

February 12, 2025

A Taxpayer Boondoggle:

The Utah Inland Port Authority's Impact on Utah Taxpayers



Over the last seven years, the Utah legislature has systematically created taxpayer funded financial tools to fast track development throughout Utah. The [Military Installation Development Authority](#) was the first entity of this type, followed by the [Utah Inland Port Authority \(UIPA\)](#), the [Point of the Mountain State Land Authority](#) and last year the [Utah Fairpark Area Investment and Restoration District](#). The creation of [Public Infrastructure Districts](#) in 2021 was an additional new tool to provide assistance to developers by allowing them to bond (borrow money) for their development projects. There are problems with each one of these bodies in terms of accountability to Utah taxpayers and the uses of public incentives, but this report focuses on the impacts of the Utah Inland Port Authority (UIPA).

In the waning hours of the 2018 Utah legislative session, a bill creating the Utah Inland Port Authority (UIPA) was passed with little public notice or involvement. UIPA was established to fast track industrial development in Salt Lake City's northwest quadrant by providing taxpayer

funded subsidies to developers. The 2018 bill establishing UIPA created a 16,000 acre Northwest Quadrant Project Area mostly in Salt Lake City despite opposition from Salt Lake City.

Seven years later UIPA is poised to have a dramatic, negative statewide impact on Utah's environment and public health, financed with \$1.3 billion in taxpayer money.

From the beginning UIPA has struggled to do anything productive in the Northwest Quadrant Project Area. They originally claimed they needed to take over the area because of the magnitude of the work, and because Salt Lake City didn't have the capacity to create an inland port. The original scheme called for a second intermodal train-to-truck facility to be built. The argument was that the existing Union Pacific intermodal facility was not enough, and that warehouse developers needed another facility to create "competition" and lower shipping costs, thus making their warehouses more attractive to tenants.

Unfortunately, beyond rhetoric about how this would be one of the most beneficial economic development initiatives ever, UIPA supporters had not done their homework. The location that legislative leaders chose was the unremediated North Temple landfill owned by the State Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) and a private partner on the north side of I-80. This idea died due to engineering challenges such as getting large volumes of train traffic across I-80 to the mainline of the Union Pacific, enormous cost and the fact that the only entity that could build and operate it, the Burlington Northern Santa Fe, had no interest.

After this plan fell through, UIPA pivoted to Plan B, which was to issue bonds for [150 million dollars](#) in part to support construction of a \$53 million "transloading facility" next to the existing Union Pacific Intermodal Facility that was supposed to somehow expedite shipping. Again, they failed to do their homework. This project fell through leaving UIPA holding the bag on a \$120,000 monthly lease with the Gardner Company, based on a proprietary contract that did not follow the normal state bidding process. Ultimately, [in a limited audit](#) published in September of 2022, the Utah State Legislative Auditor's Office determined that many questionable decisions had been made by UIPA. They recommended a full programmatic audit which was never conducted.

Just prior to the audit, the Utah legislature amended the authorizing statute to change the composition of the board, reducing the size from 12, to 5 people, stacking the deck even more favorably to developers, making it even more dismissive of concerns about pollution and environmental consequences, and eliminating local representation. Community members with Stop the Polluting Port recognized that change in the board was a violation of the Separation of Powers clause of the Utah State Constitution, as 3 of the 5 UIPA Board members are chosen by the legislature, allowing the legislature to encroach on what should be the function of the executive branch.

After the trouble in the Northwest Quadrant area and with an uncertain way forward, UIPA decided to create additional project areas. They did so at such a rapid clip it has been hard for the public to keep up. Over the last 22 months they have approved 11 project areas, for a total of 12, including the Northwest Quadrant.

