



COMMISSION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, December 15, 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
Brent Wilde, Provo
Chris Keleher, Dept. of Natural Resources
Daniel Hales, Springville
Doug Sakaguchi, DNR-Dept. of Wildlife Resources
Jim Hewitson, Lehi
Kim Struthers, Lehi

Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs
LaVere B. Merritt, Consultant
Michael Mills, JSRIP
Nathan Lunstad, Highland
Reed Oberndorfer, CUWCD
Richard Nielson, Utah County
Ty J. Hunter, DNR-Parks & Recreation
Rick Cox, URS

ABSENT:

American Fork, Genola, Mapleton, Pleasant Grove, Santaquin, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, UT Dept. of Environmental Quality, Forestry, Fire & State Lands, DNR-Division of Water Resources, Vineyard, Woodland Hills, Utah Water Users

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Bruce Chesnut called the meeting to order at 8:36 A.M. He acknowledged Mr. Clyde Naylor as this being his last meeting before retiring and expressed thanks for all the work he has done for the Utah Lake Commission as well as Utah County. All wished him the best on his retirement. Mr. Naylor is leaving on a mission for his church in January. Mr. Naylor introduced Mr. Richard Nielson who is assuming the position of Public Works Director for Utah County and will replace Mr. Naylor in that position. Mr. Nielson will be recognized tomorrow formally as the representative on the Technical Committee. Mr. Nielson previously worked in Spanish Fork City as the Assistant Public Works Director and was welcomed to the Technical Committee.

It was announced that Mr. Barry Tripp who represents Forestry, Fire & State Lands, will officially retire on January 1, 2009.

Mr. Reed Oberndorfer was introduced as alternate for Sarah Sutherland, representing the Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD). Everyone introduced themselves.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from November 10, 2008

Mr. Chesnut referred everyone to the minutes from November 10, 2008. Mr. Chris Keleher moved to approve the minutes and it was seconded by Mr. Ty Hunter. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Overview of plan organization

Mr. Chesnut requested that Mr. Price give an overview report of the Master Plan. Mr. Price said it would be helpful to look at the structure of the plan before discussion. The first section is an acknowledgment of all the people who were involved in the creation and review of the plan. It includes members of the Governing Board, Steering Committee, Executive Committee, Technical Committee, Subcommittees and others. Mr. Price asked if anyone noticed anyone missing in the list to let him know. Mr. Cox said he was informed that there are some corrections and he will give those to Mr. Price. Section 1 will be the Executive Summary which will be finalized when the plan is close to being finalized.

Section 2 will be the Introduction and this section will give a brief history of the Commission, the objectives of the Commission, and the purposes of the Master Plan. It discusses an amendment process, the public trust doctrine, the authority of Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL), the management classification map, and the plan adoption.

Section 3 is the Plan Process section and includes explanations of how the project was organized, how the public was involved and what internal meetings were held.

Section 4 is a compilation of the Vision Statements that have been proposed.

Section 5 is the primary section where the goals are stated and the objectives to accomplishing those goals as well as the policies.

Section 6 is a prioritization of goals and objectives for Utah Lake itself regardless of who is responsible for them.

Appendix A will be a CD with all the public comments received scanned on. Newspaper articles involving the process will be included.

Appendix B is the Statement of Current Conditions.

Appendix C is the Implementation Strategies. In Appendix C there will be information on tasks that the Utah Lake Commission will undertake to accomplish goals and objectives.

Appendix D is a list of rejected goals and objectives, i.e. dredging, ferry services, Provo Bay, etc.

The goals for this meeting are to review the different sections and identify any concerns and suggest alternatives the Technical Committee might have and how to address those concerns. It was requested to try to avoid wordsmithing and submit those grammatical corrections by email.

4. Summarize public comments and invite comments or concerns from Committee members

Mr. Chesnut referred to the summary of the public comments that were collected at the last Open Houses. The comments made were useful and helpful in supporting the work being done on the Master Plan. He said the public would have a 45-day comment period following the final Master Plan draft prior to its adoption. The topics will be responded to during that period of time.

Mr. Naylor inquired what was meant by the comment that "policies are not enforceable." Mr. Cox clarified that at the Open Houses he had explained to the public that the Commission did not have legal authority and this was just a response from them.

Mr. Hansen referred to a comment regarding planning for a wildlife preserve which Mr. Cox said that Goshen Bay and Provo Bay are preservation areas and essentially bird areas.

Mr. Cox explained that the concept to the public comment that access and campgrounds should be private was that the government would spend a lot of money on campgrounds and that person who commented felt campgrounds should be a self-sustaining function. The public comments will be available on CDs.

Mr. Price asked if anyone had any specific ideas or concerns to address before the discussion of the document. As an example he stated that the State had suggested that the policies be moved from the end of each section to the front before the goals and objectives are mentioned.

Mr. Keleher stated that the State felt there is a lot of redundancy that can be eliminated by restructuring the document. The State suggested changing the terms now called Broad Vision Statements to Utah Lake Vision Statement and that General Vision Statements be changed to Vision Statements for Plan Elements. It was suggested that Section 6 would benefit from a Gantt chart that would visually show the implementation schedule in the Section. Mr. Cox asked if this chart could be put in the Appendix rather than in that section. Mr. Keleher stated that some of the objectives warrant a visual representation on the map, i.e. the buffer zones. Other locations were submitted in their comments to Mr. Price.

Mr. Sakaguchi said that he supported the policies being put at the front of each element followed by the goals and objectives in Section 5. In the Executive Summary the policies will be listed all together. Mr. Hewitson supported both the Gantt chart and the visual representation map and Mr. Naylor also voiced support.

Mr. Cowie had some concerns with the structure of the document. He suggested that the acknowledgments be moved to the back of the document rather than in the Introduction section.

Mr. Price thought the acknowledgements should be further condensed. Mr. Cowie said that Section 2.1. and 2.2 involve the History, but that the preceding segments are processes on how the plan can be changed. He felt it's not correct to put information about how the plan can be changed at the front of the document before the plan has even been introduced and suggested these items be put in an appendix. He said that Section 3 could be inserted into Section 2 following 2.2. In section 5.8 there are Considered and Rejected Goals and Objectives and Mr. Cowie asked if they were rejected why they end up in the document anyway. Following discussion it was agreed that it would help if another term was used instead of rejected.

