

APPROVED – July 20, 2009



COMMISSION

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, May 18, 2009, 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

Adam Cowie, Lindon

Ann Merrill, DNR-Div. of Water Resources

Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources

Chris Tschirki, Orem

David Grierson, DNR-Div. of Forestry, Fire & State Lands

Dave Wham, UT Dept. of Environmental Quality

Kim Struthers, Lehi

Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs

Michael Mills, JSRIP

Michael Vail, Genola

Nathan Lunstad, Highland

Richard Nielson, Utah County

Sarah Sutherland, Central UT Water Conservancy District

Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Spring Homeowners

Jackie Watson- DNR-Div. of Wildlife Resources

Evan Freeman-DNR- Div. of Wildlife Resources

**ABSENT:**

American Fork, Mapleton, Pleasant Grove, Santaquin, Springville, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, UT Dept. of Parks & Recreation, Woodland Hills, Utah Water Users

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 8:32 A.M. by Chairman Bruce Chesnut. He requested that everyone introduce themselves and what agency or municipality they represent.

**2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from March 23, 2009**

Dr. Lee Hansen requested a change on page 4 of "algae groups." Ms. Mausser will check the recording for the correction. Mr. Michael Mills requested a grammatical change on page 2 and asked that on page 2 and 3 where it reads FFSL it be changed to JSRIP where noted. Mr. Richard Nielson moved to approve the minutes with the corrections as noted. Dr. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. Master Plan Update**

Mr. Reed Price reported that the comment period as required by Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL) concluded on April 30, 2009. Twelve comments were received on the Master Plan ranging from critical to complimentary. Mr. David Grierson and Mr. Price have been meeting to get appropriate responses to those who made comments.

## APPROVED – July 20, 2009

The Steering Committee will be meeting following the Technical Committee meeting to discuss and finalize those responses. They will be strategizing how best to adopt the plan. The goal is to adopt the plan at the next Governing Board meeting which is on Thursday, May 28, 2009 with a ceremonial signing at the Utah Lake Festival on June 6, 2009.

Mr. Price has been working to get some of the federal delegates to the Festival for that signing. Senator Hatch will not be able to attend, but Senator Bennett is hoping to attend. He has also been attempting to encourage the Governor, but it is doubtful as he will be resigning as Governor to accept the Ambassadorship. He has also been talking to the Lieutenant Governor Herbert who will be the new Governor and it is hopeful he will be able to attend.

Mr. Grierson added that he received thirteen letters and some of those submittals had as many as twenty-two to twenty-six comments. Mr. Mills asked what types of groups or individuals made comments. Mr. Price said comments were received from Mr. Jim Price of Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) who is a member of the Technical Committee. Other comments submitted included the Great Salt Lakekeeper, Farm Land Reserve which has property of 66,000 acres of a development plan near Goshen Bay, and Western Resources Advocates. Western Resources Advocates is an environmental group that represents several groups such as the Sierra Club. Several private citizens commented and some of them also came to the public hearing that was held in the last Governing Board meeting. Dr. LaVere Merritt submitted comments.

Dr. Hansen asked if they could be given a sense of the comments, in particular, the critical ones. The comments from Western Resources Advocates basically mirrored the issues that are involved in an ongoing lawsuit with FFSL on the Great Salt Lake. The attorney for FFSL is attempting to draft an appropriate response keeping the lawsuit in mind.

Mr. Jeff Salt with the Great Salt Lakekeeper was critical of the process, public participation, formatting and contents.

Mr. Price said the Executive Committee will meet this Thursday to review and offer recommendations on how to proceed with the final adoption of the Master Plan.

Chairman Chesnut asked Mr. Mills to give the Committee an update on the carp removal project.

