



COMMISSION

Technical Committee Meeting

Monday, August 25, 2008, 8:30 A.M.

Historic Utah County Courthouse

51 South University Avenue, Suite 212

Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Greg Beckstrom, Provo, Vice-Chair

Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

Clyde Naylor, Utah County

Chris Keleher, Dept. of Natural Resources

Doug Sakaguchi, DNR-Div. of Wildlife Resources

Sarah Sutherland, Central UT Water Conservancy District

Michael Mills, JSRIP

Nathan Lunstad, Highland

Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove

Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs

H. Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire & State Lands

Rick Cox, URS, Inc.

Bob Fisher, Woodland Hills

Chris Tschirki, Orem

Daniel Hales, Springville

Dave M. Wham, Dept. of Environmental Quality

Jim Hewitson, Lehi

Jim Price, MAG

Paul Goodrich, Orem

Brent Wilde, Provo

Ty J. Hunter, DNR-Div. of Park & Recreation

Ron Kidd, JWCD

Kim Struthers, Lehi

LaVere Merritt, Consultant

ABSENT:

American Fork, Genola, Lindon, Mapleton, Santaquin, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, DNR-Div. of Water Resources, Vineyard, Utah Water Users

1. Welcome and Introductions.

Vice Chairman Greg Beckstrom called the meeting to order at 8:35 A.M. He acknowledged that Chairman, Bruce Chesnut, was not in attendance as he had a family conflict. Everyone was asked to introduce themselves.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from June 23, 2008.

Discussion was opened on the minutes from the June 23, 2008 meeting. Mr. Chris Keleher moved to approve the minutes. It was seconded by Mr. Dave Wham. The minutes were approved unanimously. Mr. Beckstrom asked that the meeting proceed to Agenda Item #4 as it was the primary purpose of the meeting.

4. Master Plan: Vision Prioritization and Opportunities and Constraints Analysis.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that members of the Technical Committee should have received copies of 1) Draft Master Plan Outline, and 2) Current Copy of the Vision Statement. At the Governing Board this coming Thursday the Governing Board will be reviewing the Vision Statement which will eventually be the goals in the Master Plan. They will be looking to the Technical Committee for recommendations, analysis and feedback on the Visioning Statement.

The Vision Statement is basically categorized into three parts; 1) Broad Vision Statement, 2) Vision Statements more specific in the four major categories in the Master Plan and, 3) Specific Vision Statements. These statements came out of the Visioning Workshop held in April. The Steering Committee discussed them last week and they would like to report to the Governing Board in this format. Opportunities and Constraints Tables for each of the four major portions of the Master Plan were also sent for review and those would be discussed following the Vision Statement discussions. The feedback on the tables is for the consultants rather than the Governing Board at this time.

Broad Vision Statement –

Utah Lake is the centerpiece of a natural resources system that contributes to the environmental health, economic prosperity and quality of life of area residents and visitors. Through collaborative restoration, protection and sustainable use efforts, the lake and its multiple-use amenities are fully recognized and enjoyed by current and future generations.

Mr. Beckstrom clarified that the Broad Vision Statement that is presented to the Governing Board on Thursday will be a tentative statement. There will still be opportunity to modify the Vision Statement following the Thursday meeting. The floor was open to discussion on this document. Mr. Price stated that comments of support would also be appreciated.

Mr. Clyde Naylor questioned if the three key principles listed underneath the statement paragraph needed to be included in the Broad Vision Statement and Mr. Beckstrom said it is not necessarily considered part of the statement.

Mr. Bob Fisher opened discussion on the word “restoration” in the phrase “Through collaborative restoration, protection and sustainable use efforts...” and expressed approval of the word “sustainable”. There was discussion on the interpretation of the word “restoration” and if it should be replaced with another word such as pro-active management, management, or stewardship.

Mr. Naylor moved to approve the Broad Vision Statement and send it as a recommendation for approval to the Governing Board. It was seconded and approved unanimously.

