

Utah Inland Port Authority Board 2026

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Utah Inland Port Authority Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, March 16, 2026 - 1:00 pm
Duchesne County Centennial Event Center
60 W 400 S, Duchesne, Utah 84012

Board Members Present in Person: None

Board Members Present Electronically: Jonathan Freedman, Jerry Stevenson, Jefferson Moss, Tyler Clancy

Non-Voting Board Members Present in Person: None

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

Board Members Absent: Abby Osborne, Joel Ferry

UIPA Staff: Ben Hart, Ariane Gibson, Larry Shepherd, Amy Brown Coffin, Kaitlin Felsted, Jenna Draper, Lynne Mayer, Danny Stewart, Carol Watson, Diana Gardner, Stephen Smith, Lindsay Pedersen, Mona Smith, Mark Nord, Allen Evans, Nick Archambault, Stephanie Pack, Caroline Mackleby, Michelle Bohnen, Sebastian Abril, Scott Wolford, Doug Pierce, Amy Chanthalyxay, Nadine Stevens-Hendry, Michelle Bohnen

Others in Attendance: Michelle Ebben, Nicole McDermott, Won Hee Park, Candice Hasenyager, Bryce Bird, Ryan Robinson, Debbie Lyons, Foe Finley, Michael Resare, Robert Green, Bill Cobabe, Byron Black, Erik Stromberg, James Harris, Alicia Fairbourn, Jeri Hamilton, Bucky Whitehouse, Gary Hanneman, Tussy King, Rachelle Custer, Jeff Ostermiller, Joy Peters, Jen Hart, Helene Cuomo, Eric Tholen, Logan Stefanich, Heather Dove, Teri Durfee, Ann Florence, Deeda Seed, Rebecca Burrage, Ben Holcomb, Andy Hulka, Tony Semerad, Allison Barton, Joan Gregory, Brock Harrison, Brian Moench, Penny Fine

1. **Welcome**

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

2. **Executive Director Report**

Executive Director Ben Hart provided an executive director report. He thanked the legislature, the governor, and others who worked to craft legislation over the past 60 days to help the port fulfill its mission. That mission is to provide financing tools,

particularly tax differential, to benefit the public and support the economic vision of the local community.

He noted a contract completed with SWCA for \$150,000 in the last 30 days in connection with the Clean Ports Grant.

3. Presentation: Quarterly Budget Update

Ariane Gibson, Deputy Director and Chief Financial Officer, provided the budget update, reviewing through the second quarter of FY 2026, ending December 30, 2025. She noted that property tax revenues are usually passed through to the port in the third quarter of the fiscal year, which explains why revenue in this report appears lower than might be expected midway through the year. Expenses in this report are at 28.51% of the budgeted amount halfway through the year and will similarly rise to come closer to budgeted expectations as other items are expensed through the end of the fiscal year. Overall, UIPA is doing well with expenses versus revenues for this 6-month period ending December 1, 2025.

