

APPROVED 3/23/2009



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, February 23, 2009, 8:30 A.MmR.
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 212
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Bruce Chesnut, Orem, Chairman	Jim Hewitson, Lehi
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission	Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs
Greg Beckstrom, Provo, Vice Chair	LaVere Merritt, Consultant
Ann Merrill, DNR-Div. of Water Resources	Michael Mills, JSRIP
Ben Bloodworth, Forestry, Fire & State Lands	Nathan Lunstad, Highland
Bob Fisher, Woodland Hills	Sarah Sutherland, CUWCD
Chris Keleher, Dept. of Natural Resources	Tim Witman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Chris Tschirki, Orem	
Dave Wham, Dept. of Environmental Quality	
Doug Sakaguchi, Div. of Wildlife Resources	

ABSENT: American Fork, Genola, Lindon, Mapleton, Pleasant Grove, Santaquin, Springville, Utah County, UT Dept. of Parks & Recreation, Vineyard, Utah Water Users

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Bruce Chesnut called the meeting to order at 8:37 A.M. He acknowledged Mr. Tim Witman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and welcomed him to his first meeting. He asked everyone to introduce themselves and to state the agency they were representing.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from January 12, 2009

Chairman Chesnut opened the floor to any corrections of the minutes of the Technical Committee meeting of January 12, 2009. Mr. Greg Beckstrom pointed out on page three, where it is referring to the list of goals and said that in that context the word "Immediate" should be changed to "Intermediate." He then moved to approve the minutes with that correction. It was seconded by Mr. Jim Hewitson and the minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Carp removal update

Mr. Michael Mills reported on the carp removal project and stated that as of last week there had been close to 1.2 million pounds of carp removed from Utah Lake since October. Because of the current conditions of the ice at this time the program is in a holding pattern with the weather making it difficult to fish. As the lake opens up and the ice starts melting the fishing will continue, but the time frame for that is unpredictable at this point.

The goal for the pilot program was contracted at the end of October which gave the fishermen six months to remove 2 ½ million pounds. They found when the weather conditions were conducive they did really well in the open water and also when the ice was thick. In the periods when there hasn't been good open water or good ice it has slowed the project down. Almost half of goal has been achieved. Most of the fishing has been done with one crew and Mr. Loy who is the contracted fisherman has regularly been able to remove between 25,000 -40,000 pounds daily on an average basis. Mr. Loy started with old equipment, but with the money he has made he has purchased better and newer equipment. When conditions improve it is expected he will be able to put out more crews and double his efforts. Most of the fish has been caught in Goshen Bay and around the mouth of the Spanish Fork River. Most of the fish have been dumped in a field owned by Mr. Richard Davis down at the mouth of the Spanish Fork River. Some of the fish have been taken to a meat farmer for animal feed.

Mr. Mills announced that the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) will be holding their annual symposium on March 17 and 18. Once a year they hold a meeting where all of their researchers, and everyone who has been working with the program get together for two days to give a series of presentations on their research and findings. He extended an invitation to the Committee members. The meeting will be held at the Utah Tax Commission at 250 North 1950 West in Salt Lake City. Presentations tend to be June Sucker specific, but there is a lot of information on Utah Lake. Mr. Hansen requested all the information be emailed to the Technical Committee members.

Dr. Merritt questioned in regard to the carp removal what the by- catch has been with the fishing removal. Mr. Mills said it has been very low. They estimate it has been as low as 5% with one exception. On the first haul that was done through the ice they caught numerous species of fish such as white bass, crawpie, blue gill, etc. They did get over thirty June Suckers in that haul. Most of the other fish caught that aren't carp have been able to be released. It is estimated the total fatalities have been no more than thirty fish.

4. Phragmites removal pilot project

Mr. Price reviewed that phragmites have been identified as an invasive species in Utah County. The Commission plans to collaborate with different commission agencies in removing as much of the phragmites as possible. A funding opportunity became available through the Utah Department of Conservation and Development (UCPD). The Commission has teamed with Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL), Utah County Weed Abatement, and the Division of Wildlife Resources to establish a long-term phragmites removal plan. In order to get started on the project while the long-term plan is being formulated the group decided to seek funding to remove phragmites from 112 acres of shoreline starting at the Lindon Boat Marina and going south to about Center Street in Vineyard. This is approximately a mile and a half of shoreline that they will be focusing on.