The financial tool given to UIPA by the legislature (and administered by legislators on the board in violation of the separation of powers clause of the Utah Constitution), is to draw a boundary around an area and scoop up future property tax revenue to give to developers to fast track industrial development. Project areas are then put on track to borrow money through bonds, receive very low interest loans from UIPA itself and be eligible for other kinds of public financial support. In 2019, the legislature decided to make the use of the UIPA project area tool potentially available to any local government in the state and in 2021 the legislature approved a companion tool that allows UIPA and property owners throughout the state to form “Public Infrastructure Districts” to issue bonds to finance their development projects. Projects are also eligible for “[Authority Infrastructure Bank Loans](#)”.

According to their own planning documents, their 12 project areas are anticipated to sweep up approximately \$1.3 billion in property tax revenue which will be given to developers to fast track industrial development. The 12 project areas are in 14 counties and cover **76,138** acres.

Of significant concern are the 6 project areas in the Great Salt Lake Basin, many close to the shrinking Great Salt Lake and in Great Salt Lake wetlands. These project areas in Salt Lake, Box Elder, Weber, Tooele and Utah County contain **29,921 acres**. Property tax revenue subsidies for developers are estimated to be over a billion dollars (**\$1,014,300,000**). These developments will impair over **77,000 acres** of Great Salt Lake Basin wetlands and **add over half a million new vehicle trips** to roads throughout the Wasatch Front. They will make communities less healthy from increased air pollution, and depletion and degradation of critical water resources. The truck traffic will damage roads and make roads more congested. And all of this is being enabled with taxpayer dollars.

The Great Salt Lake Basin is already in a well established crisis due to lack of water for Great Salt Lake and the basin’s wetlands. The last thing we should be doing is using public money to make this situation worse, yet this is exactly what UIPA is doing.

Depletion of Water Resources

All of the UIPA project areas in the Great Salt Lake Basin will deplete water resources in ways that have not been fully studied and will impact local communities. Tooele County, currently the fastest growing county in the state, is dependent on the poorly understood resources of its groundwater aquifer which is connected to the hydrology of Great Salt Lake. Tooele County

officials know that they don't have enough water to support this growth and that residents' wells are going dry. UIPA sponsored development will further deplete limited water resources and take water away from Great Salt Lake.

In Box Elder County, one location in the project area is intended to subsidize [Bailey Farms International](#), a Utah company that exports alfalfa, a water intensive crop. Other project areas have "data centers" listed as desired uses in addition to warehouses. Data centers require large amounts of water to cool computer servers.

In spite of the Great Salt Lake Basin being closed to new appropriations, new water rights are still being granted (e.g., this water rights situation described in the SLTrib: [Amid a freeze, Utah granted millions of gallons of new water rights in the Great Salt Lake basin](#) [2025/02/08] and [Utah lawmaker wants to pump millions of gallons of groundwater near the Great Salt Lake](#) [2023/11/14]).

Questions about water resources adequate to support UIPA sponsored development also exist in areas outside the Great Salt Lake Basin.

At the January 31, 2025 meeting of the Natural Resources, Agriculture and Environmental Quality Appropriations Subcommittee, the General Manager of the Central Iron County Water Conservancy District made a 'request for appropriation' [for \\$ 4 million from the general fund to help pay for pumping and transmission for a water reuse facility](#). [In his presentation, he noted that the State Engineer has determined that their basin is overallocated by 29,000 acre feet and curtailment will begin in 2035 if they don't resolve the problem](#). He also emphasized the challenges of tremendous growth in Iron County and that he's getting calls all the time with concerns about the inland port.

Water Pollution

Industrial development creates many kinds of pollution. One of the most critical concerns resulting from industrial developments is the stormwater runoff pollution that contaminates adjacent water bodies and groundwater. We've heard from property owners adjacent to the Northwest Quadrant project area that contains newly constructed warehouses, that untreated stormwater is flooding onto their property. This is happening in spite of assurances that stormwater pollution would be well managed. In Tooele County, the Tooele Valley Project Area, is next to Great Salt Lake and 12,000 acres of high functioning Great Salt Lake wetlands. It is slated to host a newly constructed wastewater treatment facility next to Great Salt Lake, but in the interim they got approval to use a large septic tank system. Utah Lake, next to the Verk Project Area, already struggles from water quality issues. In addition, pollution from the

approximately 29 million square feet of new warehouse space and the 50,000 new vehicle trips, will not help.

