



Utah Lake Technical Committee Meeting  
Monday, November 12, 2007  
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 211  
51 South University Avenue,  
Provo, Utah 84601  
8:30 A.M.

**ATTENDEES:**

Bruce Chesnut, Orem, Chairman  
Reed Price, Utah Lake Committee  
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs  
H. Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire & State Lands  
Kris Buelow, JSRIP  
Michael Mills, Dept. of Natural Resources  
LaVere B. Merritt, Private Consultant

Greg Beckstrom, Provo, Vice-Chair  
Clyde Naylor, Utah County  
Bob Fisher, Woodland Hills  
Ty Hunter, Division of Parks & Recreation  
Sarah Sutherland, CUWED  
Andy Spencer, American Fork  
Carol Mausser, Executive Assistant

**ABSENT:**

Adam Cowie, Lindon  
Michael Vail, Genola  
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove  
James Linford, Santaquin  
Brad Stapley, Springville  
Dave Wham, UT Dept. of Environmental Quality  
Norman Holdaway, Vineyard

Scott Bird, Mapleton  
Don Blohm, Highland  
Jim Hewitson, Lehi  
James McMillan, U.S. Army Corps. Of  
Engineers  
Ann Merrill, Division of Water Resources

**1. Welcome**

Bruce Chesnut welcomed all to the Utah Lake Technical Committee meeting and called the meeting to order at 8:40 A.M. He asked everyone to be sure to sign the roll. Bob Fisher requested that everyone introduce themselves and what organization they were representing.

**2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical minutes from October 22, 2007.**

Lee Hansen requested there be some clarification on Page 6 of the minutes where it stated "the FDA uses a lower level for commercial fishermen in comparison to the EPA level set for recreational fishermen". It will be changed to read, "...a lower level (less stringent) for commercial fishermen...". Chris Keleher asked that on Page 4 where stated "Mr. Keleher asked if there is a possibility of revisiting the district plan since it is fifteen years old..." to "...revisiting the State Engineer's Distribution Plan since it is fifteen years old...".

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes with these two corrections. The minutes were approved.

3. Discuss and prioritize potential projects in and around Utah Lake to be drafted into a resolution of support of representative Sumsion's proposed legislation for a Transportation/Ecological Study of Utah Lake.

Mr. Chesnut summarized that in the past week the Transportation subcommittee met and had a discussion with Representative Ken Sumsion and asked Clyde Naylor who is a member of that subcommittee to give an update of that meeting.

Mr. Naylor stated that the meeting was a combined meeting of the Commission's Executive Committee and the Technical Committee's Transportation subcommittee to discuss Representative Sumsion's proposal with respect to transportation. In that meeting, the Representative explained his concerns about the lack of transportation solutions. He identified the fact that there is some potential that within 20 years a possible 250,000 people would be living on the west side of the Lake. That area is already congested particularly in the Lehi area. The basic concern is that there needs to be some kind of a transportation corridor across Utah Lake to accommodate these people. What is of interest is that the State has surplus money right now and he feels it would be an appropriate time to ask the State to fund a study to determine the feasibility of a transportation corridor and the effects that would have on the lake and the ecology. The discussion ended up that the Representative will be proposing to the State that an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) be approved for five million dollars (\$5M). In the meeting there was a lot of discussion about the effect on the lake's ecology. There are two proposals circulating now that say they have the ability to build the corridor. One of them says they will even pay for the study. It was felt that having a private individual fund these studies would be counterproductive to the Master Plan. If the State funds the study including the issues that surround the lake, i.e. transportation, ecology, etc., it would make more sense.

Bob Fisher questioned if the private party is suggesting using tolls for the corridor and Mr. Naylor responded that that is what he understood.

Mr. Chesnut added that Representative Sumsion indicated that with this opportunity of having extra funds available, he would like the Commission's support to draft a proposal to present to the State to request the \$5M study. The Executive Committee asked that the Technical Committee put together a proposal to support a bill that Representative Sumsion will take before the legislature this coming session for this "one-time" money. The Executive Committee will meet on Wednesday, November 14 at 7:30 A.M. to review that draft. The Governing Board will meet on Thursday, November 15 at 7:30 A.M. to review the draft that, hopefully, can be sent to Representative to include in his bill. With the legislative session starting soon, the time line is short.

