

**Utah Lake Technical Committee Meeting
Monday, August 13, 2007**

**City of Orem Public Works Complex
1450 West 550 North, Orem, Utah
8:30 a.m.**

ATTENDEES:

Bruce Chesnut, Orem	Chris Tschirki, Orem
Kris Buelow, CUWCD	Greg Beckstrom, Provo
Clyde Naylor, Utah County	Adam Cowie, Lindon
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove	H. Barry Tripp, UDFD
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs	Ty Hunter, Div of Parks & Recreation
Chris Keleher, DNR	Ann Merrill, Dept of Natural Resources
Jim Hewitson, Lehi	Reed Harris, UDWR
Norman Holdway, Vineyard	Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission
Bob Fisher, Woodland Hills	Sarah Sutherland, CUWCD
Michael Vail, Genola	Brad Stapley, Springville
Ruth Ann Ivie, Clerical	Dave Wham, Div of Water Quality (Phone Conference Call)

ABSENT:

Don Overson, Vineyard	Paul Hawker, Utah County
Clark Labrum, Saratoga Springs	Chris Erb, Payson
Ray Loveless, MAG	Scott Bird, Mapleton
Howard Denney, American Fork	Don Blohm, Highland
Art Adock, Santaquin	Michael Mills, Div of Wildlife
Todd Adams, Dept of Natural Res.	Glen Turner, Utah County

Visitor: Bill Kunsman, Kunsman Enterprises

Bruce Chesnut welcomed all the Technical Committee members and had everyone introduce themselves.

Review Meeting Minutes:

Change 1500 tons of fish to 15 tons of fish on page two second paragraph.

Carp Removal Management Update: Kris Buelow

Kris Buelow told Technical Committee members they are currently in the middle of a pilot testing some larger traps, called pond nets, with leads that are 400 feet. The pots that are on the traps each hold about 20,000 pounds. They are currently testing two different designs as well as other traps that they traditionally use to make a comparison catch rate. They haven't had a chance to test the traps completely but they will continue to test for the next two weeks and then run tests again in the fall. They are still pursuing looking for other methods and they have some leads on an individual that might have some better equipment and techniques. His techniques are a little bit more mechanized and efficient. Norman Holdaway asked for an overview of the program for carp since he is new to the Technical Committee.

Kris Buelow explained that they have been trying to find the most efficient method for removing as many carp as they can with the least amount of effort. Currently, with the method they are using on the Lake, they can remove between 9,000-15,000 pounds per boat, per day. At this rate it would take five or six crews to remove the daily quota that would be required to reduce the population. The idea is that once they can reduce carp in the Lake it would improve the water quality standards in the Lake, benefit the endangered June Sucker and other native species, and help stabilize fish population in the Lake. Reed Price mentioned that the Commission sees the carp removal process as a high priority item. The experts say that if we can remove the carp it should help clear up some of the other problems that are seen in the Lake. The Commission hopes to work hand-in-hand obtaining additional grants, over and above what they are already getting. One of the bottlenecks is finding the most efficient method for getting the carp out of the Lake. It is not easy to fish in a shallow Lake that has phragmites growing in the Lake where the carp can hide. There are lots of different problems that they are hoping to address. Reed Price mentioned that in September they would like to have Kris Buelow present to the Board some of the methods he is using so the Board will have an idea of how the carp removal process is going.