Mr. Beckstrom directed everyone to turn to Page Two of the document for discussion of the Vision Statements for each of the main use areas in the Master Plan. He requested that the discussion focus more on them one at a time and to focus on substance rather than grammar.

Land Use/Shoreline Protection

Mr. Doug Sakaguchi pointed out that in the Natural Resources Vision Statement it references laws, regulations, ordinances, and policies and suggested that similar language be used in the Land Use/Shoreline Protection statement. Mr. Keleher questioned what the term “land use plan” specifically refers to in the last sentence. He questioned whether it refers to the Master Plan land use plan or something else. Mr. Rick Cox replied that it had been discussed in committee. Each governing entity has to do their own land use plan and the Commission helps to coordinate them. There was discussion on different solutions that included changing the word “plan” to the plural form of “plans”, to insert the word “collectively”, adding the word “supported”, or adding the phrase “guided by”. At the end of discussion Mr. Beckstrom suggested inserting the same language as included in the Natural Resources Vision Statement so that it would include, “land use plans, regulations, ordinances and policies”. Mr. Sakaguchi voiced agreement with that change.

Mr. Keleher requested that language be added to clarify that “plans” would mean collectively all the plans of the different jurisdictions that surround the lake. Discussion followed. Different solutions were

suggested including adding “independent land use”, “appropriate land use plans”, “land use plans that are ordained” and others. Also, it was suggested to delete the sentence altogether.

Mr. Keleher voiced concern that the Master Plan Vision Statements would remain within the study area.

Mr. Jim Hewitson moved to alter the sentence to read as “Land use plans, regulations, ordinances and policies affecting the Utah Lake study area are guided by the Utah Lake Master Plan.” It was seconded.

Discussion followed. Mr. Keleher suggested a change in the terms “guided by”. Mr. Hewitson suggested inserted adding “and/or consistent with” and there wasn’t any opposition.

There was discussion on the first sentence of the Vision Statement. Mr. Cox suggested that it might read better with different punctuation. Mr. Cox stated that the sentence should read “Utah Lake benefits from land use principles, ~~and~~ best management practices...” There was also discussion on the intent of the phrase “support lake management objectives” and how to improve its clarity.

It was suggested to insert the word “sound” so that it would read, “support sound management objectives.” Discussion continued and focused on the choice between inserting the words “sustainable management” or just inserting “sound management”. It was decided that “sound” includes quality.

Mr. Ty Hunter stated that the while the statement is stating that one objective is to “showcase natural and cultural features” that protection of the natural and cultural features should be included.

It was proposed to insert the words “and protect” into the phrase, “showcase ~~and~~ **protect** natural and cultural features”.

There was further discussion and it was agreed to avoid getting too specific in the statement. The suggested revisions were reviewed.

It was moved and seconded to approve the Land Use/Shoreline Protection Vision Statement as follows:

Land Use/Shoreline Protection: Utah Lake benefits from land use principles, ~~and~~ best management practices and tools that: protect the shoreline; support lake management objectives; showcase natural and cultural features; maximize public ownership and access; offer diverse experiences and uses to visitors; provide for mixed use development that protects the lake’s natural features. Impacts to shorelines from development of adjacent properties are minimized. ~~All such land~~ **Land use plans, regulations, ordinances and policies affecting the Utah Lake study area** activities are guided by **and/or consistent with the Utah Lake Master Plan.** ~~a land use plan tailored to the presence and function of the lake.~~

***Land Use/Shoreline Protection:* Utah Lake benefits from land use principles, best management practices and tools that: protect the shoreline; support sound lake management objectives; showcase and protect natural and cultural features; maximize public ownership and access; offer diverse experiences and uses to visitors; and provide for mixed use development that protects the lake’s natural features. Impacts to shorelines from development of adjacent properties are minimized. Land use plans, regulations, ordinances and policies affecting the Utah Lake study area are guided by and/or consistent with the Utah Lake Master Plan.**

The motion was approved unanimously.

