

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
Monday, August 24, 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  
Ann Merrill, DNR-Division of Water Resources  
Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources  
Commerce  
Chris Tschirki, Orem  
David Grierson, DNR-Division of FFSL  
Dave Wham, Dept. of Environmental Quality  
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove  
Doug Sakaguchi, DNR-Div. of Wildlife Resources  
James Linford, Santaquin  
Jim Hewitson, Lehi  
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs  
Michael Mills, JSRIP  
Michael Vail, Genola  
Nathan Lunstad, Highland  
Sarah Sutherland, CUWCD  
Timothy Witman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Ty Hunter, UT Dept. of Parks & Recreation  
Woodworth Mataele, Lindon

Mike Morley, House of Representatives  
Dick Buehler, DNR-Div. of FFSL  
Ken Sumsion, House of Representatives  
LaVere Merritt, Consultant  
Steve Densley, Provo/Orem Chamber of  
Commerce  
Bob Trombly, Provo  
Shane Marshall, UDOT  
Laura Snow, Utah Valley Sierra Forum  
Marc Heilesen, Sierra Club  
Todd Frye, Bonneville School of Sailing and  
Seamanship  
Jim McNulty, Saratoga Springs  
Jim Price, MAG  
Paul Goodrich, Orem  
Chris Crockett, DNR- Dept. of Water Resources  
Brent Arns, Payson  
Pete Kuennemann, Sierra Club  
Betsy Herrman, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service  
Leon Harward, Utah Crossing  
Bryan Nield, Utah Crossing  
Jeff Salt, Great Salt Lakekeeper  
Tom Twedt, Bio-West  
Russ Call, FIGG  
Chris Burgess, FIGG  
Mike Keller, FIGG  
Clay Chivers, Sailor  
Blair Abbott, Citizen

**ABSENT:**

American Fork, Mapleton, Springville, Utah County, Woodland Hills, Utah Lake Water Users

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Bruce Chesnut at 8:32 A.M. He asked everyone present to introduce themselves and state whom they represent.

**2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from July 20, 2009**

Chairman Chesnut expressed gratitude to Executive Assistant, Carol Mausser, and announced that today would be her last full day with the Commission as she is moving to California. Ms. Mausser expressed her thanks to the members of the Commission and to Mr. Reed Price, Executive Director.

Mr. Lee Hansen requested that page 7 be corrected to read, "...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." It was moved by Mr. Beckstrom to approve the minutes with that correction and seconded by Mr. Hansen. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**3. Report on carp removal efforts**

Mr. Michael Mills reported that the carp removal efforts for this year have not yet started. The June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) is proceeding to prepare an environmental assessment in order to finalize obtaining federal funds that have been allocated. Mr. Bill Loy plans to start fishing about mid- September. The goal for this year is to remove five million pounds. The contract with Mr. Loy has been finalized. Mr. Hansen questioned how the carp would be disposed and Mr. Mills answered that they will be composted and used as fertilizer. Most of the fish will be composted at Bay View that is on the west side of the lake. He reminded that the JSRIP advertised for a request for proposal looking for methods to market the fish. They received two proposals and are evaluating them at this time.

Mr. Chesnut asked those who had entered the meeting to introduce themselves.

**4. Report on phragmites eradication efforts**

Mr. Price reported that last week the 110-acre parcel located between Lindon Boat Harbor and Gammon Road in Vineyard was sprayed with glyphosate, which is commonly known as RoundUp. There should be significant progress soon. A burn will be conducted in the late fall/early winter to remove the biomass. Mr. Price said that this is a small pilot project effort, but they are in the process of creating a long-term removal plan working with the Utah County Weed Management Agency, FFSL, and Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR).

Mr. Jeff Salt asked if the root systems are removed with the biomass removal and Mr. Price said they would not be able to do that as the Army Corps will not allow it as it disturbs the sediments in the lake. They are using some of the methods that the DWR has been using in Farmington Bay. Mr. Price pointed out that there are some desirable species by the lake and it is not all phragmites.

