



Technical Committee Meeting
Monday, March 24, 2008
Historic Utah County Courthouse
51 South University Avenue, Suite 212
Provo, Utah
9:30 A.M.

ATTENDEES:

Bruce Chesnut, Orem, Chairman	Greg Beckstrom, Provo, Vice-Chair
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission	Clyde Naylor, Utah County
Adam Cowie, Lindon	Ann Merrill, DNR-Div. of Water Resources
Chris Keleher, Dept. of Natural Resources	Chris Tschirki, Orem
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove	Douglas Sakaguchi, DNR-Div. of Wildlife Resources
H. Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire & State Lands	Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs
Michael Mills, JSRIP	Michael Vail, Genola
Sarah Sutherland, Central UT Water Conservancy District	Jeff Niermeyer, Utah Lake Water Users
Howard Denney, American Fork	Gene Shawcroft, Central UT Water Conservancy Dist.
Jim Carter, Logan Simpson Design, Inc.	

ABSENT: Highland, Lehi, Mapleton, Santaquin, Springville, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, UT Dept. of Environmental Quality, DNR-Div. of Parks & Recreation, Vineyard, Woodland Hills

1. Welcome and Introductions.

Chairman Bruce Chestnut welcomed everyone to the meeting. He called the meeting to order at 9:31 A.M. and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from February 25, 2008.

Chairman Chesnut invited discussion of the minutes from February 25, 2008. Dr. Lee Hansen had some technical terms he requested be corrected. There was a motion made by Clyde Naylor to approve the minutes with the suggested corrections. It was seconded by H. Barry Tripp. The minutes were approved.

3. Master Plan.

Reed Price reported that in the past few weeks he has been conferring information back and forth with Rick Cox, Project Manager and Jim Carter, Deputy Project Manager of the Master Planning Consultant Team to try and get the preliminary copy of the Existing Conditions Report in the most complete form as possible. It's a difficult task to do. Mr. Price emailed a copy of the preliminary copy of the Existing Conditions Report to the Technical Committee members and asked that it be reviewed for accuracy and completeness. It has changed only slightly since then. Mr. Price hoped that all had the opportunity to review it and, if not, will do so soon. He then turned the time over to Jim Carter.

A. Review Progress.

Mr. Carter reported that the Steering Committee had a good discussion in the meeting prior to the Technical Committee meeting about what is the purpose of the Existing Conditions Report document. What the consultants are trying to do is gather all the relative information on Utah Lake and digest it in a way that preserves the core kernels that are necessary to the planning process of Utah Lake and winnows out the encyclopedic information of the Lake. Even last week the document was still in flux with adding additional maps and changing some of the text. The sense is that this report will be the source document for the next steps in the planning process. They want to make sure it is accurate. The document will evolve over the course of the project and even this morning they designated some things that need to be added in regard to some of the conclusions the document is making. But it is intended primarily to be a statement of the facts without an analysis. The members of the Steering Committee are taking a critical look at it to make sure it is not presuming too much. It is desirable that everyone can at least agree on the facts to establish a good starting point. This report is the first big work product of the planning process.

The consultants are now beginning to set up meetings with the subcommittees to ask them for their comments on the documents. Mr. Carter stated that the consulting team would also like input from the members of the Technical Committee especially in regard to omissions and accuracy so that the document can make an accurate and complete statement.

The planning process is to continue working on the Existing Conditions document over the next few weeks. The upcoming Open Houses will bring in another element of information. Working with Forestry, Fire & State Lands this will be the scoping part of the planning process. Forestry, Fire & State Lands have done some scoping already but it is a little bit dated. The public will be given an opportunity to weigh in on what should be considered and issues they think should be addressed in the planning process.

The Open Houses will be held on Wednesday, April 2 in Lehi at the Senior Citizen's Center at 123 North Center Street. The second Open House will be held on Thursday, April 3 at the Utah Lake State Park. Both Open Houses will be from 6:00 – 8:00 P.M.

In putting the document together the consultant team is trying to compose a compendium mostly of maps with the text being more supportive of the maps. It is hoped that the public can get most of the information they need by viewing the maps. At the Open Houses the maps will be in large format. There will be some description of the project but the information from the Current Conditions Report will not be shared at that point. The public will be asked for their suggestions and ideas of what they think the planning process should address.

Following the Open Houses there will be a Visioning Workshop where the Governing Board, Technical Committee and Subcommittees will articulate the vision for Utah Lake addressing all the components. Mr. Price added that there may be some representatives from the municipalities in attendance that are not on one of these committees but are experts on issues that involve one of the subcommittee areas and their mayor may have requested they be invited.