Wetlands

These developments are going to impair over **77,000** acres of Great Salt Lake Basin wetlands, and surrounding areas in multiple ways (there will also be wetland impacts in project areas outside the Great Salt Lake Basin). Wherever wetlands exist, they serve as pollution sponges, absorbing particulate air pollution, and filtering water pollution. Losing wetlands increases pollution, but replacing them with asphalt is even worse, as the asphalt itself is a continuous source of pollution, irrespective of the traffic and industrial activity that it facilitates. The new impermeable surfaces of the development create storm water pollution. New industrial development depletes water resources and creates noise and light pollution. Obviously the cars, trucks and train and switcher locomotives servicing this development generate even more air pollution. As invariably happens in similar warehouse and industrial developments areas of other states, all this combines to make the directly impacted area, as well as surrounding communities suffer a severe degradation of quality of life and a healthy environment.

Vehicle air pollution

All of the project areas will create new air pollution due to the vehicles needed to service these industrial facilities. Based on conservative estimates, inland port development will cause **556,770** new vehicle trips in the Great Salt Lake Basin, an area already failing to meet federal air quality standards. That is over half of the number of vehicles currently registered in the entire state. And, even a small number of train and switcher diesel engines may emit even more pollution than all those vehicles.

Subsidies for the fossil fuel industry

Ben Hart, the Executive Director of UIPA, used to claim that UIPA would not be in the fossil fuel business. But outside of northern Utah, UIPA project areas are being positioned to specifically support the polluting fossil fuel industry. In the Castle Country Project Area in Emery and Carbon Counties, there are two fossil fuel focused projects: [a Savage Industries planned oil transloading facility where waxy crude from the Uinta Basin would be loaded onto trains and then shipped east along the Colorado River](#) and, [the Fossil Rock Mine, currently owned by Wolverine Fuels LLC, which reopened in September 2024.](#)

In Juab County, in the Central Utah Agri Park Project Area, Wolverine Fuels owns the Canyon Fuel Company Coal Loadout where [mined coal from the Sufco Mine in Sevier County is transported via truck to be loaded into rail cars.](#)

Benefits for Favored Industries and Developers

Developers are unsurprisingly enthusiastic about all the public assistance they are getting.

[At the April 16, 2024 meeting of UIPA’s “Authority Infrastructure Bank Loan Approval Committee”](#), Benn Buys, who at the time was working for UIPA (he’s now the director of the [Utah Fairpark Area Investment and Restoration District](#)) was asked by a committee member how developers were finding out about the opportunity to borrow money from the Infrastructure Bank and he replied that when “cheap money” is available “word gets around” and then pointed out that some of the “biggest developers in the state” were involved in UIPA project areas.¹

Example: Savage Industries

Savage Industries is a company that doesn’t need support from Utah taxpayers, as it reportedly [ended 2023 with over \\$300 million of cash to support its investments](#), yet the company is benefiting from multiple taxpayer subsidies provided by UIPA.

In Tooele County, UIPA supported the **Savage** Transload Network with a \$2.4 million loan over 10 years at 3.04% interest, and they’re supporting the Savage Tooele Railway with a \$10 million loan over 10 years at 3.45%.

In Iron County, UIPA is supporting the **Savage** Transload Network Iron County Transload with a \$5 million loan over 10 years at 3.04% interest.

In Carbon County they are poised to subsidize a new **Savage** Industries transload facility for Uinta Basin waxy crude in the UIPA Project Area just outside of Wellington.