Mr. Price met with FFSL and the County and they are in the process of creating a burn plan, but are not sure when they can begin as the phragmites are very wet right now. They are also facing the challenges of weather problems as a burn can only be done when a front is coming through so the smoke will be blown out of the Valley and not inverted. They are trying to get the burn plan in place so they can burn with a 24-hour notice. FFSL will be directing the prescribed burn.

Once the burn is done then a spot spray is done on the area with chemicals to maintain fire breaks. Following that the phragmites will grow about one foot and then will be sprayed with Round-up to kill the plant. It is hoped that will be around July. In November another burn will be conducted.

Although this is a small project of 112 acres, and there are about 5600 acres to deal with, it is intended to show what can be done, what should be done and how it should be done on Utah Lake. It is hoped the project will encourage other funding mechanisms to accomplish this goal for all the phragmites around the lake.

Mr. Ben Bloodworth added that the spray would more likely take place in August. He said that FFSL had gone out about two weeks ago to test burning and it was too wet.

Dr. Merritt asked if anyone is looking at other species that will compete as the phragmites come back.

Mr. Bloodworth said they have had good luck in Farmington Bay and a lot of the native species have come back naturally after the burn project. However, in Farmington it is a different situation in the fact that the water level can be controlled. Utah Lake will be different in that respect. Mr. Tim Witman requested affirmation that there isn't any seeding being done after burning. Mr. Price said this group he is working with has been told that the area they will be burning has a lot of natural seeding. They recognize that they will learn from the process of the project.

Mr. Bob Fisher questioned what the role of the Utah Lake Commission is in this project. Mr. Price answered that since the phragmites are on sovereign lands it is primarily the responsibility of FFSL. The Commission is acting as a coordination center, making sure the appropriate assignments are delegated and completed. Mr. Price requested an approval from the Governing Board to contribute \$4,000, that he had previously budgeted, to assist with this phragmites removal project. This will be spent in providing temporary help for the project.

Mr. Hansen asked how the spraying is actually done. Mr. Price replied that the first spraying is done by hand and the second spraying will be done by crop duster.

Mr. Chris Keleher asked what the budget was for the 112 acres. Mr. Price answered it was approximately \$60,000 of which included manpower and equipment. The chemical allowance was projected to be about \$20,000. Mr. Keleher asked what had been outlined for follow-up. Mr. Price said the County and FFSL will be working together to oversee the follow-up.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if it required any haul-off following the burning and spraying. Mr. Price said it will just burn away and not require anything further. He inquired about the progress on obtaining the grant money. Mr. Price said the project ranked high in the submissions. There were about eighteen submissions and this project ranked at about eighth. Also, Mr. Buehler and Mr. Styler can support the project on the selection committee.

Mr. Chris Tschirki questioned the monetary total of the grant. Mr. Price said they had requested \$20,000 which would pay for the chemicals.

Mr. Bloodworth commented that the biggest issue will be the smoke. They expect public reaction to the smoke and they are trying to prepare the public. The burn plan is being written explicitly for weather conditions so the smoke will go out of Utah Valley. He said this area has a really good fire break and very few native trees. The pocket parks are somewhat distant from where the fire will be.

Mr. Chesnut asked Mr. Price to notify everyone by email when the burn is going to take place.

5. Review and consider recommending approval to the Governing Board of the Utah Lake Master Plan.

Mr. Greg Beckstrom as the Representative from the Steering Committee summarized that it has been a year since the Master Plan was started. The discussion today would refer to the Draft Master Plan dated January 29, 2009. He expressed recognition and his appreciation to everyone who has participated in the development of this document. He said it has been a great team effort and many people have contributed many hours to the collaboration. He thinks the document will be recognized as a foundation for the future. He stated that the Governing Board is scheduled to hold a four-hour work session on the document this Thursday, February 26 starting at 7:30 A.M. It is planned to have a group of people who have been involved in the process seated at the meeting to answer questions from the Governing Board. Mr. Rick Cox, Consultant, Mr. Chesnut, Mr. Beckstrom, Mr. Price and Mr. Keleher and Mr. Grierson have been invited to participate in the discussion as well.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that the intention for the Technical Committee today was to conclude the meeting with a recommendation to the Governing Board to approve this document with whatever recommendations and amendments come about throughout the course of the day's meeting.