Mr. Lee Hansen questioned if the Management Classification Map could be expanded to allow details. Discussion points included delineation of boundaries, accuracy, and problems of updating. It was agreed that the information needs to at least be accessible in a file.

Mr. Hansen questioned an indicated boat launch on the Management Classification Map. Mr. Hunter clarified the point of reference, but there was still question whether the indicated boat launch would be legal or trespasses. Mr. Cox will check with the FFSL to see if it is legal before showing the launch on the map.

Mr. Sakaguchi questioned if some of the access points shown were "wish lists" and wondered if those should be included on the map. Mr. Cox replied that all the established points should be on the map and those that are identified for future development.

Mr. Beckstrom expressed appreciation to Mr. Cox and his staff for putting the document together. He also thanked the State committee members for the extensive work they have done in reviewing the document and submitting their suggestions. He said that he felt the Governing Board would be focusing on the Policy Statements, Goal Prioritization, the Management Classification Map and the Implementation Strategies. Some of the issues with the policy statements will be resolved with the Executive Summary. The Board will want to see the rejected policies although it was agreed that a better term should be identified. Those policies don't need to be in the Plan, but need to be listed in the document even if in an appendix. He expressed his opinion that the map needs further study. He felt all the goals should be identified in Section 6 and disagreed that the goals should be differentiated between Utah Lake strategies and Commission strategies.

He proposed that the work still remaining to be done on the document is not going to allow making schedule deadlines. It doesn't seem realistic that a final draft will be feasibly completed in one meeting.

Mr. Keleher said the State reserves the right to add further comment after there is a revised document.

Mr. Cox asked if the State had been able to review the Implementation Plan and Mr. Keleher replied they did not get to that point.

5. Review Document by section

a. Sections 1-4

Mr. Cox stated that the Executive Summary is in progress and he intends to include a list of policies, priorities and goals.

Section One-Executive Summary

Mr. Sakaguchi clarified that the policies listed in the Summary will be the same as listed in each section and will not be rewritten.

Section Two –Introduction

Mr. Cowie’s previous suggestions and Mr. Price’s request for more brevity will be used for editing this section.

Mr. Beckstrom referred to 2.2 and 2.3 where it discusses the objectives of the Commission and purposes of the Master Plan. He said that some of the wording that had been requested to be changed is wording directly from the Interlocal Agreement and would need to remain as written.

Mr. Keleher commented that Table 2.1 should be restructured to clarify membership possibly by adding footnotes to denote affiliations. For the general reader he said it would be helpful to add the table that was included in the Current Conditions Report in regard to regulating authorities on Utah Lake. This would help demonstrate the role of the Commission in terms of activities on Utah Lake. It was agreed to include this in the Introduction under a heading of Regulatory Authorities on Utah Lake.

Mr. Hewitson asked if Timpanogas was considered as being listed under Special Districts. It was answered that they would be welcome, but as of yet have not expressed interest. They are represented through the cities, Pleasant Grove and Lehi. If they make a request now they would be a part of the Public Advisory Group (PAG). It was agreed that PAG would not be listed in the Plan because they have not yet had the opportunity for much involvement.

Mr. Cowie referred to page 9, Section 2.7, Class 5-Potential Resource Preservation Area where Hobble Creek is identified. There was discussion and the conclusion was to strike the identification of Hobble Creek.

Mr. Beckstrom referred to Section 2.4-Master Plan Elements where it states, “...management policies based on best management practices...” He pointed out that the term “best management practices” might be reconsidered. In Sections 2.5 and 2.6 the term Public Trust Doctrine is confusing. It is his understanding that FFSL is responsible for the bed of the lake, another division for the water and another division for the parks and so on, but the document seems to suggest that FFSL has the overall responsibility and suggested that this needs to be addressed. Discussion followed and it was agreed that a new section 2.7 should be added that will give a perspective on how the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Divisions interact with each other in regard to Utah Lake.

Mr. Keleher suggested that this interaction goes beyond the DNR to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers and a number of entities. The General Policy Statement of the Commission recognizes those authorities.

Mr. Price clarified that Forestry, Fire and State Lands should be referred to consistently in the document as FFSL.

In regards to 2.7-Management Classification Map Mr. Price said that it was requested there be a broader understanding of the implementation of it. Mr. Beckstrom questioned the descriptions of the classifications. Mr. Cox said FFSL created the classifications for this particular Master Plan although they are generally similar to the Salt Lake Plan. Mr. Beckstrom questioned the area of Provo Bay as being heavily classified as Class 5-Potential Resource Preservation Area. The fact that future mitigation projects, possible expansions to the Airport and agricultural projects would be in that area, possibly

should be better classified as Class 4-Resource Inventory and Analysis. There was discussion on the future impact of assigning classifications and the definitions of the classifications.

Mr. Hewitson commented that he reads the classifications as being identified as “potential.” Mr. Cox said he would take these recommendations back to FFSL as to the definition of the classifications. This is a key document for the FFSL and Mr. Price said FFSL wants this map to be congruent with the municipalities land use maps and the Commission needs to understand and agree with the classifications. It is important to identify the open space areas that the Commission feels warrants protection in the future, as well as those targeted for development.

Mr. Hansen said the document should describe the differences of the classifications and by what criteria areas they were classified. Mr. Cox stated that Class 6 and Class A are previously existing classifications. There was discussion on the area classified as Class A which is on the east shore of the lake, north of Provo River. Mr. Keleher explained that area was classified as such because Provo City has the open space easement of the Despain Ranch and Nature Conservancy has the conservation easement on the property to the north. In discussions it was agreed it would be good to identify all the upland areas that have essentially been locked up from development on this map. There was discussion on the variances of the identified Class A areas and the differences may need to be discriminated. Class A also needs to be described in Section 2.7. It was agreed that there needs to be a working session on the Management Classification Map with FFSL and Mr. Price will schedule the meeting. It will be open to all the Technical Committee members.