**5. Presentation from Mr. Leon Harward, Utah Crossings, Inc.**

Mr. Price introduced Mr. Leon Harward of Utah Crossing and his group. As background, Mr. Price stated the Commission's official stance at this time. He said that for many years there has been a lot of discussion about the need for improvements that would help alleviate traffic congestion experienced by those municipalities who live on the north side of the county especially with population projections showing dramatic increases over the next several decades. There have been many ideas proposed. During the 2008 legislation session, Governor Huntsman proposed one million dollars to go to the Utah Department of Transportation to conduct an environmental study to determine the feasibility and need for a road that would alleviate the congestion. The Legislature ended up approving three million dollars for the study. A resolution of the Utah Lake Commission Governing Board endorsing the appropriation of funds for transportation and ecological studies and for strategic implementation for projects related to Utah Lake was used to help secure the funding. This study would look at, but would not be limited to, a

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

crossing of Utah Lake. Funding for the study was removed by the legislature with essential budget cuts later in 2008 that were experienced statewide.

Mr. Harward who will be presenting today has been proposing a specific crossing for Utah Lake for several years. The Utah Lake Commission's Interlocal Agreement states, "As they are proposed, the Commission will review all private development plans, programs or proposals, including residential, commercial, and recreational developments, ("private submissions") within the Master Plan Study Area for conformance with the Master Plan." The crossing of Utah Lake would fall within the study area of the Master Plan.

The Interlocal Agreement also required that the Master Plan, which was recently adopted, would include a Transportation Plan. As the planning process moved forward the idea of building a cross-lake transportation corridor was proposed and considered for inclusion in the plan by the Commission. At that time the Commission decided to take a neutral position on the concept. The Commission has avoided taking any official stance to the idea until potential impacts and benefits could be properly reviewed.

The Interlocal Agreement also states, "The Commission has no authority to nor does it supplant any powers of individual members as set forth in the Utah Constitution, state law, county or municipal ordinance, or other powers specifically given to them." That being said the permitting authorities and affected municipalities are aware of the proposal. They have told Mr. Harward in previous discussions that they are awaiting a recommendation from the Governing Board of the Utah Lake Commission before they consider his proposal.

The Commission has created a formal process where such proposals can be reviewed in order to make an informed decision. This process will begin today with a formal presentation of the project to the Technical Committee. The Governing Board has been clear that they will not act on significant issues such as this one until they have a recommendation from the Technical Committee. A group has been brought together to ask the questions that will enable them to make an informed decision and to understand the benefits and obstacles to the lake in regard to this proposal. They will try to identify the key questions and concerns that go with such a project.

The task for the Technical Committee is to listen to Mr. Harward's proposal, ask questions to better understand the impacts and benefits of the project, state concerns and determine what additional information is needed, if any. In the future, a formal recommendation will be expected in regard to the project.

Mr. Price recognized that there were other interested stakeholders present who were in attendance to hear more information about the project and to voice their opinions. He asked that they recognize that the primary purpose of this meeting is to begin a formal public dialogue between Mr. Harward and the Utah Lake Commission to allow the Commission to begin asking questions that are important to the various organizations. He respectively asked that comments regarding the proposal be withheld until the public comment period and be limited to not more than three minutes. Additional comments should be emailed to Mr. Price so that they can be easily distributed to members of the Commission.

Mr. Price introduced Representative Ken Sumsion who represents American Fork, Eagle Mountain, Lehi and Saratoga Springs.

Representative Sumsion stated that when he ran for office four years ago he saw tremendous population growth that is projected to continue. The House District is created for about 33,000-35,000 people and he now represents 85,000 people because, basically, ten years ago Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs didn't exist. Any demographic projection is showing 500,000 as the lowest number of people that will live on the west side in the next 30-40 years. Some projections extend to over a million people.

