



**COMMISSION**

Technical Committee Meeting

Monday, November 10, 2008, 8:30 A.M.

Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 212

51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

**ATTENDEES:**

Bruce Chesnut, Orem, Chairman

Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

Greg Beckstrom, Provo, Vice-Chair

Clyde Naylor, Utah County

Adam Cowie, Lindon

Ann Merrill, DNR-Div. of Water Resources

Chris Keleher, Dept. of Natural Resources

Chris Tschirki, Orem

Daniel Hales, Springville

Dave Wham, Dept. of Environmental Quality

Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove

Doug Sakaguchi, DNR-Div. of Wildlife Resources

H. Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire & State Lands

Jim Hewitson, Lehi

Kim Struthers, Lehi

LaVere B. Merritt, Consultant

Michael Mills, JSRIP

Nathan Lunstad, Highland

Sarah Sutherland, CUWCD

Ty Hunter, DNR-Parks & Recreation

Jim Carter, Logan Simpson Design

**ABSENT:** American Fork, Genola, Mapleton, Saratoga Springs, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vineyard, Woodland Hills

**1. Welcome and Introductions.**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Bruce Chesnut at 8:32 A.M. Mr. Chesnut introduced Daniel Hales representing Springville as he is fairly new to the Committee.

**2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from September 22, 2008.**

Mr. Chesnut gave everyone time to review the minutes from September 22, 2008. Mr. Price noted that some time had elapsed since the last meeting since the October Technical Committee meeting was cancelled. He reviewed that at the September meeting final edits were made to the Specific Vision Statements for the Master Plan before being presented to the Governing Board. Mr. H. Barry Tripp moved to approve the minutes and it was seconded by Mr. Adam Cowie. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**3. Steering Committee update.**

Mr. Price stated that in his email of November 5 that was sent to the Committee members there were eight items highlighted that the Steering Committee had requested the consultants to re-address. That list of eight had been toned down from a list of fifteen items and these items were felt to be the most pertinent. These are the items the Steering Committee asked to be addressed.

1. The consultants suggested that an Executive Summary was not conducive to the Master Plan document because it would basically be re-stating what was already in the Master Plan. However, the Steering Committee thought that an Executive Summary could highlight the main points and that would help those who might only read the summary and not the entire document. The consultants will be adding an Executive Summary to the document.
2. There seemed to be some possible confusion in reading the document as to what are the goals and objectives. Some of the terminology has been used interchangeably. The Steering Committee has asked the consultants to clarify the difference between goals, objectives and visions.
3. There was some discussion regarding Section 6 of the Master Plan document. The current Section Six is an "Implementation Strategy for the Utah Lake Commission." This addresses how the Utah Lake Commission will be involved in implementing these goals and objectives for the lake. In discussion with the consultants it was emphasized that the Master Plan is a plan for Utah Lake. The Division of Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL) will also be using the Master Plan as their Management Plan. The Steering Committee requested that Section 6 focus on the important issues that are for Utah Lake and not for the Utah Lake Commission. They have been asked to re-prioritize the items. As it is now there are two tiers of issues listed with Tier One being the more important tasks. Carp removal was listed as a Tier Two task. It has been agreed by all the different committees in the Commission that carp removal is of great importance for the Lake, regardless of the level of the Commission's involvement. Section Six has since been rewritten with a different priority list specific for Utah Lake. This Implementation Strategy for the Utah Lake Commission section was also requested to be moved in the document to an Appendix rather than be a part of the Master Plan. In the Appendix it will show how the Commission will seek to accomplish the Vision for Utah Lake similar to what FFSL will be doing.
4. It was requested that Table 6-1 be simplified.
5. There was discussion about the creation of the new Section 6.
6. It was requested that some terms such as "should" and other indefinite terms be re-evaluated to terms that would apply more certainty to the identified objectives.
7. There was some question about the FFSL Amendment Approval process. The current flow process that has been presented for amending the plan would satisfy the rules for FFSL which would be necessary if any amendments affected sovereign lands. If a needed amendment did not affect sovereign lands the same rigorous, public process would not be needed so the consultants have been asked to identify a different process for amending the plan in that instance.
8. The Management Classification Map was emailed to the Committee members a week ago. Members will be asked for feedback on that map.