| Utah Inland Port Authority | | Income Statement FY2026 Period 06 | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Current YTD as of 12/31/25 | Approved Budget Appropriation | Surplus (Defecit) | Surplus (Defecit) % |
| Revenues | | | | |
| Taxes | | | | |
| Property Tax Differential - Current | - | 35,376,000 | (35,376,000) | 0.00% |
| Sales Tax | 863,879 | 1,048,000 | (184,121) | 82.43% |
| Intergovernmental Revenue | | | | |
| Legislative Appropriation | 3,183,200 | 3,184,000 | (800) | 99.97% |
| Other (specify): | - | | | |
| Miscellaneous Revenue | | | | |
| Interest Earnings | 1,286,519 | 2,368,000 | (1,081,481) | 54.33% |
| Lease Rent | 381,170 | 772,000 | (390,830) | 49.37% |
| Unrealized/Realized Gains(Losses) on Investment | (107,158) | 489,000 | (596,158) | -21.91% |
| Federal Grants | 311,957 | 1,272,000 | (960,043) | 24.52% |
| Materials and Supplies | 17,468 | - | 17,468 | 100.00% |
| Other (specify): Miscellaneous | 1,829 | 2,000 | (171) | 91.43% |
| TOTAL INCOME | 5,938,864 | 44,511,000 | (38,572,136) | 13.34% |
| Beginning Balance | 53,540,592 | 33,760,906 | | |
| TOTAL REVENUES | 65,418,319 | 122,782,906 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Operating Expenses | | | | |
| Personnel | 2,171,129 | 4,675,000 | 2,503,871 | 46.44% |
| Travel | 63,078 | 135,000 | 71,922 | 46.72% |
| Office Lease | 2,009,275 | 646,000 | (1,363,275) | 311.03% |
| Legal fees | 318,465 | 315,000 | (3,465) | 101.10% |
| General and Administrative Expenses | 118,753 | 189,000 | 70,247 | 62.83% |
| Technology & Licenses | 130,014 | 183,000 | 52,986 | 71.05% |
| Professional Services | 233,643 | 300,000 | 66,357 | 77.88% |
| Other (Specify): Office Build Out | 627,089 | 900,000 | 272,911 | 69.68% |
| Grant Expenditures | 307,255 | 1,296,000 | 988,745 | 23.71% |
| Judgments and Losses | - | - | - | 100.00% |
| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE | 5,978,701 | 8,639,000 | 2,660,299 | 69.21% |
| Inland Port Development Activities | | | | |
| Salt Lake City Differential Allocation | 425,404 | 890,000 | 464,596 | 47.80% |
| Acquisition of Property | - | 7,969,000 | 7,969,000 | 0.00% |
| Publicly Owned Infrastructure and Improvements | 5,599 | 1,140,000 | 1,134,401 | 0.49% |
| Fees & Transfers | | | | |
| SLC Housing Affordability Payment | - | 3,300,000 | 3,300,000 | 0.00% |
| Transfer to Series 2021 Bond | - | 6,514,000 | 6,514,000 | 0.00% |
| Tax Sharing Agreements & Incentives | 325,183 | 1,906,000 | 1,580,817 | 17.06% |
| TOTAL DEVELOPMENT, FEES, & TRANSFERS | 756,186 | 21,719,000 | 20,962,814 | 3.48% |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | 6,734,887 | 30,358,000 | 23,623,113 | 28.51% |
| Closing Balance | 58,683,432 | 92,424,906 | | |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | 65,418,319 | 122,782,906 | | |

4. Presentation: 2025 Monitoring Activities at Utah Inland Port - Utah Department of Environmental Quality

Bryce Bird, Director, Division of Air Quality, provided a summary of air monitoring activities established around the Inland Port area six years ago to create a baseline before major development.

Key points of the report include:

- Emissions Inventory: The Division tracks emissions from existing regulated sources and new companies moving into the area, focusing on point sources (smokestack industries) and road traffic.
- Emissions Trends (2017-2024):
 - Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx): Emissions have decreased due to new technology and replacement of older systems, which is positive as NOx is a precursor to PM2.5 and ozone.
 - Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs): Emissions have slightly increased due to increased activity and new sources, though VOCs from motor vehicles are also a factor.
 - Fine Particulate Matter (PM): Direct emissions have increased with activity but the trend is currently decreasing since 2020.

- Air Monitoring Network: Funding was used to establish upwind and downwind monitors (e.g., at the correctional facility, Lake Park Elementary, DEQ Technical Center, Rose Park) in addition to existing monitors.
- Initial Findings: The Inland Port area currently shows similar concentrations and ranges of pollutants as the rest of the Salt Lake Valley, overlapping well with neighborhood and industrialized areas. The monitors have also captured wind-blown emissions from the Great Salt Lake and notable spikes like fireworks on July 4th.

The Division will continue to operate these monitors.

Candice Hasenyager, Director, Division of Water Resources, and James Harris, Great Salt Lake Water Quality Coordinator, provided the report on water quality.

They summarized a multi-year project evaluating potential water quality impacts on sensitive wetland areas near the Great Salt Lake, specifically addressing concerns related to the development of the Utah Inland Port.

Key Challenges:

- Stormwater Monitoring: The division does not typically monitor stormwater directly but rather monitors the impacts (or lack thereof) through compliance with Best Management Practices (BMPs) No established water quality standards exist for stormwater in this area, unlike for surface waters.
- Difficult to determine impact of small area: Difficulty in isolating the small study area within a large, developed urban environment (Salt Lake County).
- Connectivity and local hydrology is unclear: Unclear connectivity of monitored sites to receiving waters and complicated hydrology.
- Difficult to plan for monitoring: Planning and executing monitoring is difficult due to the random nature of storm events.
- Limited resources and time: Lack of 'before and after' monitoring data necessitated a design comparing newly developed, older developed, and undeveloped (reference/agricultural) sites.

Monitoring Design & Findings:

- Site Comparison: Stations were set up in drainage catchments categorized as newly developed, older developed, and underdeveloped (ag/reference).
- Impervious Surface: Analysis of impervious surface mapping confirmed rapid development in the area, which was the anticipated mechanism for water quality impact.
- Runoff Expectation: Greater runoff was expected (and observed) from impervious surfaces.
- Sampling Bias: Auto-samplers triggered fewer events in the reference and agricultural (ag) sites due to higher perviousness, confounding the intended site-to-site comparisons.
- TSS (Sediment): Newly developed sites had lower Total Suspended Solids (TSS) than older developed sites, possibly indicating the effectiveness of modern BMPs being installed on the new sites.

