

APPROVED – August 24, 2009



COMMISSION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Monday, July 20, 2009, 8:30 A.M.

Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 319
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Bruce Chesnut, Orem, Chairman

Reed Price, Executive Director

Greg Beckstrom, Provo, Vice Chair

Adam Cowie, Lindon

Ann Merrill, DNR-Div. of Water Resources

Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources

Chris Crockett, DNR-Div. of Wildlife Resources

Chris Tschirki, Orem

Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove

Jim Hewitson, Lehi

Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs

Nathan Lunstad, Highland

Michael Mills, JSRIP

Sarah Sutherland, Central UT Water Conservancy District

Jim Price, MAG

Sam Rushforth, Utah Valley University

ABSENT: American Fork, Genola, Mapleton, Santaquin, Springville, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Utah County, UT Department of Environmental Quality, DNR-Division of Forestry, Fire & State Lands, UT Department of Parks & Recreation, Vineyard, Woodland Hills, Utah Water Users

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Mr. Bruce Chesnut at 8:35 A.M. Mr. Chesnut welcomed everyone and stated his appreciation for their attendance and participation and asked everyone to introduce themselves. He acknowledged Mr. Chris Crockett's attendance for the first time on behalf of Mr. Doug Sakaguchi. Mr. Sam Rushforth was also attending for the first time.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from May 18, 2009

Mr. Chris Keleher requested that on page 2 a correction be made to read "Dr. LaVere Merritt." On page 3 the following editorial correction was requested, "Mr. Keleher suggested that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service be listed as a secondary agency due to the fact that ~~the JSRIP is~~ they will be the lead agency in seeking NEPA Compliance." He also requested that on page 5 under Objective N-4.4 the lead agency be identified as Division of Wildlife Resources.

It was moved by Mr. Greg Beckstrom to approve the minutes with the noted corrections and seconded by Ms. Sarah Sutherland. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Synopsis of Master Plan signing and implementation plan

Mr. Price thanked everyone for their diligent efforts towards the Master Plan. The plan was adopted at a signing ceremony on June 26, 2009. The signing ceremony was a nice event and many of the Technical Committee members attended. Senator Bennett attended and spoke at the ceremony. The media was well represented and the event received decent coverage.

Mr. Price expressed his appreciation to the Technical Committee for the numerous hours they put into the plan. The Commission will now be moving towards implementation of the plan. Mr. Chesnut remarked that the majority of the Governing Board was in attendance at the ceremony and there was also support from municipalities, County and State. Mr. Price pointed out that all the members were there except for one whose mother has just passed away. Mr. Greg Beckstrom said it was a great accomplishment following a year and a half of hard work. He said people will need to understand that the plan is only the foundation and there is much more hard work to be done.

Mr. Price said the copies of the plan have been distributed for the most part. Hard bound copies and additional binder copies that were ordered will be distributed soon.

Mr. Beckstrom requested that invoices be sent for the additional copies that were ordered and payment for those will be paid to the Commission.

4. Discuss implementation strategies for the remaining High Priority Goals of the Utah Lake Master Plan

Mr. Price reviewed that at the last meeting of the Technical Committee work began on the Implementation Strategies Workbook. High priority goals and objectives that were identified in the Master Plan were combined in the Workbook for the purposes of discussion and identifying recommended strategies, lead agency, secondary agency, start date and completion date. At the meeting approximately one-half of the objectives were discussed and edited.

It was decided that the second half might be discussed in a smaller group with the Steering Committee, who could then offer their suggestions to the Technical Committee. That group met together last month and Mr. Price pointed out that a summary of that discussion was on pages 10-19. This information was previously sent in an email to the Technical Committee. Mr. Price asked if there was any further discussion on those objectives previously addressed on pages 1-9.

