

UTAH LAKE STUDY COMMITTEE MEETING

December 9, 2004

7:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.

County Commission Conference Room, Room 2300
100 East Center Street, Provo, UT

ATTENDEES:

Members

Mayor Lewis Billings, Provo
Mayor Rulon Gammon, Vineyard
Mayor Fritz Boyer, Springville
Mayor Jerry Washburn, Orem
Clyde Naylor, Utah County
Mayor Bernell Evans, Payson
Quentin Francom, Genola

Other Interested Parties

Dan Nelson, MAG
Dave Gardner, citizen and developer
Jarret Whicker, Envision Utah
Chris Keleher, June Sucker Recovery Program
Robert West, Provo City
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Linda Walton, citizen
Karl Kappe, Div. of Forestry, Fire/State Lands
Sharon Haddock, Deseret Morning News

Each jurisdiction is invited to have a voting and alternate member on the Utah Lake Study Committee and the Utah Lake Technical Committee.

The Utah Lake Study Committee Minutes of October 28, 2004, were approved as amended.

New Information sharing

- Map of Shoreline Settlement Locations. Mayor Billings presented the map for review as requested. There is renewed interest in negotiations at some locations around the lake. Representatives of the State Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands are meeting with each property owner in an attempt to settle boundary lines. Settlement is anticipated by spring.
- A copy of the Great Salt Lake Comprehensive Management Plan Resource Document and Decision Document were provided for the resource library. The Utah Lake study could be similar.

Causeway Alternatives and Transportation Impacts Presentation - Dan Nelson

- Almost anything can be engineered if there is enough money, but impact on the lake must be considered.
- As property west of the Lake becomes more desirable as an alternative for affordable housing, the question of a structure across the lake will be raised again.
- A *West Lake Highway Conceptual Analysis* was distributed. The document presented projected traffic figures in 2030, various options for access and transportation patterns west of Utah Lake, and the anticipated impact of the various options on

traffic numbers. Options included a freeway around the Lake and a freeway across Goshen Bay.

- About 17,000 Utah County job commuters daily travel north on I-15. About 8,000 job commuters daily travel south on I-15 from Salt Lake County to Utah County. The bulk of the 147,000 Utah County workers stay in Utah County and that is why the interstate is congested. Numbers do not include student commuters and others.
- Estimated costs for Utah Lake Bridge Crossings (handout)
 - Goshen Bay, 2-lanes with median @ 28,115 feet long -- \$303.6 Million
 - Goshen Bay, 4-lanes with barrier @ 28, 115 feet long – \$475.7 Million
 - Mid lake, 2-lanes with median @ 29,553 feet long – \$319.2 Million
 - Mid lake, 4-lanes with barrier @ 29,553 feet long – \$500 MillionAssumes estimated costs of \$180 per square foot (current building costs - could increase) and does not include approaches to the bridges or right-of-way costs.
- A toll of \$1 each way would not be unreasonable considering the time savings and would help pay for building and maintaining a bridge.
- Current valley traffic is about 130,000 cars a day on I-15. Utah County population is about 430,000 with projections for close to a million by 2030 and about 1.2 million people by 2040.
- A north end connection to I-15 for the west lake freeway has not been identified.
- The Legacy Highway would connect somewhere around 5400 West in Salt Lake City and is not part of I-215. Two options are under consideration, one as far west as 7200 West. Four alternatives are considered for I-15 connections.

Causeway to Mosida – Developer Proposal by Dave Gardner

Mosida, a master-planned community on the west side of Utah Lake, is a development being considered by Mr. Gardner and partners. A document, “A Proposal to Develop a Causeway as a part of a Master Planned Community on the West side of Utah Lake,” was distributed.