- TDS (Salts): Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) were generally higher in more developed sites, particularly in the spring, likely due to snow control activities.
- Metals (Toxicity): Highest metals concentrations were found in older developed sites, potentially due to legacy contamination (e.g., old landfill), shallow groundwater, or reduced control of TSS/metals in older infrastructure. Newer developed sites were much lower.

Recommendations/Conclusion:

The project provided valuable insights into monitoring complex stormwater environments. A key suggestion for future monitoring is to incorporate actual discharge measurements (volume of flow) to better account for differences in storm intensity and runoff volume across sites. The division is willing to share the data and lessons learned to assist others interested in repeating or improving this type of monitoring in other areas of the inland port.

5. **Presentation: Preferred Scenario, Northwest Quadrant Study**

Stephen Smith, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, led the presentation of an update on the Preferred Scenario Study for the Northwest Quadrant area in Salt Lake City.

Key Points:

- Context: This is the second of two studies under an interlocal agreement with Salt Lake City. The first was a baseline study presented in November of 2025.
- Purpose of Preferred Scenario Study: To develop recommendations for using Salt Lake City tax increment generated in the Northwest Quadrant and potential policy recommendations, based on opportunities identified in the baseline study.

Nicole McDermott of WSP provided additional context and background information on the Preferred Scenario Study.

- Study Area: Specifically focused on the UIPA jurisdictional land within Salt Lake City limits in the broader Northwest Quadrant area.
- Baseline Findings Overview: The baseline study compiled data and conducted community engagement across environment, community and health, economic development, and transportation. Key findings included a lack of community facilities/amenities and insufficient transit service, especially for the workforce.
- Connection to Preferred Scenarios: The preferred scenarios (investment and policy recommendations) aim to address the opportunities and concerns from the baseline study.

Debbie Lyons, Salt Lake City Sustainability Director, noted the city's collaboration in this effort - advising on stakeholder identification, community outreach, and ensuring the

recommendations aligned with city policy, sustainability goals, and community input.

Stephen Smith reviewed recommendations for priority investments, with a focus on items with a clear path to immediate implementation.

- Tax differential support for wetland restoration.
- Tax differential support for public safety.
- Support for Salt Lake City's water usage assessment program (water conservation).
- Funding for community organizations addressing health disparities.
- Funding for educational partnerships (workforce training for Westside residents).
- Support for vanpool or on-demand transit service.

Priority Policy Actions

- Water Conservation programs
- Truck parking
- Sustainable building practices
- Water quality improvement
- Expanded, efficient air cargo handling

Long Term Recommendations

- Rail Crossing improvements
- North Temple Landfill remediation

Next Steps

- Incorporate UIPA board feedback and finalize priority recommendations
- Work with partners to finalize recommendations and agreements
- UIPA and partners to track metrics
- Ongoing engagement, reporting, town halls, and presence at community events

6. Policy Updates

Amy Brown Coffin, Chief Risk & Compliance Officer, presented the following policies for review:

BP-04 - Project Area & Tax Differential

BP-10 - Records Retention (there are no staff recommended changes at this time)

BP-12 - Segregation of Duties

BP-17 - Wetlands (there are no staff recommended changes at this time)

