

<p>Mayoral Candidates</p>	<p>1. What action do you plan to take related to growth in the Northwest Quadrant? In what way is Salt Lake City's adopted Northwest Quadrant Masterplan important to your district, or to the City as a whole? Link to the Northwest Quadrant Masterplan. Link to Plan Salt Lake . Link to West General Plan.</p>
<p>Erin Mendenhall</p>	<p>The NWQ Master Plan was developed before the State takeover of this property for the Inland Port, but it still sets forth a strong and relevant vision for this critically important area. The concept of planning for the future by protecting sensitive wetlands, requiring sustainable development, and thoughtfully attracting jobs that can provide opportunities to an area of the City that has not been traditionally well-served. I fought hard when I was on the City Council to preserve the City's land use authority when the State forced its way into this area, and I continued to fight as mayor to regain the City's control of taxpayer money. By building relationships with state and Inland Port leaders, I've solidified the City's position as a key decision maker in future development, including the use of funds to incentivize sustainable infrastructure, land preservation, good jobs, and mitigate negative health and community impacts. My administration will continue aggressively taking our place at the table and working with community stakeholders to ensure that the Port carries out its obligations to conduct comprehensive study in the NWQ so that we can understand all potential impacts of development and fight for the best possible Inland Port for our residents and the wildlife that depends on this area.</p>
<p>Rocky Anderson</p>	<p>The adopted Northwest Quadrant Masterplan is vital to Salt Lake City, particularly since it has been the product of extensive study, analysis, and public process and takes into account crucial environmental and quality of life concerns. Although there should be changes over time to the Masterplan, particularly with respect to the emphasis on industry and jobs over environmental protection, it should be SLC that has control over its destiny and not the state or an unelected body like the Inland Port Board. I've made my views publicly known, long before deciding to run for mayor. A SL Tribune article entitled "'Such a horrible idea on so many levels'--former SLC Mayor Rocky Anderson rails against inland port," SL Tribune, March 7, 2022, stated: "Years ago, when Rocky Anderson was Salt Lake City's mayor, he had a vision for the northwest quadrant. He had nixed a planned 'Grand Salt Lake' megamall for the area shortly after taking office in 2000, decrying it as a magnet for more traffic and pollution. Instead, for this undeveloped land, Anderson saw transit-connected neighborhoods, where there were no roads, where kids could play in front of their houses without fear of being run over, where people valued community and open spaces over cars. With the grand mall thwarted and, later, a 'mini-city' development akin to Daybreak dissolved, Anderson said he did not see the ultimate fate of the northwest quadrant coming: an inland port, chock-full of massive warehouses, manufacturing plants, fueling centers, rail infrastructure and more."</p>
<p>Michael Valentine</p>	<p>City expansion into our environmental areas is important to all of us. I remain skeptical of any and all plans for growth, especially when "economic" interests are the main concern. I would reexamine every single current masterplan and expansion plans in the city, county that impact Salt Lake. Environmental concerns and protections must be central to these plans with scientists, researchers, and environmentalists at every table, dedicating us in the right direction as the experts they are.</p>

<p>Mayoral Candidates</p>	<p>2. What is your position on how the City should exercise its annexation and zoning authority in the Northpoint Area? Do you support the draft Northpoint Small Area Plan as it's written? Link to Draft Northpoint Small Area Plan . What is your position on whether transfer of development rights could satisfy the competing interests in this area? Are your positions influenced by the issue of takings?</p>
<p>Erin Mendenhall</p>	<p>My administration has been working toward a City-led annexation of properties in the Northpoint Area. This is important because including these properties in the City gives us the most control over their future development. Transparently, the City has multiple concerns regarding development in this area: proximity to the airport, impacts on municipal services and maintenance, and haphazard development on or near sensitive wetlands and wildlife habitat. Annexing property under its existing "agricultural" classification and requiring a rezoning process before property is entitled to upzone is a key piece of ensuring thoughtful future development. One of the items addressed in the small area plan is a transfer-of-development-rights program, which could certainly help satisfy some competing interests by providing a path where property owners could consolidate development, leave more buffer areas, and not lose value in their investments or subject the City to a takings action. I support the Plan as a valuable path toward managing competing interests in the community, but acknowledge that the circumstances in this area are quite different from when the City Council funded and directed Planning staff to embark upon this process, and there's always room for improvement.</p>
<p>Rocky Anderson</p>	<p>Instead of the City accommodating more warehouses in the Northpoint Area (which the present administration has done, to the detriment of Northpoint residents -- and to all others who seek to preserve the unique character of the Northpoint Area), the city should do everything possible to protect against the deterioration of the Northpoint Area by allowing more warehouses. Already, the Inland Port has control over about 20% of the area of SLC; there is no justification for allowing warehouses in the Northpoint Area. I joined in signing a petition for the administration to reverse course, although a lot of the damage has already been done. "Pushback against Northpoint plan builds as two former SLC mayors, inland port boss raise concerns - Is Salt Lake City prioritizing warehouses over farms, homes and habitat for the Great Salt Lake?," SL Tribune, January 13, 2023, found at https://www.sltrib.com/news/2023/01/13/is-slc-prioritizing-warehouses/. I agree with the statement of the Stop the Polluting Port Coalition and Great Salt Lake Audubon in that article: "It's outrageous that Salt Lake City is proposing another warehouse district, which will further degrade our air quality with polluting warehouse development, when dust from the drying Great Salt Lake is increasingly threatening to human health." I was heartened by a letter from the Director of the Inland Port stating that priority will be given to promoting a higher quality of life for area residents. We can protect legal rights under the "takings" doctrine and still protect human health, the GSL, and the ecosystem.</p>