As he came into office he looked at the transportation plans. As reference he pointed out that 500,000 people is larger than Salt Lake City. The State Legislature recognized that the east-west movements are horrible throughout the state and within Utah County.

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

As he started looking at proposals he first examined the possibility with people to build a causeway. He met with Mr. Marc Heilesen about three years ago and discussed the issues and concerns the Sierra Club had with a possibility of a causeway. Plans have now migrated away from a causeway and moved to a bridge structure. In his meetings with UDOT, Mr. Harward and engineering firms the concerns are to provide a financial asset to the community as well as to provide the needed transportation corridor for the future.

A few years ago three million dollars was appropriated to do an environmental study, but that funding was used to balance the budget. Mr. Harward's proposal does not require any state funds.

Representative Sumsion pointed out the school trust lands on the west side of the lake on a map. He pointed out that the education system would benefit from the population growth expected. The proposed crossing from Pelican Point to 800 North in Orem fits within the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) and UDOT plans. Studies have looked at other possible locations. This area would have the least impact on the environment of the lake and the habitat.

Representative Sumsion introduced Mr. Russell Call of FIGG Engineering and Mr. Leon Harward of Utah Crossing.

Mr. Call gave some background history of FIGG Engineers and Utah Crossing and their accomplishments. The proposal for Utah Lake is to develop a bridge that would connect from Saratoga Springs to Vineyard and would be approximately six miles long. The proposal is currently with the Department of Natural Resources, and FFSL. Their purpose would be to design, build, operate, maintain, own and finance the project. They do not anticipate that any city, state or federal funds would be required and would put the state at no risk. They anticipate the project would be open in three years. They believe it is a true stimulus project and is sustainable and eco-friendly. They anticipate the same user electronic tolling as used statewide. Emergency vehicles would use the bridge free-of-charge.

The lake crossing would provide an east/west corridor opportunity for utilities, and also for transportation. It would provide connectivity to the cities, state routes, and interstate as well as the UTA lot.

The first phase of the project would be a single bridge with two lanes, one each direction, and a pedestrian bike path, separated by a barrier. Another bridge would be added in the future. They are discussing a special use permit with FFSL in order to build the piers in the lake bottom and to maintain the project.

Mr. Call explained the map of the project and pointed out the connectivity. He showed a map of the design of the lake. They anticipate that the bridge would be converted to a three-lane bridge in the future after building another similar structure adjacent to the first bridge.

The project would be constructed using piles with 24 inch pipe paneling. The piles would be driven into the lake to support the structure. He further explained the construction process. This included renderings of the proposed structure from different locations.

Mr. Call requested Mr. Tom Twedt of Bio-West to join him as he entertained questions from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Chris Tschirki asked how many pilings would be anticipated for each column and how deep would they be? Mr. Call replied that there would be two structures, one wider than the other. The wider structure would be about eight pilings and the narrower structure would be six pilings. The pilings would be between 100-150 ft. long

Mr. Steve Densley asked what the expected toll would be one-way and Mr. Call said their plan is to charge a \$2.00 toll.

In response to Mr. Tschirki there would be no toll for bikers or pedestrians.

Dr. LaVere Merritt requested more information on the pilings and how much preliminary work has been done relative to the stability.

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

Mr. Call said the seismic activity on the lake needs to be addressed more fully. They are in the process of conducting a seismic analysis to insure the stability.

Dr. Merritt asked if they had any geotechnical coring information that the piling estimates were based on. Mr. Call said they used foundation studies that had been done and that the firm of RB&G Engineering, Inc. in Provo is doing the geotechnical work for them.

Mr. Dave Grierson requested that Mr. Call address the status of the discussions with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Call responded that the project team has met with the FFSL and the Corps of Engineers. Mr. Tom Twedt reported that the Corps of Engineers permitting process would not be required for unfilled piles driven in a body of water. There are existing wetlands but the project would not fall into jurisdiction at that water level. They are coordinating with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services in regard to any endangered fish.