Mr. Mills reported that the fishing pilot contract with Loy Fisheries ended on April 29 and the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) allowed that contract to expire. During the pilot project Loy Fisheries was able to remove 1.47 million pounds of carp from Utah Lake since October, 2008. The original goal was to remove 2.5 million pounds, but overall, the JSRIP was extremely pleased with the number of fish that were harvested. At the end of the project the average daily catch was 21,000 pounds per day as the last few weeks of fishing in April brought the overall average down. The JSRIP has evaluated that the project was, on the whole, very efficient with the number of fish that Loy can harvest in a day. They are confident that by expanding the crews they will be able to reach the next goal.

Since the contract expired the JSRIP received a grant from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for one million dollars to put towards carp removal. This needs to be matched with state funds. They are planning to begin compliance with the Natural Environment Policy Act (NEPA) to be concluded by the end of August. At the end of August or early September they plan to enter into another contract with Loy Fisheries to meet the carp removal goals for 2010.

Mr. Beckstrom inquired about the grant from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services. Mr. Mills added that this grant comes through a program called State Wildlife Grants that funds endangered species work. It is required that the grant be matched with \$500,000. The JSRIP has a good portion of that and only need another \$200,000, which they are confident of getting. The money left from the pilot program will be put towards matching the grant.

Mr. Mills said most of the fish was disposed of in the Bayview Landfill facility in Elberta and was used by them in their compost process.

## APPROVED – July 20, 2009

Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Mills if there are any hopes for this to be of an ongoing nature given that carp removal is a multi-year project. Mr. Mills responded that the JSRIP has a great deal of political support to keep the funding from federal and state sources.

Mr. Price reminded the Committee that the Utah Lake Commission will again be joining the JSRIP in putting on the Utah Lake Festival which will be held on Saturday, June 6 from 10:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. It is a free fishing day and there will be many fun activities for the family. All the Technical Committee members and their families are invited to attend. Flyers for the Festival were passed around.

#### **4. Discuss implementation strategies for High Priority Goals for the Utah Lake Master Plan**

Mr. Chesnut invited Mr. Price to conduct the discussion on Implementation Strategies for High Priority Goals. Mr. Price explained that the consultants for the Master Plan created an implementation strategy program which was met with mixed reviews from the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee decided they would review the strategies and recommend how the Commission and other municipalities should be involved as they implement the different goals and objectives. He previously had discussions with Mr. Beckstrom, the Vice Chair and with Mr. David Grierson, (FFSL). He sent an Implementation Strategies Workbook to all the Committee members via email prior to this meeting.

A few months ago the Technical Committee prioritized the goals and Mr. Price took the High Priority Goals and listed the Goal and the associated objectives in the workbook. In the discussion he requested the Committee discuss recommended strategies, funding, lead agency, secondary agency, start date and a completion date.

Discussion followed on Natural Resources Goal 4 – Invasive Species and its four objectives.

Mr. Keleher said that Objective 4.1 – Promote Understanding of Impacts of Invasive Species seems like it would be beneficial to develop a public outreach strategy. He said some of this is already being done by the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) such as with the quagga mussels. Mr. Evan Freeman said that the Division has one full time technician operating out of Utah Lake and they hope to hire two more technicians by June for the summer for the purpose of public outreach. Mr. Price agreed with Mr. Keleher on 4.1 and pointed out that 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 seem to be aimed at removing a specific invasive species. Mr. Keleher stated that even though the State has certain outreach programs, the Commission may want to tailor some outreach specific to the Commission. In discussing the lead agency for 4.3 Mr. Beckstrom asked what agency would be receiving the one million dollar grant. Mr. Mills replied that the funds would be allocated to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and then would be transferred to the JSRIP. Mr. Keleher suggested that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service be listed as a secondary agency due to the fact that they would be the lead agency in seeking NEPA compliance. Mr. Price reported that since the last Technical Committee a phragmites burn was done and was less than successful. It was realized that it would be more effective to wait for the lake to freeze over and try to burn in late December or January. In August they are going to chemically spray the phragmites. Mr. Grierson said that they are looking into some utilization possibilities of the carp. FFSL is also looking at using some of the phragmites in compost.