Mr. Hewitson asked who was involved in the Steering Committee discussion. Mr. Price said Mr. Chris Keleher, Mr. Dave Grierson, Mr. Bruce Chesnut, Mr. Greg Beckstrom, Mayor Jim Dain, and himself were in the discussion. Mr. Michael Mills was invited to also participate as an expert on Utah Lake issues. Mr. Gene Shawcroft was unable to attend. It was suggested at that meeting that some of the objectives be presented to the Public Advisory Group (PAG) for their input and that was done on July 8, 2009 and those suggestions have been incorporated.

Discussion then commenced with page 10 of the Implementation Strategies Workbook.

Natural Resources Goal 1 – Natural Areas

Objective N-1.1 – Investigation of Expansion of Preservation Area

Utah Lake Wetland Preserve

Mr. Mills asked why Genola Town was included as a Secondary Agency and not Goshen. Mr. Price said that Genola is a member of the Commission

Mr. Hewitson referred to the statement in the Recommended Strategies that says, “Continue implementation of existing plans to purchase lands as they become available.” He questioned if there is a budget for purchasing lands.

APPROVED – August 24, 2009

Mr. Price replied that the lead agency is the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission and they would be the agency that would be involved in purchasing lands. Most of the lands that are desirable for purchase are privately owned and as they become available the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission has a budget to acquire those lands.

Mr. Hewitson suggested adding the information of who will be purchasing the land in the objective.

Provo Bay

Provo Bay has been identified as an area where it would be beneficial to have a wildlife preserve. The lead agencies would be Springville City and Provo City. Secondary agencies would include Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL), Utah Lake Commission and Division of Water Resources.

North Shore

The Master Plan identifies the buffer area extending from 1,000 feet north of existing jurisdictional wetlands to the sovereign land boundary. Mr. Price said that it is hopeful that the model ordinance process will help identify the buffer. The lead agencies are Saratoga Springs, Lehi, American Fork, and Lindon.

Dr. Hansen questioned who will be in charge of getting the trail around the lake completed. Mr. Price said Utah County has been taking the lead on getting the trail done. Utah County will be added as a secondary agency on the North Shore and Provo Bay sections on this objective.

Objective N-1.2 – Powell Slough Wildlife Area

This Objective identifies Powell Slough Wildlife Area to encourage protection and increase public education of the area. The Steering Committee came to the conclusion that the current ownership and management responsibilities are not clear. Before assigning the lead agency the Committee suggested that they work with FFSL to determine the management responsibilities for that area. It is more than likely that the lead agency will be DWR or Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Mayor Washburn of Orem City has expressed an interest in developing portions of that area. Orem City is trying to incorporate some development for educational purposes into their General Plan. Mr. Sam Rushforth added that the Utah Valley University (UVU) would also be interested. The map will be drafted by FFSL. Mr. Rushforth asked if the Objectives are listed in order of priority. Mr. Price answered the high priority goals were ranked by the Technical Committee and are listed in order in the document.

Land Use Goal 3 – Land Use Buffers

Objective L-3.1 – Create Buffer

The Recommended Strategies for this Objective includes determining criteria for a non-flood based buffer along the lake. It was discussed earlier that the current buffers are flood based. At this time the Utah Lake Commission would be the lead agency and will be working with a consultant to create a model ordinance. Mr. Price met with a couple of consultants last week.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that he thinks the issue will be resolving the criteria for establishing buffers that are other than flood based. He felt it might be important to address that issue in context with the model ordinance analysis. Mr. Price said the Land Use Subcommittee will be called upon to answer those questions.

Dr. Hansen asked what the reasons are for creating these buffers. Mr. Price replied to preserve an area of land that can be used for parks and trails. He referred to Lakeshore Drive in Chicago that is a really nice recreational area. Mr. Rushforth said he thinks of natural habitat in relation to buffers.

Objective L-3.2 – Flooding-based Development Restriction

The Recommended Strategies for this objective includes, “Determine what flooding restrictions are used by the municipal governments at this time.” The strategies also suggest to use the model ordinance process to recommend elevation restrictions and to determine if the model ordinance should allow to bring in fill to increase the elevation.

