



COMMON SENSE VS. THE UTAH INLAND PORT

It's time for answers to obvious questions.

COMMON SENSE VS. THE UTAH INLAND PORT

It's time for answers to obvious questions.

Cover photo: Charles Uibel

Introduction

The Utah Inland Port includes approximately 24.4 square miles of land of which 19 square miles lie within the boundaries of Salt Lake City (about 17% of the city's total area). Of this, approximately 7.7 square miles lie north of I-80, consisting mostly of undeveloped land, much of which is vital habitat for birds and other wildlife. This area is slated to be covered with warehouses and other light industrial development.

As its purpose is to facilitate the movement of goods in and out of Utah by truck and rail, the Port will generate enormous increases in car, truck, rail and air traffic. The Port's effects will not be confined to the immediate area: they will affect the entire Salt Lake Valley and beyond.



Simple common sense makes it easy to foresee the Port's potential impact on the overall health and well-being of our residents and our wildlife.

Will the Utah Inland Port make the Salt Lake valley's air quality even worse?

Simple common sense makes it easy to identify the potential problems with the Port:

- » Enormous expansion of diesel-powered truck and rail traffic, as well as air traffic, will inevitably worsen our already poor air quality.
- » This problem will be made even worse by thousands of additional daily car trips as employees drive to work in the Port, an area distant from housing and not served by mass transit.
- » The upsurge of vehicles on the road will add to traffic congestion, disturbing neighborhoods, lengthening commutes and requiring costly road upgrades.
- » Paving thousands of acres of presently natural land will greatly increase the amount of storm water runoff, contaminated by fuel and residues of vehicle exhaust that accumulate on pavement



The Port will house thousands of shipping containers and equipment to move them between trucks and trains.

Despite constant public demands that they do so, the Utah Inland Port Authority Board has refused to even attempt to adequately address these concerns.

- » This will in turn affect delicate wetlands on which millions of birds depend for food and shelter. Periodic increases in runoff will inundate nesting grounds.
- » The traffic, light and noise that will accompany this development will threaten the livability of nearby neighborhoods.
- » Light and noise pollution may disrupt migration and the feeding and reproductive cycles of wildlife.



At left- the Utah Inland Port (shaded in blue).

WHAT IS AN "INLAND PORT"?

The community deserves answers.

Member groups of the Coalition to Stop the Polluting Port:

- Blue Sky Institute
- Capitol Hill Action Group
- Capitol Hill Neighborhood Council
- Catalyst Magazine
- Center for Biological Diversity
- Elders Rising
- Utah Environmental Caucus
- Fair Park Community Council
- Glendale Community Council
- Great Salt Lake Audubon
- Green Party of Utah
- Jordan Meadows - West Salt Lake City Community Council
- League of Woman Voters of Utah
- Poplar Grove Community Council
- Rose Park Community Council
- SLC Air Protectors
- Salt Lake Community Network
- Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment
- Westpointe - A Salt Lake City Community

In the minds of the state authorities developing the port, its economic benefits justify ignoring its likely impacts on the environment and residents' quality of life. *But these economic benefits are unproven.*

Proponents claim that the Port will create thousands of jobs, but *the livability and stability of those jobs are open to question.* In other U.S. inland ports, promised high-quality jobs have failed to materialize. Instead of well-paid industrial jobs, the positions have been largely in warehouses, many of which do not pay a living wage and are *vulnerable to being made obsolete by automation.*

Other economic obstacles cited by feasibility studies of the Port include:

- » The absence of a second rail carrier necessary for competitive shipping rates
- » Utah's low unemployment rate
- » The cost of upgrading arterial and surface roads to accommodate the increased volume of traffic outside the Port

Simple common sense makes it easy to foresee the Port's potential impact on the overall health and well-being of our residents and our wildlife.

Yet, despite constant public demands that they do so, the Utah Inland Port Authority Board has refused to even attempt to adequately address these concerns.

In response to this refusal, we've prepared this report, written by volunteers with specialized expertise. The Stop the Polluting Port Coalition is a diverse, people-powered organization of community members working for a sustainable, healthy future for Utah.

The report is designed to inform the public of the many potential risks and harms associated with the Utah Inland Port, and to compel those in charge to research and address those risks and harms before the Port is developed any further. There are many questions. The community deserves answers.

- The Stop the Polluting Port Coalition

The **Stop the Polluting Port Coalition** is a diverse, people-powered organization of volunteer community members working for a sustainable, healthy future for Utah.

BACKGROUND

Globalization has produced an explosion in the import and export of manufactured products, inundating seaports worldwide with cargo. To relieve congestion caused by thousands of trains, trucks and trailers arriving daily to pick up or deliver containers of products, municipalities throughout the world have created inland or "dry" ports -- located miles away from the seaports they serve.

