

## Utah Inland Port Authority Board 2024

### DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Utah Inland Port Authority Board Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, March 11, 2025 - 12:30 pm  
Utah State Capitol, Room 445  
350 State Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84103

---

**Board Members Present in Person:** Abby Osborne, Jerry Stevenson, Jonathan Freedman

**Board Members Present Electronically:** Ryan Starks, Jefferson Moss

**Non-Voting Board Members Present in Person:** none

**Non-Voting Board Members Present Electronically:** none

**Board Members Absent:** Victoria Petro, Bill Wyatt, Joel Ferry

**UIPA Staff:** Ben Hart, Ariane Gibson, Larry Shepherd, Kaitlin Felsted, Jenna Draper, Amy Brown Coffin, Carol Watson, Lynne Mayer, Stephanie Pack, Danny Stewart, Diana Gardner, Stephen Smith, Lindsay Pedersen, Scott Wolford, Mona Smith, Dain Maher

**Others in Attendance:** Brook McCarrick, Karen Pierog, Stacy Smart, Aaron Wade, Andy Hulka, James Westwater, Isabel Quilantan, Andrew Whitmer, Patti Hobfoll, Brett Behling, Brian Moench, Beth Blattenberger, Jake Heyerdahl, Lance Bullen, Baron Gajkowski, Randy Larsen, Jay Griffith, David Zinn, Deeda Seed, Brandi Obrien, Joan Gregory, Shannon Bond, Nancy Sloper, Gary Hanneman

1. **Welcome**

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

2. **Oath of Office, Board Member Jonathan Freedman**

Carol Watson, Notary, administered the oath of office to Board Member Freedman, who was recently reappointed to the board by Governor Cox.

3. **Approval of Minutes, January 6, 2025 Board Meeting**

Board Member Freedman moved to approve the minutes from the January 6, 2024 board meeting. Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.  
The motion was approved unanimously.

**4. Legislative Update**

Executive Director Ben Hart provided a brief update. He noted that the meeting agenda today has no items that have not previously been approved by the board. Recent legislation realigned the makeup of the UIPA board, moving the appointment of one additional board seat to the governor. Following this legislative action, UIPA attorneys have instructed the board to reconsider and look to reapprove the items on the agenda today.

**5. 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.

Comments included a request for more public information and additional study before project area creation, opposition to the project area in Spanish Fork, environmental concerns over water, air, and critical wildlife habitat, and requests to reject prior project area creations.

**6. Resolution 2025-02 Adopting Iron Springs Inland Port Project Area Plan and Amendments**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval and amendment of the Iron Springs Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-02 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan and its amendments.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**7. Resolution 2025-03 Adopting Verk Industrial Park Inland Port Project Area Plan and Amendments**

Board Member Starks moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval and amendment of the Verk Industrial Park Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-03 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan and its amendments.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**8. Resolution 2025-04 Adopting Golden Spike Inland Port Project Area Plan and Amendments**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval and amendment of the Golden Spike Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-04 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan and its amendments.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

9. **Resolution 2025-05 Adopting Central Utah Agri-Park Inland Port Project Area Plan and Amendments**

Board Member Starks moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval and amendment of the Central Utah Agri-Park Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-05 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan and its amendments.

Board Member Freedman seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

10. **Resolution 2025-06 Adopting Mineral Mountains Inland Port Project Area Plan and Amendments**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval and amendment of the Mineral Mountains Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-06 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan and its amendments.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

11. **Resolution 2025-07 Adopting Twenty Wells Inland Port Project Area Plan and Amendments**

Board Member Starks moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval and amendment of the Twenty Wells Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-07 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan and its amendments.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

12. **Resolution 2025-08 Adopting Tooele Valley Inland Port Project Area Plan**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval of the Tooele Valley Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-08 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

13. **Resolution 2025-09 Adopting West Weber Inland Port Project Area Plan**

Board Member Starks moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval of the West Weber Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-09 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**14. Resolution 2025-10 Adopting Castle Country Inland Port Project Area Plan and Amendments**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval and amendment of the Castle Country Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-10 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan and its amendments.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**15. Resolution 2025-11 Adopting Historic Capitol Inland Port Project Area Plan**

Board Member Starks moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval of the Historic Capitol Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-11 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**16. Resolution 2025-12 Adopting Skyline Corridor Inland Port Project Area Plan**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval of the Skyline Corridor Inland Port Project Area Plan and adopt Resolution 2025-12 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this project area plan.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**17. Resolution 2025-13 Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Salt Lake City Corporation, Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City and the Utah Inland Port Authority**

Board Member Starks moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement and amendments between Salt Lake City Corporation, Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City and the Utah Inland Port Authority and adopt Resolution 2025-13 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this interlocal agreement and its amendments.