Transportation

Mr. Keleher began by expressing his thoughts that the statement goes beyond the study area and suggested that the statement be narrowed down to the study area. Mr. Beckstrom said that the same concern may exist with the Natural Resources statement. Discussion followed.

Mr. Naylor stated he was concerned with the last sentence in the statement in that it assumes systems are already “in place”. There was discussion on the tense of the statements and the semantics.

Discussion also included transportation systems that provide access to and around the lake. Mr. Naylor suggested that the statement on Page Five titled "Transportation Planning" needed to be included in the Vision Statement.

Mr. Cox stated that the subcommittees met back in the spring and there was much discussion on the specifics, but the Broad Statement had not been reviewed until at this meeting. Suggestions were made to revise the Transportation Vision Statement. Mr. Keleher agreed with Mr. Naylor that the statement on Page Five was adequate if included in the statement and to remove the specifics that were outside of the study area. Discussion followed.

Mr. Hansen suggested altering the first sentence and Mr. Jim Price suggested changing the first sentence to read as:

"...A comprehensive multi-modal transportation system that provides efficient mobility and access options while safeguarding the ecological integrity and natural features of the area."

This would replace the first two sentences.

It was suggested to remove "other modes, such as" from the next sentence. It was also agreed to change "a long term transportation plan" to be pluralized.

Mr. Jim Price suggested a correction of the last sentence to read "Long term transportation plans are consistent with the Utah Lake Master Plan to ensure that the presence and function of the lake are appropriately considered and protected." Discussion followed and corrections were proposed to the statement.

Transportation: ~~Utah Lake residents are well served by~~ A comprehensive multi-modal transportation system ~~that is both function (e.g., high volume commercial traffic, commuting, and adequate parking) and aesthetically pleasing (e.g., scenic drives and overlooks).~~ **provides efficient mobility and access options** ~~East-west and north-south road systems provide efficient transportation routes while safeguarding the ecological integrity and natural features of the area. Motorized transportation routes are complemented by other modes, such as a non-motorized trail system encircling the lake with multiple access points. A~~ Long term transportation plans **are consistent with the Utah Lake Master Plan** ~~to addressing highways, trail systems, mass transit and air transport is in place in~~ ensure that the presence and function of the lake is appropriately considered and protected.

It was moved by Mr. Naylor and seconded by Mr. Keleher to approve the Transportation Vision Statement to read as follows and to be forwarded to the Governing Board:

Transportation: A comprehensive multi-modal transportation system provides efficient mobility and access options while safeguarding the ecological integrity and natural features of the area. Motorized transportation routes are complemented by a non-motorized trail system encircling the lake with multiple access points. Long term transportation plans are consistent with the Utah Lake Master Plan to ensure that the presence and function of the lake are appropriately considered and protected.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Natural Resources

Ms. Sarah Sutherland expressed concern with the term "lake level regulation" being included in the statement. Suggestions were made to changing the wording to "implemented" or "evaluated" and even removing all the examples inserted as "e.g."s.

Mr. Cox suggested leaving in the first examples as they contribute to better understanding and are not controversial. Mr. Beckstrom suggested dividing the first sentence into two sentences. Following discussion it was decided to alter the first sentence to include "and/or desirable plant and animal species".

A preliminary statement was suggested to read:

Utah Lake supports healthy populations of native **and/or other desirable** plant and animal species ~~and protects and preserves other natural features (e.g., wetlands, shorelines, and habitat)~~ Other natural features are protected and preserved for both their ecological benefits and the enjoyment of visitors. Throughout the watershed; laws, regulations, ordinances, policies, programs and research/monitoring efforts are coordinated and harmonized to both ~~restore and~~ **protect and improve** the quality of water and related natural resources for all current and prospective uses. Resource enhancements **balance** ~~(e.g., selective dredging, habitat construction and lake level regulation)~~ are implemented balancing stakeholder interests with the ecological integrity of the lake.