The cumulative impact of all of this is that Utah taxpayers are poised to provide \$1.3 billion in taxpayer subsidies for speculative projects that even if successful in terms of actually getting built, will benefit wealthy developers, while causing tremendous harm to the public via more air and water pollution, noise and light pollution, water consumption, increased highway traffic (especially more trucks), and the overall degradation of quality of life associated with industrial development.

The following chart shows the cumulative impacts of proposed Utah Inland Port Authority development.

¹ <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1112707.mp3> "cheap money" is available "word gets around" is in this time frame [10:24 - 10:40 - 11:08] in the recording. "biggest developers in the state" is spoken in this time frame [33:48 -33:52] in the recording.

Summary of Utah Inland Port Authority Project Area Impacts²

GREAT SALT LAKE BASIN

Project Area	Location	Acres	Tax differential ³	Estimate Sq ft warehouse	Wetlands impacted	Additional vehicles per day	Air Quality Issues
Northwest Quadrant	Mostly SLC, SLC County	16,000 & ~7,000 developable	\$150,000,000 (\$7.5/yr x 20 yrs)	152,460,000	26,588	258,400	yes
Tooele Valley	Tooele County	242	\$54,200,000	2,600,000	12,397	4,420	yes
Twenty Wells	Grantsville, Tooele County	498	\$113,500,000	16,197,514 ⁴	See above	50,000	yes
Golden Spike	Brigham City, Box Elder County	1500	\$175,500,000	16,335,000	5,497	27,710	yes
West Weber	Weber County	9,000	\$360,800,000	98,010,000 ⁵	29,000	166,600	yes
Verk	Spanish Fork, Utah County	2,681	\$160,300,000	29,196,090	3,800	49,640	yes
Total GSL Basin		29,921	\$1,014,300,000	314,798,604	77,282	556,770	

² The location, acreage, and projected tax differential come from UIPA project area plans. Estimates of warehouse space are based on available acreage divided by 2 to get approximate buildable acres. One acre can contain approximately 21,780 square feet of warehouse space. Each million square feet generates approximately 1,700 new vehicle trips. Wetland impact estimates are based on measurements of wetland acres.

³ Tax differential over 25 yrs unless otherwise indicated

⁴ <https://lakeviewbusinesspark.com/> (4,659,822 for data center)

⁵ This assumes only 4500 acres are built out.

OUTSIDE OF NORTHERN UTAH

Project Area	Location	Acres	Tax differential ⁶	Estimate Sq ft warehouse	Wetlands impacted	Additional vehicles per day	Air Quality Issues
Castle Country	Carbon and Emery Counties	12,930	\$15,600,000	Unknown	NA	Unable to estimate	no
Central Utah Agri Park	Juab	2,185	\$30,700,000	Unknown	NA	Unable to estimate	no
Historic Capitol	Fillmore City, Millard County	1,960	\$41,000,000	Unknown	NA	Unable to estimate	no
Iron Springs	Iron County	2,300	\$118,300,000	25,047,000	NA	17,000	no
Mineral Mountains	Beaver County	25,427	\$39,700,000	Unknown	NA	Unable to estimate	no
Skyline Corridor	San Pete, Sevier, Wayne	1,415	\$42,000,000	Unknown	NA	Unable to estimate	no
Outside of Northern Utah Total		46,217	\$287,300,000	Unknown	NA	Unknown	

GRAND TOTAL: GREAT SALT LAKE BASIN and OUTSIDE OF NORTHERN UTAH

Grand Total		76,138	\$1,301,600,000		77,282		
--------------------	--	---------------	------------------------	--	---------------	--	--

⁶ Tax differential over 25 yrs unless otherwise indicated

Current Status of Project Areas

GREAT SALT LAKE BASIN

Salt Lake County: Northwest Quadrant

For seven years UIPA has struggled to find a reason to exist in Salt Lake City's Northwest Quadrant, where the UIPA Jurisdictional Area covers 16,000 acres. Their public investment has largely consisted of payments to developers and vendors for failed contracts, consultants and their own staff. The [Utah Legislative Auditor General Office's 2022 Audit](#) was requested by legislative leaders because of concerns related to the Northwest Quadrant. To justify its existence in the Northwest Quadrant, UIPA has set its sights on buying the 770 acre unremediated North Temple Landfill from SITLA. In 2018 the property was donated to SITLA by Suburban Land Reserve, a for-profit subsidiary of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The plan was that SITLA would remediate and develop the property.