Mr. Densley said many people are curious about the lake being frozen in the winter and how to deal with the ice on the bridge. Mr. Call said salt and sand are commonly used and would be used for this bridge. Mr. Densley asked if that would be in keeping with the environmental issues. Mr. Twedt said they had done many loading analysis and it did not look to be a problem.

Ms. Laura Snow asked if they had researched anything about migratory birds and the Clean Water Act. Mr. Twedt said they had done that research and there were no issues.

Mr. Beckstrom asked what the cost estimate is for the project. Mr. Call said they are working on that and that it would be hundreds of millions of dollars. Mr. Call said the traffic and cost studies are being done. The design was just completed.

Mr. Beckstrom asked how maintenance would be handled on the bridge as a private facility. Mr. Call said Utah Crossing would do it all such as snow removal. It will be a private road and everything such as graffiti, inspection, etc. would be handled by Utah Crossing.

Mr. Beckstrom asked what considerations had been done in design with the vacillating elevation of Utah Lake. Mr. Call said the main consideration would probably be ice. The footings themselves do not touch or remain on the bed of the lake. The footings are 7-8 feet deep with about two feet exposed. There should always be about two feet exposed above the water level. All of the elements are designed to withstand the ice. However, the governing control is seismic. Mr. Beckstrom stated that five years ago the lake level was five feet above compromise. Mr. Call said the footing design can be anywhere above compromise.

Mr. Paul Goodrich asked if any origin and destination studies had been done. Mr. Call said those studies are in progress. They are using the MAG model to evaluate the traffic from this location. Mr. Goodrich questioned if there are impacts to connecting roads and how those would be addressed. Mr. Call said that information will be shared with UDOT and the public. He mentioned that improvements to Geneva Road and I-15 are already in the process of being done. This location has already been reviewed and approved with UDOT. Mr. Shane Marshall of UDOT said UDOT hasn't approved anything as of yet, but pointed out that a crossing had been discussed by MAG. Mr. Jim Price of MAG clarified that this type of facility is not officially in the MAG long-range plan, but is in the visionary plan. Mr. Jim McNulty of Saratoga Springs stated that their position was that an origin and destination study was needed to show where the need really was.

Mr. Leon Harward explained some history to show why the proposed alignment was selected. He said that Utah Crossing spent about five years looking at various locations along the lake on both sides. On the east side they first looked at Provo. They looked at the JSRIP, wetlands, and the interchange with Center Street in Orem and University Parkway Interchange. They are trying to develop a good east/west transportation corridor in Utah County. It took Salt Lake County 17-18 years to deal with the construction of I-215. The proposed corridor being considered does not interfere with neighborhoods, churches, or schools. He stated that Mr. Darrell Cook of MAG told him that the proposed location of the corridor was the only one that makes any sense.

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

Mr. Goodrich replied that he is not opposed to a lake crossing, but feels it should be based on an origin and destination study. Mr. Call said it is a private venture. The public process will depend on what is required for a permit and today's meeting is part of the public process.

Mr. Marc Heilesen commented that this bridge cross is not in the 20-30 year plan for MAG. UDOT did a study for the Mountainview corridor and all the cities along the western side passed resolutions opposing it. He questioned if the variables specific to this area had been taken into account. Mr. Call said the model has accommodated all future MAG plans.

Mr. David Lifferth asked if based on the construction outlines the bridge was projected to be a one-year build-out. Mr. Call said it would be a one to two year plan depending on multiple factors.

Dr. Merritt asked if a dredged channel would be needed for the construction barges. Mr. Call said the lake bottom cannot be disturbed. They will put out whatever trestle is needed so the barges can be used. It's all a function of weight and size of the barge.

Dr. Merritt asked if there are alternative plans if the pilings don't give enough strength. Mr. Call said it is typical for that to be evaluated as the construction proceeds. Dr. Merritt asked if floats had been considered which are sediment floats attached to piles for additional buoyancy and support. Mr. Call said he would not anticipate that right now.