Organize Sub Committees: Bruce Chesnut

Bruce Chesnut turned the time over to Reed Price. Reed Price mentioned that the Request for Proposal (RFP) is being reviewed by the Technical Committee and other concerned citizens and the Board has asked for input, hopefully to approve the RFP for advertising on Thursday. The five areas they would like to have addressed in the Master Plan outlined in the RFP are Land Use, Transportation, Natural Resources, Recreation, and Public Service. Whoever is awarded the contract to develop the Master Plan will be trying to address these five areas. Currently a few of the Technical Committee members have volunteered for sub-committees. Adam Cowie and Barry Tripp have volunteered for Land Use, Chris Keleher, Anne Merrill, and Kris Buelow have volunteered for Natural Resources, Brad Stapley, Lee Hansen, Leon Giles, and Ty Hunter have volunteered for Recreation. Transportation and Public Service currently do not have anyone assigned to them. The sub-committees are where the work is going to get done as the Master Plan is created. The consultant is going to rely on these sub-committees to hear the concerns and ideas of each entity. Reed Price mentioned that the Technical Committee member doesn't have to do all the work on the sub-committee. The bylaws allow them to assign anyone from their organization to represent them. Organizations were encouraged to assign someone to serve on a sub-committee where they have some concerns or interests. Technical Committee Members that volunteered for sub-committees were Jim Hewitson, Land Use; Clyde Naylor, Transportation; and Michael Vail, Land Use and Transportation. Chris Keleher mentioned that there is going to have to be a lot of work between the different sub-committees for instance in terms of land use there are wetland areas that are important around the Lake that the Natural Resources Committee would have an interest in but would need to coordinate with Land Use Committee.

Reed Price explained that the Land Use Committee would be looking at all the municipal zoning and how things are laid out, maintain current zoning and to protect or allow development. Michael Vail mentioned there was a lot of growth and was concerned about how to meet the needs of all areas. Norm Holdaway volunteered for the Land Use committee.

Reed Price explained that the Transportation Committee would deal with issues regarding transportation around and, potentially, across the Lake. They have had ideas come to the Commission about a causeway, ideas specifically to the Division of Forestry, Fire and State Land, and they are anxious to get our support for or against it to help them decide. Clyde Naylor mentioned this committee also includes access to the Lake. Volunteers for the Transportation Committee are Clyde Naylor and Michael Vail so far. Reed Price asked if any of the Technical Committee's entities have any transportation experts as they

might need representation in this area. He mentioned that it doesn't have to be the Committee member to volunteer; it can be another member of the organization or other concerned citizen. Bruce Chesnut said that City of Orem would come up with someone for the Transportation sub-committee. Chris Keleher mentioned that UDOT already has a lot of planning going on for Utah Valley that is within the regional scope of this group so it might be worth touching base with UDOT to see if they want to be involved. Greg Beckstrom mentioned that MAG deals with a lot of transportation issues already and we should see if a representative from MAG to serve on the Transportation Committee. Norm Holdaway will talk to planners.

Ty Hunter made a suggestion for the Recreation Committee that the five public harbors be represented through the State, cities, and private entities leasing from State lands. They should at least be involved in this because they are stakeholders. Bruce Chesnut inquired if there was a group that meets together. Ty Hunter explained that he will try to coordinate some kind of meeting. He mentioned that Mark Cook is very interested to be involved in a committee and Lee Henson is on that committee so both city and private should be involved. Clyde Naylor commented that Paul Hawker may be willing to serve on the Recreation Committee. Committee members discussed private harbors and who should represent them on the Recreation Committee.

The Natural Resources Committee is probably going to be compiling a lot of the existing management plans with the different resource management authorities. They will be working with federal regulatory agencies and that information should become available to the consultant. Ann Merrill volunteered for the Natural Resource sub-committee. Clyde Naylor mentioned that each sub-committee needs to put things together to help the consultant for financial reasons. Reed Price mentioned that the sub-committees will be a tool for the consultant. They are not to sit back and wait to see what the consultant come up with, but are to help direct them and give them ideas on the Master Plan perspectives and help compile the information. Committees will need to meet every other week or monthly at the beginning, to discuss issues and make sure they are moving in the right direction.

The Recreation Committee has pretty good representation and Mark Cook was added. Reed Price mentioned all the recreation aspects of the Lake and Committee members felt there would be a big sub-committee if special interest groups from the public were added.