While inland ports vary in size, they usually consist of several hundred acres of land, subdivided by paved roads, railroad tracks, warehouses and large asphalt staging areas for storing, stacking and transferring containers using specialized "transmodal" vehicles. And some inland ports also include airports.

For example, the Inland Empire Port in Riverside/San Bernardino, California boasts a cargo-dedicated airport attached to its massive railroad, trucking and warehouse network. Created to relieve seaport congestion in Long Beach and Los Angeles, it has itself become a notorious, massive source of pollution and environmental degradation in southern California. *The port is spread out within a cross-section of several inland mountain ranges that trap air pollution from airplanes using the port's cargo-dedicated Southern California Logistics Airport, as well as the pollution from its daily "tsunami" of trucks and trains.*

In fact, one rationale for building an inland port in Queensland, Australia, was to prevent a truck tsunami from overwhelming the sea Port of Brisbane (an estimated two million trucks per year in the near future). But transferring a truck tsunami from a seaport to an inland port only creates the same problem in a different locale.

OUR CONCERNS

The location selected for building an inland port is crucial to any chance of it serving as a solution, rather than becoming a new problem. Some 16,000 acres, much of this along the fragile shores of Great Salt Lake, are proposed for Utah's inland port development, considered the worst possible location for the health of humans and the ecosystem. In addition, the ongoing expansion of the Salt Lake International Airport may be further expanded and annexed by the port in order

Inland ports usually consist of several hundred acres of land, covered with paved roads, railroad tracks, warehouses and large asphalt staging areas for storing, stacking and transferring containers. In Utah it will also include the airport.



The Utah Inland Port will create an enormous increase in air traffic at the Salt Lake International Airport, contributing further to the pollution of our air.

THE LAWSUIT QUESTION

Can the legal system help save our valley from the risks associated with the Inland Port?

to accommodate its capacity to handle an exponential increase in air-cargo.

The proposed Utah Inland Port will include an area similar to the photo at left, (plus many additional proposed components including rows of warehouses, new and expanded transportation networks and fossil fuel-run heavy equipment), which displays the two most common types of transmodal containers found in inland ports: *metal containers the size of railroad cars that can be stacked on top of one another for the "bundling" of physical cargo; and similarly-sized tanks for transporting liquefied gases, chemicals and combustible fuels.*



The Union Pacific rail yard in Sparks, Nevada- a similar facility to the planned Utah Inland Port.

- By Dr. Robert Broadhead

The entire What is an Inland Port report is available at https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/what_is_an_inland_port

THE CASE BETWEEN SLC AND STATE OF UTAH OVER INLAND PORT*

Background

In 2015 the State and the City negotiated an agreement for the City to provide municipal services for the construction and operation of a new prison in the NorthWest Quadrant (NWQ), including construction and maintenance of streets, and water supply and sewer.

In 2015 and 2016 the City also began negotiations with property owners who wanted to take advantage of those future new municipal services.

- » Two owners (Kennecott & NWQ, LLC) wanted to develop an inland port
- » These negotiations resulted in the City and the owners executing development agreements for that plan, which was approved by the Salt Lake City Council acting as the Redevelopment Agency in January 2018.

In February 2018, Speaker of the House of Rep. Greg Hughes informed the City, Salt Lake County, the other landowners and legislators that *he intended to pursue legislation to govern and support the development of an inland port in the NWQ.*

The City Council then met with Speaker Hughes, Rep. Francis Gibson and Senator Jerry Stevenson and discussed this mutual goal. **The City reported it had already taken steps to facilitate the development of the port and would support legislation for further development as long as the City retained authority to regulate land use and other core municipal functions.** *The State legislators agreed to work with the City toward their mutual goal of facilitating an inland port.*

On February 26, 2018, only 15 days after meeting with the City, the three legislators released their own proposal for an inland port (S.B. 234). *This bill excluded the City from any regulation of land use or other core functions of government and instead created an Inland Port "Authority" assigning all future property tax revenue to it, and giving it jurisdiction to exercise powers over the land and its development instead of the City.*

The City made numerous significant efforts to push back against this hijacking, but the Legislature rolled over these efforts and *at 9:34 p.m. on the*

The City made numerous significant efforts to push back.... but the Legislature rolled over these efforts and at 9:34 p.m. on the second to last day of the regular session, a vote of the House was conducted and the inland port bill was passed, less than thirteen minutes after it was introduced.

*This represents a summary litigation between SLC & STATE OF UTAH OVER INLAND PORT AS OF 1-13-20. It is purely my opinion and not intended to provide legal advice or be used in determining any rights that may be involved in the matter.