Mr. Price has communicated with most of the Land Use subcommittee representatives and they have expressed support, but they may not realize the implications of how once this plan will affect them once it is adopted. Mr. Beckstrom feels there is a lack of understanding in the local municipalities of the policy implications of this plan beyond sovereign lands. Mr. Price will organize a meeting of the Land Use subcommittee to discuss the implications of the map.

In regarding Section 2.8 an attorney from FFSL provided some verbiage suggestions. The following was suggested to be added to the Section and Steve Schwendiman, Attorney for the state added to it to read: “Notwithstanding FFSL adoption of the Utah Lake Commission master plan as FF&SL’s management plan, nothing therein precludes FF&SL from modifying and amending their management plan independent of the Utah Lake Commission’s master plan; however, if such a need arises, FFSL will not amend their management plan without first consulting with the Utah Lake Commission.”

Mr. Beckstrom suggested inserting the word “legally” before the word “precludes.”

In regard to Section 2.8.1 Mr. Price said that the State recommended that the plan be approved by the Commission and FFSL simultaneously and Mr. Price concurred. Mr. Hales requested verification that an amendment to the Plan must originate with a voting member of the Governing Board. Mr. Cox verified that, but said an individual could initiate an amendment through FFSL. It was pointed out that it is permissible for FFSL to make an amendment to the plan without Commission involvement.

Mr. Keleher offered some changes to Figure 2.3 in that an arrow be added from the Division of Forestry, Fire & State Lands box that would provide a rejection of an amendment back to the Executive Director and Committee. This chart will also be moved to the end of the document.

Section 3- Plan Process

There was discussion of the suggestion by Mr. Cowie to move Sections 3.1-3.3 to the Introduction. It was proposed that Sections 3.1.-3.3. be inserted after Section 2.4 in the Introduction. Sections 2.5-2.7 would remain and create a new Section 3. Section 2.8 will be moved further back in the document. Mr. Cox voiced some concern with moving 2.5 and 2.6 because it was so important to FFSL. This will be further discussed in the meeting being scheduled with FFSL.

Section 4 – Vision Statement

Mr. Price reviewed that a suggestion from the State to rename Broad Vision Statement to Utah Lake Vision Statement and General Vision Statements to either Vision Statements, Plan Elements or Plan Element Vision Statements. Mr. Keleher said that the terms Broad and General were used interchangeably. Mr. Cox agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Keleher suggested that the Specific Vision Statements be taken out of this Section while adding some verbiage that would say that they were developed as goals.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that Section 4.2-Utah Lake Vision Statement should be included in the Executive Summary. Also the Vision Statements/Plan Elements should be included. Discussion followed. The Board has already approved the Vision Statements. Mr. Price said the Board could be told that minor corrections were made and this will be discussed in the Executive Committee meeting for approval. The only correction the State suggested to the Plan Elements (General Vision Statements) was in Recreation with the insertion of the word “recreation” to read, “Utah Lake is a recreation destination that provides economic benefits to the area and is perceived positively by local residents and other visitors.” Mr. Beckstrom said the only modification to the Specific Vision Statements, now Goals, that he had concerns with was in #17 where it reads, “...recognizing that the lake level is uncontrolled and is influenced by many factors...” Mr. Keleher agreed and will re-address this with the Water Rights Division. One possible solution is simply to remove the words, “uncontrolled and” and leave it to read, “...the lake level is influenced by many factors.” Mr. Kim Struthers suggested that the thirty items be listed in a specific order, possibly alphabetized.

There was discussion about the Specific Vision Statements and where they should be listed. It was suggested that the Goal to which they are associated be inserted parenthetically following the Statement. The Specific Vision Statements need to be listed altogether somewhere in the document. The letter classifications currently following each Specific Vision Statement will no longer be included. A reference to the Specific Vision Statements becoming goals may also be included in the Executive Summary. The Specific Vision Statements could be mentioned in the Executive Summary without listing them but called Goals. Another idea was to have the goals summarized at the beginning of Section 5 and link them to the objectives. Further alternatives were discussed including dissolving Section 4 and absorbing the material into the Executive Summary and Section 5.

It was decided to take a short break and the meeting reconvened at 11:02 A.M.

Following the break, discussion continued and concluded with the proposal that Section 4 will remain in the same format with a notation correlating the Visions and the Goals. The Broad and General Vision Statement will be included in the Executive Summary. Section 5 will not include General Vision Statements. In summary, the General Policies will be moved to the front of Section 5 and each element will have their specific policy followed by their goals and objectives, and the policies will be included in Executive Summary.

Mr. Price interjected that he thinks it is important to move the policies to the front of each section so the position can be stated first.

b. Section 5

In summary, the Vision Statements have been deleted in Section 5. The General Policy Statements will be moved to the front. Within each Element section the policy statement associated with that element will be listed first, followed by the goals and objectives.

In discussion, Mr. Price stressed that all the goals should be included. Mr. Sakaguchi suggested that the goals be grouped in Section 4 by elements. It had been suggested that they be alphabetized as well. Mr. Beckstrom deferred to Mr. Keleher to present the suggested restructuring from the state for this section. They requested to change Section 5.1 to read as follows:

5.1 Policies, Goals, Objectives

Policies are statements of principle that support objectives and will guide specific Commission decisions and actions. They are derived from, and consistent with Plan goals and objectives. They will be particularly valuable as “guideposts” in evaluating future proposals and program/ project alternatives that affect Utah Lake.

Master Plan *goals* are general statements that provide guidance in achieving the vision for Utah Lake. They are based on outcomes of the Visioning Workshop, and support achievement of the Visions for Plan Elements (i.e., Land-use and Shoreline Protection, Transportation, Recreation, Natural Resources, Public Facilities.). Specific Vision Statements are the foundation for the Goals of the Master Plan.

Opportunities identified during the Opportunities and Constraints Workshop are the root sources or ideas for development of the objectives of the Master Plan. *Objectives* are actions that may be undertaken to achieve Plan goals. Each is associated with a primary goal, but may also support other goals as well, as indicated in Section 5.2.