Mr. Mills pointed out that the Completion Dates for Objectives L-3.1 and L-3.2 should be changed to March, 2010.

Objective L-3.3 – Obtain Elevation Data for Shoreline

In discussing this Objective the Steering Committee considered that this might not be relevant depending on the outcome of L-3.2. Strategies for L-3.3 are to determine what data exists and how old it is. The Technical Committee will help determine what data there is from each municipality and what data is needed. There was discussion on elevation data and how it varies.

Land Use Goal 5 – Sovereign Lands Boundary

The ruling from the judge on determining the sovereign lands boundary is still being anticipated. FFSL is the Lead Agency.

Recreation Goal 1 – Public Access

Objective R-1.1 – Secure Legal Public Access

The purpose of this Objective is to make sure there is enough access to the lake for the public’s enjoyment. It was recommended that the Public Advisory Group (PAG) give input on this Objective and some of their ideas were incorporated. It was suggested that input be acquired from the users of the lake and identify needed access points. FFSL mentioned that they would like to get at least one more access point on the West side of the lake. Another idea was to require access points in development plans. If municipalities have ideas of what they want to do they should put those in their Master Plans. The PAG recommended that improvements should be focused on the existing thirteen legal accessible points before moving slowly onto the other seventeen not-as-accessible points.

The Lead Agency will be FFSL. Secondary agencies will be DWR, Department of Parks & Recreation (DPR), Utah Lake Commission and the Municipalities.

Objective R-1.2 - Improve Access Points

Recommended Strategies are to get input from users and identify what the best uses are for each access point. Some recommendations from the PAG were decent roads, common standards to ensure quality work, safety, and cleanliness. The birders mentioned that they would like some kind of platform at some of the birding areas. Boardwalks were suggested and to inform the public with some educational components.

Mr. Beckstrom asked what state entity has responsibility for maintaining the access points.

Mr. Keleher didn’t know for sure, but said FFSL and DPR would also be involved. He said it’s easier to get the initial funding, but then there needs to be a solution for road maintenance and trash removal.

Mr. Beckstrom said that many of the access points are hard to find and people are not aware of them. Public notification is needed and should be done when it is decided what agency is the lead agency, but that is hard to do that until they identify the agency responsible. Some information on access points may be obtained from the Fish Forum as they have an access improvement list.

Dr. Hansen requested that the wording regarding an additional West side access point include the wording of “at least one” in Objective R-1.1.

Objective R-1.3 – Common Standards and Themes

Recommended Strategies from the Steering Committee were that the Commission determines what standards are needed for various developments including: signage, construction of trails, boardwalks, fencing, and building construction. Developers should be aware any construction that will be done will be required to be good quality.

Objective R-1.4 – Additional Access

Mr. Price said the Steering Committee discussed additional access that was referred to in Objective R-1.1. That Objective refers to improving known access points and seeking additional access points at a later date when it is available.

Mr. Keleher reminded that the mountains used to be more accessible before developments increased and many access points weren't secured before developments took over and closed them off. He said it is important to improve the access points we have as discussed previously, but he feels it is important to maintain a focus on identifying where public access points will be needed in the future when the opportunities are presented. This needs to continue to be a priority.

Land Use Goal 6 – Illegal Activities and Misuse of Resources and Land Use Goal 7 – Public Safety Coordination

Objective L-7.1 – Enhanced Law Enforcement

Recommended Strategies were to determine what are the real problems and what do they include such as environmental violations or illegal fishing or poaching. It was recommended to create a document that describes these activities and to inform the public safety agencies of those problems and suggest how those problems should be handled. Determining where jurisdiction lies and who is responsible to patrol was another issue. Another strategy was to identify enforceable laws and create a subcommittee with expertise to answer these questions. Mr. Price will check the law enforcement agreement that Bear Lake uses.