Mr. Jim Price wished to clarify that the MAG model takes this crossing into account in terms of concept and in terms of future need, but is not adopted into the plan.

Mr. Chris Keleher asked if there would be an impact to the fish as a result of the percussion of driving in the piles. Mr. Twedt said the intent is to have an underwater signal before they start construction to drive the fish away. Mr. Doug Sakaguchi asked what kind of alarms would be used and Mr. Twedt said they would be underwater sirens.

Mr. Goodrich asked Mr. Price what the next step would be following today's discussion. Mr. Price replied that when the Technical Committee is comfortable they would make a formal recommendation to the Governing Board. The Governing Board will also hear a presentation in relation to that recommendation. Mr. Keleher stated that as a member of the Technical Committee he would like some time to digest and review the information as presented before formulating a position.

Mr. Jim McNulty wondered if the bridge in South Dakota is heated which is the bridge closest in structure to the proposal. Mr. Call said it is not cost effective. Mr. McNulty said it was a concern with freezing and the wind element.

Mr. Call said in South Dakota they have open barriers on the structure which allows the wind to blow some of the snow off. There is also salt that can be used and snowplows. There can be variable message signs that reduce the speed and the structure can be closed. The structure is designed for 70 mph speeds, but posted speed can be determined. Mr. McNulty asked if bikers and pedestrians would use the bridge with that speed. It was noted that there is a traffic barrier between the pedestrians.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if wind was a factor in the design. Mr. Call replied that wind is a part of the design, but that seismic criteria are the priority. Mr. Call said it would be a concern for high profile type trucks, but aerial message signs or weather stations can give real-time information.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if the transition on each side of the bridge to private roadways would be with state or municipal rights-of-way. Mr. Call said they had been meeting with UDOT for state's rights-of-way and private.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if this is a bridge project for Utah Crossings or if they are tied in with any development projects. Mr. Harward confirmed that it is a bridge crossing only. Mr. Beckstrom also asked what the assurances are being a private project that it won't end up being a partially constructed project. Mr. Call said that would be evaluated by FFSL and developed during the permit process.

Mr. Price asked if the non-filled pilings, not affecting wetlands, is the core reason the U.S. Army Corps does not have jurisdiction and what environmental requirements for compatibility would be required with FFSL issuing the permit? Mr. Grierson said that with the completion of the Master Plan, FFSL would

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

be looking to Utah Lake Commission as a partner in the process. He anticipates putting together a committee that would decide the studies that need to be done. He plans to assemble a committee with some of the members of the Technical Committee included that would require such studies as economic, natural and cultural resources, best use of the land, and other kinds of approval. If the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service need any kinds of approval in this process they would need to be included.

The nomination must first be received by FFSL and then it will be sent to the RDCC, which is the clearing office at the state level. They will also send the nomination to the Utah Lake Commission simultaneously. There will be opportunity at that point to look at the nomination and see what kinds of impacts this bridge might bring. They would give the contractors the opportunity to address those impacts.

Following that would be the Record of Decision process. That is when all the factors of the studies would be studied before issuing the permit. The FFSL is required in their public trust obligations to insure that the public process has not been circumvented, but adhered to in the process.

Mr. Hansen asked what the comparison in miles is between the six-mile bridge crossing and the mileage traveling around the north end of the lake. Mr. Harward said that depends on where you are starting from, but that it can be a difference of up to 25 miles.

Mr. Call said the difference in time and cost savings will be part of the traffic study analysis that is currently underway. It will also address emissions.

Mr. Witman said that the U.S. Corps of Engineers hasn't made any final determination of this project yet. Based on what they have seen with the drawings it would not require a permit from the Corps. However, they are waiting to get the final details on the project. They have not issued a no-permit required notice. Mr. Call said they are meeting with the Corps in the afternoon to provide them with more detailed design information.