- 7. Presentation: Resolution 2026-07 Landfill Development Authority**
Mark Nord, Director, Director of Real Estate, presented an update on landfill remediation and the resolution allowing the UIPA Executive Director to act as an agent on behalf of the port in matters related to the development of the real estate.
- 8. Presentation: Resolution 2026-08 Memorandum of Understanding, UIPA/Office of Energy Development**
Ben Hart introduced Joe Finley, Energy Council Policy Advisor with the Utah Office of Energy Development. Joe offered information on the creation of Energy Development Zones in the state and the partnership with UIPA to assist in the back-end support of establishing and managing these zones. For this support UIPA will receive 2% of the Energy Council's portion of tax increment as an administrative fee.
- 9. Presentation: Amended Trigger Resolutions**
Amy Chanthalyxay, Financial Manager, explained the need for amended trigger resolutions for three areas to correct the designation of trigger dates for collection of tax differential for parcels in these areas.
Resolution 2026-09 Amended Trigger Resolution for Castle Country Project Area.
Resolution 2026-10 Amended Trigger Resolution for Skyline Corridor Project Area.
Resolution 2026-11 Amended Trigger Resolution for Central Utah Agri-Park Project Area.
- 10. Presentation: Resolution 2026-12 Twenty Wells Project Area Amendment #2**
Stephanie Pack, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, provided a presentation on amendment #2 to the Tooele Valley Project Area. The proposed amendment adds 155 acres to the project area, bringing the total land area to 775 acres. The new parcels will be for mixed-use development with industrial, commercial, and residential usage and will be known as The Crossing District. As the property is developed, future residential areas will be amended out of the project area as a final build-out plan is determined.
Michael Resare, Grantsville City Manager, called this area pivotal to Grantsville, as it represents development that will introduce higher density uses into the city.
Eric Stromberg, Tooele County Councilman, expressed optimism in what this area of light industrial and retail growth can bring to the county.
- 11. Presentation: Resolution 2026-13 Tax Sharing Agreement, Twenty Wells Project Area**
Stephanie Pack detailed the requested tax sharing agreement with Romney Group where they have fronted the money for qualifying public infrastructure in the Deseret Meadows development and are requesting reimbursement through this tax-sharing agreement. The infrastructure includes sewer, water, stormwater, other utilities, and roads. The request is for 100% of available tax differential up to \$3.8 million.
- 12. Presentation: Resolution 2026-15 Iron Springs Project Area Amendment #3**
Danny Stewart, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, presented amendment #3 to the Iron Springs Project Area. This amendment adds about 432 acres of industrial park property at the north end of Enoch to the project area to facilitate a business incentive for a company expansion there.

Enoch Mayor Ryan Robinson expressed appreciation for the opportunity for this property to be included in the project area and for the growth of MCM Engineering/ LS Electric.

13. Presentation: Business Incentive Consideration - LS Electric

Danny Stewart presented a proposed business incentive for LS Electric/MCM Engineering in support of their expansion in Enoch. The project is a proposed 5-to-7 year, \$168 million initiative to expand the company's campus and add 3 new factories. In 2022 MCM Engineering was acquired by LS Electric, a global South Korean company that provides smart energy, automation and electrical solutions. This expansion is slated to add 250 new high-quality jobs to the area. The recommendation is for a property tax rebate of 30% of the Inland Port's percentage of tax differential for 25 years, subject to continued operation in the project area over that time.

14. Presentation: Resolution 2026-16 Ancient Sky Project Area Amendment #1

Jenna Draper, Associate Vice President of Regional Project Area Development, presented the amendment to the Ancient Sky Project Area in San Juan County. This proposed amendment will add 2,685 acres to the project area in the La Sal area and Blanding City.

15. Presentation: Resolution 2026-17 Ancient Sky Trigger Resolution

Jenna Draper, also presented the Ancient Sky trigger resolution which will designate the trigger date for collection of tax differential on certain parcels in the Ancient Sky Project Area.

16. Presentation: Resolution 2026-18 Black Gold Project Area Plan & Budget

Jenna Draper presented the Black Gold Project Area in Duchesne County and Roosevelt City. She noted that the proposed project area met all statutory requirements to be considered as a UIPA project area and explained how the tax differential model is used to fund regional infrastructure needs.

Deborah Herron, Duchesne County Economic Development Director, highlighted Duchesne County's energy and agriculture base, and their desire to build a more resilient and diversified economy. They look to intentionally recruit complementary industries including logistics, manufacturing, warehousing, and information technologies.

Drew Eschler, Planning and Zoning Division Manager in Roosevelt City explained that 62% of all the oil produced in Utah comes from Duchesne County, roughly 95,000 barrels of oil per day. More than 24% of the county's workforce is directly employed in oil and gas extraction.

Participation in an Inland Port project area will help diversify the economy and help during the times when the energy industry is in a down cycle.

17. Approval of Minutes, January 13, 2026 Board Meeting

Board member Stevenson moved to approve the minutes from the January 13, 2026 board meeting.

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously by all board members present.

18. Public Comment

Board Chair Osborne opened up the public comment period.

A comment from Dr. Brian Moench asked the board to reject the MOU between UIPA and the Office of Energy Development, expressing concerns about the development of a data center in Tooele County and pollution caused by the power generation required by the facility.

Terri Durfee also expressed concern about a data center in Tooele County and wetlands protection there.

Rebecca Burrage spoke in opposition to the MOU between UIPA and the Office of Energy Development over environmental concerns.

Joan Gregory expressed disgust over the purchase of a warehouse in the northwest quadrant by the Department of Homeland Security and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. She questioned whether UIPA had any role in this transaction.

Duchesne County Commissioner Jeff Chugg spoke in support of the Black Gold project area and the economic benefits it can bring to the county.