Mr. Price emphasized attendance at the Visioning Workshop and requested the members that they make it a priority. The Workshop will be the one time that everyone can sit down together as a group and define what the Commission sees as the Vision for Utah Lake. The Visioning Workshop will be on April 24 following the Governing Board meeting. The expected time that the Workshop will commence was estimated at 9:00 A.M. and will be held at the Health and Justice Court Building in Room 1600. The Workshop is projected to meet until about 2:00 P.M. Mr. Carter stated that this much time has been blocked out so that a statement of the Vision of Utah Lake will include all facets.

Mr. Price added that another set of meetings currently being scheduled are sit-down meetings with each subcommittee and the consultants. In those meetings each subcommittee will review and discuss their section of the Current Conditions Report with the consultants for accuracy. Those meetings should be completed within the next few weeks. He informed the members that they should be contacted soon if

they are a member of one of those subcommittees. If a municipality does not have a representative on one of those subcommittees and they wish to have one, they should inform Mr. Price as soon as possible. Chairman Chesnut summarized for the Technical Committee members that they are being asked to review the report in preparation for two meetings: 1) the subcommittee meetings they are going to be attending with the consultants in the next few weeks, and 2) the Visioning Workshop being held on April 24th. Mr. Price stated that if anyone has specific comments on the report they can send them to him via email. Chairman Chesnut requested the names of the members of the Steering Committee which meets with the consultants prior to the Technical Committee meeting. They meet with the consultants prior to the Technical Committee meeting to see what has been accomplished in the past month and to give direction for the next month and for upcoming projects. Members of the Steering Committee include Reed Price, Clyde Naylor, Greg Beckstrom, Chris Keleher, Gene Shawcroft, Dave Grierson and Mayor Jim Dain. There has been an invitation extended to Governing Board members to attend the Steering Committee meetings and occasionally someone will attend.

Mr. Price asked if anyone did not know what subcommittee they are on. Mr. Jeff Niermeyer commented that he did not know. It was discussed and he was referred to Chris Keleher, Chairman of the Natural Resources subcommittee for Mr. Niermeyer to be added as a member of that subcommittee.

Mr. Carter emphasized that the Existing Conditions document needs to be as final as possible although it is evolving. After the Visioning Workshop there will be another Workshop, as yet to be scheduled, to develop and identify opportunities and constraints in terms of achieving the objectives that have been envisioned. At that point the Existing Conditions Report will become critical as to evaluating what opportunities are available, what are the constraints, what sensitivities need to be taken into consideration, what projects need to be undertaken, etc.

Mr. Chesnut reminded everyone that as they read through the document again any questions or suggestions should be filtered to Reed Price. Mr. Price mentioned that the Chairpersons of the subcommittees will be the ones making direct contact with the committee members. The Chairman of those subcommittees are 1) Natural Resources – Chris Keleher, 2) Transportation – Clyde Naylor, 3) Recreation – Ty Hunter and, 4) Rod Despain – Land Use.

B. Discuss Current Conditions Report.

Detailed discussion of the Current Conditions Report will take place in the individual subcommittee meetings with the consultants during the next few weeks.

4. Discuss special-interest group requests to become Ex-Officio members of the Commission.

Mr. Price informed the Committee that he had received a request from the Utah Valley Sierra Forum to join the Commission as an Ex-Officio member. In meeting with the Executive Committee last week they requested Mr. Price to bring this subject up to the Technical Committee to discuss their thoughts on how to involve environmental interest groups and the importance of involving those groups in the Commission. Although the Executive Committee seems to be in support of allowing the environmental groups to be represented as Ex-Officio members, they struggle with the guidelines of determining how to handle the requests from different groups. Recently, as an example, the Water Users met and elected one representative to the Technical Committee to represent them all collectively. There was also a question of how long they would serve as a representative. Mr. Price opened the subject for discussion. Mr. Keleher agree that it might be best if any stakeholder group that requested to be an Ex-Officio member could be looked at as the Water Users were and elect one representative to serve them all. That representative would be a conduit for the Commission. Mr. Niermeyer stated that his experience with similar issues was that interest groups will voice their opinions and it's better to have them meeting with the Commission and getting accurate information rather than meeting with others and forming their own

opinions. Mr. Douglas Sakaguchi shared that when the Utah Reclamation Mitigation Conservation Commission (URMCC) plans were being made there were a lot of groups that wanted to be heard. They had one spokesman and Mr. Sakaguchi expressed his opinion that having one representing a group works best than having an individual for each group. It was questioned whether a list should be made of the environmental groups that could be included in one category.

Mr. Carter agreed that having stakeholder Ex-Officio members is a good thing. He suggested one way to approach this is by accepting the first application and then when there is another request to refer them to the Ex-Officio member. He said it might be best to start there and let it unfold. Then groups that appear to have similar interests can collaborate. Mr. Price said they had discussed in the Executive Committee that it would be undesirable to try to notify all the different groups. Mr. Gene Shawcroft interjected that the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) actually did something like that when they were organized. They sent a letter to anyone they could think of that might have interest notifying them of JSRIP and they only had two answers returned. Mr. Price said he has had one other request to join as an Ex-Officio member.

