

Utah Inland Port Authority Board Meeting – May 27, 2020 Questions/Comments

Questions – as they were submitted in the Q/A during the public board meeting

- 1. What research has the UIPA conducted regarding the scenario of purchasing the land North of I-80 to remain undeveloped? What is the cost of the land? Where will the purchase funds come from? The primary landowners in this area are Rio Tinto, NWQ, LLC, and SITLA. What are their comments?
- 2. Obviously Scenario 2 is the most effective path to address air quality, wetland/habitat impacts and traffic. No development, no pollution. Please explain how Scenario 2 is not the best option.
- 3. Could you provide a sample of how scenario 3 will work in practice? How would existing property owners collaborate/participate with the UIPA to create new sustainable and smart logistics solutions? (happy to have a conversation offline if this is too into the weeds for this call)
- 4. Wouldn't we get the cleaner trucks in the future under the baseline scenario?
- 5. How will you contribute to the necessity of reducing our fossil fuel emissions by half by the year 2030?
- 6. Will you insist that all trucks and trains entering our air shed headed for the Inland Port be powered by electricity?
- 7. As in the case of massive warehouses (truck supported) currently being built and planned, it appears that developers are doing whatever they please. As if the Utah Inland Port Authority has no real authority now or in the future. As if the public has no real voice. Regardless of what the Utah Inland Port Aurhority is saying publicly. Business plans and green dreams are great. But monied interests always speak louder. How will the UIPA really have any authority now and in the future?
- 8. The slide has a LEED Silver Certified Distribution Center in the picture. Does the business plan require LEED Silver Certification within the Inland Port? Will your buildings be LEED certified?
- 9. Can you go into more detail about EcoDistricts certification? Is this something the UIPA board can vote to commit to, or would it require an amendment to the authorizing UIPA legislation? What would the process be for evaluating development proposals against the requirements of EcoDistricts?
- 10. Zero emission and near zero for diesel truck and rail could be achieved now with 97% efficiency and no sulfur utilizing hemp biodiesel. Is the board planning to consider alternatives?
- 11. An electric freight semi-truck retails at \$180,000. The UIPA vision is very invested in zero emission fleets. One hundred trucks will make a teeny dent in emissions and cost 18 million dollars. Where is this investment coming from.
- 12. You mentioned diesel engines are "fairly dirty" can you explain you conclusion to that? older vehicles? arent newer trucks much cleaner now?
- 13. I am pleased to see a picture of a ware house with the roof covered with solar panels, which is an appropriate place for a solar farm. Will you insist that all buildings in the Inland Port hold as many solar panels as possible?
- 14. On Page A-104 of the Technical it states that through 2050 70% of heavy vehicles in the US will be conventional diesel. How does that leave room for significant reductions in truck emissions by electrifying the truck fleet?
- 15. What kinds of improved and more efficient fuels are you considering for the trucks?

- 16. Will you insist that the trucks entering your facilities be using these fuels?
- 17. What will be done about the old polluting Union Pacific engines?
- 18. Is there an electric train locomotive or switcher on the market?
- 19. Is the board aware that hemp building materials are "green" 100% eco friendly and continue to sequester carbons out of the air as they fossilize essentially making each building a stand alone air cleaner? Do you plan to utilize that technology?
- 20. The heavy infrastructure changes to add an entire electric grid is major investment. Why start over when hemp biofuels have already been identified by Congress as the #1 replacement to fossil? Why replace entire fleets of vehicles when we can simply change to the fuel that Rudolph Diesel intended to use (Hemp biodiesel is Tier 2 and sulfur free)? Even utilizing hemp diesel to create electricity would burn at 97%. What other ideas have the board entertained?
- 21. Other than tax differential incentives, what will the UIPA do to ensure that the Wasatch Front air quality doesn't get worse with the building of the Inland Port?
- 22. As I understand it, local municipalities are still expected to provide standard municipal services in the form of infrastructure services, though the uipa has authority to coordinate those services to create publicly owned infrastructure and improvements related to pretty jurisdictional land. what is the expected económic impact on municipal budgets, esp given that the uipa will be collecting the majority of tax revenue from this land? also can you clarify the tax breakdown to be collected by uipa and shared asking municipalities? Elizabeth Totterer