THE LAWSUIT QUESTION

Can the legal system help save our valley from the risks associated with the Inland Port?

second to last day of the regular session, a vote of the House was conducted and the inland port bill was passed, less than thirteen minutes after it was introduced.

Eleven minutes later, it was presented on the Senate floor. At 9:51 p.m., less than forty-five minutes from the time Rep. Gibson introduced it, the bill was passed by both the House and the Senate and was sent to the Governor for his signature.

On March 18, 2018, Mayor Biskupski and Council Chair Mendenhall met with Gov. Herbert to request that he veto the bill and sent him a letter reiterating the City's concerns and its feeling that it had been led astray by Speaker Hughes, et al.

The letter asked that significant changes be made to the bill or that the Governor veto it because of serious constitutional and policy issues it ignores. *Instead, the Governor signed the bill while acknowledging its problems, promising to call a special session of the legislature to "modify and improve the bill."*

In July of 2018, the Governor called a special session to address the concerns raised by the City. At the conclusion, HB 2001 was passed by both houses and signed by the Governor. *This new law did not resolve the City's concerns and, in fact, made them worse.*

On March 11, 2019, after numerous subsequent attempts by the City to convince the legislature to include the City in managing the NWQ *the City filed a lawsuit against the Utah Inland Port Authority, the State of Utah, Governor Herbert and Attorney General Sean Reyes as defendants.*

The suit is based on a provision of the Utah Constitution that allows the City to claim that *the Inland Port Authority is unlawfully a "special commission"* that has been given the authority to supervise or interfere with the municipal functions and the money of Salt Lake City in violation of this provision.

The State argues that all of the City's authority is derived from the State's grant of power, and what it has given, it can take away. Therefore, the State says it can take away the City's authority to control Port development in order to make sure that it is managed on behalf of the entire state, not just the citizens of the City. It also argues that the Port Authority is not a special commission under the provision of the state constitution. Instead, it is a "public corporation" not covered by the provision.

The bill passed by the legislature excluded the City from any regulation of land use or other core functions of government.

Current status of the case

On January 8, Judge James Blanch ruled against the city and granted summary judgment to the State. (This judgment means the State wins even though the facts and law argued by the City might be right.)

This means community effort and protest are essential to saving the valley from the risks of the Inland Port.

- » The case has now moved to the district court level.
- » Salt Lake City Mayor Erin Mendenhall stated that the city will appeal this ruling to the Utah Supreme Court.
- » There may be other legal challenges that could be filed related to harm from the proposed port.

Meanwhile, the Port Authority will likely do whatever it thinks necessary to facilitate its goals, regardless of the City's concerns.

- by Daniel Darger, Esq.

Salt Lake City Mayor Erin Mendenhall has stated that the city will appeal this ruling to the Utah Supreme Court.

The entire litigation report is available at
<https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/lawsuit>

THE AIR POLLUTION QUESTION

Won't the port be a significant new source of air pollution in the Salt Lake Valley, other areas of the Wasatch Front, and especially the nearby neighborhoods on the West Side?



Thousands of studies have established that air pollution is a broad-based health hazard, provoking a long list of diseases very similar in type and scope to those related to smoking cigarettes.

BACKGROUND

Thousands of studies have established that air pollution is a broad-based health hazard, provoking a long list of diseases very similar in type and scope to those related to smoking cigarettes, including:

- » Shortened life expectancy
- » Premature death

A landmark study published last year showed that extremely small increases in ozone over ten years were associated with loss of lung tissue and function equivalent to nearly three decades of a full pack a day smoking habit.

The World Health Organization has declared air pollution the most important environmental cause of cancer, especially for increasing the risk of lung and bladder cancer. However, just about every other type of cancer has been shown to occur at increased rates among populations exposed to more air pollution. Other studies show that cancer survival is also decreased among patients exposed to more air pollution.

The wide range of illness and death from air pollution includes increased risk of:

- » *Birth defects*, miscarriages, still births and higher rates of infant deaths
- » *Brain diseases* such as Alzheimer's
- » Juvenile and Type 2 *diabetes*
- » *Lung diseases*
- » *Liver and kidney diseases*
- » *Inflammatory bowel disease*
- » *High cholesterol*
- » *Auto-immune disorders*
- » *Metabolic diseases* such as hypothyroidism
- » *Osteoporosis*
- » *Arthritis*
- » Multiple types of *infections*
- » *Chromosomal damage*, which can be passed on to *future generations*

There are two common denominators for most of the health consequences of air pollution:

- » The stimulation of an inflammatory response that affects the lungs and the vascular system and, downstream, all major organs including the placenta of a

pregnant mother.

- » The invasion of human tissue by pollution particles, which is both another source of inflammation and a means by which attached toxic chemicals gain access to our cells.