There was discussion about the inclusion of "watershed" being beyond the scope of the Commission. Mr. Fisher suggested changing the word "restore" to "improve". Mr. Keleher asked that the phrase be changed to read "protect and improve". The Vision Statement was read again with the suggested changes.

It was moved by Mr. Fisher and seconded to approve the following Transportation Vision Statement:

***Natural Resources:* Utah Lake supports healthy populations of native and/or other desirable plant and animal species. Other natural features are protected and preserved for both their ecological benefits and the enjoyment of visitors. Throughout the watershed; laws, regulations, ordinances, policies, programs, and research/monitoring efforts are coordinated and harmonized to both protect and improve the quality of water and related natural resources for all current and prospective uses. Resource enhancements balance stakeholder interests with the ecological integrity of the lake.**

Discussion continued on the inclusion of the watershed. It was pointed out that because the watershed is a source to the lake it needs to be of a quality that improves the lake.

It was recommended that when the Vision Statements are presented that it be stated the wording can be as presented or the statements can say that as a Commission they can coordinate efforts that are outside the Study Area but that may affect the Study Area.

The Natural Resources Vision Statement was approved unanimously.

Recreation

Mr. Lee Hansen opened discussion by stating that in the first sentence of the Recreation Vision Statement the wording implies that the county is the only organization that is benefitting economically. It was suggested adding state, city, or municipalities along with "county".

Also in the first sentence it was suggested to change the language in the phrase "and enjoys a positive perception." Discussion followed and it was agreed to change the first sentence to "Utah Lake is a destination spot that provides an economic benefit to the area and is perceived positively by local residents and other visitors."

It was suggested to alter the phrase "overnight accommodations, roads" to read "and roads".

In the final sentence it was agreed to modify the word "amenities" with "and cultural features."

There was continued discussion on whether the examples should be included. Even though there were some issues with the specifics there was dialogue about them being included for clarification and for the benefit of the public.

It was moved by Mr. Hunter to approve the Recreation Vision Statement with the noted changes and seconded by Mr. Hansen. The Recreation Statement motion to approve with the inclusion of the examples was passed unanimously.

Recreation: Utah Lake is a destination spot that ~~provides is an economic benefits to the area county and is perceived positively enjoys a positive perception by local residents as well as state, regional, and national and other~~ visitors. Multiple access points and a variety of well-maintained facilities offer visitors many options that support active recreation (e.g., parks, sandy swimming beaches, boat launches, marinas, campsites, fishing/hunting, and special events); passive recreation (e.g. , natural areas, trails, and boardwalks); educational opportunities (e.g., concessions, shops, overnight accommodations, and roads) that both safeguard and showcase the lake's natural ~~and cultural features.~~ amenities.

Recreation: Utah Lake is a destination spot that provides economic benefits to the area and is perceived positively by local residents and other visitors. Multiple access points and a variety of well-maintained facilities offer visitors many options that support active recreation (e.g., parks, sandy swimming beaches, boat launches, marinas, campsites, fishing/hunting, and special events); passive recreation (e.g., natural areas, trails, and boardwalks); educational opportunities (e.g., interpretive sites and research areas); and supporting amenities (e.g., concessions, shops, overnight accommodations, and roads) that both safeguard and showcase the lake's natural and cultural features.

Public Facilities

The last Broad Vision Statement is included because the scope of services for the Master Plan as defined in the Interlocal Agreements had a section titled "Public Facilities" and so it was determined there needed to be a Vision Statement for that area. There were originally six specific areas listed in the Agreement with one of them being "Shorelines" which was combined with "Land Use" to satisfy the Interlocal Agreement. Discussion followed. There was an inquiry to the document titled 'Vision Statements without Opportunities. " It was stated that the handout was a document only to discuss.