Michael Valentine	I am concerned by any advancement and development further west and north, into our environmental areas and closer to the lake. All zoning should be utilized to protect the environment and these areas. Our wetlands must be protected and I am concerned with expanding industrial, business interests in the area vs public spaces, and more sustainable forms of development. I would like to examine this plan in much greater detail with full input from the community and especially environmental groups and scientists. Any annexation and zoning would not be taken lightly and I wouldn't support anything that would negatively impact these ecological areas. I'm concerned by any and all development in the area.
-------------------	---

Mayoral Candidates	3. Do you support the concept of the recently-proposed Shoreline Preservation Plan that proponents hope will protect the perimeter of the Great Salt Lake? What development would be appropriate near the preservation area?
Erin Mendenhall	I absolutely support the Shoreline Preservation Plan, and my administration has recently worked with community members to apply for a \$10 million Great Salt Lake Watershed Enhancement Trust grant that could be put toward acquiring property for conservation. We are also looking at potential City funds to put toward this effort, and will continue to work with the state, county, advocacy groups, and private property owners to try to make this plan a reality. In terms of development that would be appropriate near the preservation area, I think the priority would be development that is sensitive to wildlife, wetlands, and the interface of stormwater runoff with the Lake.
Rocky Anderson	I enthusiastically support the concept of the Shoreline Preservation Plan intended to protect the perimeter of the Great Salt Lake. I also believe we should fast-track designating the perimeter of the Great Salt Lake as a protected heritage area so it can never be developed. I was pleased to learn about the emphasis on protection of the shoreline and wetlands of the GSL by the Executive Director of the Inland Port, who is insisting that the Utah Inland Port Authority (UIPA) dedicate some of its funding and land mass in SLC to wetland preservation along the Great Salt Lake. Of course, much more needs to be done, but a recognition by the UIPA of the need to focus on the preservation of GSL shoreline and wetlands is a significant step. Now we need to set a firm, coherent goal about what "protection" really means and make certain that the UIPA is not allowed to contribute to the deterioration of the GSL and its wetlands, our air quality, or the public health.
Michael Valentine	Yes, support the Shoreline Plan that fully protects the perimeter of the Great Salt Lake. We are stewards of our natural lands, the lake, and our environment. I am by no means an expert, but a staunch environmentalist and someone who cares deeply about the future of the lake, climate change, and our environment. Protecting that is my ultimate concern above all else. I would support any development that is sustainable, regenerative, that won't have negative impacts on the area and environment, that is fully aligned with our goals of protecting the perimeter of the Great Salt Lake and the area. I love the idea of agriculture, recreation, and wildlife management as well as public trusts. I also fully support the GSL getting personhood status so it can be protected more as an environmental wonder.