The goals and objectives presented below represent actions generated from the ideas and suggestions received during the planning process and selected by the Commission as priorities for achieving the Utah Lake Vision. Ideas and suggestions not selected as current Goals and Objectives of the plan are presented in Appendix D, Considered and Rejected Goals and Objectives.

This section was reorganized and the title will be “Policies, goals and objectives.” The heading was changed so it didn’t duplicate Section 5.0.

It was discussed whether a glossary needed to be created. It was decided that as members review the document to highlight terms they think might need to be defined. If it turns out there are 15-20 words that may need clarity then a glossary might be a good idea. Rather than repeating the title from Section 5.0 in Section 5.1 it was agreed to change Section 5.0 to “Introduction.”

Mr. Price requested anyone to forward any key words that think should be included in the index to Mr. Cox.

Mr. Hansen suggested removing the words “high” and “medium from the phrase “high- and medium-priority.”

Since the Policies will now be listed first, Mr. Beckstrom asked that the Section be discussed in the order it will appear.

LAND USE AND SHORELINE PROTECTION POLICIES

Policy 2 - Mr. Price said that the State wanted to add to Policy 2 to read, “...enhance the ecological function of Utah Lake’s natural resources in balance with navigable and economic necessity.”

There was discussion on the change and if it improved the policy or if it should be a separate policy. It was agreed to leave Policy 2 as stated and to ask the State author to request this change in the January Governing Board meeting.

Discussion was opened to the possibility that Land Use Policy 5 was essentially covered in Land Use Policy 2. Mr. Cox stated that the difference is that Policy 2 talks about enhancing the ecological function of the lake and Land Use Policy 5 encourages recreational and commercial projects. Mr. Hewitson agreed that there were enough differences to merit separate policies.

In the Interlocal Agreement it calls for Commission review of proposals within the plan area and Mr. Beckstrom said there wasn’t anything in this section that mentions it. After the Master Plan is adopted modifications of the plan review functions should be studied. Activities that are outside the study boundary may have influence on some things within the study boundary.

Land Use Goal 1 – Coordinated Land Use Planning

Objective 1.3- Sovereign Lands and Local Land-use Coordination - Mr. Keleher said that the intent was primarily editorial and the State made some clarifications. The word “shoreline” is difficult to define, so wherever that word was used they suggested a change to “sovereign land boundary” or “settlement boundary.” In the second paragraph they changed the sentence to read, “The purpose of this map is to share FFSL’s classifications with the public and local communities and to encourage consistency for planned use and development of upland areas adjacent to sovereign lands.”

There were concerns that the statement needed to convey that the map was a collaborative efforts for FFSL and the Commission. The statement will be toned to do so.

Land Use Goal 2 – Mixed Land Uses

Objective 2.1 – Lake-oriented Development – It was agreed to delete the last sentence, “Much of the previous development in the vicinity of Utah Lake did not take advantage of the presence of the lake as a resource and amenity, and frequently disrupted the functioning of the lake’s ecological systems.

Land Use Goal 3 – Land Use Buffers; Land Use Goal 4 – Land Acquisition and Management

Mr. Keleher commented that both Goal 3 and Goal 4 need to have visual representation on the map of the intent of the objective. In Goal 4, the State felt that Objective 4.1 should not be under the Land Acquisition Goal unless it is a goal of the commission to acquire all the lands below 4,495 feet in elevation. If it is not a land acquisition goal, then it should be moved to the Land Use Buffers. It was agreed that it was better suited there. An alternative map, Flood Hazard Map 2.4, indicating the flood zones could be used to show the 4,495 elevation. Mr. Cox will check with Utah County for a current map that shows the 4,495 compromise. The cities will need to be contacted for their Land Use maps as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has apparently lost those maps. The County’s atlas could be checked for the data they use for their flood plan map. Mr. Hunter advised that in obtaining the maps from each city they made have different contours. Mr. Beckstrom said that the map is more for general guidance and may not need to be that precise. It was determined after discussion that the solution might be in rewording the first sentence of the objective that states, “Residential and commercial and industrial development in the Plan Area will be located outside the historic flooding elevation of Utah Lake at 4,495 feet above mean sea level.” The purpose of the objective is to protect private property and to prevent flooding. Developments should not occur where it is subject to flooding. It was suggested that 5.2.5.1 be simplified and focus on the purposes as an objective to a goal as discussed.

Mr. Keleher summarized that there should be two objectives. One objective needs to show that development should not occur in areas where private properties in the future would be subject to flooding. A separate objective should address the buffer issue in terms of ecological function of the lake. Mr. Price added that Mr. Cowie’s suggestion of encouraging municipalities to have ordinances to protect private property would address the first objective.

Mr. Beckstrom commented that he had a vision that there would be a non-development zone or buffer that would exist between the sovereign boundaries and the historic flood elevation of Utah Lake. That sensitive land zone would encompass a number of benefits including the protection from flooding, ecological protection, wildlife zones and wetlands protection, etc.

Mr. Price summarized that the bottom line is that 4.1 needs to be reworked to address the two objectives that Mr. Keleher expounded on.

Mr. Cowie said he thought the buffer zone will be different for every jurisdiction. Mr. Daniel Hales agreed that it would vary significantly between the east and west side of the lake if the development is geared to the 4,495 elevation.

Mr. Cox said he will draft two new objectives; one that protects the flood area for ecological reasons and the other that will focus on the ordinances. Those will be prepared in time for the Land Use meeting.

Mr. Keleher questioned if in Objective 5.2.5.2 the phrase "In order to protect the function of ecological systems and avoid hazards," the term "avoid hazards" was the correct terminology. It can be clarified by inserting flooding to read, "avoid flooding hazards."

It was noted that the Land Use Goal 5-Sovereign Lands Boundary is not articulated and needs to be inserted.

Mr. Sakaguchi said in regard to Objective 4.3- Acquisition of Sensitive Lands, he has some concern that with the highway projects proposed around Utah Lake that will probably impact some wetlands which may require wetland mitigation and that might need to be mentioned. It was decided that this could be addressed in the Transportation section.