The Public Service Committee doesn't have any members right now. The Public Service Committee will address Capital Facilities plan and Shoreline Protection Plan. Clyde Naylor mentioned that we need a representative from the land owners who have interest in obtaining services for their facilities. Barry Tripp mentioned that there is going to be some correlation with land use. Clyde Naylor mentioned that there is a group of Utah Lake Land owners who felt like they should have been included in the document from the beginning, so maybe this could be where they can be included. Clyde Naylor suggested that we not have a separate Public Service Committee but combine interest among the other groups. Committee members discussed issues and decided to just have the four committees and combine Public Service with Land Use. Greg Beckstrom asked if we want to bring in the Utah Lake Land Owners Association at this point. Clyde Naylor suggested that we bring them in early because if we bring them in later they will become an opposition rather than a participant and Lee Hanson agreed. Greg Beckstrom questioned if there was a common interest challenging the State on the location of the shoreline. Barry Tripp mentioned that there is a lawsuit going on and they are hopeful that it will be wrapped up by the end of the year. There are only about thirty land owners out of 210 that are holding out. There was a filing a few days ago by the State's attorneys which was the last filing before a hearing will be scheduled. Greg Beckstrom mentioned there is definitely the risk if we don't bring them in early they will complain.

But on the other hand, if we have someone who is not genuinely representing the common interest of the property owners, the property owners are going to be just as upset as if no one represented them on the committee. Barry Tripp mentioned that the advantage he can see right now is that they only have 30 people involved in the lawsuit and they didn't sue the association just the land owners, and most of those members are settled at this time. So the attitude of most of those members might be that this is just a step in moving forward. Bruce Chesnut inquired if the Association has a chairman. Barry Tripp mentioned that Neil Christensen could possibly be the Chairman. Bruce Chesnut suggested that we have only one representative to speak for the land owner's interest. Clyde Naylor mentioned that when they were in the process of forming the Interlocal Agreement for the commission, the land owners came to every public meeting. Another group that has been coming regularly to meetings is the Home Builders Association.

Request for Proposal Discussion: Reed Price

Reed Price told Committee members that at the most recent meeting with the Mayors they were ready to put the RFP out but Mayor Billings was hesitant and wanted to give the entities a chance to review it and make sure the RFP is ready. They put it on the website and contacted all the Board and asked them to review it. Reed Price has received several comments back. Dave Wham, the Representative from Utah Division of Water Quality, and Walt Baker had some concerns which were read. The first concern is the time frame for responding to the RFP being one month which they feel is too short given the complexity and scope of the proposal. It is more important to select the right consultant even if negotiations need to occur after their selection to refine the scope of work. The second concern is that the evaluation sheet on page ten identifies that cost will be evaluated and heavily weighed in selecting the consultant. Qualification based RFP's should not use cost as a factor. Cost can be fine-tuned after the most qualified consultant is selected. If an appropriate agreement cannot be reached with the most qualified contractor, including costs for each element of work, negotiations can begin with the second best contractor. To evaluate the proposals with an eye to costs will only lend itself to a lowball contractor who will trim corners, come in within budget, or who will seek multiple amendments to the contract for cost increases. Either way you wind up paying for what you get. The third concern is perhaps instead of scoring the proposal in each of the categories from 0-5 and using a multiplier the committee could delete the multiplier and simply state that the proposals will be scored on either 0-15, 0-20, or 0-25 point basis throughout respectively. The fourth concern was instead of having everyone submit a detailed proposal it would be more efficient and less costly for those responding to the RFP to submit their qualifications for review in a three to five page submittal. Following a review of these submittals the top three consultants could be asked to prepare a proposal. There is a huge amount of work we are asking potential respondents to perform just to respond to the RFP. It would be better to initially call out those who don't qualify or won't qualify later to do the work in an effort to avoid the time and expense by all parties. Finally it is unclear who is going to evaluate the proposals that are received. It was suggested that select members of the Technical Committee and two or three Commission members should participate. Also, the amount budgeted for the RFP was a concern.