Mr. Beckstrom questioned the burn in regard to air quality in the winter with inversion characteristics. Mr. Grierson said the major problem with phragmites burn is there is heavy black smoke. If there is a wind from the west the smoke blows into Provo and they have to be very careful. Mr. Beckstrom asked why the burn couldn't be done in October or November when the water level is low. Burning in the winter has been successful on Bear Lake and the Great Salt Lake. The County weed supervisor is confident the winter plan will work. Mr. Dee Chamberlain added that research on the subject of chemical spraying has proven to be most effective in the fall because of the movement in the root of the plant.

Mr. Price affirmed that the burn is still focused on the 116-acres as previously stated. Mr. Price said that the grant that was received will purchase enough chemicals for 116 acres. The phragmites group that is organizing

this burn has identified the different areas around the lake that need to be burned and they will section all the areas into 116-acre parcels and prioritize the areas for future burns.

Mr. Kim Struthers asked where the 116-acres that is targeted for the burn is located. Mr. Price clarified that the land is west of Geneva Steel between the Lindon Boat Harbor and Center Street in Vineyard.

Mr. Hansen questioned if other control measures had been considered for areas that can't be burned or sprayed. Mr. Grierson said they are looking into other forms of equipment like a harvester that can go into shallow areas. Mr. Hansen said he understood if the phragmites are cut down for three years they do die out. Mr. Hansen asked about the status of the tamarisk invasive species and the Russian Olive Tree. Mr. Grierson said FFSL has introduced the tamarisk leaf beetle down in the southern part of Utah Lake by Goshen Bay and West Mountain. It's doing a great job. They haven't done much work yet on the Russian Olive Tree as it is labor intensive.

It was reviewed that NEPA grants have to be done by Federal agencies. JSRIP is planning to finish their NEPA compliance by the end of the summer.

In reference to 4.4 Mr. Freeman added that DWR will have three technicians for seven day coverage for Utah Lake. But Utah Lake is a large body of water. Last year they started talking to the cities that operate boat ramps and DWR is willing to train and provide material to all of the cities to foster cooperation so they can assist the DWR.

Discussion resulted in the following strategy assignments:

#### **Natural Resources Goal 4 – Invasive Species**

Existing invasive species (e.g., carp, phragmites) are controlled and effectively managed to minimize their negative effects on Utah Lake natural resources. Programs are implemented to prevent additional invasions.

##### **Objective N-4.1 – Promote Understanding of Impacts of Invasive Species**

The Commission will promote understanding by the public and stakeholders (e.g., such land owners with invasive species on property) of the negative ecological and recreational impacts of invasive species.

*Recommended Strategies:* Develop public outreach strategies. Disseminate information and create Commission-specific outreach, submit articles to be published in city newsletters, create brochures for symposiums and festivals, and add links on websites

*Lead Agency:* Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* DNR, JSRIP, Municipalities, others

*Start Date:* As soon as possible

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

##### **Objective N-4.2 – Phragmites Control**

The Commission will actively promote efforts to control phragmites and be a resource for information on effective phragmites control measures. Phragmites are an invasive, non-native species that result in a monoculture that reduces habitat for numerous beneficial species.

*Recommended Strategies:* Integrating and coordinating removal projects

*Lead Agency:* FFSL

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Lake Commission, Department of Water Resources (DWR), Utah County, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Municipalities

*Start Date:* Immediate

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

## APPROVED – July 20, 2009

### **Objective N-4.3 – Control of Carp and Other Undesirable Fish Species**

The Commission will support efforts to reduce populations of carp and other undesirable fish species in the interest of improving habitat and increasing populations of native and other desirable species.

*Recommended Strategies:* Ongoing funding

*Lead Agency:* JSRIP

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Lake Commission, DNR, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, private sector

*Start Date:* Removal has begun

*Completion Date:* Seven years for initial removal efforts to remove 75% of the carp. A maintenance effort is expected as well when at least 75% removal has been accomplished.

