



COMMISSION

Technical Committee meeting

Monday, September 8, 2008, 8:00 A.M.

Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 212

51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Bruce Chesnut, Orem, Chairman

Greg Beckstrom, Provo, Vice-Chair

Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

Clyde Naylor, Utah County

Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs

Jim Hewitson, Lehi

Sarah Sutherland, Central UT Water Conservancy District

Brent Wilde, Provo

Nick Jones, Provo

Jim Carter, Logan- Simpson Design

Dave Wham, Dept. of Environmental Quality

Rick Cox, URS

Adam Cowie, Lindon

Ann Merrill, DNR-Div. of Water Resource

Chris Keleher, Dept. of Natural Resources

Michael Mills, JSRIP

Doug Sakaguchi, DNR-Div. of Wildlife Resources

H. Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire & State Lands

Ty Hunter, DNR-Div. of Parks & Recreation

Paul Goodrich, Orem

Jim Price, MAG

Kim Struthers, Lehi

Monique Shurtliff, URS

ABSENT:

American Fork, Genola, Highland, Mapleton, Pleasant Grove, Santaquin, Springville, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vineyard, Woodland Hills, Utah Water Users

1. Welcome and Introductions

The follow-up Technical Committee meeting was called to order by Chairman Bruce Chesnut at 8:05 A.M. He turned the floor over to Mr. Greg Beckstrom, Vice Chair.

Mr. Beckstrom explained that the Broad Vision Statements previously discussed at the August 25, 2008 meeting were approved by the Governing Board at the August 28, 2008 meeting. The Specific Vision Statements will become the goals that are intended to be implemented into the Broad Vision Statements after they have been approved. He outlined that in today's meeting the Specific Vision Statements would be reviewed. The purpose of the review would be to decide if the statements essentially promote and fulfill the Broad Vision Statements. He requested that the discussions concentrate on the content of the Vision Statements rather than the language. During the next week any details in regard to wordsmithing can be forwarded to Mr. Reed Price, Executive Director. The Steering Committee will draft a goal statement that will be presented at the next Technical Committee meeting on September 22nd and then forwarded to the Governing Board on September 25th for their approval.

Specific Vision Statements

Mr. Beckstrom requested that the discussion be conducted by page numbers of the statements.

He said that the Steering Committee had discussed the statements and with the exception of a few of the statements they felt that these statements support the Broad Vision Statements with some word changes.

Page One, Statements 1-10.

Mr. Barry Tripp asked in regard to Statement #5. **Hosted Campgrounds** who would be considered the host. Mr. Beckstrom stated that question would not be answered in the Vision Statement but in the implementation. Discussion followed.

Page Two, Statements 11-23

Mr. Price noted that the Steering Committee had some issues with **#17. Lake Level Fluctuations**. In speaking with Gene Shawcroft, Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD) Mr. Shawcroft requested some word changes. He pointed out that water rights issues as well as natural hydrology primarily dictate lake levels.

The Steering Committee will draft some substitute language that will incorporate natural hydrology and water rights into the statement.

#20. Water Quality and Supply – Mr. Doug Sakaguchi suggested that public facilities (P) should be added to the statement. There was discussion and Mr. Price said the Steering Committee had also discussed the usage of the phrase “for household use” being included in the statement.

#11. Trails – there was discussion if the word “most” in “A continuous trail system for non-motorized use around most of Utah Lake” should be deleted.

Page Three, Statements 24-33

Mr. Tripp proposed that in Statement 26 the word “natural” be inserted before the word “agriculture”. Mr. Beckstrom stated that the Steering Committee had issues with both Items #24 and #33. Regarding Item #24 the perception of the Steering Committee was that it was less of a vision or goal than it was an objective for implementing other vision statements. They recommended that it be deleted as a Vision Statement. He said that it wasn’t because of lack of support.

The Steering Committee also suggested deleting Item #33 because it’s more of a means than an end and is a duplication of Item #19. Chris Keleher added that Item #33 is not tied into any specific need. Discussion followed on how the statements must support the commission goals and how this will help in the future as the Commission supports or does not support proposals from developers.

Mr. Sakaguchi questioned whether Item #32 is too limiting in the phrase “by decreasing water loss by evaporation from Utah Lake” in regard to water savings because there are other methods of water saving. Item #32 will be reviewed and rewritten.

Mr. Beckstrom summarized that with these thirty-one vision statements (with the elimination of #24 and 33) Technical Committee members are encouraged to send any recommendations for additions or changes to Mr. Price by the end of the week. The Steering Committee will be meeting next Monday, September 15 to draft an edited version of these statements based upon all the input received. The Technical Committee will vote on those drafts at the September 22 meeting and then they will be presented at the Governing Board meeting on September 25.