#### **4. Discuss Draft Master Plan Policies by group**

Mr. Chesnut introduced this agenda item and handed out copies of the Master Plan policies. Mr. Price said that he had received emails from some of the Steering Committee members with some suggestions. The Policies are similar to the Vision Statements which had both Broad Vision Statements and Specific Vision Statements. The Policies that have been developed also follow the specific areas of focus; Land Use, Transportation, Natural Resources, Recreation, and Public Facilities. Mr. Keleher suggested that some general overarching policies be created.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that Mr. Jim Carter relay some background perspective on the development of the policies. Mr. Carter said that, generally speaking, in the planning process the approach is to identify future visions and then goals and objectives to achieve those visions. The role of policies is that to the extent that goals and objectives are identified, themes that develop can be captured into policies. He said that he and Mr. Rick Cox both see their role as consultants in terms of working with the Committee is to put language in front of the Technical Committee for consideration and discussion. The objective is to

encourage the Commission and its committees to use its own language to articulate their own vision and their own policies.

Mr. Price read the three suggested General Policy drafts suggested by Mr. Keleher as follows:

General Policy 1 – When available information is insufficient to make informed decisions about matters that concern Utah Lake, the Commission will encourage the development and completion of focused studies to fill information gaps.

General Policy 2 - The Commission recognizes and acknowledges that member and non-member entities have statutory and/or corporate responsibilities that must be respected and cannot be delegated. This master plan is not intended to abrogate any member or non-member statutory or corporate responsibilities.

General Policy 3 - The Commission recognizes that implementation of certain components of this master plan may require the acquisition of private lands and/or water rights and in such situations private acquisitions will be completed in accordance with appropriate laws.

Mr. Chesnut asked for ideas as to where these General Policies might be located in the document. Mr. Keleher responded that the Steering Committee discussed that that they need to be in a section that would stand out, possibly as a compilation as presented. A definite solution was not resolved in that meeting. Mr. Carter encouraged the Committee to aggregate the policies and put them in a separate, prominent place. Policies should be ground rules that will be used as reference.

Mr. Beckstrom said that in the discussion of the Executive Summary it was stated that the policies might be included in that area.

Mr. Chesnut asked if it was agreed that having General Policies was a good idea. There seemed to be a positive general consensus from the Technical Committee members and Mr. Chesnut requested Mr. Price to send the suggested statements to the members for review.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that the Committee's discussion of the Policies would be the beginning of a process that will take a couple of months. The policies that would be reviewed in this meeting should be viewed with a broad perspective and not necessarily focus on wordsmithing. The results of the Technical Committee meeting will not produce a final product to send to the Governing Board but identify the broad areas of concern to go forward with further reiteration with the consultants. The Steering Committee will take the discussion points from today's meeting and generate revised policies that will be subject to detail and wordsmithing and work with the consultants on them. The consultants will then make a presentation to the Governing Board on November 20<sup>th</sup>. Following that there will be Public Open Houses on December 3 in Lehi and December 4 in Provo. The Technical Committee will meet in December and at that point will prepare a more detailed document. The consultants will then prepare a refined draft that will be intended to go back to the Governing Board in January, followed by a public hearing process and a 45 day waiting period as required for the FFSL.

Mr. Tripp commented that in regards to General Policy #3 the legislature is against properties being purchased from private lands because of the taxes. They do not want a reduction of taxes.

Mr. Carter stated that the thrust of the statement is that the Commission doesn't support the acquisition of private lands except when a need is identified that involves private interest. What is the preferred course of action is to convince the landowner that the need is important for their cooperation.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Carter stated that in the discussion of the policies the consultants would like to get a consensus from each focus group that all the specifics have been drafted and included that would meet with their approval.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the discussion be conducted by discussing groups of focus rather than by policy number. Also, any omissions should be noted that should be included. Handouts were passed out

of the policies as presented for discussion. It was stated that the Subcommittee members have received the draft of the Master Plan, but not the summarized document of the policies being discussed today. Mr. Price said he will email the individual policies to each separate subcommittee.