Board Member Freedman seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**18. Resolution 2025-14 Amending the Crossroads Public Infrastructure District Governing Document and Appointing Two Additional Trustees**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the Amendment of the Crossroads PID Governing Document and Appointment of Two Additional Trustees and adopt Resolution 2025-14 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) this PID document and the appointment of two additional trustees.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**19. Resolution 2025-15 Creating the TV PID**

Board Member Starks moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the Creation of the TV Public Infrastructure District, its Amendment, and Interlocal Tax Sharing Agreement and adopt Resolution 2025-15 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) the PID creation, amendment, and tax sharing agreement.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**20. Resolution 2025-16 Creating the Verk PID**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the Creation of the Verk Public Infrastructure District and Interlocal Agreement and adopt Resolution 2025-16 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) the PID creation and interlocal agreement.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**21. Resolution 2025-17 Trigger Resolution for Verk Industrial Park Project Area**

Board Member Starks moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval of a Trigger Resolution for the Verk Industrial Park Project Area and adopt Resolution 2025-17 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) the trigger dates for the designated parcels in this project area.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**22. Resolution 2025-18 Trigger Resolution for Mineral Mountains Project Area**

Board Member Freedman moved that the UIPA Board reconsider the approval of a Trigger Resolution for the Mineral Mountains Project Area and adopt Resolution 2025-18 approving, adopting, and ratifying (as necessary) the trigger dates for the designated parcels in this project area.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**23. BZI Innovation Park, LLC Development Agreement & Amendment**

Board Member Starks moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board reconsider the action of May 20, 2024 authorizing staff to finalize and execute a development agreement for BZI Innovation Park, LLC for the Iron Springs Inland Port Project Area, and the action of September 5, 2024 to amend the tax differential financing agreement for BZI Innovation Park, LLC, attached as Exhibits A and B (the “Prior Approval”); furthermore, the Utah Inland Port Authority Board determines that the Prior Approval is hereby approved and adopted without any impact to the Prior Approval and any and all related actions taken in reliance thereon.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**24. PCC Land LCC Development Agreement**

Board Member Freedman moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board reconsider the action of May 20, 2024 authorizing staff to finalize and execute a development agreement for PCC Land, LLC for the West Weber Inland Port Project Area attached as Exhibit A (the “Prior Approval”); furthermore, the Utah Inland Port Authority Board determines that the Prior Approval is hereby approved and adopted without any impact to the Prior Approval and any and all related actions taken in reliance thereon.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**25. Tooele Valley Developer Agreement**

Board Member Starks moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board reconsiders the action of September 5, 2024 approving amendments to the Tooele Valley Developer Agreement, attached as Exhibit A (the “Prior Approval”); furthermore, the Utah Inland Port Authority Board

determines that the Prior Approval is hereby approved and adopted without any impact to the Prior Approval and any and all related actions taken in reliance thereon.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**26. 2023 Salt Lake Interlocal Tax Differential Allocation**

Board Member Freedman moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board reconsiders the action of November 6, 2023 approving funds allocated under the direction of the Salt Lake City interlocal agreement, attached as Exhibit A (the “Prior Approval”); furthermore, the Utah Inland Port Authority Board determines that the Prior Approval is hereby approved and adopted without any impact to the Prior Approval and any and all related actions taken in reliance thereon.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**27. 2024 Salt Lake Interlocal Tax Differential Allocation Approval & Amendment**

Board Member Starks moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board reconsiders the action of June 24, 2024 approving funds allocated under the direction of the Salt Lake City interlocal agreement and the action of September 9, 2024 to amend the allocated funds, attached as Exhibit A (the “Prior Approval”); furthermore, the Utah Inland Port Authority Board determines that the Prior Approval is hereby approved and adopted without any impact to the Prior Approval and any and all related actions taken in reliance thereon.

Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

**28. Adjourn**

Board Chair Osborne adjourned the meeting.