Ms. Betsy Herrman wondered about the trash, petroleum, storm water runoff and periodic cleaning being addressed. Mr. Twedt said they have looked at periodic cleaning. The run-off would not be feasible. Mr. Call added that on a structure six miles long it is practically and physically impossible to collect, remove and treat water. The key is dispersion. There are some emergency elements that still need to be evaluated along with the water quality.

Mr. Price asked if Utah Crossing and FIGG feel that their plan complies and adheres to the Utah Lake Master Plan including the other elements such as land use, recreation, natural resources, etc. Mr. Harward answered affirmatively. Mr. Call replied that the bike paths tie in with what would be referred to as lakeshore bike paths. The pedestrian plans comply and allow travel underneath the bridge and along the shorelines. This project will bring more people to the lake and provide increased accessibility. It helps provide access to facilities. Dr. Merritt asked if there had been any discussion to provide potential recreation sites along the bridge. Mr. Call replied that the purpose of the bridge is a transportation facility. It does accommodate sailing and boating and that is why the bridge is so high off the water. Dr. Merritt said that through the years there have been a number of proposals for islands being developed in the lake for various reasons and asked if there had been any discussion linking into those ideas. Mr. Harward said no.

Dr. Merritt complimented Utah Crossing and FIGG on selecting a type of bridge that minimizes many of the concerns for the lake. He said he felt the cost would be the major issue.

Mr. Price requested that the members of the Technical Committee finish asking their questions so there would be time for public comment.

Mr. Hansen commented that he didn't see any plans in the design for emergency purposes such as disabled vehicles. Mr. Call replied that the bridge would have large shoulders that would allow for disabled vehicles and tow trucks. In phase two there would be median openings.

Mr. Ty Hunter questioned what emergency services will respond and take the burden of funding for emergency issues. This will affect the cities of Saratoga Springs, Orem and the marine environment. Mr.

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

Call said there are incident management plans that are developed for these types of toll roads. It depends on what cities, county and states are involved. It can be developed in many different ways. Mr. Tschirki asked Mr. Harward if it was always his intent to make this a privately owned facility. Mr. Harward said that UDOT was not interested in helping with the funding. Toll bridges will become a reality nationally. He did look at a partnership with the state originally, but there isn't any money to build it. Mr. Marshall said that even though UDOT is not planning on investing any money they are supportive of the concept.

Mr. Hansen asked who would have the property taxes. Mr. Grierson remarked that since it is a use of public land there are no property taxes associated with this land. The lakebed is sovereign land. The land will be leased from the state and that is how taxes are compensated.

Mr. Wham asked if there is some idea of the timeline for the studies to be conducted. Mr. Call said their goal would be to get the permit process completed this year.

Mr. Sakaguchi commented he is concerned about the amount of salt and sand that will go into the lake annually. Mr. Call said as far as the sand, the sweeper will pick up most of that, but the intent is not to drop things into the lake.

Mr. Price opened the public comment period and requested that comments be limited to three minutes. He suggested that if someone felt they did not have enough time to express all their concerns or ideas of support that they be submitted to him in writing in electronic form.

#### PUBLIC QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Jeff Salt, Great Salt Lakekeeper said one of the main concerns from his constituency is with water quality. With a six mile stretch of road there will be trash, tire rubber, salt, and other caustic elements. He requested further information on protecting the lake from these elements. He asked if utilities would be going across the bridge if there could also be a storm water pipe as well. Mr. Call said he didn't feel he could answer that and that water quality was still under investigation and being researched.

Mr. Salt asked if wave action had been reviewed in regard to the bridge clearance. Mr. Call said the fifty-foot clearance design accommodates all the existing boats on the lake.

Mr. Salt commented that the structure would be based on pilings. He would like to hear more information about the soil profile in regard to the stability of pilings. Mr. Call said the geotechnical information would be required once the project is initiated.

Ms. Laura Snow, Utah Valley Sierra Forum, said that she would like a better understanding of the structure itself. Mr. Call said he had a separate presentation of the foundation of the bridge that is about fifteen minutes long. He could show it following the meeting if there is interest.