### **Land Use and Shoreline Protection**

Mr. Beckstrom opened discussion on identifying issues associated with these policies.

Mr. Barry Tripp questioned whether in Policy #1 “state governments” should be added to the already stated “local governments.” There was discussion and it was suggested that the word “local” be eliminated.

Mr. Adam Cowie suggested that the wording in the policies is as strong as the Commission can be since the Commission recommends and does not enforce policy. Mr. Beckstrom stated that he feels it likely that the Governing Board will encourage the Technical Committee and the Land Use Subcommittee to engage in the consideration and development of a model ordinance that ideally would be approved by the Commission and then forwarded to the municipalities.

Mr. Keleher wondered if enough outreach was being done to the federal agencies regarding Land Use, and maybe beyond, insofar as timing and scheduling. He suggested the Committee consider outreaching to some other agencies such as Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Fish & Wildlife, Bureau of Reclamation, and other regulatory agencies. Mr. Beckstrom stated that many of these agencies have been active in the planning process, particularly in the area of Natural Resources with the exception of BLM. He asked if there were some potential issues he foresaw and Mr. Keleher stated outreaching would be more of a courtesy. Mr. Hunter concurred that some of these agencies should be contacted. Mr. Sakaguchi suggested that the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission (URMCC) be included.

Mr. Kim Struthers asked if the word “local” would be struck from Policy #1 and Mr. Price said they will take all suggestions and prepare a second draft.

### **Transportation Policies**

Mr. Beckstrom clarified that motions and actions were not being entertained but input and evaluation. He suggested that more formal actions may be made at the December meeting.

Mr. Struthers said that in the first policy it did not seem clear that if the Commission is not in opposition to projects than it will support them. Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the word “opposition” could be replaced with the word “consistent” in order to support the intent of the policy. It may need additional revision. Mr. Keleher said that the words “support” and “oppose” should be reworded also as those words represent two ends of the extreme. Mr. Sakaguchi voiced that the policy was written more in a negative context as opposed to the other focus area policies which are written in a positive context. Mr. Price said that Mr. Keleher had provided some modification wording in the effect to read, “The Commission will not endorse transportation projects unless they are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan.”

Mr. Beckstrom stated that his perception is that the attitude of most of the Governing Board is to attempt to take a neutral position on the transportation issue of a corridor across Utah Lake. He is concerned if the language in this policy shows a negative bias.

Mr. Keleher stated that he sees the purpose of the plan being focused on Utah Lake. He said maybe there should be a General Policy that states that the Commission will not endorse projects that aren’t consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan.

Mr. Struthers asked if Policy #3 should be written more specifically. Mr. Chesnut questioned if that policy were more a statement of action. Mr. Sakaguchi questioned whether this policy should be one of the objectives in the Transportation Policy section. Mr. Beckstrom stated he would be comfortable if the

Policy read as, "Creation of a trail around Utah Lake is a high value objective for the Commission" and not include the details. Mr. Chesnut said the remainder of the policy could be transferred to an objective.

Mr. Chesnut pointed out that similar changes could be done in Policy #4. There was discussion and it was suggested that Policy #4 could be changed to read:

Policy #4 – The Commission will support efforts to improve access to destination points around Utah Lake.

### **Natural Resources**

Mr. Jim Hewitson questioned the meaning of the word "optimal" in Policy #7 in the phrase, "Optimal lake levels." Mr. Carter answered that lake level is an issue. The consultants are struggling to develop a policy that shows that the Utah Lake Commission is concerned about lake level situations. He stated that the lake level policy needs more work. There was discussion on the different perspectives of lake levels. Mr. Keleher stated that the lake level fluctuates naturally and different opportunities can be taken advantage of at different lake levels. Somewhere in the Master Plan that should be acknowledged. Mr. Beckstrom added that there are two elements of fluctuation; 1) long-term fluctuations which are associated with hydrological cycles, and 2) annual lake level fluctuations which are associated with the inflows/outflows within a twelve month calendar year. There is a sense that there is less control over the long term lake level fluctuations. However, in any committee he has attended the term "optimal lake level" has not been discussed. Mr. Sakaguchi stated that it should just be stated that the Commission recognizes lake level fluctuations.