The Governing Board will review what the Technical Committee recommends and offer any further comments or corrections at the Thursday meeting. That document will be preliminarily approved and put on the website and made available to the public. A public meeting will be scheduled in the month of March which will be decided on Thursday. It will be discussed with FFSL at what date they would like to officially begin their required 45-day review period. It is anticipated that sometime in late April or early May, following the public hearing and the 45-day review period, that there will be a joint ceremony to adoption the final Master Plan by both the Utah Department of Natural Resources and the Utah Lake Commission.

This meeting will be the last opportunity for the Technical Committee to have input on the Master Plan document. Mr. Beckstrom said all things from broad issues to grammatical corrections should be addressed today. He proposed that some issues can be acted on by motion, but that Mr. Price as the Executive Director be given the latitude to make grammatical and wordsmithing corrections without motions. He suggested that the document be discussed by Sections.

Mr. Keleher commented that a Master Plan is only useful by how it is implemented. He requested Mr. Price to comment on the implementation strategies of the Commission once the plan is adopted.

Mr. Price outlined that Appendix C is the consultants attempt to recommend how the Utah Lake Commission should be involved in implementing the objectives of the Master Plan in order to accomplish the Commission's visions and goals. The Appendix will require some additional work once the plan is adopted. Probably during the comment period the Technical Committee will be working to make the Appendix clearer and to identify the lead agency for accomplishing each objective, recognizing that the Commission is an integral part in achieving all the visions. Implementation strategies for other agencies and other municipalities will also be needed.

Mr. Beckstrom referred to the Table of Contents as listed on pages ii and iii and noted that the plan that is actually being adopted is listed as Sections 1 – 7. Any changes in these Sections will require a plan amendment. The Appendices as listed on page iv and listed as Appendix A through Appendix E are included in the plan document but it is anticipated that these can be modified that can occur by resolution by the Governing Board and not a plan amendment process. It is understood that the State Department of Natural Resources will probably make some implementation strategies of their own and, hopefully, there will be some coordination between the State and the Commission. Mr. Price that with that being said it might be wise to add a statement to the document that the Appendices are in effect "living documents." In the Steering Committee it was discussed whether or not Appendix C and Appendix D should be included in the document itself. According the Section 2.4 – Purposes of the Master Plan, under the second item where it states that the purposes of the Plan are "to develop implementation strategies to achieve the Commission's objectives," the implementation strategies are essentially part of the Master Plan. FFSL has indicated that when they approve the Master Plan they will probably approve the Appendices A, B, D and E and not approve Appendix C as it does not relate directly to them.

Mr. Keleher suggested that language stating the future plans of the Commission following the plan's adoption and identifying the Appendices as "living documents should be added to the document. Mr. Tschirki suggested adding it to Section 6. Mr. Hewitson suggested adding the adoption date to the beginning page.

Mr. Beckstrom asked everyone to proofread the acknowledgment pages and give any additions or corrections to Mr. Price. Discussion proceeded on the Master Plan by Sections.

Section 1.0 – Executive Summary

Mr. Beckstrom stated that these policies were reviewed in the November and January Governing Board meetings. They reflect the actions that were taken from those discussions. It was reviewed that Mayor Thompson had suggested adding to the last sentence in paragraph two the bolded phrase which would then read, "however, if such a need arises, FFSL will not amend their management plan **pertaining to**

Utah Lake without first consulting with the Utah Lake Commission.” It was decided to let him raise that issue to the Governing Board.

Mr. Keleher requested deleting the sentence under **1.2 - General Policies** which reads, “Following are the General Policies of the Master Plan” and it was agreed to make that deletion.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that Mr. Price send an email to the Governing Board members with the corrections made in this meeting preparatory for the Thursday meeting.

Section 2.0 – Introduction

Mr. Keleher suggested adding a brief statement in **2.2 – Regulatory Authority**. The language would be to the effect that the Commission recognizes the regulatory agencies that have responsibilities and authorities on Utah Lake and will work with respective agencies to insure regulatory compliance for actions implemented in association with the Master Plan.

Mr. Beckstrom said that if that is added in that section that it be referenced in the General Policies. He also encouraged everyone to carefully review the Management Classification map located on page 16 and be sure that they fully understands this map. This map will have much significance to the municipalities.

Section 3.0 – Vision Statements

These Vision Statements were reviewed and tentatively approved in the September and October Governing Board meetings. They are subject to future revision by the Governing Board but have been reviewed significantly. There were no further comments on this Section.