Irene Hansen recalled her days in economic development and as an elected official in Duchesne County and expressed appreciation to see the economic development tools that the project area can provide coming to the county and the additional wealth, prosperity, and good paying jobs that can come.

Jason Woodger spoke of the energy industry in the Uintah Basin, its anticipated future growth, and the opportunity to improve transportation from the area. He feels the partnership with UIPA will be a help.

Executive Director Ben Hart addressed questions about UIPA involvement with the DHS/ICE facility in Salt Lake City. "We had no collaboration, coordination, facilitation, or even awareness of that facility before it was announced last week. So, just to be clear, the port had no role in that new facility at all."

19. **Policy Update**

Board member Moss moved to approve Board Policy BP-04 - Project Area & Tax Differential as presented.

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

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

20. **Resolution 2026-07 Landfill Development Authority**

Board member Stevenson moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-07, a Resolution Granting Authority to Executive Director as Authorized Agent.

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

21. **Resolution 2026-08 MOU, UIPA/Office of Energy Development**

Board member Moss moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-08, a Resolution Granting Authority to Executive Director to Enter into Agreement with Office of Energy Development.

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

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

22. Amended Trigger Resolutions:

Resolution 2026-09 Amended Trigger Resolution for Castle Country Project Area

Board member Moss moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-09, Amended Trigger Resolution for Castle Country Project Area.

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

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

Resolution 2026-10 Amended Trigger Resolution for Skyline Corridor Project Area

Board member Stevenson moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-10, Amended Trigger Resolution for Skyline Corridor Project Area.

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

Resolution 2026-11 Amended Trigger Resolution for Central Utah Agri-Park Project Area

Board member Stevenson moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-11, Amended Trigger Resolution for Central Utah Agri-Park Project Area.

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

23. Resolution 2026-12 Twenty Wells Project Area Amendment #2

Board member Moss moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-12, a Resolution of the Utah Inland Port Authority Board Adopting Amendments to the Twenty Wells Inland Port Project Area.

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

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

24. Resolution 2026-13 Tax Sharing Agreement, Twenty Wells Project Area

Board member Stevenson moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-13, Romney Group Interlocal Tax Sharing Agreement.

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

25. Resolution 2026-15 Iron Springs Project Area Amendment #3

Board member Moss moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-15, a Resolution of the Utah Inland Port Authority Board Adopting Amendments to the Iron Springs Inland Port Project Area Plan.

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

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

26. Approval of Business Incentive

Board member Freedman moved that The Utah Inland Port Authority Board approves for LS Electric/MCM Engineering an annual Project Area Incentive/Property Tax Differential Rebate equivalent to 30% of the Utah Inland Port Authority's percentage of tax differential, 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 completion of a contract agreement.

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

27. Resolution 2026-16 Ancient Sky Project Area Amendment #1

Board member Stevenson moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-15, a Resolution of the Utah Inland Port Authority Board Adopting Amendments to the Iron Springs Inland Port Project Area Plan.

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

28. Resolution 2026-17 Ancient Sky Trigger Resolution

Board member Moss moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-17, Trigger Resolution for Ancient Sky Project Area.

Board member Stevenson seconded the motion.

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

29. Resolution 2026-18 Black Gold Project Area

Board member Stevenson moved that the Utah Inland Port Authority Board adopt Resolution 2026-18, a Resolution of the Utah Inland Port Authority Board Adopting the Black Gold Inland Port Project Area Plan.

Board member Moss seconded the motion.

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

30. Adjourn

Board Vice Chair Freedman adjourned the meeting.

Board Chair Abby Osborne

Written Public Comments submitted during and after the meeting:

Katie Pappas - Salt Lake City - 3/20/2026

Written Comments

Eight years ago, when UIPA was created by the Utah legislature, we were told the Utah Inland Port's purpose was to improve logistics by building distribution centers and taking cargo out of trucks and putting it on trains. Benefits would include better air quality, monetary savings and improved safety on our roads. Impacts in the NWQ would be mitigated.

Since then, we've seen expansion around the Great Salt Lake, threatening wetlands, migratory bird and wildlife habitat, and air quality even though potential loss of the lake is considered an existential threat to life along the Wasatch Front. The Tooele Valley project is especially troubling with its location in wetlands, and inclusion of an AI facility and natural gas power plant. Other project areas are also being considered for data megacenters. The STPP coalition has put together a water report documenting the current water situation in each port area in the Great Salt Lake Basin.

Eight years in, studies that would project future impacts of these ports have not been done. My point is that we are seeing real threats from these developments and no will to impose restraints. When can we expect to see a report from UIPA showing the benefits provided to the state from all this tax subsidized development?