Discussion followed. Jim Hewitson agreed with the concerns of Dave Wham and Walt Baker and suggested aiming for a short list of qualified firms. Chris Keleher mentioned that when they release their RFP's they have them send a budget in a sealed envelope and they rank their RFP's based on the quality. They take their top ranking and if it is over what they budgeted then sometimes they drop to the second choice. This does help make a cleaner selection for quality of work and keeps the budget out of the selection process. Reed Price mentioned that this is how the RFP is designed. Companies are supposed to submit their budget in a sealed envelope. He agreed with the concerns that Dave Wham and Walt Baker have in that an RFP would put a lot of people through unnecessary work and the process should

be streamlined a little bit and go for those who we know are qualified. Greg Beckstrom said he largely agrees with what Dave Wham and Walt Baker. To a certain degree the concept was reinforced by the Commission Board at the last meeting. At that time the Board wanted to take some additional time to look out the RFP and send out the message that we really want to get it done right the first time even if it takes a little bit longer. He mentioned that he is not sure whether six or eight weeks is going to get that much better of a proposal. On the cost issue he suggested early on is find a middle ground position of having the initial RFQ not include any requirements for budget submission or cost submission, but when it gets down to the final three and they make their oral presentation then go ahead and include cost information in that formal presentation. Also, when we get budget proposal, it does give some indication of the level of detail that the consultant has given to various aspects of the proposal. It is useful not just in the sense of knowing where you are relative to your budget but it also reveals something about the thought process the analysis consultant has put into the presentation. Clyde Naylor suggested we need to take the time to do it right and find the best one we can find. As far as the budget is concerned he agrees with Reed Price that we might have to have two years of budget to get through this process. He mentioned the budget year is just beginning, July 1st, so they have a good half year before they need to talk about budget for next year.

Bruce Chesnut asked how the Technical Committee members felt about a Statement of Qualifications (SOQ). He recommended requesting a three to five page SOQ, then the list can be narrowed down and then those selected will be invited to submit the regular full blown RFQ with cost. Reed Price mentioned that he thinks that is a very fair way to proceed because we will get the most interested and most qualified people and they won't go to a huge expense putting things together to come up empty. Committee members agreed that it would streamline it for us as well. Reed Harris mentioned that if people do this a lot they have these canned anyway. He agreed it does give one the opportunity to really see who can do the job. It is going to lengthen out the time frame a little bit by six to eight weeks. Greg Beckstrom mentioned the one reason we might want to give a little more time on that front end for the SOQ. What we are probably going to get is some lead consultant that is bringing with him one or more other consultants and they are going to create a consultant team, so three weeks may not be enough time for them to get together and engage in the needed discussions. Bruce Chesnut asked committee members if three or four weeks is enough time to put together an SOQ. Greg Beckstrom said they are going to want to present their team as part of their SOQ so three weeks would be a little tight. Bruce Chesnut suggested he has been hearing committee members suggest that the period be four to five weeks to put together an SOQ and then narrow that down to potentially three firms to come in and make a presentation with costs. Reed Harris mentioned that we are going to be lucky to get the final proposal selected within eight weeks. Also, as we talk about the time frame for selecting a consultant we are going to need more time for the whole plan to be put together. His biggest concern is that we allow enough time for the whole planning process to involve the public to get their input in, and we are not going to get that in a matter of six to eight month. Chris Keleher mentioned that the sub-committees have an understanding of what they need to be doing and if it takes 8-12 weeks to get a consultant on board it may take that much time for the sub-committees to get organized and get their information together. He suggested we could initiate some of the sub-committee work while this process is going on so that when we get consultants on board we can hit the ground running and we won't have to play catch up. Clyde Naylor mentioned that one of the things they attempted to do in the RFP is have the consultant tell us what time they needed to do the work.

Discussion continued. Greg Beckstrom suggested that if we had an SOQ that was approved by the Board at their Thursday meeting the advertisement could go out the first part of next week. Then we could give them a month for the submission of their initial SOQ. The three or more qualified consultants could be presented at our scheduled meetings on the 24th and 27th of September. Then the following month