Mr. Keleher said that the State wondered if Goal 6 and Goal 7 could be with two objectives under the heading of Law Enforcement. One objective is oriented towards vandalism and the other is oriented more towards public safety. Another suggestion was to have one objective serve two goals and that was accepted.

At this time, 12:15 P.M., a lunch break was taken.

The meeting reconvened at 1:04 P.M. and began with discussion of Section 5.3 – Transportation.

TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

The General Vision statement was deleted and the Section will begin with Transportation Policies.

Policy 1 it was suggested to delete changing the wording "either opposes or supports" and replace it with the words "will consider." Another change would be to insert the words, "or not" to read, "The Commission will consider transportation projects based on whether or not they are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan." Mr. Sakaguchi also suggested that rather than using the words "will consider" to use the word "encourages." Other suggestions were discussed and it will be edited to "will consider" for now.

Policy 3 had some suggestions for editing from the State. They inserted the words "will pursue mechanism and opportunities" to replace "supports changes in Utah Law." That would now read as, "The Commission encourages member agencies to develop trail ordinances and will pursue mechanisms and opportunities to facilitate the completion of the trail around Utah Lake."

Transportation Goal 1 – Trails

Objective 1.2 – Trail Ordinance – Mr. Keleher said that the State thought an additional objective should include soliciting funds to complete trails in remote areas of the lake. Another objective should include developing standards for trail design and signage.

Mr. Sakaguchi said that a trails committee could be formed to help those jurisdictions that have areas that need trail development in order to complete the trail around the lake. Mr. Keleher reviewed that at the beginning of the Master Plan process it was hoped that Mr. Mike Donohue who is on the URS team would be helping to solicit funds. Mr. Cox said that Mr. Donohue has identified 25 areas for funding and Mr. Price just received those names.

After discussion Mr. Cox said an objective will be added regarding developing standards and a section for funding will be inserted into the Implementation Plan.

Mr. Wilde said that he thought the Land Use Committee should also revisit the relationship between buffers and trails. This had been discussed in a previous subcommittee meeting. It would be an option to have the trail establish the buffer where possible. Mr. Beckstrom said in some areas it might be nice to have the trail within the buffer to have some isolation from the urban environment. Regarding the phrase, “pod parks” it had previously been decided to change “pod” to “pocket” which would read, “pocket parks.”

Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning

Objective 2.1 – Continuous Participation in Planning Activities – it was requested to combine the last two sentences into one sentence to read, “Once issues are identified, the Commission will have an early and significant role in addressing them by maintaining continuous communications with local governments, the Utah County Public Works, UDOT Region 3, the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), and other entities. (Supports Specific Vision Statements 3, 4, 7, 12, 20, and 28.)

Objective 3.2-Cross Lake Transportation – the State requested this objective be re-worded to read, “Without supporting a specific action to improve cross-lake transportation (east-west transportation), the Utah Lake Commission will encourage and support studies to determine the need for and the feasibility of a cross-lake transportation corridor.”

Mr. Beckstrom requested that the sentence be accepted, but re-ordered so the sentence would begin, “The Utah Lake Commission will encourage...” He also thought it might be good to have a study that would address the issue of wildlife and wetland preserve and identify the prime sites and the criteria for selection.

Mr. Hansen said he would prefer the term “east-west transportation” as opposed to “cross lake transportation” and it was agreed to do that and to change the title of the objective also. In discussion it was pointed out that there are proposed corridors that run north-south that would impact the lake. Considering that, Mr. Cox said it would be better to leave the title as is and to delete the parentheses of (east-west transportation) in the body of the text.

NATURAL RESOURCE POLICIES

Policy 5 – Mr. Hansen questioned the reference to “undesirable plant and animal species.” He felt the phrase “invasive species” should be in the policy. It was decided to add “undesirable and/or invasive species...”

Policy 3 – Mr. Keleher asked that this be clarified and be changed to read, “The Commission values and supports efforts to recover federally listed, threatened and endangered species and prevent additional listings within the Utah Lake Master Plan.”

Mr. Beckstrom asked that “to” be added in front of “prevent.”

Policy 6 - The Water Rights Division requested adding a Policy between Policy 5 and Policy 6.

Policy 6 – The commission will not adversely impact existing water rights and flood control storage capacity without first entering into agreements with impacted water users or entities.

Mr. Beckstrom said this same type of policy could be adapted to property owners as well. Mr. Keleher said he would take this suggestion back for review and possibly they could edit the policy that is already in place. The Water Rights also made some other policy recommendations that read:

Policy 6 – The Commission encourages studies to work within Utah water rights law and determine the feasibility to reduce lake level fluctuation to accommodate Commission objectives such as recreational use and ecological integrity.

Mr. Reed Oberndorfer requested that whatever terms are used in regard to lake level that they be consistent throughout the document.

Mr. Cox questioned the word of “encourages studies” being used. He also asked the Committee if the intent is to do studies or to seek opportunities. Discussion followed in regard to terminology. It was stated that when this issue was brought before the Board there was a faction that wanted the language not to simply be a reaction, but to be proactive. The Board didn’t want to seem too active, but also did not want to be neutral and that is why the terminology “actively considered.” was accepted. It was suggested to modify the wording of the proposed Policy 6 for the intent to be that if any studies take place they do so within the Utah Water Rights Law.

Mr. Cox suggested Objective 5.1-Lake Level Studies be read in context with the policy as it states, “The Commission will support lake level studies by its members or others that identify benefits to the Utah Lake environment but are consistent...”

Discussion continued on the different perspectives of the CUWCD, water users and water rights. Endorsing studies does not mean that the Commission will endorse doing things. Mr. Cox said he feels the policy needs to be rewritten to be more middle ground.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the language in the above policy could be changed to read, “The Commission encourages studies to determine the feasibility to reduce lake level fluctuation....and such studies should be completed within Utah Water Rights Law.” Mr. Price said this item should be discussed with the Board.