Paradoxically, the relationship between premature death and air pollution is even stronger at low doses. From any baseline, an increase in air pollution will have public health consequences. But increases from a low-level starting point actually pose a greater public health danger than the same increases occurring at a more polluted baseline. *There is no safe level of pollution, but the more pollution, the greater the adverse health outcomes.*

Inland ports in other cities have been burdened by the pollution from hundreds to thousands of new semi-trucks and dozens of additional fully loaded trains every day.

At the Port of Los Angeles, locomotive diesel engines operating within the port were responsible for as much pollution as 480,000 cars (about half the cars registered in Utah) and were found to increase the risk of cancer for nearby residents.

A recent study of the Los Angeles airport has also shown that emissions from air traffic are much larger than previously estimated:

- » Double the particulate pollution downwind as far out as ten miles
- » Increased levels four to five times above baseline, as far out as 5-6 miles

The study also estimated that the city's airport was responsible for pollution equivalent to half the amount produced by all vehicles on the city's freeway network. This lends evidence to *the expectation that air cargo related to our Inland Port will also be a significant new source of pollution.*

OUR CONCERNS


While what has been revealed about the Utah Inland Port is still vague, it has become increasingly clear that the Port will be a significant new source of air pollution for the Salt Lake Valley and other areas of the Wasatch Front. There is also little doubt that the West Side will become a new pollution hotspot. *Nearby neighborhoods will bear the brunt of the health consequences from the Port and could be characterized as "sacrifice zones."*

At the Port of Los Angeles, locomotive diesel engines operating within the port were responsible for as much pollution as 480,000 cars, (about half the cars registered in Utah) and were found to increase the risk of cancer for nearby residents.



THE BIRD QUESTION

How will high-value, fragile wildlife and habitat be protected?



Even if some of the loading machinery located in the Port is electrical, a “successful” port would increase pollution from three types of mobile sources carrying various commodities:

- » Diesel powered trucks
- » Train locomotives
- » Air cargo

Increased large truck traffic will add to existing congestion on Salt Lake Valley freeways, which will further increase traffic emissions of pollutants and greenhouse gases from non-port vehicles on the freeway network.

by Dr. Brian Moench, President, Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment

The entire Air Pollution report is available at <https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/air>

BACKGROUND

Birds migrate to the Great Salt Lake and its wetlands by the millions to feed, rest, and for some, to breed before moving to northern destinations or returning southward.

The following internationally recognized organizations have designated the Great Salt Lake wetlands ecosystem to be of hemispheric and global importance to birds of the world:

- » National Audubon Society Important Bird Areas (IBA) and Global IBA
- » BirdLife International IBA and Global IBA
- » Western Hemispheric Shorebird Reserve Network (WHSRN).

As habitat fragmentation and loss, water diversion, drought and climate change continue to take their toll, Great Salt Lake is increasingly critical to bird survival.

OUR CONCERNS

The Utah Inland Port is situated in the worst possible location, the south end of Great Salt Lake, directly in the flight path of some 10 million birds that use the Lake annually. The birds and our community will experience increased:

Habitat Loss

The designated Inland Port land is all wetland and upland habitat, in an area utilized by owls, raptors, waterfowl, shorebirds and passerine birds. It is also home to a resident herd of pronghorn. The area is critical to wildlife in high water years, as the shore of the lake expands, and only higher elevation land is left for nesting. The Inland Port would entirely destroy this important habitat.

Air Pollution

All inland ports, by virtue of the fact that they are vehicle-intensive, cause increased air pollution. *Birds and other wildlife will suffer the same respiratory, cardiovascular and reproductive consequences from port caused pollution as humans will.*

Light and Noise Pollution

Migrating birds use the stars and the night sky to navigate. Bright lights at night create confusion and disorientation and can result in throwing off the birds’ migration timing. This can cause birds to arrive too early or too late to take



American avocet



American white pelicans



Marbled godwits

THE BIRD QUESTION

How will high-value, fragile wildlife and habitat be protected?



Ferruginous hawk photo: Deborah Drain

advantage of available food sources. Light pollution can negatively affect not only birds, but also insects, fish, reptiles and other species, causing changes to behaviors, feeding habits and reproductive cycles. Light pollution from the port would affect entire ecosystems.

Noise is a great disturbance and stress to resting, nesting, foraging and staging birds. The port would likely create noise 24/7. Cranes, communications towers, storage tanks, shipping container stacks and solar panels, to name a few, would all negatively impact birds.