lizzytotterer@gmail.com

- 23. Were the Property Tax Differential Projections modeled before the COVID pandemic? Obviously property values and tax revenue will be impacted dramatically by the global recession.
- 24. Are the satellite locations going to be held to the same standards/ working under the same agreements mr. hedge intimated? i.e. Rocky mt power agreement, the u of u resiliency study, working with similar groups like the Audubon society/property owners.
- 25. are there any preliminary ideas on how to connect satelite locations in the state with the hub? what modes of transportation?
- 26. Your facility will be surrounded by fragile wetlands. Will you be collecting and treating storm sewage before it is released from the Inland Port?
- 27. For Jack H, there has been no discussion of water supply. Given water supply trends, what is your assumption here? We killed the Las Vegas Pipeline project on water supply, lack thereof.
- 28. The only specific reference to air quality that I have heard is someone's comment about not exceeding the National Ambient Air Quality Standards because that would jeopardize federal highway funds. Every medical organization in the country has been calling on the EPA to tighten those standards. For example, the 24 hr. PM2.5 standard has not been changed since 2006, and is well recognized by the country's medical organizations as being grossly inadequate to protect public health. Is the port taking the position that if the modeled air quality after a robust, highly used inland port is operational meets the current EPA standards that public health would be adequately protected? If so, every medical organization in the country

would disagree with that.

- 29. What will the UIPS do to ensure that the Wasatch Front air quality doesn't get worse?
- 30. How will the profoundly negative impacts that have plagued other inland ports be prevented in this one?
- 31. How will the impact on wildlife be minimized?
- 32. How will the mosquitoes that live there now be dealt with? Will this result in widespread pesticide spraying?
- 33. How will the stormwater runoff be handled and the contamination of the Great Salt Lake be prevented?
- 34. How much water will the project require and where will it come from?
- 35. Utah businesses already transport, clear and deliver in bond cargo. how would the port enhance that? is the plan to clear a larger amount of in bond cargo here? would would the mecahnism be to do so?
- 36. could you please speak more to the "new technologies and ways of doing business" mentioned by Mr. Hedge? If it is the "triple bottom line", how can citizens concerned about air quality, wetlands, good jobs/stewardship for west side of valley denizens be assured of the committment of UIPA to all these values rather than just the profit component? (as we all know short term economic incentives are hard to resist thus accountability to the other components may be imperative

- 37. you mentioned electric cargo handlers. they are typically double/tiple the cost currently. would UIPA help with grants for those types of equipment? Since they are 'essential' workers, will your employees be paid a livable wage, with all associated benefits—health insurance, generous vacations, family leave?
- 38. Looking at Figures 22 & 23, there doesn't appear to be any UIPA staff who will have sustainability as their primary responsibility. There is also no mention of a UIPA board committee focused on sustainability. How will these ideas remain a priority if it isn't part of the organizational structure?
- 39. Are you taking qurestion and using chat?
- 40. How can listeners register to speak?
- 41. I guess we arent taking questions from the audience just the Board?
- 42. how do the public get access to these technical appendices?
- 43. How was the first public commenter chosen?
- 44. Am I still on the list to speak?
- 45. Did you know that the link you sent out will only work through Facebook? Lots of folks can't get in.
- 46. What has happened to all the high paying manufacturing jobs that were promised?
- 47. So your visual is an electric truck, will that be a requirment?
- 48. How much additional diesel pollution will result from the development?
- 49. How much additional diesel pollution will result from the development?
- 50. How many additional excess deaths will occur each year from air pollution resulting from the additional shipping and air flights resulting from the pollutting inland port?
- 51. COVID pandemic supply chain breakdown relates to overreliance on global logistics. Isn't investment in global logistics over local manufacturing a bad strategy for Utah in 2020?
- 52. Will you be insisting that all these methods of transport to bring in goods take the waste from these goods back to the manufacturer?
- 53. More of a comment than question- your plan to have dual access rail is a very very good one. states with multiple rail heads increase cross town intermodal traffic because of the need to equalize chassis pools between rail locations. single site dual access eliminatees that need and electric hostlers can move chassis instead of diesel. go with that...
- 54. Tucson AZ has an Inland Port which is much closer to most of the california ports. Why would they come through Utah?
- 55. Thanks for taking comments. I just heard Mr. Hedge say when we see obstacles, we deal with them and "play offense". But I was not able to see anything addressing the new reality Mother Nature has given us anywhere in the Strategic Plan. I know it's difficult to change plans and documents on the fly, but COVID-19 has shown how to do it. The new economy will be nothing like the one we have now, which effectively demolishes the whole plan.

Furthermore, COVID-19 arose from the very same blind exploitation of earth's resources inherent in the idea of the port. Failing to understand this will bring on more devastation.