### **Objective N-4.4 – Prevent Infestation of Aquatic Nuisance Species**

The Commission will support efforts to prevent infestation of aquatic nuisance species (e.g. zebra (*Dreissena polymorpha*) and quagga (*Dreissena bugensis*) mussels).

*Recommended Strategies:* Continuing of programs already in place

*Lead Agency:* Division of Wildlife Resources

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Lake Commission, Utah Department of Parks & Recreation (DPR), Saratoga Springs Homeowner's Association, Municipalities, private marinas

*Start Date:* Has begun

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

The second highest priority goal was discussed next; Land Use Goal 4 – Land Acquisition and Management and its four objectives.

In reference to Objective 4.1 – Sensitive Lands Management the Commission has identified the sensitive lands. It was asked who manages the Wetland Reserves and it was answered that it is The Utah Reclamation Mitigation & Conservation Commission. They are a Federal agency and operate independently and were authorized under the Central Utah Project Completion Act (CUPCA). In discussion it was decided that there wasn't really a lead agency and that the Commission should be the coordinating agency. None of the sensitive lands are on the west side of the lake.

Regarding Objective 4.2 - Acquisition of Sensitive Lands, Mr. Price stated that the same agencies would be involved in this objective as in 4.1. The Commission should be made aware of when sensitive lands become available.

Mr. Struthers asked if there is a way to prioritize targeted areas that have high value for acquisition when funds are available. Mr. Hansen suggested contacting the landowners and letting them know of the Commission's interest.

Objective 4.3 – Non-Sensitive Land Management was an objective that was added, recognizing that the Commission wanted to manage not only the sensitive lands, but the other lands around the lake as well. Mr. Hansen commented that the west side is underused and could be more useful with access to the lake. That would involve mostly private lands. This objective will parallel the completion of the trail around the lake as well as Objective 4.4 – Acquisition of Non-Sensitive Lands.

### **Land Use Goal 4 – Land Acquisition and Management**

Shoreline, open space, critical lands, and wetland areas are acquired, expanded, and/or protected for public use, preservation of natural resources, and potential mitigation purposes.

#### **Objective L-4.1 – Sensitive Lands Management**

Resource management in environmentally sensitive areas will be coordinated among local jurisdictions and state and federal agencies. In order to protect the function of ecological systems and avoid flooding

## APPROVED – July 20, 2009

hazards, local governments and state and federal agencies should collaborate to specifically identify sensitive areas such as wetlands, important habitat, riparian corridors and high groundwater areas, and the Commission will facilitate collaboration on management prescriptions for the agencies and land-use regulations for adoption by local governments.

*Recommended Strategies:* Coordinate with all agencies with resources and provide assistance

*Coordinating Agency:* Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Reclamation, Mitigation & Conservation Commission, FFSL, DWR, Municipalities, County

*Start Date:* Immediate

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

### **Objective L-4.2 – Acquisition of Sensitive Lands**

Sensitive habitat areas of special importance will be acquired by legal mechanisms (e.g. conservation easements, fee purchase, transfer of development rights) to ensure long-term protection.

*Recommended Strategies:* Prioritize targeted areas for acquisition and contact landowner's to notify them of the Commission's interest.

*Coordinating Agency:* The Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Reclamation, Mitigation & Conservation Commission, FFSL, DWR, Municipalities, County

*Start Date:* Immediate

*Completion Date:* Ongoing, until all sensitive areas have been legally obtained.

### **Objective L-4.3 – Non-Sensitive Land Management**

Land use and resource management in areas acquired to implement portions of this master plan will be coordinated among local jurisdictions and state and federal agencies.

*Recommended Strategies:* Identify and prioritize non-sensitive lands and purchase

*Coordinating Agency:* The Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* FFSL, DWR, Utah County, Municipalities

*Start Date:* Immediate

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

### **Objective L-4.4 – Acquisition of Non-Sensitive Lands**

Non-sensitive land will be acquired by legal mechanisms to accomplish the purposes of this Master Plan.