Water Pollution

The proposed Inland Port is close to the south shore of Great Salt Lake. All water from this area that already has a naturally high water table, will eventually find its way to the Lake. Uncontrolled, untreated runoff will introduce toxic pollutants to the wetlands, including antifreeze, grease, oil, and heavy metal from cars; fertilizers, pesticides and other chemicals from landscaping and mosquito abatement. Additionally, uncontrolled pulses of water will destroy nests and chicks residing in the affected wetlands. Runoff will also introduce erosional sediment and dust stirred up from port construction. Uncontrolled, untreated runoff will have both short term and long-lasting effects that will further degrade water quality and destroy habitat and wildlife.

Invasive Species

Untreated stormwater runoff can act as a path for introducing invasive species such as phragmites and other non-native plants. Phragmites is a scourge to the Great Salt Lake ecosystem that the state already spends great quantities of time and money trying to control and eliminate. Phragmites robs the lake of water and degrades the plants and nutrients available for forage to ducks and other birds. The port would increase the phragmites problem, further spoiling shoreline views and blocking access to the water for hunting, boating and wildlife viewing.

Increased Chemical Exposure

The land designated for the port experiences blooms of biting insects at various times in the year. Indeed, these insects are in part why birds flock to the area, as they provide a rich diet of protein. Unfortunately, these biting insects, which include mosquitoes, deer flies and biting midges (“no see-ums”), are miserable for humans. So it is expected that increased human activity in this fragile area will result in increased application of chemicals in an attempt to control these noxious biting insects. This will reduce the mosquito population and also kill off non-



Eared grebe photo: Deborah Drain



Western grebes photo: Deborah Drain

target species, especially invertebrates, also important food sources for foraging birds. The port would negatively impact insects and invertebrates, elemental in maintaining a healthy wetland food web.

Collision Hazards

It is expected that the port will introduce substantial collision hazards to birds traveling along the flyway. Cranes, communications towers, storage tanks, shipping container stacks and solar panels, to name a few, would all negatively impact birds.

- by Heather Dove, President, Great Salt Lake Audubon



Burrowing owl photo: Deborah Drain

South Shore Preserve Priority Bird Species

| Species Name | USFWS | USSCPP WL | UTAH | NABCI | GREAT BASIN | Status PRESERVE |
|------------------------|-------|--------------|------|-------|----------------|--------------------|
| Eared Grebe | X | | | | X | CT |
| Western Grebe | X | | | | | UT |
| American Avocet* | | X | | | | CS |
| Black-bellied Plover | | X | | | | UT |
| Snowy Plover* | X | X | | X | X | CS |
| Long-billed Curlew* | X | X | X | X | X | CS |
| Marbled Godwit | | X | | X | X | CT |
| Western Sandpiper | | X | | X | | CT |
| Willet* | | X | | X | | CS |
| Lesser Yellowlegs | | X | | X | | CT |
| American White Pelican | | | X | | | US |
| Bald Eagle | X | | X | | X | RS,UW |
| Swainson's Hawk | X | | | | | US,CT |
| Ferruginous Hawk | X | | X | | X | RS |
| Golden Eagle | X | | | | X | UP |
| Burrowing Owl* | X | | X | | | CS |
| Short-eared Owl* | X | | X | X | | CP,I |
| Peregrine Falcon | X | | | | X | UP |
| Loggerhead Shrike* | X | | | | X | CP |
| Sage Thrasher* | X | | | | X | CS |
| Brewer's Sparrow* | X | | | | X | CS |

Abundance and status codes

C- Common U- Uncommon R- Rare
P- Year-round resident S- present in
summer T- Transient W- Winter I-Irregular
* Documented nesting records

The entire Bird report is available at
<https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/birds>.

THE PESTICIDE QUESTION

How can mosquitoes and biting gnats in the proposed port location be managed without extensive pesticide spraying?



Midges swarm in the future Utah Inland Port

Reshaping Salt Lake's NorthWest Quadrant into an economic hub would likely result in an unprecedented use of chemical pesticides that are considered biologic poisons, exceptionally toxic to infants, children, and babies in utero.

The danger to humans of even small doses of pesticides is well documented and linked to many health issues, including:

- » Obesity
- » Cancer
- » Heart disease
- » Birth defects
- » Reproductive pathology
- » Neurologic and brain disorders such as Parkinson's, Autism, Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and impaired intellect

The American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Society for Reproductive Medicine, International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO), World Health Organization, and the Endocrine Society: all have advocated for a sharp reduction in human exposure to pesticides.

Pesticides contaminate air, water, food and soil, and are now detected from the top of Mt. Everest to the deepest parts of the oceans; they're found in the blood and urine of most all of us, in newborn babies, even mother's milk. While the many problems caused by pesticides are worldwide, the most important place to reduce their use is in our own communities.

- by Dr. Brian Moench, President, Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment

The entire pesticide report is available at
<https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/pesticides>

The danger to humans of even small doses of pesticides is well documented and linked to many health issues.