Mr. Price introduced a draft in resolution format and he explained that he tried to draft something that would incorporate the concerns that the Executive Committee discussed. It was their concern that the proposal includes other studies beyond transportation issues such as ecological studies and potential pilot projects such as reclaiming shorelines, invasive species, PCBs, water quality, and also phosphorous levels. He explained he tried to keep it as broad as possible and stated that he is open to any wording suggestions or other things he might have forgotten. Any additions should be added before Thursday so the proposal can be finalized at the Governing Board meeting.

Mr. Keleher suggested that some background of the Commission be included. He also suggested that the draft specifically identify the Master Plan and the carp removal program to which the Commission is already committed.

Mr. Naylor expressed support that it be identified that the Commission is already pursuing a Master Plan and previously agreed to support the carp removal program which would include the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program. It should be established where the Commission wants the money to go and yet allow for some flexibility. Discussion followed. It was pointed out that the bill hasn't been written yet. Mr. Beckstrom stressed that it might be best to focus on the Master Plan and include some other issues, one of which is the carp removal. Mr. Hunter asked that in the paragraph that includes

lines 26-28 that "recreational" be added. Mr. Keleher suggested wording to the effect of "Whereas the Utah Lake Commission recognizes the values of Utah Lake that it include recreational, ecological, etc." It was suggested that the wording be similar to what is stated in the Interlocal Agreement. There was discussion of line 21 and the connection between the north county transportation problem. Mr. Hansen mentioned that the trails around the lake are of consideration. It was suggested they could be included under the recreational umbrella.

Sarah Sutherland expressed opinion that without the Master Plan in place she felt jumping ahead with other projects puts the Commission in a "piece-meal" situation. Mr. Naylor replied that the Master Plan was discussed with the Representative and is estimated to be completed by December, 2008. However, this money that is available now and may not be available when the Master Plan is completed.

Mr. Keleher suggested that we identify the subcommittees that are already in effect, transportation being one of those. He stated that the Commission will have additional needs once the Master Plan is in effect.

Mr. Chesnut summarized that many viewpoints are good and valid. When Representative Sumsion started his presentation to the subcommittee he was totally focused on transportation. The committee tried to broaden that scope. However, the challenge that exists is that he is looking for transportation through UDOT to get this proposal funded and if too many other things are included the resolution may get weakened and not get funding. Discussion followed on the role of the Commission in supporting this resolution.

Mr. Fisher voiced that the opportunity in the resolution is to be able to conduct studies. It is a chance to get funds to do studies that the Commission will need. Mr. Chesnut expressed that while the transportation corridor is driving the resolution the committee can try to broaden the study in order to evaluate the impact that the corridor will have on Utah Lake and all the other factors of the Lake including recreation, water quality, etc. Mr. Keleher suggested that something to the effect be drafted as "Whereas growth in Utah County continues and is projected to grow and the growth has impact on Utah Lake, the Commission has adopted a Master Plan process to study these issues. We support legislation to support funding to address these issues." Mr. Chesnut stated that there are several private people who have the funding to do this and want to do the EIS and it will happen. Mr. Beckstrom commented that even though the Commission would like to fund all of the Lake's interests that, as Representative Sumsion pointed out, even though it is justifiable to want to study all the ecological issues surrounding the lake, there probably isn't legislative backing to do that. The transportation issue has the priority right now. The Commission is being asked to support a proposal that will allow funding to be allocated to do studies on the Lake that are needed albeit that it is driven by a transportation interest. Mr. Keleher expressed his opinion that he feels it compromises the Commission to emphasize transportation this early. Mr. Beckstrom stated he shared that opinion with Mr. Keleher and commended Mr. Price in drafting a proposal to attempt to reach middle ground. Mr. Naylor commented that Representative Sumsion already has support for the transportation issue and suggested that the Commission surely would want to tie into that support and, by doing so, accomplish many of the Commission's interests. Mr. Fisher interjected that we should not focus so much on the "Whereas" and concentrate on the second page of the draft where it is stated in items 1 and 2 what the Commission role will be.