UIPA is negotiating to purchase the unremediated North Temple landfill from SITLA and SITLA's private partner, to fast track cleanup so the site can be developed. Their vision is to use it for advanced manufacturing, bio tech and other uses that are not warehouse/distribution uses. UIPA's public justification for buying the property (and as far as we know this hasn't happened yet) is that the whole area needs to be remediated at once, and that SITLA's phased plan is stymying the plans of developers (Colmena and Rio Tinto) to the north of the landfill.

With much fanfare in 2024 the Utah Legislature amended the UIPA statute to include a prohibition on distribution centers (warehouses) on contaminated land - there is currently [a bill before the legislature](#) that amends that language to exclude land that is owned by a private landowner.

When fully built out, the Northwest Quadrant will contain approximately 152 million square feet of new industrial development, generating approximately 258,400 additional vehicle trips. Northwest Quadrant developers are slated to get \$150 million in tax differential to fast track development.

Utah County in Spanish Fork: Verk

The 2,681 acre Verk Project Area is next to the rural farming community of Palmyra, which according to agriculture experts is some of the best farmland in Utah. Over the 2 years since it was introduced, the project area has grown so it now includes an even greater amount of impacted wetlands, close to the edge of Utah Lake's Provo Bay and just a mile from a restoration area for the [Endangered Species Act listed June sucker](#). There's the potential for a total of 29 million square feet of new warehouse space built by prominent Utah developers including Boyer,

Colmena, Gardner/Black Pine/Vest, Hamilton Partners, Ritchie Group, and Wadsworth.⁷

In addition to damaging wetlands, stormwater pollution will be created, water will be depleted for industrial uses, light pollution and noise pollution will be created.

The Spanish Fork City Project Area has received a \$10 million, maximum one year loan, at 3.47% interest from the UIPA Authority Infrastructure Bank. [The loan terms are \\$10 million, maximum one year, at 3.47% interest. Funds will be used in the following way: \\$3 million for regional sewer lift station, \\$2 million for easements and materials for 138 KV power line, and \\$4 million for land right of way acquisition for roads.](#)

The anticipated 29 million square feet of new warehouse space will generate approximately 49,640 additional daily vehicle trips. Verk developers are slated to get [\\$160,300,000](#) in taxpayer provided subsidies.

Golden Spike in Box Elder County

The Golden Spike Project Area encompasses 1500 acres in a set of 4 zones spread throughout Box Elder County in the critical Bear River Basin, which is a major water source for Great Salt Lake and contains the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge.

The development area in Brigham City will bring industrial development next to the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, an “Important Bird Area” of global significance. Another development area is designed to benefit [Bailey Farms International](#), an international alfalfa export company.

In the Golden Spike Project Area there is the potential for 16 million square feet of new industrial development generating 27,710 new daily vehicle trips. Golden Spike developers are slated to receive \$175 million in tax breaks.

Tooele County: Tooele Valley and 20 Wells

Tooele County is the fastest growing county in the state, yet the valley doesn’t have the water to support that growth. The county’s water resources come from wells drilled into the aquifer in the Tooele Valley which urgently needs further study as the aquifer is connected to GSL. It is possible that water rights are currently over allocated. We have heard recent reports from people that their wells are running dry. In spite of this significant challenge, UIPA is using its financial tools to fast track new industrial development. There are 2 project areas in Tooele County.