THE WESTSIDE COMMUNITY QUESTION

Who is protecting Westside residents from the additional traffic congestion and air, noise and light pollution associated with the proposed Port?

BACKGROUND

Since the late 1940s, the Westside of Salt Lake City has been a vibrant and diverse community. Originally developed on what was farmland north and west of the City, the early development of Rose Park (one of the first communities) was home to many returning from service in WWII. Today it is home to the most ethnically diverse population in the State, much richer in diverse ethnicities than is Salt Lake City as a whole:

- » 74.5% of Salt Lake City's Hispanic residents live on the westside
- » 63% of the westside population is from a minority ethnicity (compared to 24.9% of SLC as a whole)

74.5% of Salt Lake City's Hispanic residents live on the westside

OUR CONCERNS

Many of the challenges the westside faces are geographical:

- » Ringed by interstate highways, the SLC International Airport and railroad tracks
- » Home to several railyards, the wastewater treatment plant, and two refineries

Utah Division of Air Quality data show *air quality in this area is far worse than any other part of the valley*. The proposed Utah Inland Port creates another immediate challenge for Salt Lake City's westside neighborhoods as the 17,000-acre area to the immediate west is slated to become the giant warehouse and freight transfer facility known as the Utah Inland Port.

The diverse Westside community makes us a more vibrant city, and its residents are likely to suffer the biggest impacts from the inland port. *As proposed, this development will create more air pollution at a time when current activities already overwhelm the air shed. In addition, it will add to traffic congestion, noise and light pollution.*

- by Richard Holman, Chair, the Westside Coalition

The entire Westside Community impact report is available at
https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/westside_community

THE SATELLITE PORT QUESTION

A concerning lack of transparency has characterized much of the Inland Port process. Does the public realize there is also an additional Satellite Ports component already in motion?

The Utah Inland Port plan includes an expanding network of trade hubs in rural counties statewide.



The Richmond, CA coal terminal which exports much of Utah's coal. The city of Richmond recently voted to phase out coal exports over the next three years.

BACKGROUND

The Utah Inland Port plan actually has two separate but related parts:

1. **Main Port Complex in Salt Lake City:** The Utah Legislature's expropriation of municipal land in Salt Lake City's Northwest Quadrant in 2018. Proposed development of a massive manufacturing, storage, and transshipment center by the Utah Inland Port Authority (UIPA) has been met by strong opposition based on environmental, socio-economic, and jurisdictional concerns. *Limited construction has begun, but the future of Northwest Quadrant development remains uncertain as Salt Lake area residents await release of UIPA's business plan.*
2. **Multiple Port Hubs Across Utah:** The under the radar plan to create an expanding network of trade hubs in rural counties statewide linked to the central Inland Port complex in Salt Lake City, which surfaced officially in 2019.

OUR CONCERNS

The Legislature authorized development of satellite ports under the aegis of UIPA. Promoted to take impact pressures off Salt Lake City, the proposed system of remote hubs and spokes sparked quick engagement by rural authorities seeking easier export of local commodities, including fossil fuels. With upgrades to existing transportation infrastructure, a satellite ports constellation under UIPA control could succeed despite whatever happens to Inland Port plans for Salt Lake City.

Recent legislation has boosted plans for a statewide mega-Inland Port System

The satellite ports network concept enjoys appeal on different sides of the Salt Lake City-centered Inland Port debate:

- » Foes of the Legislature's NWQ takeover recognize that reducing or eliminating a Salt Lake City port complex would mitigate negative impacts on the Wasatch Front.
- » At the same time, several rural counties that have expressed interest in a broader Inland Port system are *suffering very real economic distress* due, in part, to reliance on extractive industries with declining future prospects.

A satellite ports network committed to environmentally sound, sustainable development could provide new options. Thus far, however, UIPA's overdue business plan and the Legislature's single Inland Port-specific environmental action [2019 Senate Bill 144] center on a Salt Lake City hub, not satellite ports. The fossil fuel industry has had a disproportionate influence on the process so far.

Rural counties like the idea

The prospect of satellite port export channels drew immediate interest from rural county officials when H.B.433 was first introduced by Rep. Francis Gibson. After it passed in March 2019, several county commissions sent envoys to Envision Utah's April 2019 meeting intended to discuss hub-and-spoke opportunities. At meeting's end, they plotted a dozen [potential trade hubs](#) on a large map of Utah. Participants left with assignments that included drafting 'wish lists' to be discussed at the next satellite port development meeting. That August 2019 meeting, hosted by Utah Association of Counties and moved to a small police station room, was abruptly cancelled with blame placed on the presence of protesters. *While the public meeting was never rescheduled, planning by commercial and political stakeholders continues apace at the county level, and presumably with the knowledge of UIPA.*

A whole new economic system?