Chairman Chesnut asked if the consensus of the Committee is that the two interest groups that have contacted Mr. Price should now meet together and elect one representative as an Ex-Officio group and that as other groups present themselves they be forwarded to the current representative. If someone comes along that is dissatisfied with that procedure they will surely voice that sentiment and then the Technical Committee can address that issue at that time.

Mr. Beckstrom questioned whether there might be some pro-active value if the Committee did solicit input similar to what the JSRIP did as was shared by Mr. Shawcroft. He said it might avoid future problems from other environmental groups who might say they weren't notified. Sarah Sutherland questioned the management plan of JSRIP of contacting groups. Mr. Shawcroft said JSRIP started from scratch which is different from the Utah Lake Commission which has been organized for over a year.

Mr. Chesnut clarified that Mr. Price would like suggestions from the Technical Committee to take back to the Executive Committee in regard to what they want to do with the requests to become Ex-Officio Members.

Mr. Price stated that this item had been taken off the Agenda for this Thursday's meeting and tabled to the April meeting in order to provide time for discussion.

Mr. Keleher expressed that being an Ex-Officio Member is not a small thing. He suggested the Commission may want to be more pro-active in selecting the representative for environmental interest. He stated he just recently heard about The Sierra Forum and doesn't know much about them. He requested more information be gathered before they be accepted as an Ex-Officio member.

Mr. Niermeyer asked Mr. Shawcroft how the JSRIP accumulated their list of whom to send letters. Mr. Shawcroft said they basically brainstormed about all the possible contacts and even used the phone book.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that there is value in the way Mr. Niermeyer was selected by the Water Users as the groups he is representing rather than being selected by the Governing Board. He felt it would be best for all the environmental interest groups to collectively select their own representative.

Mr. H. Barry Tripp pointed out that the Open Houses are just a week away and those may provide a pro-active opportunity to broaden the list of interested groups. A list of interested parties can be gleaned from those Open Houses.

Mr. Chesnut reviewed that this matter will be discussed at the April Governing Board Meeting. Mr. Price said that since The Sierra Forum has made a formal request this issue will have to be addressed and he will need to know how to proceed and act upon this request by the next Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Chesnut summarized that what he was hearing from the Committee is that they would like time to identify potential environmental interest groups. Then the Committee will send out letters suggesting that they meet together and select from those groups interested one representative for this industry. Mr.

Niermeyer suggested that the interest groups may have a broader scope that might not be well represented by one representative.

Mr. Tripp suggested that this challenge will be clearer following the Open Houses. Mr. Beckstrom agreed that there may be different categories that would require two Ex-Officio Members. For example, it might be difficult to combine environmental and recreation interests to be represented by one person and it might be better to have two individuals. Mr. Sakaguchi suggested that even if the interests are varied it should be limited to not extend beyond one representative for each Subcommittee; i.e. Land Use, Transportation, Natural Resources and Recreation.

Mr. Shawcroft suggested that for now letters should be sent to the interested parties inviting them to the Open Houses that will be held on April 2 and 3. Then, based on the interest at those meetings it will be determined how and if there will be representation. If they are interested enough to come to the Open Houses then that makes a statement and will help the Committee determine the group's real interest. There was discussion on if other letters should be sent and it was pointed out that there have been public notices and will be advertised in several locations. Also, there are two opportunities to attend and if they can't attend either Open House and are interested they should be calling the Commission. Mr. Price stated that the legal notices include addresses and phone numbers. Also, there has been great response from the municipalities by including the information in their utility bills and newsletters. Wilkinson-Ferrari is sending out press releases and is going to be doing some radio spots as well. Mr. Price asked for opinions if the Ex-Officio representatives should have an allocated amount of time of service. The Interlocal Agreement states that an Ex-Officio Representative serves at the pleasure of the Governing Board. He wondered if it would be wise to establish a set time of service. It was decided that at this time that a time of service not be specified.

Mr. Chesnut summarized that the consensus of the Committee is to gather response from those who attend the Open Houses as far as interest groups and interest parties. Following the Open Houses the responses will be evaluated and then the groups will meet together and elect one representative.

Mr. Naylor read from the Interlocal Agreement, Article 5, Section 5.4 which address Ex Officio Members of the Board. The article states "By a majority vote of the governing Board, Ex-Officio members may be appointed or removed to act as advisors to the Commission from other interested parties including other Utah County cities; Federal agencies; additional State Departments; recreation organizations; water user organizations; and other public or private organizations." He emphasized that who can be represented is pretty open.