The Lead Agency will be the Commission with Secondary Agencies as DWR, FFSL, and municipal public safety departments. The start date is immediately with a completion date of six months.

Dr. Hansen said that by increasing the access should help this problem. Saratoga Springs had a problem at Inlet Park and then volunteers helped to clean up the area which helped solve those problems.

Mr. Adam Cowie suggested that the name of the agency that is represented on the subcommittee be listed rather than the individual's names.

Recreation Goal 3 – Boating

Objective R-3-1 – Study Needs for Marinas and Informal Boat Access

Subheadings for this Objective include the following: Expand/Improve Existing Marinas, New Marinas, Expand/Improve Existing Informal Boat Access, and Additional Informal Boat Access.

The Recommended Strategies from the Steering Committee were to tie this in with the Access Points discussion earlier relating to Recreation Goal 1 and be specific to boating needs. The need for marinas is a market driven question.

Mr. Mills brought up that a temporary facility/harbor may be needed for carp removal efforts that could be converted into a public facility in the future.

The PAG suggested improving the existing facilities. They discussed the problems with congestion in just getting to the harbors.

APPROVED – August 24, 2009

The lead agency depends on the desired uses. Secondary agencies would be FFSL, DWR, DPR, Utah Lake Commission and municipalities.

Objective R-3.2 – Boat Use

The Objective states that the Commission will work with the Utah Division of State Parks and Recreation, the boating authority and administrator of the Utah Boating Act to promote safe and enjoyable boating experiences. They will also assist in promoting education and outreach programs. Recommended Strategies include working with Parks and Recreation to make materials available to different harbors and to promote their programs.

Natural Resources Goal 8 – Integrated Resource Management

This goal is to coordinate management and protection of Utah Lake through communication, institutional arrangements, and other mechanisms.

Objective N-8.1 – Continuous Coordination of Resource Agencies

The Commission will use its Technical Committee to identify and pursue opportunities to coordinate efforts of federal, state and local resource management agencies.

The Recommended Strategies suggest continuing using the Technical Committee and Governing Board meetings to coordinate activities of the Commission and other lake stakeholders. This has been going on for awhile and will continue to be done.

Natural Resources Goal 10 - Water Savings

Objective N-10.1 - Reduce Surface Evaporation

This objective was included recognizing that evaporation is the cause of much of the loss of water in Utah Lake and if there are any legitimate ideas that can help lessen evaporation they would be considered.

The Lead Agencies would be the Division of Water Resources and the Division of Water Rights.

Secondary agencies would include CUWCD, Utah Lake Water Users and the Utah Lake Commission.

There isn't a start date, but is more of a response to opportunities that may come in the future.

Objective N-10.2 - Increase Operational Efficiencies

This Objective is linked to N-10.1.

Recreation Goal 10 – Insect Control and Public Health

Insect abatement reduces mosquitoes thereby improving the recreational experience and minimizing mosquito-related public health concerns around Utah Lake.

Objective R-10.1 – Improve Mosquito Abatement

Utah County would be the Lead Agency with the Utah Lake Commission being the Secondary Agency in the abatement of mosquitoes and other pests.

Mr. Price thanked the Steering Committee for all their ideas that helped facilitate the discussion on these goals and objectives. He said this document is the basis for his presentation to the Governing Board in the August meeting showing how the Commission will begin implementation.

Mr. Rushforth emphasized that the Commission integrate with Salt Lake County on insect abatement and the ecological health of the lake.

Mr. Beckstrom asked what Mr. Price expects from the Governing Board after they receive his presentation. Mr. Price replied that he sees the Implementation Strategies Workbook as a working

APPROVED – August 24, 2009

document from the Technical Committee that he will use as Executive Director and the Governing Board will be given a presentation of key points of the document and not the document itself.

Mr. Beckstrom moved to approve the working document for the Executive Director and the Executive Committee to pursue implementation of the High Priority Goals. It was seconded by Dr. Hansen.