Mr. Daniel Hales questioned if the goal is to minimize lake level fluctuations. He stated that the way the policy reads is that the goal is to maintain the lake level at a certain level. Mr. Carter agreed that stating that there is an "optimal lake level" is unrealistic. Mr. Beckstrom said that many different interest groups i.e., recreational, land use, etc., may picture the ideal scenario to keep the lake at compromise but with other factors such as water rights, that is not an achievable goal. It may be best to identify management practices that could minimize lake level fluctuations. Mr. Hales stated that if the goal is to minimize the fluctuation in the lake then something should be stated as a goal in the policy.

Mr. Keleher said that the reason the Commission wants to minimize lake level fluctuations is because then it can help achieve other goals, but it should be stated that some of this is out of the Commission's control. Mr. Sakaguchi added that since lake level fluctuation affects more than one of the amenities then it may be that lake level fluctuations should be addressed as a general policy.

Mr. Beckstrom said that so many of the policies are bridged to others within the focus areas that a case could be made for only having general policies that are not tied to specific sections of the Master Plan. Different variations of policies were discussed.

Mr. Price opened discussion on Policy #4 where it reads, "The Commission values and supports efforts by member agencies to eliminate carp, recover the June sucker and improve sport fishery in Utah Lake." He questioned whether these listings should be generalized and moved to Policy #6. Mr. Keleher suggested that carp is covered under Policy #6 and suggested that a Policy #4 should be a specific policy that says that the Commission values and supports June sucker so that it no longer requires protection under the Endangered Species Act. Sport fishing is a recreational policy as well as a natural resource policy. He said that there are some people who would consider support of the June sucker and efforts to improve sport fishery as conflicting

Mr. Beckstrom stated that he hasn't seen in the plan an understanding of the value of the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program. Mr. Keleher said it may be a general policy statement that the

Governing Board supports efforts to recover federally listed species and prevent additional Federal listings.

Mr. Hales stated that improved sport fishery seems to be more of a recreational policy rather than a natural resources policy. There was discussion on the conflicts of grouping carp, June sucker and sport fishery. It was suggested that carp would be covered in the general statement policy. Sport fishery can either be a recreational or natural resources policy.

Mr. Hunter and Mr. Cowie voiced their agreement that Policy #4 should be re-categorized. Sport fishery could be moved to a recreation policy. Mr. Hunter stated that the Utah Lake could be considered the best urban sport fishery in the State. He feels that there should be goals listed that would promote more development that would get people to come to the lake even more.

Mr. Dave Wham reviewed that it should be included that a resolution was passed by the Commission supporting phosphorous removal and that it should be mentioned.

Mr. Chris Tschirki commented that Policy #2 and Policy #3 seemed very specific and that in being so could exclude other opportunities. Mr. Sakaguchi added that Policy #2 should also recognize or respect the authority of the URMCC efforts in establishing the Goshen and Benjamin wetland reserves. Mr. Carter said that there had been discussion about that, and the thought seemed to be that the policy should be broader.

Discussion continued about the value of articulating specifics in regard to the buffer zones listed in Policy #3 or if that should also be more general. Mr. Tripp said that when buffer zones are discussed there are usually private property rights involved. Saratoga Springs has done an excellent job of requiring any new developer to provide a trail along the lake which creates a buffer. Mr. Carter suggested that the wording could be changed to "in appropriate locations" rather than specifically listing locations. The policy as it stands does not distinguish between sovereign, private or public lands but says there needs to be a habitat buffer area. The only area that may be a significant issue is within the private lands.

Mr. Keleher said that he agreed with Mr. Carter in making this policy broader and more general so the policies can be more long lasting. Discussion supported that the Policy should state something to the effect that the Commission supports habitat buffers around the shore of Utah Lake that would be appropriate to the area.