- 56. The global economy is tanked and may be tanked for years. Now seems like a great time to lease the land North of I-80 from Rio Tinto, NWQ LLC, and SITLA for 10 or 20 years. Has the UIPA approached the landowners with this idea?
- 57. How many people are on this zoom webinar?
- 58. How can i see who is at this meeting? What board members are present and what other people are present?
- 59. another comment- Utah is different from most inland intermodal markets where exports can outpace imports. in Q1 and Q2 to date this year, export bookings were almost double imports. some may think covid, but it happened last year as well, and previous yrs. a shortage of shipping containers exists here always where shiplines repostion empty containers from as far away as memphis TN to salt lake for export bookings. 30,000+ containers of pressed hay alone will leave utah this year. hay is the 4th highest export cargo leaving port of long beach, with much of it coming from here. utah is the hub of solid long term export opportunities which give new companies access to foriegn markets and cheaper import rates due to strong exports. i dont know of another market with this scenario. the port can maximize this unique situation. UIPA will give companies a vision of a strong infrastructure here and facilitate responsible growth.
- 60. The wftc baseline seems a moot point of comparison as the nw quadrant of slc are already non attainment zones according to the epa's national ambient assure quality standards. the Utah Division of air quality will be issuing air permits for the port in which applicants must demonstrate that they

will not cause our contribute to the already failing air quality standards. how can port functions and development feasibley not contribute to a further violation of these standards given the baseline failures? Elizabeth Totterer lizzytotterer@gmail.com

- 61. This format is very bad for public participation. It is impossible to monitor the board in this format. Is the board only seeing what the public is seeing?
- 62. newer trucks are more dependable. down time is reduced. one newer, cleaner truck has potential to reduce traffic by reducing the numbers of trucks needed to haul a given number of loads. can the port regulate more environmentally cleaner trucks and not allow access of "dirty trucks" into the port? if so, wouldnt it be in the best interest of a cleaner environment to have the port regulate trucking?
- 63. All rural Utah counties should have the ability to participate in this economic opportunity. Is the board going to entertain other strategies to provide jobs to all counties instead of just metro zone.
- 64. The flight zone of the wild bird population is located within the boundries as currently drawn. Major water and light issues that will change those migratory patterns of the entire western hemisphere. That changes food. The pourus pavement idea is not good as contiminates wash off hard surfaces to pourus salt is a disaster. These environmental concerns are major to humanity. What mitigation could the board offer?
- 65. Great presentation. Thank you for your hard work and efforts to resolve public concerns and create an environmentally concious and sustainable economic engine for our Utah economy.
- 66. How can the inland Port be repealed? Why were the voters not allowed to vote on the Port. Many of us do not want the Port.
- 67. WHAT? Is this a public comment???
- 68. How do we get rid of the Port? Why were the voters not allowed to vote on this issue. Many of us do not want the Port.
- 69. You mention sustainable exports. Can you guarantee us that the port will not increase extraction and export of Utah's hazardous materials such as fossil fuels and heavy metals like uranium?
- 70. The port is illegal according to the constitution of Utah. Most of the people of Salt Lake are opposed to the port; why persist? A better option for clean air is a Nature Preserve.
- 71. how can i get an answer to my questions?
- 72. Why are there only comments included in the red zone and only 9 from outside of the metro area? Rural Utah seems not to be represented, at all, althrough it's their natural resources the are highlighted as the export. I am interested in what Envision Utah and the Board did to reach out to rural Utah? The farmers I have spoken feel that the special energy fossil interests are respresented when they are not. How can the board assure us they have been interactive with all 29 counties?
- 73. Please produce a list of upcoming commenters so I have some idea of how long til I speak. Thanks.
- 74. Why is the state of Utah better at planning the port than Salt Lake City? Or is it all a plot by Republicans in the legislature to "commit an act of violence" against the Democratic people of Salt Lake City? That phrase is in the Salt Lake Tribune last Sunday. The port is an autocracy, not a democracy.
- 75. Hemp cleans carbons out of the air at four times the rate of trees. It creates jobs in energy, manufacturing, lumber and paper, fabrics, textiles, medicine, and building products that are 100% eco friendly. Rural Utah wants to have these job opportunities that are truly green. Is there a comprehensive list of what the board has identified as exports and in what industries?
- 76. There is little diversity on the Port Board. Please resolve this issue.
- 77. All Utah Counties should be able to participate with taxpayer money in use.