we could go through that selection process, schedule the presentations by the consultants and give them a couple of weeks to put together their detailed presentations. Their detailed presentations could be in October and a final decision be presented at the October 22nd meeting. After that selection is confirmed by the Board in their October 25th meeting we would be looking at negotiations late October and then have our consultant enter into the contract. Realistically they will probably have some of their preliminary meetings with sub-committees late in the year and then get a lot of serious work done on the project the first part of the year. Bruce Chesnut inquired how the Technical Committee members felt about the time frame Greg Beckstrom suggested. Committee members agreed to push the date back to the November 15th meeting for the detailed presentation and Committee members agreed that four weeks was plenty of time to put together an SOQ. Technical Committee Members agreed that we should limit the SOQ to three to five pages with additional appendages attached as necessary. After SOQ is approved by the Board they will advertise on their website, Salt Lake newspaper and The Daily Herald. They will also make some direct mailings to people who are interested and qualified. One of the Technical Committee members inquired as to how broad we want to cast the net. Committee members discussed pros and cons of local advertising and national advertising and it was discussed that even if we advertised on the local level there are many local firms that have national/international representation. Clyde Naylor and Reed Price have both been contacted already by firms who are interested. Chris Keleher mentioned that when the SOQ's come in and we are not satisfied with the quality of the quotes we just re-advertise on a broader scale. Reed Harris mentioned that he talked with Logan Simpson Design and they have attended some of the Commissions' meetings and are interested. They are primarily out of Phoenix area, but they have a small office in Salt Lake. A lot of these groups have small offices around Utah and are interested in what's happening on Utah Lake. They may see this as a stepping stone to additional work in the future. Bruce Chesnut told committee members that they will make a recommendation this Thursday and invited committee members to be there at 7:30 A.M. Bruce Chesnut mentioned that this is a different report going back to the Board because they are assuming we are coming back with the refined RFP. He doesn't see this as a problem, but wanted to verify that the committee is unified in these recommendations. Discussion followed.

TMDL Update: Dave Wham

Bruce Chesnut mentioned that Dave Wham is not here but he made a presentation on August 1st on the report to the Commission. Bruce Chesnut mentioned they need a statement from the Technical Committee to give to the Board this Thursday regarding Dave Wham's presentation. Reed Price is going to conference with Dave Wham and Committee members.

Reed Price mentioned that what they are looking for is any big issues that come about in the Lake they want to be able to issue a statement that is appropriate. One of the committee members was concerned because they have been asked to comment but he is not sure what he is commenting on because there are no recommendations. Reed Price mentioned that the recommendations were given in Dave Wham's presentation and Dave Wham explained that the recommendations become official after the public comment period. His proposed recommendations are to keep Utah Lake on the 303D list of impaired waters for total phosphorous because they couldn't tie a link to the impairment of phosphorous. The Lake has been put on the impaired list because it is out of compliance, but the fairness of the law is being questioned. They just took a number and said most lakes have this level of phosphorous. This is the level we recommend, so since it is out of compliance they put it on an impaired list and then they have to do a study to determine if that number is a fair number. Chris Keleher mentioned the studies are organized to identify how to deal with the impairment and how to improve the situation. The challenge that water quality has is they cannot make a direct connection that the impairment is a result of Utah Lake's natural condition or whether it is a result of continued phosphorous inputs. They are having a hard time making

a recommendation to put phosphorous controls on the treatment plants if they can't scientifically justify levels. Lee Hansen mentioned that there is phosphate cycling in the Lake coming from the sediments, so the question becomes if you change the input would it make any difference at all in the concentration. The current thinking is probably not because it is probably being determined by the solubility of phosphates in the sediment; therefore, changing any inputs wouldn't make any difference. Reed Price told committee members that they are trying to come up with a statement from the Commission of support. Dave Wham prepared the report with the DEQ and they are trying to determine what they as a Commission can say if there are local entities that don't agree with it. People might best respond directly to the Department of Environmental Quality with their concerns. As a Commission they are trying to determine how they should proceed, on the record, as supporting it or not supporting it. Committee members recommended that they study it for a few more years and then decide at a latter date.