Policy #2 can be changed to read, "The Commission supports and encourages creation of new wildlife preservation areas."

### **Recreation**

Mr. Beckstrom opened discussion and said that Policy #2 does not seem like a policy, but reads more like a statement of fact. Mr. Carter agreed that the Policy could be rewritten so that it would include the goals of the Commission. Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the same verbage could be used as was discussed previously such as "that is consistent with the Master Plan." Mr. Keleher questioned whether a general policy could be written and added regarding the development of all types of facilities to minimize the impact to sensitive lands and to mitigate that impact rather than limiting the policy to recreation.

There was discussion about the criteria that the Commission will use when some parts of a proposal are in agreement with the Commission's goals and some parts are in opposition. Mr. Hewitson said that when that happens it shouldn't negate the entire project.

Mr. Hunter said that there should be policy in the Recreation Policies that could be used as a mode to influence people in their perception of the Lake and to gain stewardship of the lake. Not all of the policies should deal with development.

Mr. Carter said that many of the policies overlap with each other in the different categories and possibly some of the policies need to be regrouped and discussed in general policies.

Discussion was opened on Policy #4 which reads, "Recreation facilities located on sovereign lands will be public facilities." Mr. Hunter pointed out that Lindon Boat Harbor was built on sovereign lands but is owned privately. Another example was when Saratoga Springs wanted to close the old resort they were mandated to build a new facility to replace the public access. Mr. Tripp explained some of the problems that could arise. Homeowners do not want public access around their property. The state has had several issues arise with the jurisdiction between private, public and sovereign land areas. He suggested deleting Policy #4. He stated that the sovereign lands document already dictates public access rights. Mr. Carter said that there was question about people wanting to build private docks in Saratoga Springs. Mr. Tripp said that this is a problem that is still being addressed and many things are being considered. He said to his knowledge there isn't any area on the lake that the public is denied access as long as they don't trespass on the private land. Some structures can be privately owned on sovereign lands as long as the land around it is accessible. Mr. Carter will try to draft a rewrite of this policy.

In discussion of Policy #6 Mr. Tripp stated that when Saratoga Springs Harbor applied for a general permit the Corps of Engineers was the ultimate decision maker. Mr. Carter said through the public comments they had received there was concern expressed from the owners and operators of the marinas to discourage the Commission from approving new facilities without considering the economic impacts on existing operations. He suggested the Commission consider the extent they want to engage in the private business sector.

It was stated that although the Commission does not have regulatory influence, it does have considerable peer influence. This policy will be discussed further by the Steering Committee.

Mr. Tschirki suggested that in Policy #1 the word "maximized" be changed to "optimized."

Mr. Keleher questioned the definition of "equitably distributed" in Policy #3. Mr. Carter answered that the intent was in regard to population centers. Mr. Hunter stated that diversity to less developed areas is obviously desirable, but this is already stated in the opportunities section. Mr. Carter said that some of the policies can probably be collapsed.

Mr. Tripp that in Policy #6 it should be inserted that the Commission encourages use of the lake.

### **Public Facilities**

The single policy statement reads "The Commission will consider and evaluate the availability of public facilities to support proposed projects" and was acceptable.

Mr. Price said the Steering Committee will meet on Monday and review additional feedback and important issues for the five sections and forward them to the consultants. Any further ideas for wordsmithing should be forwarded to him.

### **5. Discuss Management Classification Map**

Mr. Price distributed a Management Classification Map that had previously been forwarded to the Technical Committee. The Steering Committee sees this as a planning map that can be used by the different municipalities and jurisdictions as a reference to the Commission's visions for the lake's development. There are six different classifications. The consultants have been requested to clarify those classifications. There was discussion on the criteria used in deciding on which classification to assign to each area. The consensus was that an area was defined by a certain classification (color) by its presumption to be more acceptable towards that designation.

Mr. Carter answered that the criteria used was either the existing development or the available infrastructure. Some exceptions to that existed on the west side of the lake in regard to areas that would support recreational development such as boating. He said the amount of the area designated can be changed according to the Committee's evaluations. Mr. Beckstrom reminded that the numbers are from

the sovereign land boundary and that may differ from the practical shoreline. The idea is to designate the sovereign lands for future use.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that the state should have input on these designations. Mr. Tripp said the state would like to have a reference map to be able to conduct conversations in regard to authorization for future plans.