*Recommended Strategies:* Identify and prioritize non-sensitive lands for acquisition

*Coordinating Agency:* The Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* FFSL, DWR, Utah County, Municipalities

*Start Date:* Immediate

*Completion Date:* Ongoing, until all non-sensitive areas have been legally obtained

### **Land Use Goal 1 - Coordinated Land Use Planning**

Mr. Price stated in discussion that he sees the Commission taking the lead in a coordination role. When there isn't a clear agency and there are several agencies involved the Commission will act as the coordinating agency. He deferred to Mr. Adam Cowie to comment on a previous discussion regarding the Interlocal Agreement where it states that all development plans would go through the Commission and that some kind of reporting process would be created. Mr. Cowie commented that a simple notification from jurisdictions that were similar would be sufficient. They would bring the plans before the Commission for a review process.

Objective 1.2 - Develop Model Ordinance is going to take some time to develop but Mr. Price said there is money in the budget that has already been approved by the Governing Board. This model ordinance or

## APPROVED – July 20, 2009

ordinances will be utilized by the communities that don't have ordinances that will help to protect, preserve and develop appropriately in the Master Planning area. A Request for Proposal (RFP) will begin at the beginning of FY2010.

Mr. Struthers suggested that the Commission should acquire all the ordinances from the cities that already do have them in place. Mr. Cowie suggested that the ordinances from Bear Lake and Lake Tahoe should be researched first before the consultant is even selected.

In discussing Objective 1.3 – Sovereign Lands and Local Land-Use Coordination it was stated that the Management Classification map has had significant review. Mr. Grierson suggested that the Commission act as the Coordinating Agency between FFSL and the municipalities. As a completion date the FFSL is required to review their management plan every ten years.

### **Land Use Goal 1 – Coordinated Land Use Planning**

Coordination and communication for land-use planning proposals affecting Utah Lake are established through the use of model ordinances, which provide consistency and compatibility among jurisdictions.

#### **Objective L-1.1 – Facilitate Communication among Jurisdictions**

Create mechanisms to facilitate regular communication among Commission members and federal agencies. Until creation of the Utah Lake Commission, there was no forum for communication among the communities that surround Utah Lake, Utah County and the state and federal agencies with jurisdictional and management control over the lake, its shoreline and its resources. The Commission has established a standing Technical Committee with supporting subcommittees. After adoption of this Master Plan, the Commission will utilize the Technical Committee and subcommittees to provide a forum for regular discussion of Master Plan implementation strategies and issues that arise in the future.

*Recommended Strategies:* Implement a notification process between the jurisdictions for the Utah Lake Commission's review.

*Lead Agency:* Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* Municipalities, Utah County, and FFSL

*Start Date:* Immediate

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

#### **Objective L-1.2 – Develop Model Ordinance**

Develop a model shoreline protection ordinance intended for adoption by local government entities within the Plan Area. The land-use regulation ordinances of communities surrounding Utah Lake vary in their approach and terminology. Some have developed specific sensitive area or shoreline protection ordinances that establish standards for residential and commercial development. Others have development review processes that impose specific development-related conditions at the time a rezoning or development approval is requested. A challenge to adopt uniform shoreline protection regulations is that the situations, histories and political climates of the communities vary, as do current and future anticipated land uses. The process of developing regulations that have broad support among the communities will consume time and resources and may meet with only limited success due to these differences. It is the sense of the Commission, however, that efforts to develop a model ordinance will enhance communication among Utah Lake area communities and decrease inconsistencies in regulations.

*Recommended Strategies:* Research other like ordinances; issue RFP

*Lead Agency:* Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* Municipality representation on Land Use Subcommittee

## APPROVED – July 20, 2009

*Start Date:* July 2009

*Completion Date:* March 2010

### **Objective L-1.3 – Sovereign Lands and Local Land-use Coordination**

Ensure coordination of land-use regulation by local governments adjacent to Utah Lake with sovereign land management. FFSL has adopted a management classifications map for Utah Lake that identifies FFSL's management objectives for Utah Lake's sovereign lands. The land uses and development standards applied by the local governments that abut sovereign land should be consistent with the management classifications identified by FFSL.