Reed Price got Dave Wham on speaker phone for the conference call. Reed Price mentioned that the issue the Technical Committee has is what kind of statement to make in regards to the final recommendations as they were presented. Dave Wham told Committee members that as far as the regulatory side of it they are proposing to leave Utah Lake on the list of impaired waters for phosphorous as it stands right now. That would balance out the danger signs for sealing the Lake, but won't have an effect if there isn't a clear cause and effect relationship between phosphorous and dissolved oxygen. Additional information needs to be collected. They are also making a recommendation to move forward for future upgrades for waste water plants and to move towards biological phosphorous removal for waste water treatment. TDS is a little less clear because they are currently reopening their water quality standards so they are not sure what the TDS standard will be. They are going to move forward with a site specific standard recognizing that there is a cycling nature out on the Lake caused mainly by hydraulics, by drought and by wet periods. What they are trying to do is isolate the man-caused inputs for TDS and the non-man in an appropriate number. Reed Price inquired if they have determined what that would be and Dave Wham told committee members that they have not done the analysis yet. They looked at the kind of impact for the uses and it doesn't look to be a highly significant impact to agricultural use. What they usually do is try to subtract out the man-caused sources and then take a 90th percentile of the data. They compare that with the historical data and try to take a number that is reasonable for protection use. They haven't done that analysis yet.

In summary, Reed Price said that for the proposal we are leaving phosphorous on the list of impaired waters be and recommending additional studies to see if there is a link. Dave Wham explained that the reason they are leaving it on as opposed to taking it off or reclassifying it is because they are seeing other danger signs that the Lake is impaired. The reason they are not moving forward with the TMDL study limits on allocations on waste water plants and other point sources is because they don't see the linkage. Bruce Chesnut mentioned to Dave Wham that he made a statement that talked about waste water treatment plants implementing some type of biological process. He asked if Dave is proposing in his recommendations that the plants look at that or if it will be mandated. Dave Wham mentioned that they are making more of a plea or recommendation to their stake holders to work in partnership to move towards biological phosphorous removal and an interim level of phosphorous removal, but it's totally voluntary at this point. Bob Fisher asked what is the basis for making that recommendation. Dave Wham said that they feel that it is just not appropriate to keep increasing the load of these nutrients into the Lake as the populations expand because they realize it will reach a tipping point where we have problems with fish kills, algae etc. In view of that happening down the road this is the course of action to take. Reed Price suggested that a statement be presented about these recommendations to the Board. One of the Committee members inquired about the political implications of biological treatment plants requirements and future mandates. Dave Wham said it is dependent on additional data that they will be collecting. For example, if they were to find that internal nutrient cycling in the Lake were a small

component and it was mostly input phosphorous, it would be more of a concern for the treatment plants because they would see more chance to affect the change in the phosphorous loading coming from those point sources. Seventy-five percent of the inflowing loadings from waste water plants would make a difference if they put a lot of probes out there and collected the 24 hour oxygen cycles and they see low dissolved oxygen levels at night. If in the next year or two they start seeing fish killed or something changes in the Lake, all bets are off and they would need to proceed with TMDL. Dave Wham said they feel it is a proactive step for future planning and it's not their intent to start putting out bids for construction, but just that we incorporate this type of technology into future upgrades. Dave Wham made some suggestions to certain cities and changes they could make as they upgrade or redesign their waste water facilities. Greg Beckstrom said that the concern that he is hearing is that by adopting or supporting this goal of biological phosphorous removal at the treatment plants takes on the sense of inevitability and it becomes a question of when and how much and no longer if, phosphorous removal is going to take place. He senses that the experts on the subject are already at that conclusion and the only reason we are not proceeding with it immediately is because the documentation is not there. The only thing we need to wait for is adequate documentation. It is still somewhat of an open question until we see the documentation that suggests that any phosphorous removal, biological, chemical, or otherwise is actually going to result in a beneficial impact on the water quality of Utah Lake. There is a willingness to proceed with phosphorous removal at such time or when further studies document such a beneficial impact on the water quality of Utah Lake, but some are reluctant to make any sort of commitment or establishment of goals until such time as further studies bring forth that documentation. Dave Wham said he can understand that position. His first thought is the whole Valley is growing at such a high rate and he doesn't see how you can keep increasing nutrient flows to the Lake unchecked into the future. It makes sense to, at least, incorporate it into future planning. As far as the science goes, sometimes we don't have all the answers to these kinds of systems and there's a lot of unknowns. When he looks at other regions of the country it isn't much of a stretch. A lot of other regions are already in chemical phosphorous removal. If you were to build a plant you wouldn't necessarily have to manage for phosphorous removal right at the beginning, but there would need to be a place that is available for it.