Section 4.0 – Policies, Goals, and Objectives

Mr. Beckstrom stated that this section has lately evolved the most. He reviewed that the goals were reviewed and prioritized at the Technical Committee January meeting. They were acted upon at the Governing Board last month. The objectives associated with these policies have been presented.

Mr. Hewitson commented on the improvement of this Section.

It was suggested to discuss this Section sequentially.

4.3 – Land Use and Shoreline Protection

4.3.4.2 – Mr. Keleher noted that in this Objective the FEMA 100-year floodplain is referred to and questioned if there is a map of this in the Current Conditions Report section. Mr. Price said the flood maps which are based on this map is in the Report. Mr. Beckstrom added that Map 2.4 – Flood Hazard Areas is noted in Appendix B and can be printed out from the Website. On Map 2.4 which is dated October 16, 2008. This was discussed at last month’s meeting and it was pointed out that a dark blue area on the map essentially represents the 100-year floodplain and the language was modified in this objective. Mr. Cox wanted every community in the county to refer to their formal FEMA maps for definition because those maps are all subject to revision over a period of time. Mr. Keleher suggested adding language to the objective stating that each community boarding the lake has their own 100-year floodplain map. Mr. Price will make that addition.

Land Use Goal 4 – Land Acquisition and Management - Mr. Keleher pointed out that under this goal there is an objective for Sensitive Lands Management and another objective for Acquisition of Sensitive Lands but there aren’t objectives for management and acquisition for non-sensitive lands such as for trails around the lake. He suggested either one or two objectives added to address those types of lands which would be written similar to those for sensitive lands. There was discussion on whether to add objectives or expand the language in the objectives already in place.

Mr. Price said both sides could be argued but since the Interlocal Agreement addresses shoreline protection/sensitive lands, he recommended that the objectives that specify sensitive lands remain as written and two new objectives be added to address land management and land acquisition other than sensitive lands. Mr. Beckstrom suggested the Steering Committee could assist with drafting of these objectives.

4.4 - Transportation

Mr. Price said the Commission has internal discussions with Leon Harwood, Utah Crossings, who is promoting a causeway plan very hard. This has been discussed at the Executive Committee and how the Commission should be involved. The question should be addressed if these policies in the Master Plan document are strong enough to allow the Commission to be involved as they should be and be able to make suggestions. It is important that the Commission can act appropriately as proposals come forward from developers.

Mr. Harwood wanted to make a presentation at next month's meeting, but the Executive Committee is hesitant to schedule that without a technical review of these policies and without a recommendation from the Technical Committee. A group is going to be formed to formulate questions to ask Mr. Harwood when he does make his presentation.

Mr. Hansen was informed a few days ago that there is a company investigating the possibility of starting a hover craft service. Mr. Price said he had heard some rumors of a ferry service which would be similar. Mr. Beckstrom voiced that the document as it is currently written reasonably walks the fine line of acknowledging the transportation issues and yet raising the natural resources issues that would be addressed with such a project. He said the Technical Committee meeting will likely hear a presentation from Mr. Harwood in either the March or April Technical Committee meeting. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is going to be looking to the Technical Committee to provide direction and recommendations in regard to this issue. Mr. Harwood's group will be looking for an endorsement or support from the Governing Board for the project. He said while the FFSL has the authority and responsibility to consider specific applications and permits on the lake, they will also be looking to the Technical Committee for their experience and recommendations for the issues they'll need to address in their review.

Mr. Dave Wham asked how far Mr. Harwood in his plans conceptually. Mr. Price said he is hesitant to move forward without recommendation. Mr. Beckstrom perceives that Mr. Harwood is looking for some kind of approval, but is reluctant to spend more money in terms of planning, geo-technical and environmental evaluation, if from a public policy standpoint the Commission and the Governing Board will no.

Mr. Price said Mr. Harwood has decided on a bridge for the cross lake transportation rather than a causeway. Mr. Price attended a presentation where the bridge builder spoke who is with a company called FIG. This company has experience in building over rivers and lakes that freeze over and were involved in the replacement bridge for the bridge that collapsed in Minnesota in 2007.

Mr. Beckstrom added that Mr. Harwood is proposing a private toll road that will be a non-state funded project. If it does proceed that way, that is an unusual and it is of note that most of the conventional review processes are triggered by state funding. Without federal funding the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers cannot make comment. Mr. Tim Witman will get more information and send any information regarding this project to Mr. Price.