Mr. Wham moved to approve the Public Facilities Vision Statement as proposed and it was seconded by Mr. Tripp. Motion was passed unanimously.

Public facilities: Public facilities are sufficient to meet the objectives of the other vision statements while preserving the ecological integrity of the lake.

Mr. Beckstom expressed appreciation to everyone for their input in this exercise to approve these Vision Statements and they will be presented to the Governing Board. Due to time constraints Mr. Beckstom suggested that another meeting be scheduled to continue discussion of the Specific Vision Statements. Options were considered. The Specific Vision Statements are essentially going to become the goals by which the Visions are implemented. Some of the statements can possibly be combined.

Ideally the purpose of the review of the Specific Vision Statements will be to focus on the Operations and Constraints Tables. Some of the questions that will be addressed are if all the opportunities to be implemented in the various visions have been identified and if the constraints that represent possible obstacles to the implementation of these opportunities have been appropriately identified.

Dr. LaVere Merritt commented that there is a point where the reality and practicality needs to be considered. Mr. Keleher stated that the Vision Statement should drive the Opportunities and not the other way around. There was discussion. In regard to the inconsistencies in the tables it was stated that they are working tables and written by multiple authors. Mr. Beckstrom reminded all that it is a working document. The key now is to try to identify all the opportunities and constraints and decide which are achievable and sustainable. The opportunities and constraints need to be prioritized.

Mr. Cox agreed with Dr. Merritt that the opportunities need to be reviewed and looked at with the reality of the visions. For example the elimination of the carp is a reality.

Mr. Keleher inquired how the Technical Committee should sequence their reviews and that was discussed.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the starting point is to first look at the vision statements and then look at the opportunities and constraints to see if they are accurate, all inclusive and or if something is missing.

Mr. Cox stated that an email will be sent to the members that will be a guide on how to review the Vision Statements and the Opportunities and Constraints Tables. It was to be discussed today but wasn't due to the time constraints.

Mr. Price suggested that the next meeting to continue discussion on the document be held as a Technical Committee meeting on Monday, September 8th at 8:00 A.M. Written feedback can be sent from Technical Committee and Subcommittee members to Mr. Price prior to the meeting.

3. June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program Update.

Mr. Michael Mills reported that this week the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) is beginning construction in the Hobble Creek area by I-15 to relocate and reconstruct a stream channel that will provide a natural spawning and rearing habitat for the June Sucker. UTA is funding the majority of the construction to receive mitigation credit for another project. JSRIP anticipates the construction to be finished in two months.

The other item of update was that the JSRIP issued a RFP for carp removal in June. They received eight proposals. Some of the proposals had very high costs and others didn't really address the whole process of catching the fish, marketing them and disposing of them. In the process they received one proposal that proposed to do the removal and marketing of the fish without using the state funds that had been acquired by JSRIP. Some aspects of that proposal required further evaluation. JSRIP decided not to award anything based on the RFP. Instead the state has issued an additional commercial fishing permit to the party to start fishing on Utah Lake. This party does have several bench marks that they will have to meet. They are required to remove 1.6 million pounds of carp by the end of January or the certificate of registration won't be renewed. If that happens then the JSRIP would probably reissue another RFP. It is possible that this group that was granted the permit may be able to fulfill its obligation. It was asked what this company's incentive is to reach the benchmark. Mr. Mills said they would be allowed to continue to harvest the fish and they have several ideas on marketing streams including human consumption, bio-fuel and fish meal. The money that was originally allocated towards the RFP is currently being held pending the success of this project. Responding to Mr. Hunter, Mr. Mills reported that this company is based out of Lindon Marina.

5. Other Business.

6. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Mon., Sept 22, 2008, 9:30 AM.

The next meeting will be held on September 8 at 8:00 A.M. and basically that meeting will be to go over the Master Plan material not covered in today's agenda.

7. Adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 A.M.