Mr. Price asked everyone to review the statements with the focus that the goals and objectives of their municipality or agency has been addressed. This will be the last opportunity to address these statements.

The floor was then turned over to Mr. Rick Cox to conduct discussion on the Opportunities and Constraints. He reiterated that the language was not the focal point in today’s discussion but to make sure that all the Opportunities and Constraints have been addressed.

OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS.

Questions/Issue to Address:

General:

1. Is it acceptable to NOT “zone areas of the lake for some opportunities but identify other areas that require protection and preservation for other opportunities? For example, preserve area(s) in Provo Bay for wildlife preserves because the existing diversity is greatest and not replaceable.

Mr. Tripp related how Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL) had designated certain areas up in Salt Lake for such things as mineral extraction, wildlife, etc. in regard to sovereign lands. There was discussion concerning setting management areas, recreational sites, and habitat in regard to sovereign lands that FFSL have jurisdiction over, and how that was applied to the Great Salt Lake Master Plan and could be applied to the Utah Lake Master Plan. Mr. Jim Carter summarized some of the ways they approached evaluating the management plans for the Great Salt Lake Master Plan. They tried to provide guidance with the geographical areas.

It was suggested that the consultants work with FFSL in the the zoning of the areas in the lake itself and also the areas surrounding the lake that are within the study area. Mr. Tripp said the position of the FFSL has always been not to trump what is happening around the shoreline and they always try to go along with the municipalities’ management. Mr. Cox summarized that there would be a map of the entire lake showing restricted zones and it would also show zoning for different areas of the lake proposed for other uses as long as certain criteria is met.

The land beyond the sovereign land boundaries have already been determined by each municipality. Mr. Price said that the Commission is not going to dictate to them how to zone the areas beyond the study area, but wants the sovereign areas to blend in with those current zones of the municipalities and will want to zone those lands so that they can be changed in the future.

2. Is it acceptable to have goals with no Objectives to accomplish goals?

Mr. Cox stated that previously a working document was sent out entitled “Vision Statements without Opportunities”. Mr. Beckstrom put forth an example that emphasized that one can have goals and not necessary the means or opportunities to achieve that goal at the present time, but that doesn’t cease to still be a desired goal. There are some of those goals associated with the Master Plan right now that are worth pursuing and should remain in the Master Plan.

3. Is it acceptable to have Goals supported only by policies that state that additional study is needed before developing specific objectives?

Mr. Keleher stated that he thought objectives could be identified for many of the Specific Vision Statements that don’t have any right now. There was discussion and it was agreed that the specific objectives cannot always be listed. Mr. Hansen cited one example where additional study is needed is the removal of the phragmites. Discussion continued on the many things that are going on that could be listed as objectives and need to be added. The opportunity can still be identified even when information is lacking and that will provide guidance to where study needs to be done.

Transportation

Transportation Corridor

1. Should the Transportation Corridor across Utah Lake opportunities be removed as an opportunity because having it as an objective conflicts with Vision Statement to have Commission participate in planning process?

Mr. Cox initiated discussion on whether or not it is appropriate to include the transportation corridor plans on the map. In the Vision Statement it says that the Commission will participate in the planning process for any Utah Lake transportation corridors. There are actual objectives to having a transportation corridor on the transportation map. These objectives were derived from public

involvement and from the Visioning Workshop. Mr. Nick Jones reviewed that UDOT is doing an EIS on this issue as mandated by the Legislature. Discussion followed on whether to remove the objective in order for the Commission to remain neutral or by not addressing it if it could be construed that the Commission is opposed a corridor.

Mr. Price put forth the question if having the transportation corridor opportunity helps accomplish the Broad Vision Statement.

Following discussion there was a consensus that the Specific Vision Statement reading “The Utah Lake commission has a significant role in transportation system planning resulting in solutions that respect the ecological integrity of Utah Lake while accommodating anticipated population growth and demographic changes in the area” should remain as is, but a specific line on the map should not be identified.

2. If removed, does the Technical Committee want to include a list of constraints that can be used by the Commission in participating in the planning process and are there more than those listed?

Mr. Cox questioned if whether or not as Mr. Price participates in the planning processes for transportation issues he should have identified constraints from which to refer. Discussion followed and Mr. Jim Price commented that the Utah Lake Commission is going to want to be actively involved in the processes of the transportation corridor studies. Even though the studies are yet to be done he felt the Commission would want to define objectives in the Master Plan.