Figure 2.4 is a map entitled Management Classifications. This map is adopted as part of this Master Plan. It contains two types of management categories; FFSL Management Classifications for sovereign lands and a management category for preservation areas that lie outside of sovereign lands. This map serves regulatory purposes for FFSL's jurisdictional areas and is intended to serve as a guidance map for adjacent land uses. 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.

*Recommended Strategies:* Follow the Classification Map; correlate compatible uses

*Coordinating Agency:* Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* FFSL, Utah County, Municipalities

*Start Date:* Immediate

*Completion Date:* Ten years

### **Transportation Goal 1 -Trails**

Mr. Price observed that Utah County has taken a lead role in the non-motorized trail around the lake and there was discussion on the strategies. The plans and maps are already drafted for trails between the Provo River trail and the Jordan River trail. It was affirmed that there is a trail component to the Westside Connector which will provide a trail from the University Avenue off-ramp to the lake

Mr. Hansen emphasized that the section of trail through Saratoga Springs needs to be completed immediately with consideration to all the development in that area. Mr. Dee Chamberlain commented that the Saratoga Springs Homeowners Association maintains some of the trail along Redwood Road by the golf course. It is a public trail.

Mr. Price commented that Objective 1.2 will help to connect the trails. Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the trail ordinances should be included in the model ordinances that are going to be written. Mr. Hansen said that there needs to be coordination between the county, the city, and the Homeowners Association for the trail in Saratoga Springs.

### **Transportation Goal 1 – Trails**

A continuous trail system for non-motorized use around Utah Lake provides a recreational and educational experience with appropriate descriptive displays.

#### **Objective T-1.1 – Non-motorized Trail around the Lake**

A public non-motorized trail circumnavigating the lake will be constructed. Multiple trail uses will include pedestrian and bicycle use through the entire reach and equestrian and other uses at designated locations along the trail. Intermittent pocket parks will be provided along the trail to access Utah Lake and provide recreational destinations.

*Recommended Strategies:* Obtain funding for continuous trail around the lake

*Lead Agency:* Utah County

## APPROVED – July 20, 2009

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Lake Commission, Municipalities, Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG)

*Start Date:* Immediate

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

### **Objective T-1.2 – Trail Ordinance**

All members adjacent to Utah Lake and with jurisdiction will have ordinances requiring shoreline trails as a condition of development. This will be part of either a model ordinance or a consistent ordinance between jurisdictions. The ordinance will recognize land use goals and objectives.

*Recommended Strategies:* Coordination of the continuous trail around the lake

*Lead Agency:* Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* Municipalities, Utah County, FFSL

*Start Date:* July 2009

*Completion:* March 2010

Discussion continued on the Natural Resources goal.

### **Natural Resources Goal 2 – Fishery**

The fish community is proactively managed to recover June sucker, support a compatible recreational fishery, and control undesirable or incompatible species (e.g., carp).

#### **Objective N-2.1 – Recovery of June sucker**

The Commission will support June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program efforts and promote public and member agency education on program benefit

*Recommended Strategies:* Extensive plans already in place and continue with those plans

*Lead Agency:* JSRIP

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Lake Commission, DNR, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services

*Start Date:* Has already begun

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

#### **Objective N-2.2 – 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.

*Recommended Strategies:* Fish Forum, and funding studies through the JSRIP to manage compatible sport fishery

*Lead Agency:* DWR

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Lake Commission, JSRIP,  
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

*Start Date:* Has already begun

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

#### **Objective N-2.3 – Control Undesirable Species**

See Natural Resources Goal 4, Objective N-4.3 – Control of Carp and Other Undesirable Fish Species (4.5.5.3).

In discussion of Natural Resources Goal 7 Mr. Dave Wham reported that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) discussed organizing a research group or a forum for discussion and finding funding. The DEQ has

recently had some of their funding cut and redirected to the Jordan River and the Great Salt Lake. They do have some ongoing work that will be done this summer including water quality monitoring, algal analysis, and sediment studies that will look at nutrient cycling.