⁷ <https://inlandportauthority.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/Verk-Industrial-Park-Project-Amendment-1-2.pdf>, p. 22

The Tooele Valley Project Area is on land owned by Zenith Bolinder LLC, an entity including the father and uncle of Utah State Representative Bridger Bolinder. [This publicly subsidized industrial development which could be significantly water intensive has begun in an area next to Great Salt Lake situated within 12,000 acres of Great Salt Lake wetlands.](#) Industrial development next to Great Salt Lake will also create significant amounts of stormwater pollution. In spite of this, the state of Utah signed off on allowing developers to use a septic system. Also their plan to mitigate wetland harm is to build a bridge over wetlands to be used by heavy trucks.

The 20 Wells Project Area is in Grantsville and mostly consists of the [Lakeview Business Park](#) owned by the Romney Group.

Together these project areas will generate approximately 54,000 new vehicle trips in Tooele County, with some of that new traffic intended to be funneled through Tooele City into Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs.

Tooele County developers are slated to receive over \$54 million for the Tooele Valley Project Area and over \$113 million for the Twenty Wells Project Area. The Tooele Valley Project Area received a special one year, \$4.875 million, one year, 3.47% interest loan from the Authority Infrastructure Bank.

In addition, Savage Industries is receiving UIPA Authority Infrastructure Bank assistance for its planned expansion of its Tooele Railport with a [\\$2.4 million loan, 10 years, 3.04%](#). The funds will pay for [one rail-to-truck or truck-to-rail transload track, which will double existing transload capacity, one conveyor, three transload tracks.](#)

Weber County: West Weber

The West Weber Project Area consists of 9,000 acres next to Great Salt Lake and between the 11,430 acre Harold Crane Wildlife Management Area and the 20,000 acre Ogden Bay Wildlife Management Area. Utah has invested millions of taxpayer dollars in both areas and it almost goes without saying that fast tracking industrial development next to them will harm existing resources. A conservative estimate is that 29,000 acres of wetlands will be harmed.

As much as 98 million square feet of warehouse space could be built in this area, generating an additional 166 thousand new daily vehicle trips. Weber developers are set to receive [\\$360,800,000](#) in tax breaks to subsidize the development.

OUTSIDE OF NORTHERN UTAH

Castle Country

The Castle Country Project Area consists of 12,930 acres in 5 zones throughout Carbon and Emery County.

Several of the units in the project area are troubling. The Castle Valley Zone, very near the Price River, is the location of [Savage Industries proposed oil transloading facility where waxy crude from the Uinta Basin would be loaded onto trains and then shipped east along the Colorado River](#). Part of the reason for the Savage oil transloading facility is to increase waxy crude production in the Uinta basin.

[In addition there's a Fossil Rock Zone which includes the Fossil Rock Mine currently owned by Wolverine Fuels LLC and reopened in September 2024](#). They already have had two safety violations. The Fossil Rock Mine is on SITLA land. In March 2024 SITLA awarded Wolverine Fuels a royalty rate reduction from 8% to 5% to incentivize the mine's reopening. The coal goes to the Hunter and Huntington power plants. Developers in the Castle Country Project Area are slated to receive [\\$15,600,000](#) in taxpayer subsidies.

Iron Springs: Iron County

The Iron Springs Project Area consists of 2,300 acres in Iron County, which is facing a water crisis. Another of the fastest growing counties in the state, Iron County has been determined by the State Engineer to have overallocated its water rights.

As mentioned earlier in this report the Central Iron County Water Conservancy District made a 'request for appropriation' [for \\$ 4 million from the general fund to help pay for pumping and transmission for a water reuse facility](#). [In his presentation he noted that the State Engineer has determined that their basin is overallocated by 29,000 acre feet and curtailment will begin in 2035 if they don't resolve the problem](#). He also emphasized the challenges of tremendous growth in Iron County and that he's getting calls all the time about the inland port.