Policy 9-Mr. Hansen suggested changing the wording of “encourages” to a more specific “encourages research.” The State also had recommended some wording changes as, “The Commission supports and encourages efforts to better understand Utah Lake ecosystem through coordinated research and monitoring programs. There was approval of that change.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that the one overall issue he has with the Natural Resources policy is the absence of any policy addressing TMDL or phosphorous removal. There may be some language in the TMDL Resolution that was approved by the Governing Board that can be included in these policies. It was suggested that an objective could be created with this insertion at least in the direction of further studies being done in regard to water quality.

Natural Resources Goal 1 – Natural Areas

Objective 1.1 – Establish Wetland Preserve at Powell Slough -the State has provided some rewriting of this objective and suggests it be changed to read: “Powell Slough and its adjacent lands have valuable natural and cultural resources that include an important discharge to Utah Lake and wetlands and is managed by the state as a wildlife management area. Preservation of existing uses and open space at this location is crucial because of its proximity to population centers and access from major transportation routes.”

Mr. Keleher explained the State had discussed identifying certain areas like Powell Slough.

It was discussed that the Management Classification Map will be helpful after it is reworked. Mr. Beckstrom said that possible rewording of this objective may state that the Commission supports the responsible managing agency in evaluating expansion opportunities or evaluating appropriate boundaries for a wetland and wildlife preserve at Powell Slough. Mr. Cox stated that FFSL changed the boundary on the Management Classification Map. They relayed to Mr. Cox that the proposed boundary is a preserved area and are currently withdrawn lands and are managed by the Bureau of Reclamation. This area will need clarification.

Because of the ongoing boundary dispute, the lease wasn’t renewed, but it is still recognized and used by the public primarily for hunting and the Bureau is not preventing it. Powell Slough is a prime area for preservation and it is appropriate to identify why it is and that the Commission endorses appropriate lands.

There was discussion on the last sentence of the proposed Objective. Mr. Cox suggested that it be modified to read, "Preservation of existing uses and open space at this location is crucial because of its natural resources, value and its proximity..." Mr. Beckstrom also suggested the objective should include wording to the effect "...and the Commission would support clear identification of responsibilities for ongoing management and clarification of potential boundaries of a Powell Slough management area." This would be added to the wording the State proposed.

Objective 1.2 - Expand the Goshen Bay Preserve – Mr. Keleher questioned the term "expand" as relating to the boundaries that were established in the Central Utah Project Completion Act (CUPCA). Mr. Cox answered that this objective came out of the Opportunities and Constraints Workshop and referred to the area beyond those boundaries. He pointed out the area delineated on the Management Classification Map. There was discussion of the zoning on the map of non-motorized boating and it was suggested to remove the words "non-motorized." At the June Sucker Symposium information was relayed that large areas of CUPCA are still under private control. It was questioned if the Utah Lake Commission is supporting the Bureau of Reclamation in the land they've acquired by working with the landowners as was laid out in CUPCA or if the Commission is trying to expand beyond those boundaries. Mr. Cox said there are some people who want to expand and add more low-impact recreational uses, but that may not be taking into consideration the private ownership. This discussion needs to be addressed with FFSL and also the mitigation commission. Rather than the objective talking about an expansion of Goshen Bay it was evaluated that a better approach would be to focus on a lake wide assessment of preservation priorities. Mr. Hansen said that Goal 1 should stipulate that the wetland areas are not limited to the areas listed.

Mr. Hunter said the term preservation should be defined also as to what areas that means; i.e. wetlands, nesting area, restricted motorized use, etc. Mr. Beckstrom suggested that under Natural Resources Goal 1 there could be a single objective that would endorse studies and prioritize existing and potential areas for wetland and wildlife preservation which should be evaluated for appropriate levels of protection and excuses and that the study and evaluation, at a minimum, would include the areas of Powell Slough, Goshen Bay, Provo Bay, North-Shore Buffer, and possibly others. There was concern about designating certain areas that could in the future restrict areas that could impact the airport or water-skiing areas, etc. Discussion continued in regard to areas being classifications on the map.

Mr. Cox summarized that there will be one objective for Natural Resources Goal 1 with Powell Slough, Goshen Bay, Provo Bay, and North Shore Habitat Buffer identified, but not limited.

Natural Resources Goal 2 – Fishery

Mr. Keleher said that the State, recognizing the important of the June sucker recovery, suggested that the goal statement might read, "The fish community is managed to recover June sucker, and encourage compatible sport fishing and the control of undesirable or incompatible species (e.g., carp)."

Objectives would follow as:

Objective N-2.2 – Recovery of June sucker

The Commission will support June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program efforts and promote public and member agency education on program benefits. (Supports Specific Vision Statements 10, 12, 13, 15 and 19.)

Objective N-2.3 – Compatible Recreational Fishery

The Commission will coordinate with Utah Division of Wildlife Resources through the public Utah Lake Fish Forum to facilitate the management and promotion of a recreational fishery that is compatible with June sucker recovery.

Objective N-2.1 - Control of Undesirable Species would remain but be renumbered. It was considered to move this objective to Goal 4 – Invasive Species.

Mr. Price pointed out that some of the wording for this goal was slightly different than the wording in the Vision Statement and Mr. Keleher said they would defer to the wording in the Vision Statement. It was agreed that the carp reference should be in fishery and invasive species but the objective will be moved to Goal 4.

Natural Resources Goal 3 – Educational Opportunities

Objective 3.1 – there was one language addition proposed. The words, “fishing access” will be added to read, “...designated hunting areas, fishing access, and other appropriate sites.”

Natural Resources Goal 4 – Invasive Species

The State requested that an additional objective be added to promote the understanding of impacts of invasive plant and animal species.

Objective 4.1- Phragmites control –Mr. Hansen said he thought it would be useful to add a sentence that the Commission would provide information on legal control strategies. The Commission needs to be a resource for the cities. Mr. Cox suggested the wording, “The Commission will actively promote effort to control phragmites and be a resource for effective phragmites control strategies.”

Objective 4.3 – Prevent Infestation of Invasive Species– Mr. Keleher said the State changed the title of this Objective to “Aquatic Nuisance Species” and proposed the following text changes:

The Commission will support efforts to prevent infestation of aquatic nuisance species (i.e. zebra (*Dreissena polymorpha*) and quagga (*Dreissena bugensis*) mussels). (Supports Specific Vision Statements 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10 and 14.)