---

Board Chair Abby Osborne

## **Written Public Comments submitted during and after the meeting:**

### **David Zinn - Morgan - 3/11/2025**

I feel in the 30+ years I have been in Utah the air quality has gotten much worse. I believe that anything to limit that is so important for future generations.

### **Nancy Sloper - Ogden - 3/11/2025**

I live in Weber County and am very concerned with the inland port being planned so near the GSL and between two bird refuges that sustain migratory birds from throughout the world. I worry about the dust and other negative things that will be in the air. I'm also concerned by the traffic that will interfere with our roads.

### **Joan Gregory - Emigration Canyon - 3/11/2025**

My name is Joan Gregory and I am the team leader of the Communication Improvement Team of the Stop the Polluting Ports Coalition, which has worked for nearly 3 years in an effort to improve communication between the Coalition and the Utah Inland Port Authority and between UIPA and the people of Utah.

I am a process wonk who cares deeply not only about fair, open and transparent government but also about our Great Salt Lake Watershed, the 11 Million birds who pass through each year, resting, nesting, replenishing for the trip south and then back north again, and us – YOU and ME (our children, our elders, our families) and the work we do from agriculture and brine shrimp harvesting to education and healthcare to skiing and hosting the Olympics to the arts and the humanities. I care about our entire Great Salt Lake ecosystem.

Eight days ago, on a very quick timeline Senate Bill 239 was enacted to require that 3 out of 5 UIPA board members be appointed by the governor, presumably in response to a lawsuit brought by the Center for Biological Diversity and Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment challenging the legislature's three appointments to the board as unconstitutional.

Over the past 2 years we have witnessed the approval of 11 new Utah Inland Port Authority project areas spread throughout Utah, in 13 counties, encompassing over 76,000 acres within which UIPA plans to subsidize industrial development at a cost of \$1.1 billion taxpayer dollars.

During that time we struggled to get information about what was planned for each project area having to resort to Government Records Access and Management Act GRAMA requests to get that information.

UIPA was churning out project area plans so quickly using a cut and paste formula that they sometimes left information from a previous plan in the new plans!

All of this, is in addition to recent changes in the Inland Port Authority's public comment rules and practices - curtailing public comment during meetings and making the process more confusing; and holding meetings in locations far from the impacted communities.

Today, March 11, 2025, the Board is planning to re-approve those 11 illegally created inland port project areas. The meeting agenda allocates a mere 30 minutes to the reapprovals, which is way too little time to hear and consider public input about matters of critical public concern.

To make matters worse, the new board is rushing to paper over numerous legally defective project areas authorized by the prior illegal board, by rubber-stamping project area plans rather than considering the consistent taxpayer and local community opposition to these plans. This is simply another example of the legislature and the Inland Port Authority being unwilling to listen to public concerns in favor of giving large taxpayer subsidies to private developers.

Holding one meeting at the state capitol—rather than meetings in each of the communities where project areas are located— will deprive many Utahns who are most directly impacted by these project areas the ability to attend and voice their concerns.

This is a big deal for taxpayers and we (the taxpayers) should have full and complete information about the consequences of this fast-tracked industrial development that UIPA is fast-tracking in these communities.

These 11 poorly-vetted project areas were often complete and unwelcome surprises to local residents upon creation, due to the perfunctory and opaque way that UIPA communicates with the affected communities and the lack of meaningful opportunity for public comment and due consideration.

Yet the board's decisions have enormous consequences on those local communities and will negatively impact their quality of life through increased traffic, pollution, and depletion and degradation of water resources.

This is also about ACCESS and TIMING ... this information needs to be shared in a way and in sufficient time for the PEOPLE in the COMMUNITY to be able to evaluate it. This has not been the case in the past, and it's definitely not the case today, with this rushed re-approval.

However, Senate Bill 239 allows UIPA to withhold from the public information about business proposals in project areas - this means what little information the public was previously able to obtain through GRAMA will no longer be possible.

This is a pattern of being OPAQUE, not TRANSPARENT. PLAYING DANGEROUS games with the future of Utahns and the precious ecosystem which sustains us.

UIPA needs to end its track record of opaque and uninformed decision-making and limited public participation and discontinue its pattern of ignoring its responsibility to address public and taxpayer concerns. The Stop the Polluting Ports Coalition calls on the Utah Inland Port Authority Board to:

- rescind all 11 illegal project area approvals;
- engage in a robust analysis of community and environmental impacts of this “fast-tracked” taxpayer subsidized industrial development, including a traffic study and water resource analysis for each project area, with opportunities for public review and comment;
- hold public hearings in each affected community;
- address public and taxpayer concerns, incorporating effective solutions into project plans;
- and be ready to disapprove projects that no longer or never met the needs of the local communities.