Mr. Price stated that the Commission is not resisting this project, but wants to go through a formal review process and make an educated recommendation before such a structure is begun. Mr. Hansen added that the business model would be important and needs to be included in his presentation.

4.5 – Natural Resources

Mr. Doug Sakaguchi referred to 4.5.2.1. - Objective N-1.1. – Investigation of Expansion of Preservation Areas. In the Goshen Bay paragraph Mr. Sakaguchi expressed opinion that there should some acknowledgment that these activities are compatible with the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission (URMCC) management plan which is yet to be developed. This is a Federal Agency that is in charge of mitigating impacts caused by the Central Unit Project Completion Act (CUPCA). Mr. Beckstrom suggested adding to the sentence parenthetically. It was agreed to change the sentence to read, "...Goshen Bay Unit of the Utah Lake Wetland Preserve (in coordination with the URMCC). Mr. Sakaguchi agreed with that change. He also questioned why Goshen Bay was identified in the Objective and not Benjamin Unit. Discussion continued and Mr. Beckstrom suggested changing the paragraph as follow:

The Utah Wetlands Preserve: The Commission will study opportunities to expand and improve the existing wetlands preserve (Goshen Bay and Benjamin Units in coordination with the URMCC) and...
If the acronym URMCC is not in the Index it should be added.

Mr. Hewitson questioned if mineral sources had been addressed and it was answered that the Commission wouldn't be involved with that, only the FFSL. It could be considered to add a policy that the Commission would review any economic proposals if requested by FFSL

4.5.7 Goal 6 – Proactive Enhancement – Mr. Keleher referred to this goal and pointed out that there are several examples given for engineering solutions (e.g., re-created deltas, urban and riparian forests, mixed-use storm water detention areas, selective dredging and diking, re-vegetation)... but there is only one objective that refers to dredging boat harbors. He suggested some other objectives be drafted. Mr. Keleher will work with Mr. Price to accomplish this issue.

4.5.6.1 - Objective N-5.1 – Lake Level Studies – Ms. Sarah Sutherland informed the Committee that there has been a study done regarding lake level study fluctuations. Mr. Keleher commented that the goal of that study was to look at how the lake functioned naturally compared to how it functioned today. It did not include information on management. Mr. Price stated that the study is referenced in the Current Conditions Report (Appendix B) on page 55. Ms. Sutherland suggested it also be noted in the Objective stating that a lake level study has been done and she will forward any specifics to Mr. Price.

4.5.8.1 – Objective N-7.1 – Water Quality Studies – Mr. Hansen stated that in the Objective it specifies phosphorous and he suggested it be more generalized. Following discussion, Mr. Wham and Mr. Hansen agreed to change the sentence to read, "...The Commission will encourage the study of **phosphorous, nutrient loading, and other pollutant effects** on beneficial uses of Utah Lake..."changing the sentence to read, ..."

4.6 Recreation

4.6.4.1 – Objective R3.1 –Study Needs for Marinas and Informal Boat Access – Mr. Keleher referred to this objective and questioned if the Commission wanted to be as definitive in stating, "The boat launching facilities at Lincoln Beach will be expanded..." Mr. Sakaguchi asked if the County has planned to do this expansion. Mr. Price stipulated that he will follow-up with Chairman Ellertson and Mr. Richard Nielson, County Public Works Director to see if this is planned. Mr. Tschirki volunteered some language changes and Mr. Beckstrom stated that Mr. Ty Hunter should be consulted about the changes as he wrote much of the objective.

Mr. Keleher made an editorial comment that some of the agencies are referred to in different ways and that it should be checked for consistency.

4.6.7.2 – Objective R-6.2 – Fishing Opportunities - Mr. Sakaguchi questioned with regard to other specific references being in the document whether it was supportive to list “Utah Lake will provide 160,000 angler hours of recreation annually,…”

Discussion followed and it was agreed to change it to read, “Utah Lake is targeted for 160,000 angler hours…”

Section 5.0 – Priority of Goals

Mr. Beckstrom summarized that in the last Technical Committee meeting the members wrestled with the terminology in regard to the prioritization of goals. After it was discussed at the Governing Board they approved the decision to categorize the goals as High Priority Goals and Medium Priority Goals. The High Priority Goals were listed in a prioritized order. The Medium Priority Goals were listed in chronological order as they appear in the earlier document.