Currently in the Opportunities and Constraints Tables there are Constraints listed from a-q. They are preliminary concerns. Mr. Jim Price pointed out that any process for any crossing will include what the Master Plan says about the lake. For the lake to have a voice in the planning process it needs to have verbiage in the Master Plan. Mr. Brent Wilde commented that even though the Commission wants to stay neutral right now they will want to have some evaluation criteria in place for if, and when, future plans are proposed.

Mr. Keleher suggested that Constraints k-m that begin with the phrase “negative impacts” be changed and the word “negative” be deleted.

Further modifications were requested to be sent to Mr. Price. Mr. Hansen commented that everything that should be in the list will not be identified and some language needs to be included that will allow for those future concerns.

North/South Corridor West of Utah Lake

Even though the North/South Corridor is not part of the lake it does have impact because it provides access to the lake. Mr. Keleher stated that there are a lot of activities outside the study area that do impact the study area and suggested the North/South Corridor not be specifically listed in the Master Plan. Mr. Hansen brought up the fact that a lack of exit ramps could directly affect the study area. Discussion included ideas about the inclusion of this topic being outside of the study area and yet can conflict the goals of the Commission if not addressed at all. It was decided that an awareness of the corridor study could be addressed and that the Commission could state the Commission’s awareness in the text without making it an objective. There was agreement to leave it open ended to even extend beyond transportation issues.

Provo Bay Transportation Corridor

1. What is the motivation for this opportunity? Is it strictly transportation?

This feature was suggested in association with diking Provo Bay. It was suggested that the challenge is that there are multiple goals in the statement and that a solution of this issue should be addressed in the same way as the North/South Corridor issue was resolved. Mr. Price commented that this corridor should be treated in the same way as a lake crossing by noting the awareness of the proposal, listing the possible constraints, and stating that other studies that may come in the future.

2. Are constraints too great for benefits to justify diking of the bay? Or warrant further study?

Mr. Cox asked if diking, excluding transportation issues, should remain as an objective. Some of the reasons for diking that were discussed in the workshops were to sustain lake levels in Provo Bay, maintain wetlands, recreational reasons, etc. In discussion it was suggested that the diking of Provo Bay would be included in the General Vision Statement with some wordsmithing. A general consensus was that it was warranted to discuss diking, but that the statement should be broad and addressed in a general nature. It needs to stay on the list but it can be stated that it would require additional study.

Trails

1. Are all the benefits and constraints identified?

Mr. Cox asked everyone to refer to Item #5 regarding a complete non-motorized trail system around the lake listed in the Transportation Opportunities and Constraints Table and to review the constraints. There was discussion regarding how to identify private property rights in the constraints without putting a negative connotation on it. Mr. Carter agreed that since the lake is surrounded by private property that the property would have to be acquired in order to build a trail, but it would be beneficial to phrase the constraint by not identifying the possibility of “condemnation”. It was suggested that it either state that the Commission does not have condemnation authority or make no reference.

Natural Resources

Island from Dredging Material for Bird Habitat and Reduce Evaporation.

1. What is (are) the motivation(s) for this opportunity? Birds, recreation, reduced evaporation, dredging?

Points of discussion included that this subject could be couched in **Item #19 – Natural Features Enhancement**. Ideas that have been brought up could be listed and stated that future studies would be needed. Issues associated with making policy need to be presented to the Governing Board. Discussion continued on the motivation for dredging an island in Utah Lake. Mr. Carter suggested that ideas that have been presented be listed and prioritized. Motivations and potential benefits should be considered as well.

It was summarized to couch this item under Item #19, not make it an objective, and list concerns or issues that should be addressed if someone were to make a proposal for an island.

Research Facilities and Science Lab

1. Is it important to identify a site or area now to protect it for this purpose? Or just establishing criteria (benefits and constraints) sufficient for the Master Plan?

Discussion points included that some locations should be identified that could be good locations. A few locations could be identified that meet certain criteria that would be good for a research facility but not exclusively. Some research facilities are already established on the Lake but they are not specific to lake research. Some potential areas should also be stipulated.

Wetland Preserves.

1. There are multiple opportunities for wildlife and/or wetland preserves. Should some or all those locations identified be protected or preserved for these purposes?

There was discussion on the areas that have been identified for wildlife and/or wetland preserves on the map. Points of the discussion included sovereign lands predominated by the state, acquired lands, private owned lands, lands that are already established as wildlife/wetlands, and non-sovereign lands. It was suggested that suitable lands be outlined but not set as a goal to be protected. It was suggested that

it would be highly useful to identify the criteria that would identify those areas that are a high priority for preservation. Those areas that have already been identified or that have been designated by other organizations for preservation should be noted.