**Natural Resources Goal 7 – Water Quality**

The lake features high quality water (chemically, biologically, and visually) that is free from deleterious contaminants and suitable for its beneficial uses.

**Objective N-7.1 Water Quality Studies**

The Commission will encourage the study of phosphorus, nutrient loading and other pollutant effects on beneficial uses of Utah Lake and other studies that may provide information on how to protect and improve Utah Lake water quality.

*Recommended Strategies:* Seeking funding

*Lead Agency:* Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

*Secondary Agency:* Utah Lake Commission, Universities, JSRIP, Municipalities/Sewer Treatment Districts, County, Public Advisory Group, Natural Resources Subcommittee

*Start Date:* July 2009

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

**Recreation Goal 9 – Public Outreach**

Public perception of Utah Lake is improved by ongoing and effective public outreach and education about its value and uniqueness and by making positive improvements to the lake.

**Objective R-9.1 – Public Outreach Plan**

The Commission will develop a plan for public outreach, promotion and education to enhance public perception of Utah Lake. In conjunction with the educational goal (Natural Resources Goal 3 – Educational Opportunities) discussed in the natural resources section of this Plan, the Commission will develop a comprehensive communications plan that promotes appropriate recreational uses; educates the public about the history, characteristics, and natural resources of the lake; and supports appropriate commercial development. The plan will include provisions for on-going communication (e.g., Commission website updates, city newsletters, periodic newsletters event advertisements) and other similar techniques.

*Recommended Strategies:* City newsletters, create flyers to promote natural resources of the lake and recreational opportunities, Utah Lake Commission website, other websites, signage, public school presentations, television, radio

*Lead Agency:* Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* Department of Natural Resources, June Sucker Implementation Program, Public Advisory Group

*Start Date:* As needed

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

Mr. Beckstrom recommended that the Committee continue with Transportation Goal 2 and table discussion of the remainder of the strategies at the next month's meeting.

**Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning**

The Utah Lake Commission has a significant role in transportation system planning; resulting in solutions that are consistent with the Utah Lake Master Plan, while accommodating population growth and demographic changes in the area.

**Objective T-2.1 – Continuous Participation in Planning Activities**

The Utah Lake Commission will identify and address transportation issues with potential implications for the ecological health of Utah Lake, as well as public access needs and usage levels. 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.

*Recommended Strategies:* Use Technical committee to identify transportation issues

*Lead Agency:* Utah Lake Commission

*Secondary Agency:* Agencies listed above

*Start Date:* As needed

*Completion Date:* Ongoing

Mr. Beckstrom stated that there might be some value for Mr. Price to coordinate with MAG in having access to their agendas and interaction with Mr. Jim Price from MAG. Mr. Nielsen suggested that MAG be requested to send their agendas to Mr. Price.

**Other items**

Mr. Price thanked everyone for their input in the day's meeting. In preparation for the next meeting he asked everyone to be prepared to respond to the rest of the strategies listed in the workbook. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 22. Mr. Leon Harward may be ready to present his proposal at that time depending on his progress with preparing his full set of plans as requested by the regional office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Grierson said the whole issue regarding Mr. Harward's proposal is if Utah Lake is navigable. There is question if the U.S. Army Corps has jurisdiction. There was discussion if the proposal would involve the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Mr. Beckstrom asked if there had been any follow-up with the Cable Project that the Technical Committee supported following their previous presentation. Mr. Price said it was his understanding that they were going to meet with Mr. Ty Hunter of Parks and Recreation. Mr. Price will report back on that status.

Mr. Michael Mills announced that the JSRIP will be having a public scoping meeting on June 3. It will be in the evening and the location is to be determined. There will be a presentation on the carp removal plans and goals and will give the public an opportunity to be involved.

Mr. Chesnut reminded everyone that the Utah Lake Festival will be Saturday, June 6.

**6. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, June 22, 2009.**

**7. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 A.M.