about the Weber County Inland Port project. I didn't hear about the project until last week when it started getting coverage in the newspaper. It breaks my heart to think of such a huge development being built in the wetlands so close to Waterfowl Management Areas and impacting the Great Salt Lake which is already in danger. This project will have long term environmental impacts for residents like me- decreasing air quality and harming already threatened birds and wetlands. Please reconsider your plans and allow for more residents to voice their opinions. Thank you.

Daniel Darger - Salt Lake City, UT - 5/21/2024

Weber Inland Port

I strongly object to establishing an inland port in the wetlands and shoreline of the great Salt Lake. The idea that this would somehow add to the value of living in this area is totally backward. Instead, the result would be increased environmental degradation for the enrichment of developers.

Mike Jones - Riverton, UT - 5/21/2024

Weber County Inland Port

Say no to a devastating Weber County Port.

Evan S Singh - Holladay, UT - 5/21/2024

Gibberish

The word-smithed, business management obfuscating words in your five values statements are a believable foundation for exactly the opposite of what you intend and what will occur if this daughter rape of an idea is completed. Nowhere on your website does it reveal your true motivation. Here it is: buy low sell high. Hooray for me and (expletive deleted) everybody else including pelicans and avocets.

Korra Cottle - Salt Lake City, UT - 5/22/2024

Inland Port Concerns

Hi, how does the new port not damage the environment?

Terry Marasco - Salt Lake City, UT - 6/13/2024

Dear Board Members:

As a community leader on the west side who recognizes that the west side is the most polluted area in the state my opposition to the Group's recommendations are herein. Note that of almost 50 in the group, only 8 are from the west side, The group is a majority of Salt Lake Government officials and environmental groups. In no way has this group come to the west side and asked for input from a broad reach of citizens and businesses.

For me, the proposal appears to be what the Salt Lake Government and environmental groups want rather than what is best for the west side.

Any discussion of this tax allocation needs to be postponed until west sliders have a voice.

Here are my suggestions:

1. RE: Great Salt Lake Shoreline Preserve land acquisition This is our priority request. Contribute match funding to land protection and restoration projects benefiting the wetlands and related areas of the GSL Shoreline.

Salt Lake City received a GSLWET grant of \$2 mil

This request \$3,000,000

The GSL has already received a large amount of attention from the city and the legislature (e.g., Salt Lake City received a GSLWET grant of \$2 mil).

\$3M spent on pollution mitigation is more useful to the west side.

While the GSL does have an effect on the west side, our needs are more immediate. For example, our neighborhoods are infected with drug dealers, illegal encampments, theft, and property damage. This money could be spent on safety issues as well as air pollution mitigation.

<https://www.clarity.io/blog/clean-air-cities-innovative-approaches-to-improving-air-quality-in-urban-settings>

2, RE: On-Demand Transportation expansion Salt Lake City

This Request \$1,000,000 minimum could fund a one-year limited pilot

This \$1M would be better spent on pollution reduction and heat reduction on the west side.

My opposition – this amount would be better spent on a tree project. The west side is already noted as lacking in trees (see Heat Island article), trees sequester carbon, remove pollutants, lower ambient temperatures. As climate change heats up the atmosphere trees are a viable solution to lower temperatures.

<https://www.kuer.org/health-science-environment/2023-10-17/want-to-know-where-salt-lake-citys-hot-spots-are-take-a-look-at-the-new-heat-map>

“New [hyperlocal heat maps](#) from a [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration](#)-funded study show where the city’s hot spots are — generally anywhere with lots of asphalt and few trees. Temperatures tend to get hotter on the west side of town, with State Street serving as a loose dividing line.”

Terry Marasco mentioned in:

<https://dailyutahchronicle.com/2023/04/12/solving-poor-air-quality-on-the-west-side/>
<https://dailyutahchronicle.com/2023/04/12/solving-poor-air-quality-on-the-west-side/>

Trees remove air pollution: https://groundworkdenver.net/devs/Trees_airquality.pdf

3. No money should be spent on the landfill remediation

Best,

Terry Marasco