There was discussion on the ramifications of a private sector funding the studies. It was pointed that there are risks in either scenario. Mr. Tripp questioned what kind of management plan will be put into place and inquired if there could be duplication of the studies with our Master Plan. Mr. Price stated that the Master Plan does not cover in detail some of these studies and it is hoped to get the funding so the additional studies can be done. Mr. Chesnut stated that the funding for the proposal will not be available until about July.

Following discussion Mr. Naylor suggested that the proposal start with reference to the Master Plan, then identify the schedule of the Master Plan and then identify that after the Master Plan is completed

there are several studies that need to be completed. One of those studies would be transportation that can be funded now and completed after the Master Plan is in effect.

Chris Keleher expressed agreement and suggested that after the Master Plan is identified that it be added;

WHEREAS the Utah Lake Commission has an active Technical Committee with subcommittees established to address pressing issues.

WHEREAS the Utah Technical Committee and other experts have determined that there are various critical issues that need to be addressed;

- Remove and control of non-native and invasive-plant species,
- Remove and control of non-native and ecologically-unfriendly fish species,
- Water quality and contaminants issues
- Transportation issues

Following these additions he suggested the rest of the draft read as written. Discussion continued on defining the proposal.

Mr. Fisher suggested that discussion should move towards the decision whether or not the Commission is going to move forward with a resolution. It was moved and seconded to support a resolution. It was approved unanimously.

Mr. Price will rewrite the proposal. It will begin with the general nature of why the Commission was formed. Then it will address some of the important issues to the Utah Lake Commission which are spelled out in the Interlocal Agreement. It will say that there are certain concerns that the Technical Committee and other experts have determined and those will include non-native and invasive-plant species, non-native and ecologically-unfriendly fish species, water quality and contamination issues, and transportation issues. It will also mention the PCBs and then address that the Commission recognizes that Utah County continues to be a place of growth and rapid development and that with the expected population increase Utah Lake may be a solution for some of these transportation problems. Then it will end with items 1 & 2 which state the "NOW, THEREFORE..." items for the resolution indicating what the Commission is proposing to do. Mr. Price will draft the resolution and email it to everyone prior to the Executive Meeting on Wednesday morning. It was asked who is on the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee consists of Mayor Lewis Billings, Commissioner Larry Ellertson, Heber Thompson, Jerry Washburn, Bruce Chesnut, Timothy Parker, Michael Styler, Clyde Naylor, Howard Johnson and Reed Price.

Mr. Fisher moved to put the resolution in a format that emphasizes the Master Plan. It was seconded by Mr. Hunter. There was some discussion and then the motion was approved. Everyone will receive a copy of the draft and need to send their comments to Mr. Price tomorrow.

#### 4. Remind committee about new schedule approved by the Governing Board at their last meeting.

The schedule for meetings for 2008 was approved at the last Governing Board meeting. The schedule is basically the same with the monthly meetings on the fourth Monday for the Technical Committee and the fourth Thursday for the Governing Board. There is one exception for the Technical Committee in January. They will meet the third week on Monday, January 14, due to the Martin Luther King holiday on the fourth Monday. The Technical Committee is scheduled to meet next month on December 17<sup>th</sup> however, it is possible the Governing Board December meeting may be cancelled and if that occurs it will not be necessary to meet on the 17<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Chesnut thanked everyone for their discussion and their input. The importance of the Technical Committee and the subcommittees is being seen. The subcommittees are in effect and the Transportation subcommittee is actively engaged. As the Selection Committee met with the firms that were being considered for the consultant job for the Master Plan there was a lot of emphasis on the subcommittees and their assistance with the consultants. Mr. Chesnut would like every subcommittee

to select a person to serve as their Chair. At every Technical Committee that is held every subcommittee Chair will report and bring the Committee up to date on what's happening. Mr. Price stated that once a contract has been negotiated with the selected consultant then the subcommittees will work hand-in-hand with them. The consultant will have a schedule of meetings that they will hold with the subcommittees and the Technical Committee. Those meetings will be announced.

**5. Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:54 A.M.