Mr. Salt asked if the bridge would allow high profile, semi-truck traffic and if HOV lanes being considered. Mr. Call replied that there is a three lane potential and one lane could be set-up as an HOV lane depending on the traffic needs. The bridge is designed for all highway loadings.

It was asked how often they projected they would have to replace sections of the bridge for maintenance. Mr. Call said bridges are designed to have an inch and a half wearing surface. Once that surface is penetrated it would be replaced. The structure is designed for a 100-year life and is expected to exist longer.

Mr. Todd Frye, Bonneville School of Sailing and Seamanship, asked where the projected 50-foot clearance would be in the bridge. Mr. Call replied that everything is based on the compromise elevation and the 50-foot clearance would be in the central portion of the bridge. The remainder of the bridge has a 35-foot clearance. A request was made to place the 50-foot clearance in an area where the lake is deepest to accommodate larger keels, if the project moves forward. There will be no dredging in the lake.

In response to Mr. Hansen it was answered that there was insufficient information in regards to scouring the lake in regard to sanitation.

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

Mr. Marc Heilesen questioned if the geotechnical tests were done where the bridge would be built or on the shoreline and it was answered that the tests were done in both places. Specifics would be available through RB&G who did the studies.

Mr. Sakaguchi commented that he believes there are springs on the eastern shore.

Ms. Herrmann asked what the distance is between the pilings. It was answered that between the tops of the pilings they are 60 feet apart, but they extend at an angle so they get more dispersed.

Dr. Merritt commented that there are, most likely, springs in the alignment. However, the springs would be those that have found the least resistant path to the surface.

In response to Mr. Sakaguchi it was answered that the time period between the building of the two structures will depend on economics and usage.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Ms. Laura Snow stated that, at this time, the Utah Valley Sierra Forum is against the project. Their main concerns are with water quality. They are also concerned about the air pollution. She, herself, is concerned with the diminished habitat for birds.

Mr. Marc Heilesen, Regional Representative of the Sierra Club, commented that he grew up in Provo and fished at the lake. He expressed his support for the Utah Lake Commission and their efforts to treasure the lake. He is disturbed about the project and is concerned about environmental studies not being required. He said the air pollution with the vehicles emissions would severely be affected. He requested that the Technical Committee demand the studies to be conducted.

Mr. Jeff Salt, Great Salt Lakekeeper, said his organization is opposed to the project at this time. They agree with the comments made by the Sierra Club. They believe a thorough environmental impact study needs to be done for the necessary precaution and for public trust. It is necessary to see the long-term impacts. Traffic impacts should be researched. He is very concerned about fugitive garbage and automobile solvents going into the lake. He urged aesthetics to be considered as well. He requested a thorough public process be conducted for the project.

Mr. Clay Chivers, Citizen, said he was born in Utah County. He is opposed to the division of the lake that would be caused by the structure for convenience sake.

Mr. Pete Kuennemann, Executive Board of the Sierra Club, said they are most concerned about automobile induced pollution to the lake. They are concerned about safety of people and the inevitable accidents and the potential of catastrophic accidents such as a tanker spill into the lake. They worry that the entities managing the bridge would not have the funds to return the lake to its natural state should such a catastrophe occur.

Mr. Blair Abbott, Spanish Fork, said that he is a concerned citizen and does not feel the bridge is a good idea. Everyone owns the lake and he concerned that the public isn't aware of this project and that their opinion won't matter.

Mr. Paul Goodrich, Technical Committee, suggested that a full environmental review be conducted. He feels most of the concerns would be addressed by such a review.

Mr. Chesnut asked Mr. Grierson to respond. Mr. Grierson said according the Master Plan and Division rules, FFSL will receive the anticipated nomination from Utah Crossing which is a brief outline of what the project is going to be and that would officially begin the process. They would then submit a project

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

proposal to the Resource Development Coordination Committee (RDCC). That allows all state agencies to make comments on the project and allows the public an opportunity to comment on the project. The opportunity for public comments would be about sixty days. Generally they allow a thirty-day process, but with a project of this magnitude a sixty-day process would be warranted. The process should generate the types of questions that the State would like answered.