Mr. Price suggested changing the “i.e.” to “e.g.”

Natural Resources Goal 5 – Lake Level

The State suggested changes in the goal definition to be changed to read:

Opportunities are actively considered to reduce fluctuations in lake elevation to accommodate recreational use and ecological improvements, recognizing that the lake level is uncontrolled and is influenced by many factors including precipitation and run off, water delivery, evaporation, outlet channel capacity, and operating agreements..

Objective 5.1 – Lake Level Studies_– Proposed changes from the State would edit to read, “Although there is evidence that existing lake level fluctuations have detrimental impacts on the environment and recreation of Utah Lake. The Commission will encourage studies to investigate the feasibility of reducing lake level fluctuations to accommodate recreational and environmental objectives while not impacting water rights and legal agreements.”

Mr. Beckstrom requested that the Objective sentences be reversed and the Objective begin with the second sentence, “The Commission will encourage....”

Natural Resources Goal 6 – Proactive Enhancement

The State wished to remove the word “urban” from the Goal statement and replace it with “riparian.” Discussion followed. There are no specific objectives identified and some need to be identified such as routine dredging of boat harbors or phosphate removal or it should be noted some were identified, but not supported.

Natural Resources Goal 7 – Water Quality

The goal statement will be rewritten that will be derived from the TMDL resolution recommended by Mr. Dave Wham of the Department of Environmental Quality.

Natural Resources Goal 9 – Research and Monitoring

Objective 9.1 – Establish Utah Lake Science Laboratory - Mr. Keleher explained that the terminology of “Science Laboratory” should be changed to “Research Facility.” The goal was suggested to be changed to read: “The Commission will support efforts of its members and/or others to establish a Utah Lake research facility. The purpose of this facility may include Utah Lake specific scientific research and monitoring.”

Some possible verbiage could be added to suggest the parameters of determining the appropriate location for the facility such as cost, available property, and access.

There was discussion concerning the facility designation in regard to research efforts and public education. It was determined that the wording should focus on research efforts rather than on a facility itself. The possibility of a research facility may be a long-term goal. The objective should state current goals and include long-term goals. It should be an invitation to research and a promotion to eventually expand to a facility.

Mr. Keleher suggested adding verbiage from the General Policies to promote efforts to coordinate research and monitoring at Utah Lake.

Mr. Sakaguchi proposed that another objective be written stating the continued support of the Commission in the Utah Lake Symposium. Mr. Hunter also stated that an objective that Commission would be a depository for research conducted on the Lake. In obtaining permits to do research copies of findings would be given to the Utah Lake Commission.

Natural Resources 10 – Water Savings

In the Goal statement the State requested that the parentheses be edited to read, (e.g., decrease evaporation losses and increase operational efficiencies).

Objective 10.1 – Reduce Surface Evaporation – the State requested that a second objective be written that would cover operational efficiencies. It was agreed to do so.

A recess was called and the meeting reconvened with the discussion of the Recreation Policies.

RECREATION POLICIES

In Recreation Policy 1 and Recreation Policy 2 the word “support” was requested to be replaced by the word “encourages.”

Policy 4 will be deleted.

Policy 5 (formerly Policy 6) – Mr. Cox initiated discussion on what the Commission’s role should be pertaining to existing marinas when evaluating proposals for new marinas. Following discussion it was agreed that this Policy would be deleted.

Mr. Cox asked that Policy 4 be discussed before deletion. Discussion followed and Policy 4 will be deleted.

Recreation Goal 1 – Public Access

Objective 1.1 – Secure Legal Public Access – Mr. Keleher said that the State made some editorial suggestions and proposed it to read, “Much of the Utah Lake shoreline is privately owned, constraining public access. There may be opportunities for expanded access on lands owned and managed by public agencies. Public access to private holdings should be secured by purchase, donation, easement or other means appropriate to the land ownership and proposed uses of the access point. The Commission

encourages the development of lake access areas for a variety of uses. (Supports Specific Vision Statements 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 21, and 26.)”

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the last sentence be moved to be the first sentence. The sentence beginning with, “Public Access to private....” would be the second sentence and the first sentence starting with, “Much of the Utah Lake...” would be the third sentence.

Objective 1.4 – Additional Access – the State suggested be changed to read, “Provide additional recreational access and amenities at Utah Lake, to encourage full and effective enjoyment of its recreational resources. The Commission will work with FFSL to identify legal access to sovereign lands. (Supports Specific Vision Statements 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 21, and 26.)

Mr. Keleher questioned whether this version maintained the intent of the original version. It was discussed if this Objective was needed. It was proposed to add language that would support free access to the lake such as inserting the phrase, “...additional non-fee access” following the opening wording of “Provide additional recreational access...”

Recreation Goal 2 – Destinations

Objective 2.1 – Variety of Recreational Activities - the State requested grammar changes to the Objective to read, “Provide multiple destinations and facilities for lake recreation such as marinas, boat ramps, beaches, trails and natural areas. Given the extensive private ownership of the Utah Lake shoreline, recreational users will be guided to specific recreation destinations. Cumulatively, lake destinations should provide a wide range of activities (e.g., motorized and non-motorized boating, water-skiing, fishing, walking, wildlife observation.) The Commission will encourage a variety of lake recreational activities and promote management and appropriate facilities to avoid user conflicts. (Supports Specific Vision Statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12.)

Objective 2.2 – Promote Destinations – the State requested to remove the parentheses (and associated facilities and amenities.)

Recreation Goal 3 – Boating

Objective 3.1 – Expand/Improve Existing Marinas – Mr. Keleher relayed that anywhere the word “toilets” was used to be replaced with the words, “sanitary facilities.” Further corrections would change this objective to read as, “Expand and improve existing publicly accessible marinas and develop new marinas as dictated by demand. The boat launching facilities at Lincoln Beach will be expanded, and additional facilities including parking, sanitary facilities and trash receptacles will be provided. The Commission will encourage the expansion and improvement of other existing marinas as needed.. (Supports Specific Vision Statements 1 and 2.)”