High-level Utah planners envision a broad new economic system across the state of Utah and are using the Inland Port program as a tool to set their plan in motion. The Satellite Ports network is being developed piecemeal without public knowledge of the grander scheme being established. Are the public's best interests being served as this behemoth moves forward?

- by Stan Holmes

Planning by commercial and political stakeholders continues apace at the county level.

The entire Satellite Ports report is available at
https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/satellite_ports

THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION

How much additional truck, rail and car traffic will the Utah Inland Port create?
What impacts will the increased traffic have on our quality of life?

BACKGROUND

The purpose of an inland port is to facilitate the movement and distribution of goods. This requires a large number of trucks and trains, as well as cars bringing in workers concentrated in the area of the Port. This will create an enormous increase in the number of vehicles on our roads and highways, impacting air quality and increasing traffic congestion. The Port will also create a large increase in air traffic.

OUR CONCERNS

Given the rapid growth in the region, we are already experiencing an increase in vehicles on our roads along with worsening traffic congestion. But the Utah Inland Port will add substantially to these problems.

We can estimate the additional vehicles the Port will generate using the number of car and truck trips generated by other similar kinds of development. While there is a lack of specific information from the Port Authority Board, two primary kinds of businesses are anticipated: warehouses and light manufacturing. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of new development will consist of warehouses. *Currently, six million square feet of warehouses are under construction within the Port while no plans for new manufacturing there have been announced.*

A large area north of I-80 and west of the airport is within the Inland Port. The area is owned by one of two companies: NWQ, LLC or Kennecott Land. The land holdings of these two companies have been “vested” by Salt Lake City with the right to develop light manufacturing, including warehouses, under the regulations in place as of January 2018. These holdings total about 4,400 acres.

If these acres are entirely developed with warehouses similar to the new Amazon fulfillment center on 5600 West, they will accommodate over 46 million square feet of warehouse. It is unlikely that the entire area will be developed in the foreseeable future, so for this estimate, we’ll assume that half of this area will be developed. This would mean about *23 million square feet of warehouses.*

According to one industry source¹, each 2000 square feet of warehouse generates about one truck trip per day. Therefore, 23 million square feet of warehouse would generate approximately *11,600 new truck trips, as well as 23,000*



What effect will 24,600 additional vehicle trips every day have on our roads?

At only half of its potential development north of I-80, the Port will generate 11,600 new truck trips, as well as 23,000 additional car trips, every day.

The entire Transportation report is available at <https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/transportation>

additional car trips, every day, making a total of 24,600 additional daily vehicle trips. By way of comparison, the total number of daily vehicle trips on I-80 between downtown and the airport was about 42,000 in 2017². This traffic would not only affect I-80, but also I-15 and other streets serving the Port area, including Bangerter Highway and 5600 West.

The Port also extends south of I-80, covering most of the area south to the 2100 South freeway and from 5600 West to the Kennecott tailings ponds. Development in this area will add additional car and truck traffic and expand the area affected by it. In determining the cost of the Inland Port to Utah taxpayers, *the cost of widening and upgrading roads to handle this enormous volume of traffic must be included.*

The Port strategy also relies on a large increase in the volume of rail traffic. The existing Union Pacific rail yard around 700 South and 4800 West handles the equivalent of about three trains of 100 double-stacked trains daily. According to UP, it can handle twice that volume without expanding³. There are too many unknowns to estimate the additional rail traffic the Port will create, but clearly, adding only another three trains (600 trucks’ worth of goods) a day will not be sufficient. *The Port will require a major enlargement of the existing rail yard and probably a second one as well, with possible new delays at rail crossings.*

- by David R. Scheer, architect and urban planner




²UDOT traffic volume statistics, 2017

³UDOT Planning Network- Intermodal Freight, PDF downloaded 12/29/19



An additional 11,600 daily truck trips would be generated by developing only half of the area two developers now control.



Union Pacific railyard in Sparks, Nevada

At left: Partial development of the Utah Inland Port north of I-80 based on the current Amazon distribution center’s building area and building to parcel area ratio (FAR). This much development would generate 24,600 additional vehicle trips per day above current traffic volumes.

¹The High-Cube Warehouse Vehicle Trip Generation Analysis, 2016

THE CLIMATE CHANGE QUESTION

How will our children survive if economic growth continues to mean burning fossil fuels?



BACKGROUND

This conversation around global warming has existed since the late 70s and 80s: with the start of Earth Day and when NASA scientist James Hansen went before Congress to say that the era of global warming had begun. Yet the world has ignored the problem and continued to expand its economy based on energy derived from fossil fuels. The carbon dioxide (CO₂) created by burning fossil fuels is the primary driver of global warming and therefore climate change.