The main questions will be the costs of conducting these studies. The cost of the permit is about \$450. Once the information is returned from the RDCC the federal and state agencies can make comment on the information. The process called the Record of Decision would follow and this is where the issues such as economic, natural resources, best use of land, etc. will be reviewed. This process will involve the Utah Lake Commission. He anticipates that members of the Technical Committee and DNR will be part of the committee that will decide the stipulations that are put on the permit to ensure the public trust is protected. He said it is a fairly lengthy project and he does not foresee the Record of Decision to be completed in this calendar year.

In response to Mr. Salt, Mr. Grierson answered that those issues that are not directly in the FFSL jurisdiction would be addressed through the Record of Decision.

Mr. Chesnut asked the Technical Committee how they would like to proceed.

Mr. Beckstrom, Vice Chair, responded that in the past two years the Utah Lake Commission has developed the Master Plan for Utah Lake to see that things done in and around Utah Lake are for the benefit of the users of the lake and that the Commission not encourage anything that would have an ecological negative impact on the lake. He is committed, personally and as a member of the Technical Committee, to adhering to the Master Plan. However, as a government official and employee, part of him sees the opportunity of a road being built with private funds as beneficial to the taxpayers and as a good concept. The key is to combine both objectives. His opinion is that it would not be possible, at this point, for the Technical Committee or the Governing Board to make any kind of a recommendation of support or non-support.

He agreed that the Technical Committee needs to work with FFSL to identify the process and the responsible parties to answer questions. He requested Utah Crossings to generate written information such as a copy of their proposal and other relative information, and provide that to the Technical Committee. He agreed with Mr. Grierson that a committee should be organized and meet before the next Technical Committee meeting and before the next Executive Committee meeting. The Executive Committee should be asked if they want to hear a preliminary presentation before it is made to the Governing Board.

Mr. Dave Wham suggested that Utah Crossing should address some of the issues that they know will be of concern in a cohesive document and include them in their proposal. Ms. Sarah Sutherland added that a cumulative impact section could be added to the proposal.

Mr. Chesnut summarized that the Technical Committee would like some of their members to meet with the State as soon as possible prior to the next Executive Committee meeting. A report of that meeting would be given to the Executive Committee to give direction as to where they would like to go with the next presentation. Mr. Price pointed out that this stems on whether or not the Army Corps determines jurisdiction.

Mr. Witman said that according to the information they have received thus far a permit is not going to be required.

The next Executive Committee meeting is Thursday, September 17 and the Governing Board meeting will be Thursday, September 24.

Mr. Goodrich suggested that an open house be scheduled for the public to see the presentation and make comments. There was discussion. Mr. Dick Buehler, FFSL, stated that the decision to issue the permit will be based on sound information from all entities including public meetings and adherence to

APPROVED  
September 21, 2009

the Management Plan. The EIS process will be addressed. Some of this information will be required from the applicant. Discussion continued.

Mr. Salt commented that in the Federal process a developer has to present a study plan and the applicant pays for the studies that need to be conducted.

Mr. Beckstrom moved that a subcommittee be established by the Executive Director to meet with FFSL within the next few weeks before the next meeting of the Executive Committee of the Governing Board and that the process that is generated at that meeting be forwarded to the Executive Committee and the Technical Committee at their September meetings to then evaluate as being appropriate for proceeding with this proposal. It was seconded by Dr. Merritt. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **6. Other items**

Ms. Mausser said that they would like all to be acknowledged as attending the meeting and requested all to please sign the attendance sheet. Mr. Price reminded everyone to please submit written comments to him via email. Mr. Chesnut thanked everyone for their attendance.

#### **7. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, September 21, 2009**

#### **8. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:04.