In summary it was stated that in developing criteria for designating preservation that it will allow areas to be shown on the map that are suitable for development of recreational, wildlife and other specific items. It was also suggested to be careful to not designate too much.

Reroute Provo River to Restore Habitat

1. What are benefits and vision statement met by this alternative?

There was discussion about the meander line. Mr. Price said that the Commission is strongly urged to protect the Provo River. Mr. Keleher suggested that this item falls under Item #19. This opportunity will be removed as it is already covered in another item.

Land Use

1. Will Utah County Communities support coordinated management of land uses around Utah Lake?

I.E. is there support for a model shoreline protection ordinance?

It was agreed that there would obviously be support from the Utah County communities for this issue. Mr. Wilde pointed out that as the policy information is delivered to the respective municipalities and agencies that it would be helpful for it to be explicit in order to have it adopted. It was stated that the presentation to the cities should be presented as a supplemental policy to those city policies already in effect.

3. Is there general support for a lakeshore no-build buffer around the Lake among the bordering communities and Utah County?

Discussion was invited on the buffer zone. It was stated that flood control regulations alone provide a buffer zone and there are other regulations that also address this item.

2. Does the commission support Lake-based commercial development provided the project meets FFSL requirements for sovereign Lands? If so, where, and under what conditions?

Mr. Price said this is a policy question. He stated that he thought FFSL would be supportive of this as long as it is identified now. There are zoning questions. The Commission will not want to take a prohibitive stance. FFSL will have more authority on this. The Provo Airport is the only commercial development that has been identified on the map. It was suggested to discuss the opportunities in the document, but not to identify them on the map.

Recreation

1. Should improving existing beach areas, such as Sandy and Lincoln Beaches be a priority in comparison to other beach opportunities? What should be criteria...existing or more dispersed locations?

The two beaches, Sandy and Lincoln, are currently identified on the map. Discussion followed whether they should be identified and if others that have potential to be developed should be added. It was pointed out that Lincoln Beach is all rock and may not be considered a beach by some people. Some beach areas can be identified by defining criteria as to define whether the area can be developed as a sandy beach or if it provides public access to the lake. It was suggested that the term "beach" could be defined as having sand and be rock-free. This item could be an opportunity to identify land for future development, particularly on the west side of the lake. Discussion continued in regard to the Commission having an opportunity to identify accessible shoreline for other reasons such as picnicking or swimming.

2. Is there support for a continuous trail system around the Lake? If so, what factors should be used to identify and preserve trail corridors?

Mr. Carter commented that they had much interest in making a continuous trail system around the Lake a high priority. Discussion pointed out that people used to be able to walk completely around the Lake but that is no longer possible. There is a lot of interest and demand for this trail.

3. What factors should be considered when identifying sites for new marinas? What criteria (benefits and constraints) should be used to assess future proposals? Are there sites that need to be preserved because they uniquely meet?

There was discussion on the many constraints that would affect identifying new marinas, i.e. dredging, parking, and access. Mr. Hunter commented that he felt there is more of a demand for parking at the existing marinas rather than for new marinas. Changing public perception of the lake will increase the demand for more parking and access and will require expansion of existing facilities or establishing new facilities. In defining what a marina is as opposed to a boat launch a marina usually connotes more fully developed facilities and power boat launching possibilities.

Areas for additional boat launches that were suggested as options included in the knolls, the south end, and Saratoga Springs.

4. Are there existing parks or beaches that should be improved to provide camping? If so which ones? Are there potential new sites suitable for camping facilities? If so, where are they and what steps should be taken to preserve those sites?

Mr. Hunter said that the camping interests decrease after the 24th of July and always depend on the water level. Mr. Carter asked if the areas suggested were feasible sites. Mr. Hewitson commented that much of the west side could be developed into camping facilities. Points of discussion concerned identifying possible future locations and securing access for expansions and improvements.

Mr. Cox thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting and requested all other comments to be sent to Mr. Price as soon as possible. Mr. Beckstrom emphasized that all comments, additions or wordsmithing suggestions on the 31 Specific Vision Statements need to be in by the end of the week to Mr. Price. He will prepare them for the Steering Committee to edit on the following Monday. They will be presented to the Executive Committee for approval on September 18th and then be on the agenda for the next Governing Board meeting at the end of the month.

Comments on the Opportunities and Constraints are also welcome.

In the final document there will be a section that will be called Objectives, Goals and Policies.

The Committee was reminded that the next Technical Committee meeting on September 22 will be held at 8:30 A.M. Mr. Chesnut adjourned the meeting at 10:54 A.M.