Further discussion prompted Greg Beckstrom to recommend that the Committee express support for the document and for the further studies on the water quality in Utah Lake. He suggested there may even be willingness from individual treatment plants as they are expanded or newly constructed that they incorporate into their design work and/or planning design work the possibility of accommodating future phosphorous removals in their planning and design. He would recommend that the actual implementation of phosphorous removal and the cost associated therewith at any treatment plants take place upon further scientific documentation regarding the beneficial impact on the quality of the water of Utah Lake as a result of those phosphorous removal efforts at treatment plants. Reed Price summarized that we will show support of the document as well as its recommendations, to leave it on the impaired list, and that as new treatment plants are built or existing treatments plants expanded, to incorporate phosphorous removal into the planning and design. Basically we are encouraging further studies to make sure that it is not just a leap of faith but it is a scientifically sound decision. Responding to Lee Hanson, Dave Wham said that for the first phase it would be one year to a year and a half time time frame, but they haven't put out an RFP for that work yet. As far as the predictive mathematical model he can't give an estimate but he would say more in the three year time frame. Reed Price will draft up a statement to be presented to the Board for discussion and approval. Chris Keleher suggested to include what the long range beneficial uses are on Utah Lake. The beneficial uses that are identified on Utah Lake that the TMDL is based on are very limited. Technical Committee members discussed the beneficial uses of Utah Lake and the categories of primary and secondary contact. Greg Beckstrom questioned whether further discussion should be included as part of the master planning process. In evaluating the classification of Utah Lake for recreational or other purposes, should we seek a reclassification in pursuit of water quality

associated with those different classifications? Ty Hunter reminded Technical Committee members about the event for the triathlon event they had this past year and the problems with classification of Utah Lake on the internet. He mentioned that by reclassifying Utah Lake for primary and secondary contact would be one way of wiping out the bad name or bad aura that the public has about Utah Lake. Chris Keleher mentioned that the TMDL is based on the beneficial uses. If it is the intent of the Commission to have uses on Utah Lake that are broader than those upon which the TMDL is based then these should be stated in the letter to DWQ. It is our understanding that these are the beneficial uses under which Utah Lake has currently and our long term interests are to have public beaches. Greg Beckstrom commented that his understanding is that the reason Utah Lake is not classed as a 2A is because when the State classified it there were no public swimming beaches; it wasn't because there was a red flag with the quality of the Lake. The primary issue for water would be the e-coli standard. Dave Wham agreed and explained that generally that's the trigger between secondary and primary contact recreation. Reed Price will try to create a statement that includes the other beneficial uses, expresses support of the document and its recommendations to leave Utah Lake on the impaired list, to have new and expanded treatment plants incorporate phosphorous removal into the planning process, and to express support of the implementation of the TMDL for phosphorus removal after further studies show that there will be a beneficial impact on the Lake. Technical Committee members wanted to make sure that the wording encouraged is used so it will not be mandated. Reed Price will fine tune this so check emails to help with process.

Other Business:

Reed Price informed Technical Committee members that he has hired an office assistant, Carol Mausser, and she will start Wednesday. He is working on getting better contact information but his temporary email address is utahlakecommission@gmail.com but hopes to be working with Provo City to get a different email address. The office is located at the Historic County Courthouse 51 South University, Suite 109, First Floor, south end of the hall. The general phone number is 851-2900, and fax number 851-2903. Future meetings will be held in the Historic County Courthouse on the Second Floor, Room 210. He wants to get sub-committees together and choose a chairperson to be the main contact for the consultant.

Bill Kunsman is interested to work with sub-committees. He expressed concern about the West Nile Virus and it being reported. Technical Committee members explained that whenever there is open water it is an issue. He requested time to present a business proposal of his to the Committee.

Chris Keleher was concerned about specific activities that are really not going to be incorporated into the Master Plan and asked where people with interests should be directed. Technical Committee members discussed when the public are going to be able to step in and become involved while the Master Plan is being developed. After the discussion it was decided that people need to come to the Technical Committee meeting and then members will decide where to direct them.

Bill Kunsman will be put on the agenda for September 24th Technical Committee Meeting to make a presentation.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.