- A causeway could be built, funded and maintained by harnessing growth, encouraging growth west of Utah Lake where ground is inexpensive enough that a huge impact fee could be assessed and still be under the price of other Utah County Developments, and making the growth pay the costs it generates.
- Future Utah County population estimates are old and will exceed current estimates. If all population growth is on the east side of the lake, there will be increased traffic problems, congestion and less open space.
- If development waits until property values increase, the impact of charging huge impact fees to cover costs would be lost.
- A toll fee would help pay for the causeway. In five years, a toll could generate revenue over and above the cost of maintenance and bond payments and could help fund other needed improvements around the lake. A minimal toll fee would be cheaper in car expenses and time than driving around the lake.
- The concept is to have a locally operated lake authority that owns the causeway to regulate the toll fee and decide how to spend revenues from the toll. Expenditures

would include bond payments, maintenance, and needed improvements at the lake, i.e., trails, wetlands, recreational amenities, causeway maintenance, June Sucker habitat, carp related issues, etc.

- A causeway could have serious environmental impacts on the lake and would have to be studied. Impacts may be mitigated if funding is sufficient.
- The vision includes a public/private partnership where public sectors--cities, county and state--work to come up with the design and construction of the causeway, and the private sector partner provides the funding through impact fees.
 - This must be publicly driven because the private sector could not get approvals necessary for the causeway. The public sector would take it through the governmental processes.
 - The private sector would fund the causeway as well as infrastructure for the development such as water, sewer, etc.
- Cost of causeway construction would be about \$100 million.
- Design would include large culverts and bridges for water circulation or anything else recommended by the environmental impact study.
- Developments in addition to Mosida will also contribute to traffic and payment of the costs of the causeway.
- This causeway proposal would be for a two-lane road (two more lane could be added later at a cost less than the original two lanes), a bike path and a walking path.
- It is critical for the development to annex into an existing city rather than create a new city. Provo is proposed because it has the experience and staff to handle the planning process of such a development.
- Location of the causeway would be somewhere off Provo, but the exact location would be designated later by the public sector.
- There is no water for the development and this will be a critical issue. The growth will come whether or not this project is developed. The questions are Where will the water come from? or Will lack of water be the limiting factor for growth?
- The Mosida development could generate \$400 million in impact fees over 25 years.
- A toll fee of \$4 could conservatively generate \$42 million annually.
- With that amount of money, dredging could be considered.
- Quality of construction and design will be better so people will be willing to move there and pay the toll fee.
- The impact of an east/west corridor on the north/south traffic problems was discussed. Any route that would reduce traffic on I-15 would be beneficial, i.e., the east/west component of the Mountain View Corridor, etc.
- Build-out for I-15 with 10 lanes could handle the projected growth traffic, but only if accompanied by commuter rail or a transit system and the Mountain View Corridor.
- Build-out on their proposal is 50,000. Ideally, populations of 10-15,000 can move to self-containment, but a population of 50,000 can be fully self-contained.
- Concern was expressed about impact of development on food sources, i.e., the 5-6,000 head dairy farm currently in existence, an additional dairy farm owned by the LDS Church, and other food sources in that area.
- Traffic to Salt Lake will normalize and by the year 2024 to 2030 a much smaller percentage of traffic will be going north because most entertainment, recreation, etc.

will be provided in Utah Valley as it becomes its own "center." However, there will still be huge transportation issues generated by traffic within the valley.

Technical Committee Report. The committee spent time reviewing and discussing a draft *issues statement* of the TMDL and water quality issues. The statement will be presented to this group for review and input.

Items for discussion at future meetings

- Review and study a Utah County based Utah Lake Authority concept. Summarize past efforts. Possibly consider a Special Improvement District that has authority to make decisions on water use and what is best for Utah Lake. A presentation from the Bear Lake Authority might be helpful. Include a summary of regulatory authorities on Utah Lake, i.e., Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act and others which cannot delegate authority to local entities. How did the Bear Lake group interact with those authorities? Mr. Naylor will work on that.
- A presentation by someone from the State, CUP or Jordan Valley to talk about long-term improvements and use for water as a limiting factor for development.
- A presentation from the Office of the State Engineer on their distribution plan for Utah Lake and water rights, etc.
- A discussion on land uses around the lake.
- The proceedings of this meeting could be broadcast on city cable channels to help educate and inform residents. Please let Mayor Billings know your feelings on this possibility.

The next meeting will be on January 27, 2005, at 7:30 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.