Mr. Price stated that the Interlocal Agreement allows anyone to petition to be an Ex-Officio member. He questioned whether or not the Board would be changing the Interlocal Agreement by requiring special interests to combine. Mr. Naylor stated that he feels it is wide open as it is written. Ms. Sutherland added that she was not sure all the different recreation interests could be combined as one group. Mr. Beckstrom suggested that until the groups come forward and express interest it can't be decided. Mr. Niermeyer added that after the Open Houses it will be clearer how to categorize the interest groups.

Mr. Niermeyer moved that following the Open Houses the environmental interest groups that express a desire to be represented on the Commission will be evaluated, categorized and organized to become Ex-Officio members of the Governing Board of the Utah Lake Commission and will then elect one representative.

The motion was seconded and approved.

Mr. H. Barry Tripp suggested that the two groups that have already expressed interest be sent letters inviting them to the Open Houses and letting them known about the decision the Board made about organizing groups to elect one representative. Mr. Price said he would send those letters.

5. Other Business.

Mr. Chesnut referred to the article that was in the Daily Herald by Caleb Warnock on Sunday, March 23 with the byline, "Lake pollution could cost residents." The article talks about phosphorous pollution. It states in the article that "State scientists have determined that 76.5 percent of that phosphorus comes from sewer treatment plants..." Mr. Chesnut said he was called late Friday afternoon by Mr. Warnock inquiring what Orem City is doing as far as phosphorous removal at the Orem Treatment Plant. Mr. Chesnut asked him what other agencies Mr. Warnock had spoken to and he answered that he had spoken to every city and agency that discharges into Utah Lake. Mr. Chesnut opened the matter for discussion. Mr. Hansen suggested that the Committee respond to this article. Mr. Price stated that at the last Technical Committee meeting there was a similar discussion on another newspaper article by Mr. Warnock on the carp and it was the Committee's decision that it wouldn't be appropriate to respond. As the Master Plan moves forward there will be opportunity to address issues from the newspaper articles. They discussed the costly procedures for phosphorous removal. Mr. Price explained to him that the resolution the Commission approved at the end of the year advised plants to make preparations for phosphorous removal as they do upgrades to their plants. There was discussion and Mr. Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove commented that Pleasant Grove City upgrades were scheduled to begin in September. Mr. Niermeyer added that in Salt Lake County some of the research has shown that not all the phosphorous comes from treatment plants but from other places. The final draft of the TMDL study will soon be done and that will be helpful in providing good science in regard to this matter. Mr. Beckstrom affirmed that it hasn't yet been established what the ecosystem impact will be if treatment plants do upgrade their phosphorous removal. Mr. Hansen stated that there are some other processes being considered as well such as creating artificial wetlands. This would help the phosphorous removal and perhaps not be as expensive.

Mr. Mills had an update from the June Sucker Implementation Recovery Program (JSRIP). JSRIP has acquired \$300,000 through Utah's Endangered Species Mitigation Fund to go towards the carp removal project on Utah Lake. Some potential uses of the money include facility development to aid in carp removal and research on the role carp play in phosphorus cycling. They are also hoping to use a portion of the money for a pilot project using new technologies and large scale equipment to remove carp. One of the areas they hope to use the money on is bringing out the company from Minnesota who approached them to remove the carp from Utah Lake as a humanitarian project. Mr. Hansen stated that he knows of some BYU students who are working on a study where they will need a few hundred pounds of carp. Mr. Hansen will pass on contact information for them.

6. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, April 21, 2008, 9:30 AM.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that given the time the Committee members need to review the Existing Conditions document and the time that they will be meeting with the consultants in the subcommittees it might be advisable to cancel the April Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Price said that the Executive Committee may need the Technical Committee to address some issues. If there are no pressing issues after the April Executive Committee meets then it might be possible to cancel the Technical Committee meeting given all the time the members will be working. It was decided to leave that decision open and when Mr. Price emails the minutes to the Technical Committee members he will include those details of whether or not the meeting will be held as scheduled.

Mr. Chesnut reviewed for the Committee the critical dates to remember:

- A. Open Houses on April 2 at Lehi Senior Citizen's Center and April 3 at Utah Lake State Park
- B. Visioning Workshop on April 24th following the Governing Board Meeting.
- C. April Technical Committee on April 21st unless notified.

D. Meetings with Subcommittees and the Consultant – Subcommittee Chairmen will contact their Subcommittee members.

Mr. Keleher suggested that when those on the Governing Board and the Executive Committee are approached by the media they should refer those people on to one spokesman. That spokesperson should be Mr. Price as the Executive Director. Mr. Keleher said it might help to avoid having articles written that are edited pieces of interviews from so many different people. Mr. Chesnut replied that in this recent instance a lot of people Mr. Warnock interviewed were treatment plant people who had information that Mr. Price would not be privy. He agreed with Mr. Keleher that any lake issues should be referred to Mr. Price as the Executive Director.

7. Adjourn.

It was moved and seconded to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 A.M.