It was questioned how the Other Jurisdiction Lands-Class A (Blue) were defined and it was answered that those were already defined (Goshen Bay Preservation Area) in the Federal legislation.

Mr. Hewitson pointed out an area on the north shore that needed to be altered showing Settlement Boundary. The color will be changed for better viewer reading.

Mr. Carter emphasized that the Management Classifications map is very preliminary and conceptual and will need refinement.

There was discussion concerning the criteria between the Class 2 – Potential Resource Development Options (Purple) and the Class 3 – Open for Consideration of Any Use (Orange) classifications. Mr. Carter said that the value to having identified areas is to have steering evaluations. Class 3 designations doesn't preclude development, but can be used as a tool.

Mr. Price suggested that it might be advantageous to have the planning agencies talk to Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL) and stipulate how they want their sovereign lands classified. Mr. Tripp said that it's hard to project because development is market driven.

Mr. Wham questioned if an area that is classified as Class 5 – Potential Resource Preservation Area (Yellow) would discourage development and likewise, would a Class 2 (Purple) designation discourage natural resources interests. Mr. Tripp said that the Corps of Engineers have the ultimate say in what is permitted.

There was discussion on the Class 4-Resource Inventory and Analysis (Green) identified on the map. There were some questions about what changes would have occurred in the present developments already in existence had the map been in place previously. Mr. Carter said that the map can be used as a steering tool for a path of least resistance. The intent of the map is to be a suitability and constraint planning map similar to what is used for outlining a community. Mr. Beckstrom added that it is a hybrid map, but with the passage of time it will become a regulatory map.

Mr. Price said the map will be forwarded to the Land Use Subcommittee and he will let them know this is the direction the Commission is headed. The Committee needs to try to make sure that this map blends in with every land use map of each respective municipality and county.

Mr. Tschirki questioned some disconnected land shown on the map east of the Provo River and Mr. Tripp answered that the area was federal land and that there aren't any private lands in the specified area. It was pointed out that the only land marker on the map was the I-15 sign at the top of the map. Mr. Struthers questioned whether Bird Island located in the middle of the lake should be identified and whether or not all the cities should be identified as well. Mr. Sakaguchi mentioned that Provo City leases some land north of the Provo River that might be identified and also Nature Conservancy owns some land in that area.

Mr. Beckstrom said the map is primarily concerned with the sovereign lands. Mr. Price asked Mr. Carter to relay all the discussion feedback to Mr. Cox.

## **6. Discuss identified priorities for Utah Lake (New Section 6.0)**

Mr. Price said that the Steering Committee asked the consultants to draft another section, Section 6.0, which would prioritize goals for Utah Lake. Mr. Cox has worked on this and has developed a decision matrix to help him present the priorities for Utah Lake itself, not the Commission and not FFSL. He has separated them into three categories; high priority-immediate, high-priority- long term goals, and medium priority. Mr. Price referred the Committee to the Section 6.0 handout for their review and requested feedback. This will be presented to the Governing Board following review.

**7. Discuss appropriate level of effort for tasks under the new “Utah Lake Commission Implementation Strategies” appendix.**

Mr. Price suggested that this item would be more appropriately moved to a later discussion due to the lack of time. Mr. Beckstrom asked everyone to encourage their various Subcommittee members and Governing Board members to look at their areas of expertise and give their input. In January it is hoped that the discussion will be in refining the document and not asking for explanations at that point.

**8. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, December 15, 2008.**

Mr. Chesnut thanked everyone for their participation and noted the date of the next Technical Committee. He emphasized how everyone’s input is valued. Any further points of discussion or input should be emailed to Mr. Price.

**9. Adjourn.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:58 A.M.

**Land Use and Shoreline Protection Policies**

**Land Use Policy 1** – The Commission will encourage member agencies to coordinate general plans and land use regulations in the Master Plan area to provide for consistency among local government jurisdictions.