Mayor Thompson since has suggested that Recreation Goal 10 – Insect Control & Public Health be moved from a Medium Priority Goal to a High Priority Goal. There was discussion regarding such points as the importance of all the goals, the effort already expended to prioritize the goals, and the explanation of how the prioritizations were selected. Mr. Hewitson requested clarification that if a Medium Priority Goal is moved to a High Priority Goal it would have to be prioritized into the list of goals.

Mr. Price suggested Mayor Thompson aware that it had been discussed in the Technical Committee and if he wishes he can present his recommendation in the Governing Board meeting on Thursday for their consideration.

Mr. Fisher moved to move the Medium Priority Goals, Land Use Goal 7 and Recreation Goal 10, to High Priority Goals. Due to lack of a second the motion failed.

5.2 - High Priority Goals – Mr. Keleher comment that in the last sentence of the first paragraph in this Section it reads, “...have been identified as being of utmost urgency…” and expressed his dissatisfaction with the terms, “utmost urgency.” Suggestions were made and suggestions will be considered. He also selected that the Explanation of Selection as High Priority follow each goal in the High Priority Goals list rather than being listed in a separate section. That idea was respected and will be a discussion item for the Governing Board.

Recreation Goal 3 – Boating (pg. 43) – Mr. Keleher referred to the Explanation of Selection of High Priority rationale as listed on page 43. He questioned the meaning of the phrase, “Although providing diverse recreational boating experiences will be accomplished principally by the private sector…”

Suggestions were made that it probably was in reference to additional recreation destinations such as dinner tours, resorts with additional boat launches, etc.

Mr. Hansen remembered a previous discussion and the intent was to state that boating would be a major recreational activity on the lake and was to be a general statement of support. Mr. Beckstrom said he remembered it as being an attempt by the consultant to recognize that this was not primarily a Commission function.

Mr. Keleher suggested that the beginning wording in the first sentence be deleted as previously stated and that the sentence with the wording, “The Commission and its members can encourage and support actions…” Mr. Hansen said the intent was to include activities such as wind-sailing, kayaking, etc.

Mr. Price suggested changing the wording as follows, “The Commission and its members can encourage and support actions that improve **diverse recreational boating experiences** on Utah Lake.”

APPROVED 3/23/2009

Mr. Beckstrom stated that this section will have more discussion at the Governing Board meeting. It will be looked at for leases and funding and these goals will become important in determining what aspects may get support for funding.

Section 6.0 – Plan Adoption and Amendment

This section has been streamlined. Referred to page 49 which shows the flow-plan for the amendment process. This is for amendment of the Master Plan. Reviewed the process of the process as shown.

Chris T – add language on how to amend the appendices. Yes.

Reed will draft a statement that the appendices are documents that can be amended as need arises and shouldn't have to go through the amendment process.

Appendix A = Public Comments – will be in the form of a CD, Will also include the comments yet to be received in the 45 day review process.

Appendix B – Statement of Current Condition

Greg – Expressed appreciation.

Include correction given by Bob Fisher on page numbering

Reed – should appendices be changed as things develop or just every ten years.

Lee – could add to; Greg – may need to change maps

Reed – appreciate everyone's review. Required much review and

Chris – maybe renaming it or Greg – dating it

Appendix C – Implementation Strategies

Will probably change the most. Has been the most frustration.

Appendix D – Procedures of Sovereign Lane Management

Written mostly by Dave Grierson. Should be reviewed to see if complete in reviewing private sector leases such as will be addressed soon regarding Leon Harwood.

Appendix E – Proposed Goals and Objectives Needing Further Review

Mayor Johnson has expressed dissatisfaction.

Perception of this Appendix not as intended.

Doug – Index ; Reed – index needs to be updated.

Doug – change zebra to zebra-mussels

Bob Fisher moved Lee Hansen seconded Recommend that the Master Plan be approved with the changes suggested in this meeting. and forwarded to the Governing Board for their approval. Unanimous approve this draft as the Master Plan with the

6. Other Items

Lee Hansen was invited by Saratoga Springs to make a presentation on the Master Plan. The Board should be apprised that their councils should be made aware of the MP. Been a long process. Greg said the document will be

Reed – re transportation proposals that is moving forward will be contacting some of the members including Army Corps. Bruce – Mike Styler would like a check list for DNR to have as they meet on the transportation presentation

APPROVED 3/23/2009

7. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, March 23, 2009. Will discussing the transportation issue and possibly will have Mr. Harwood at that meeting.

8. Adjourn

Adjourned at 10:57.