Only with thoughtful decision making and careful governance can the Board restore public confidence in UIPA and finally meet its obligation to protect the public interest.

### **Jay Griffith - Millcreek, UT - 3/11/2025**

High Concerns Regarding these ports

From my investigation of all the inland ports proposed from their conception and formation none are not nearly as transparent as they should be. Nor are the benefits and detriments clearly and honestly put before the public. This is deeply troubling. Claims of benefits to the environment are made without research and data. Harms to wetlands, air and noise pollution are minimized. Those promoting the inland ports in government, the Inland Port Board, and the private sector do not appear to have the long term concerns of land, water, air, and wildlife stewardship. Please make it a priority to consider how these ports impact the quality of life for the residents near them and the larger ecosystem of people and the environment. Inland Ports cause great harm.

### **Letter delivered by Stop the Polluting Port Coalition - 3/11/2025**

March 11, 2025

Dear Utah Inland Port Authority Board Members and members of the Utah Legislature:

We've received notice that at a special meeting on March 11, 2025, the board is planning to re-approve 11 illegally created inland port project areas, spanning 76,138 acres and 13 counties, and within which UIPA plans to subsidize industrial development at a cost of \$1.1 billion in taxpayer

dollars. The meeting agenda allocates a mere 30 minutes to the reapprovals, which is too little time to hear and consider public input about matters of critical public concern.

Just days ago, on March 3, 2025, Senate Bill 239 was enacted to require that three of five UIPA board members be appointed by the governor, presumably in response to a lawsuit brought by the Center for Biological Diversity and Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment challenging the legislature's three appointments to the board as unconstitutional. The statute and board restructuring amounts to an admission by the state that the prior board structure violated the Utah Constitution and evaded public accountability. But the new board structure remains unconstitutional, by allowing two members of the legislature, who are not accountable to a majority of Utahns, to continue to appoint and remove UIPA board members.

To make matters worse, the new board is rushing to paper over numerous legally defective project areas authorized by the prior board, by rubber-stamping project area plans rather than consider the consistent taxpayer and local community opposition to these plans. This is simply another example of the legislature and UIPA being unwilling to listen to public concerns in favor of giving large taxpayer subsidies to private developers. Indeed, the board's decision to hold the meeting at the state capitol-rather than in the communities where project areas are located will deprive many Utahns who are most directly impacted by these project areas the ability to attend and voice their concerns.

These 11 poorly-vetted project areas were often complete and unwelcome surprises to local residents upon creation, due to the perfunctory and opaque way that UIPA communicates with the affected communities and the lack of meaningful opportunity for public comment and due consideration. Yet the board's decisions have enormous consequences on those local communities and will negatively impact their quality of life through increased traffic, pollution, and depletion and degradation of water resources.

For example, the director of the Central Iron County Water Conservancy District recently told a legislative committee that inland port development was contributing to their need for a water reuse facility, compounding the existing water shortages in the county. And, in Tooele County, water resources are already likely over allocated, or, at a minimum, require serious study to understand availability-yet unrestricted inland port developers are marketing their Tooele County project areas as sites for millions of square feet of water-intensive data centers. In Spanish Fork, inland port developers are encroaching on valuable neighboring farmland in Palmyra, and the project area has been expanded to sweep in wetlands next to Utah Lake. These are just a few of the significant impacts from the proposed development that have not been fully assessed or publicly vetted.

UIPA needs to end its sordid track record of opaque and uninformed decision-making and limited public participation. Instead of continuing its pattern of ignoring its responsibility to address public and taxpayer concerns, we call on the board to:

- rescind all 11 illegal project area approvals;
- engage in a robust analysis of community and environmental impacts of this "fast-tracked" taxpayer subsidized industrial development, including a traffic study and water resource analysis for each project area, with opportunities for public review and comment; and
- hold public hearings in each affected community before approving any project area.

Only with thoughtful decision making and careful governance can the board restore public confidence in UIPA and finally meet its obligation to protect the public interest.

Sincerely,

(names, cities, and zip codes of 406 Utahns)