**Land Use Policy 2** – The Commission will encourage member agencies to require residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural uses in the Master Plan Area be designed, located, and operated so as to protect the ecological function of Utah Lake’s natural resources.

**Land Use Policy 3** – The Commission will provide means for all local governments and affected State and federal agencies to regularly communicate and work together to achieve the goals and objectives of the Master Plan.

**Land Use Policy 4** – The Commission will encourage local governments and State and federal agencies to cooperate to provide effective and efficient law enforcement in the Master Plan Area.

**Transportation Policies**

**Transportation Policy 1** – The Commission will not support or oppose transportation projects unless the plans for the project are in opposition to the goals and objectives of the Master Plan.

**Transportation Policy 2** – The Commission will be proactive in seeking early and significant participation in transportation planning efforts that may affect Utah Lake, its shorelines, or access to the lake.

**Transportation Policy 3** – Creation of a trail around Utah Lake is a high value objective for the Commission that will require active participation of the Commission and its members in

development of trail ordinances and support of changes in Utah laws to facilitate the completion of the trail.

**Transportation Policy 4** – The Commission will identify needs and support efforts to improve access to existing destination points around Utah Lake.

### **Natural Resources Policies**

**Natural Resources Policy 1** – The Commission recognizes and respects private property rights (both land and water rights) associated with Utah Lake and all plans for creation of preservation or educational areas must protect those rights.

**Natural Resources Policy 2** – The Commission supports and encourages creation of new wildlife preservation areas in Provo Bay, adjacent to Powell Slough, and expansion of the Goshen Bay Wildlife Preserve.

**Natural Resources Policy 3** – The Commission advocates creation of a habitat buffer area along the north shore of Utah Lake between Lindon Boat Harbor and Saratoga Harbor.

**Natural Resources Policy 4** – The Commission values and supports efforts by member agencies to eliminate carp, recover the June sucker and improve sport fishery Utah Lake.

**Natural Resources Policy 5** – Interpretive and directional signage is an important tool to inform the public of the values of Utah Lake and the Commission will take an active role in expanding and improving signage.

**Natural Resources Policy 6** – The Commission will plan for and encourage member agencies' efforts to control undesirable plant and animal species.

**Natural Resources Policy 7** – Identification of optimal lake levels is a prerequisite to seeking reductions in level fluctuations. The Commission will seek out this information.

**Natural Resources Policy 8** – Proposals to enhance or engineer solutions to problems must consider the other goals and objectives of the Master Plan, including but not limited to protection of the environment and Utah Lake recreational values.

**Natural Resources Policy 9** – The Commission will support proposals to improve Utah Lake water quality and will oppose those that impair the current and anticipated beneficial uses of the lake.

**Natural Resources Policy 10** – The Commission will identify and facilitate coordinated management of Utah Lake by continuing communications with its members and will seek opportunities to improve management and protection of Utah Lake.

**Natural Resources Policy 11** – A Utah Lake Science Laboratory would improve understanding of Utah Lake and provide an educational tool for the public. The Commission will support and encourage efforts to establish this facility.

**Natural Resources Policy 12** – Proposals to save water by modifying evaporation or operational efficiencies will be evaluated by the Commission. Concepts that meet the goals of the Master Plan and provide water to benefit Utah Lake will be encouraged.

### **Recreation Policies**

**Recreation Policy 1** – Public access to Utah Lake will be maximized, in conjunction with the protection of private property rights.

**Recreation Policy 2** – Development of recreation facilities will avoid impacts to sensitive lands and resources.

**Recreation Policy 3** – Recreation opportunities should be equitably distributed around Utah Lake.

**Recreation Policy 4** – Recreation facilities located on sovereign lands will be public facilities.

**Recreation Policy 5** – A variety of types of recreational opportunities should be offered at Utah Lake.

**Recreation Policy 6** - The Commission will consider impacts to existing marinas when evaluating proposals for new marinas.

### **Public Facilities Policies**

**Public Facilities Policy**– The Commission will consider and evaluate the availability of public facilities to support proposed projects.