Developers and business owners in the taxpayer subsidized Iron Springs Project Area are expected to receive \$118,300,000 in tax breaks, as well as several low interest loans:

[“a \\$10 million loan from the AIB to Commerce Crossroads Logistics Park LLC for rail infrastructure was issued in July, 2023. The terms include a 15-year repayment following a three-year deferral. Interest will accrue during these three years and be capitalized to the loan amount. The loan is secured by Property Tax Differential and is being used for the transloading facility in the park that will serve businesses in the area.](#)

[A second AIB loan for \\$5 million was approved for an additional transloading facility operated by Savage Transload Network, which will focus on dry and liquid bulk products and be hazmat capable, while BZI's RailSync transload will handle dimensional products such as steel beams and lumber.](#)⁸

[Iron County is in a fight with Beaver County over water resources.](#)

Mineral Mountains: Beaver County

The Mineral Mountains Project Area encompasses 25,427 acres in 5 zones. Anticipated development includes small scale manufacturing facilities to replace Smithfield Foods. Due to the remote location, warehousing is less practical than manufacturing.

Beaver County is currently struggling to meet its water resource needs and is in a fight with Iron County over Iron County's attempt to divert water from Pine Valley, an aquifer in Beaver County. Developers in Beaver County are expected to benefit from [\\$39,700,000](#) in tax breaks.

Central Utah Agri-Park Project Area: Juab County

The Central Utah Agri Park Project Area is a total of 2,185 acres in 5 zones. The primary intended uses seem to be related to supporting agricultural export, fossil fuels and other mineral export, and animal waste processing:

[“The proposed area for the Agri-Park currently has five rail-served facilities:](#)

- [Canyon Fuel Company Coal Loadout:](#) Mined coal from the Sufco Mine in Sevier County is transported via truck to be loaded into rail cars. Facility has 18,000 ft. siding with additional capacity for railcar storage.⁹
- [Central Utah Grain:](#) Grain elevator and storage facility located directly on rail loop track with capacity to accommodate unit trains. Facility can move stored grain from silos into waiting hopper cars for shipment on the North American rail network. Facility has additional capacity for railcar storage.
- [Redmond Minerals:](#) Railcar loading facility to handle outbound exports of mineral blend that is mined 45 miles to the south in Redmond, Utah. Currently, the facility is a single track with a single loading point. Facility is located geographically near the Canyon Fuel Company.
- [Azomite Minerals:](#) Railcar loading facility to handle outbound exports of Azomite via railcar. Located on the Central Utah Grain loop track.

⁸[Iron Springs](#), p.15

⁹ Currently owned by Wolverine Resources, LLC

• [John Kuhni Sons Inc.: Rail-served animal waste processing facility. The facility is currently closed with plans to resume operations in the near future.](#)¹⁰

Developers in the Central Utah Agri-Park Project Area could receive as much as [\\$30,700,000](#) in tax breaks.

Skyline Corridor: San Pete, Sevier, Wayne Counties

The Skyline Corridor Project Area is 1,415 acres in 5 zones. Anticipated development includes light to medium manufacturing, technology and remote hubs, logistics and transportation, cold storage agribusiness and ag processing, healthcare and senior services, and renewable energy.

Total subsidies for developers are expected to be [\\$42,000,000](#).

Historic Capital, Fillmore City, Millard County

Located inside the Fillmore City boundary, this 1,960 acre project area encompasses much of the western portion of the city. Currently the city has little to no excess electrical capacity.

Commodities in the area include petroleum or coal products, lime or lime plaster, and agricultural products. The need for additional water infrastructure, including a water tank, new city well and reservoir are also anticipated. Developers are expected to receive [\\$41,000,000](#) in tax subsidies.

Special thanks to the people who researched, wrote and edited this report including: Ann Florence, Ann O’Connell, Brian Moench, Craig Wallentine, Deeda Seed, Joan Gregory, Katie Pappas, Malin Moench, Monica Hilding, and Teri Durfee.

¹⁰<https://inlandportauthority.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/Central-Utah-Agri-Park-Project-Area-Plan-Amendment-1-FINAL.pdf> p.7