The world set two climate goals in the 2015 Paris Agreement:

- » Cap global temperature rises at 1.5 °C, a lofty standard as the temperature continues to rise;
- » Attain net-zero emissions by 2050 at the latest, an ambitious goal as global emissions continue to rise.

Very few countries are on track to meet these goals and they have been rejected by the current U.S. administration.

We are seeing significant changes in our world. CNN reports “the virtual end of coral reefs, the drowning of some island nations, the worsening of already-devastating storms and the displacement of millions.”

There is a solid scientific consensus that humans are warming the planet through burning fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and gas. Warming has skyrocketed in the last 35 years, with the five warmest years taking place since 2010 as humans have put more than 350 metric gigatons of CO₂ in the atmosphere. This rise in CO₂, and consequently temperature, has caused:

- » Rising and warming oceans
- » The loss of polar ice caps
- » Melting glaciers
- » Ocean acidification
- » Intensifying weather patterns such as the increase of hurricanes, extreme heat and cold, and drought leading to massive wildfires.

OUR CONCERNS

1. *The Utah Inland Port will directly contribute to climate change* by creating an enormous increase in the number of diesel- and gas-powered vehicles, greatly

increasing CO₂ emissions. We cannot increase the number of cars on the road without giving some thought to its greater local and global effects.


2. The port itself will bring *massive construction* to our area. Diesel-powered construction equipment is a major, unregulated source of CO₂ emissions.
3. Instead of focusing on how Utah can reduce its impact on the climate crisis, *we are choosing to exacerbate the problem.* We already are living with an increasingly catastrophic climate—why must we make it worse?
4. If Utah chooses not to address climate change and fails to reduce our emissions or to work toward a more sustainable future, *the port will eventually become functionally obsolete before it's finished.* The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimates that if we don't change our economic approach by 2030, there is little hope of maintaining current social and economic conditions.
5. Climate change most affects vulnerable populations who have not been the main contributors to the crisis. *This goes against Utah tradition of compassion for all people.*

WHAT UTAH SHOULD DO

There needs to be a balance of profit, planet, and people in order to preserve our society and the natural world. We need to understand how economic decisions can affect the environment. *Our current economic system based on unlimited fossil fuel consumption is not sustainable. The Utah Inland Port Looks backward- we must look forward.* We must find ways of satisfying a growing population without sacrificing our future. Utahns pride ourselves on our willingness to seek practical solutions to our common problems. *We need to finally acknowledge the threat we face and work together to build a sustainable future.*

by Sophie Dau

The Utah Inland Port Looks backward- we must look forward.



The entire Climate Change report is available at <https://www.stopthepollutingport.org/climate>

Authors

Robert S. Broadhead, Ph.D., is a University of Connecticut Professor Emeritus in medical sociology. He has conducted research to prevent HIV and drug addiction in the U.S., eastern Europe, and Asia.

Daniel Darger is an attorney who has practiced in Salt Lake City since 1979.

Sophie Dau is a high school junior at Rowland Hall. She's been passionate about environmental issues since joining Youth City Government her freshman year and volunteering at Representative Romero's Breathe Clean festival in Glendale. She has also worked with local coffee shops and her school on reducing their single-use plastic waste by implementing reusable cups and mugs. She learned about the issues around the Inland Port while interning at the Mayor's Office over the summer and became involved with Stop the Polluting Port in the fall.

Heather Dove is president of Great Salt Lake Audubon. She is a longtime birdwatcher and is passionate about conserving a healthy environment for wildlife, plants and humans.

Richard Holman is Vice-Chair of the Rose Park Community Council and Chair of the Westside Coalition, an advocacy group defending the health, safety and quality of life of Westside Salt Lake City residents. He is committed to improving the conditions of Westside neighborhoods including cleaner air, reduced crime and bettering economic opportunity and education.

Stan Holmes is a retired public school educator and co-founder of Utah Citizens Advocating Renewable Energy (UCARE). He serves on the board of the Utah Sierra Club, focusing on clean energy and social justice initiatives.

Brian Moench, M.D. is the Founder and President of Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment. Dr. Moench is a former faculty member of the University of Utah Honors Program, teaching public health and the environment and former chairman, Dept. of Anesthesia, Holy Cross Hospital. He has been in private practice anesthesia since 1981. Brian was nominated by the Obama Administration as one of 50 finalists to receive the "Champion of Change" award for his work on global warming.

David Ross Scheer is Research Associate Professor of Architecture at the University of Utah and has practiced architecture and urban planning for over 30 years. He also devotes time to community groups and writes about architecture and planning for the Salt Lake Tribune and other publications.



Stop the Polluting Port!