Mr. Hunter asked why Lincoln Beach is singled out from other marinas. It was suggested to have one objective which would focus on the Commission endorsing a study on boating demand and identify what the priorities would be in terms of location for expanding existing boating facilities. This would replace Objectives 3.1 – 3.4.

Objective 3.5 – Designated Boat Use Areas – This Objective will be the second objective for this goal. The State has suggested the changes to include the following: “Work with Utah State Parks and Recreation, the boating authority for the state of Utah and administrator of the Utah Boating Act, to promote safe and enjoyable boating experiences on Utah Lake for all boaters. Assist the Division to promote established education and outreach programs, which are designed to decrease user conflicts. Support mandatory boater education in Utah to give all boaters knowledge of boating laws, safety issues, ethics, environmental issues, and an understanding of various user group needs. (Supports Specific Vision Statements 2, 3, 20, and 30.)

The title will be changed to Boat Use. The word “Division” needs to be changed to “state parks.”

Recreation Goal 4 – Beaches

Objective 4.1 – Improve Existing Beaches – as previously mentioned all references to “toilets” will be modified to “sanitary facilities.”

Recreation Goal 5 – Hosted Campground

Objective 5.1 – Identify/Develop Overnight Camping – an addition of the word “operation” will be inserted into the phrase, “...prepare an acquisition, development, operation and management plan for camping facilities.”

Recreation Goal 6 – Hunting

The State made comment that similar goals and objectives be written for recreational fishing as presented for hunting.

Objective 6.1 – Designated Hunting Areas – some editorial changes were made by the State so the objective will read, “Identify and manage hunting areas on Utah Lake to maximize the quality of the experience while avoiding potential conflicts with other uses. Some areas are more suitable for hunting than others. The Commission in coordination with Wildlife Resources will identify the most appropriate hunting areas and prepare a plan to acquire and develop public access sites with appropriate facilities (e.g., parking, and toilets). (Supports Specific Vision Statements 1, 4, and 6.)”

Following discussion it was agreed to have one Fishing and Hunting Goal with a separate objective for each. There was a question if bird-watching should be mentioned. The fishing objective should say the Commission will encourage improvement, increase fishing piers, and handicapped accessible facilities. Mr. Sakaguchi will forward some language to Mr. Cox or Mr. Price. The title will be changed to Fishing and Hunting Opportunities.

Recreation Goal 7 – Events

The State wanted to make sure that sanitary facilities and trash pickup are identified and would like to insert “sanitation facilities” into the Goal statement. Mr. Hunter commented that it should be mentioned that the Commission encourages events within the conformity of the law.

Objective 7.1 –Develop Events Plans – discussion followed on the role of the Commission with events. The second sentence will be edited to state that the Commission encourages preparation of an acquisition development and management plan. The Commission will be a facilitator for events while the management will be with the Tourist Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce. The phrase “natural resources protection” will also be added to the Objective.

Recreation Goal 8 – Recreation-Related Economic Development

Objective – 8.1 – Development Standards -the State requested that the second sentence in this goal be edited to read, “The Commission will develop criteria for evaluating commercial development plans that consider seasonal demands and ecological constraints and are consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Master Plan.” It was seconded that similar wording to Objective 7.1, “the Commission encourages evaluating....”

Recreation Goal 10 – Insect Control & Public Health

The State changed the verbiage to read, “Insect abatement reduces mosquitoes, thereby improving the recreational experience and minimizing mosquito related public health concerns around Utah Lake.” Mr. Keleher asked if there was data to support this goal. Mr. Price said he is working with a phragmites group and their problem is similar to the problem of this goal.

Objective 10.1 – Increased Mosquito Abatement - following discussion it was suggested it might be better to change the title to “Improved Mosquito Abatement.”

PUBLIC FACILITIES POLICIES

The General Vision statement will be deleted. The State has suggested the following:

Public Facilities Goals and Objectives

Developments supported by the Commission will have appropriate sanitary facilities, trash removal and law enforcement patrol.

There was discussion on the Public Facilities Policy. Mr. Cox will rewrite the policy to stipulate that the standards of sanitary facilities and trash removal are satisfied.

GENERAL POLICIES

The State recommended that General Policy 1 and General Policy 4 should be combined to read:

Policy 1 – The Commission recognizes and respects both private and public property rights (both land and water rights) associated with Utah Lake and supports the lawful acquisition of private and public lands and/or water rights when needed to implement portions of this Master Plan.

Policy 2 and Policy 3 remain unchanged and Policy 4 was deleted.

Policy 5 is now Policy 4 with a new Policy 5 being added.

Policy 5 was suggested to read, “The Commission recognizes and supports efforts to apply for and receive funding on behalf of the Commission and its member agencies to implement and accomplish provisions “receive funding” and if it should be changed to “obtain grants.” Some wordsmithing may be done, but the terminology was acceptable.

The General Policies will be moved to the beginning of Section 5 as discussed.

Due to the time factor, Mr. Beckstrom asked the Committee to discuss the meeting schedule needed to finish Section 6 and the Implementation Strategies, and the meeting to be scheduled with FFSL and the Land Use Subcommittee. It was determined that it wouldn't be feasible until after the holidays.

Mr. Price will organize via email a meeting with the FFDL. The Steering Committee is scheduled to meet January 7th. Mr. Beckstrom said it is not looking realistic that a Final Document will be ready to present to the Governing Board on January 20th.

Mr. Cox will prepare an extension proposal for the consultants. The meeting with FFSL will hopefully be scheduled the week of January 5 to include the FFSL, Mr. Cox, Mr. Price, Mr. Keleher, Mr. Beckstrom and the Land Use Subcommittee members. The Technical Committee will meet again on January 12. After the Final Draft is prepared the Technical Committee will need time to review it before it is presented to the Governing Board.

The Executive Committee meeting will be on January 12.

If the FFSL can't meet on January 5th then that time will be used to discuss Section 6 and the Implementation Strategies.

6. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, January 12, 2009.

7. Adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 P.M.