<p>Mayoral Candidates</p>	<p>4. How would you address the widespread increase in the use of insecticides and herbicides to control mosquitos and suppress invasive phragmites (tall grass) over the Great Salt Lake wetlands? Does Salt Lake City have an obligation to be more engaged in the human health consequences of these chemical treatments for neighborhoods abutting the Port (especially given that these areas are already subject to the most environmental contaminants of any area in the Salt Lake Valley)? Do the entities making the decisions to use these toxins have adequate expertise in the public health consequences of toxic chemicals? How should the City address the welfare of inmates, employees, and volunteers at the Utah State Prison as it relates to mosquito and pesticide exposure?</p>
<p>Erin Mendenhall</p>	<p>In 2021, I spoke out against SLCMAD's plan to do aerial treatments during shorebird nesting times. It's vital that SLCMAD continues to evaluate impacts of pesticides on humans and wildlife as the Port area changes. While it would be ideal to not have to use chemicals to address mosquitoes and other bugs, there are very real consequences to not abating them, too. Climate change will also bring new challenges, and adjusting for very wet or very dry years will be a constant requirement. The City has an obligation to ensure that SLCMAD appointees are well qualified, and I think we've done that. I was impressed with SLCMAD's approach to finding a non-chemical intervention to abate mosquitoes around the new prison, and we have to continue to urge the District toward the most environmentally sensitive treatments.</p>
<p>Rocky Anderson</p>	<p>First, I emphasize that the siting of the new Utah State Prison was a glaring mistake, putting everyone concerned at great risk. We all deserve to know why anyone thought it was a good idea to place the prison on such an ecologically sensitive wetland site, with frequent clouds of mosquitoes covering the area. We also deserve to know who benefited financially from such a clearly unwise (to put it mildly) decision. The decision showed blatant disregard for the interests of incarcerated people, employees, and visitors, as well as millions of birds that will be adversely affected if pesticides destroy vital parts of the area's ecosystem. It's shocking to read the following: "Officials knew mosquitoes would be a problem in the area. They had years to prepare. Yet records indicate they weren't ready for the onslaught of bugs as inmates were 'getting eaten alive,' according to one loved one." "3 things to know about the mosquito problem at the new Utah prison - The site sits on ecologically sensitive wetlands," SL Tribune, Dec. 20, 2022, found at https://www.sltrib.com/news/2022/12/08/3-things-know-about-mosquito/ Everyone involved deserves to have leading scientists in the field determine the best course for dealing with mosquitos and the invasive phragmites in and near the GSL wetlands. We should also listen to the scientists rather than politicians, developers, and those who suggest building a prison on top of an ecologically sensitive site.</p>
<p>Michael Valentine</p>	<p>Yes, of course, we have an obligation to the chemicals we spray in the air across our city neighborhoods. I don't believe we are doing enough to consider the impacts here and I would call for full studies to be done. I don't think they have adequate expertise, especially as it pertains to the environmental impact by the Polluting Port. I'm well aware of what life was once like before EPA standards and am very concerned with any toxins impacting our residents, water, wildlife, and environment. I am also concerned by the diseases mosquitos can carry and was just reading about the inmates and workers at the prison dealing with a breakout of West Nile virus. It seems obvious these concerns weren't taken into account when the prisons was build near the swamp lands west of Salt Lake. It is always the responsibility of the city to keep our people safe, both from the spread of viruses as well as the</p>

harm of toxic chemicals. I am concerned by this issue and would rely on the experts, scientists, and researchers to guide us to the best solutions, while protecting both our environment and our people.

Mayoral Candidates	5. Do you think that other topics related to the environmental impacts of the Utah Inland Port need to be addressed by Salt Lake City?
Erin Mendenhall	<p>All development has impacts, and the City must exercise its authority to try to mitigate negative impacts on current and future residents regardless of where the development is. We know that private property rights are sacred in Utah, and we have to respect those entitlements. That said, the biggest driver for me as I fought to regain control of City tax increment in the NWQ was to have funds to incentivize sustainable development and mitigate negative environmental and health impacts. The studies identified in the MOU between the City and the Port will inevitably reveal impacts that we need to address, whether those are impacts to human health from poor air quality, or impacts to wildlife from stormwater runoff. I look forward to the study results to guide our future decision making.</p>
Rocky Anderson	<p>Yes! Almost everything about the Utah Inland Port is in disregard of the crucial need to effectively combat the climate crisis. More asphalt, the burning of more fossil fuels, the destruction of the Great Salt Lake and surrounding wetlands, and utilization of energy generated by other than renewable sources all spell greater harm to our atmosphere, our planet, and all living things, now and, with increasingly tragic results, far into the future.</p> <p>When we take actions that promote the climate crisis, the reverberations and destructive loop of devastating effects speed up the worst effects of climate chaos. For instance, we were told years ago by Utah's top scientists in relevant fields that if we continue to exacerbate the climate crisis by burning fossil fuels, our river basins will continue to dry up and, specifically, the GSL will lose a significant volume of water and become more salinated—which is exactly what we're now experiencing. Other than Governor Huntsman, it seems that no Utah Governor or legislator (or other mayors, it appears) has read and taken to heart the consensus scientific view of those scientists. I highly recommend everyone read "Climate change and Utah: The Scientific Consensus (September 2007), found here: https://collections.lib.utah.edu/details?id=1158936.</p> <p>We must always place foremost in our public policy considerations a commitment that we cannot undertake any actions that will further deplete the water needed for the GSL, deteriorate our air quality, or contribute to the climate crisis.</p>
Michael Valentine	<p>Yes, I am very concerned with the port and have been so for years. Some of my friends were arrested years ago for protesting the Inland Port at the meetings, or the Polluting Port as it's known. I fully support the port being moved away from the city and away from any environmental, wildlife areas. I don't agree with the notion the port is here to stay and there is nothing we can do about it. Climate change will force us to be aware of how we relate with the environment and we must change our ways now, with the Inland Port, with saving the Great Salt Lake. I have long been against the port and I remain steadfast in my opposition to it.</p>