Mr. Rushforth requested that the motion include that the document is a living document and can be changed throughout the implementation process. Mr. Beckstrom amended his motion to include that suggestion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Chesnut thanked Mr. Price for all his efforts. Mr. Price expressed appreciation for all the input from everyone that helped him in assimilating the document.

5. Other items

Mr. Price reported that the Utah Lake Festival was a very successful event. Last year 2,000 attended and this year there was close to 3,000 in attendance. Those that attended had a good time and it provided an opportunity to promote the Commission and the Lake.

At the last meeting it was reported that a Research Committee was being organized where a core group of people will meet to discuss what questions need to be answered about Utah Lake. This group has met and hopes to have further discussions in the future. Mr. Price asked Mr. Rushforth to update the Committee on his algae studies this summer.

Mr. Rushforth said his group has studied the lake for 35 years. Mr. Dave Wham and his crew will be looking at plankton samples and collecting attached algae. They will also be studying bottom sediments. They anticipate some nice ecosystem changes when the carp is removed so they want to gather data prior to the carp removal.

Mr. Price informed that another study is being conducted this summer by Dr. Ramesh Goell from the University of Utah in regard to studying the distribution of phosphate.

Dr. Leon Harward with Utah Crossing expects to be presenting his proposal to the Technical Committee next month.

There was a request at the last Technical Committee about the progress of the cable park proposal that was presented earlier in the year. Mr. Price emailed Mr. Hunter for a response and apparently the cable park team is still talking with Mr. Hunter.

If Mr. Harward is unable to present at the next Technical Committee it may be cancelled.

Mr. Mills inquired if there would be a Governing Board meeting this coming Thursday and it was answered that it has been cancelled.

Dr. Hansen reported to Mr. Price that he attended a conference in Logan on Wastewater Treatment Plants and there is a new anaerobic digester process that is being used at cattle feed lots and in Sacramento, California to dispose of the waste. They are now beginning to apply this to municipal wastewater flows in Logan. One idea is to use these anaerobic digesters for phosphorus removal. The idea is to farm algae and send wastewater effluent through an algae field which would uptake the phosphorous. Then the algae would be harvested and sent through the digester process. It would be a biological removal process. Discussion followed.

Dr. Hansen added that the newer designs of anaerobic digesters can handle wastewater up to about 15% solids effectively doubling treatment capacity of the wastewater at the treatment plants. They also destroy PCBs, pharmaceuticals and a variety of other things that are causing problems. Dr. Hansen said the odor problem is usually attributed to H₂S mixed with methane.

Mr. Chesnut commented that methane gas seems to be a problem with odors if not sealed properly. Some of these digesters have been successfully operating at dairy farms.

APPROVED – August 24, 2009

Dr. Hansen suggested that an invitation be extended to Dr. Hansen (no relation) from Utah State to attend a Technical Committee meeting to discuss this subject.

The Utah Lake Symposium will be held the end of September. An invitation was extended to everyone. Mr. Mills reported that the JSRIP is proceeding with the environmental assessment on the carp removal project. This will allow them to use the one million dollar grant from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. They held a public scoping meeting on June 3 and received two formal comments following that meeting. They are now writing the environmental assessment and hoping to receive a decision from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service by the end of August. Following that the fishing for carp will begin. Mr. Hewitson asked what the plan is for disposal. Mr. Mills replied that they will continue to dispose of the fish to be used as compost. The JSRIP continues to receive interest from a variety of interested parties that want to use the carp for some sort of marketable product. A Request for Proposal (RFP) will be issued regarding disposal of the fish in the next few weeks.

6. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, August 24, 2009

Mr. Leon Harward is scheduled to make a presentation at the next Technical Committee meeting to be held on Monday, August 24, 2009. Confirmation of that presentation will determine if this meeting will be held.

7. Adjourn

Mr. Chesnut adjourned the meeting at 9:45 A.M.