



**UTAH LAKE COMMISSION  
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

Monday, January 24, 2011, 8:30 A.M.  
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 211  
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

**ATTENDEES:**

Greg Beckstrom, Provo City  
Ben Bloodworth, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands  
Chris Tschirki, Orem City  
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove City  
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City  
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City  
Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources  
Ann Merrill, State Division of Water Resources  
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery

**ATTENDEES:**

Steve Mumford, Eagle Mountain City  
Richard Nielson, Utah County  
Douglas Sakaguchi, Department of Natural Resources  
Sarah Sutherland, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
Dave M. Wham, Division of Water Quality  
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

**VISITORS:**

Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs HOA

**ABSENT:**

American Fork City, Genola Town, Highland City, Lindon City, Mapleton City, Utah Lake Water Users, Santaquin City, Springville City, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Utah Division of Parks and Recreation, Vineyard Town, Woodland Hills Town.

**1. Welcome.**

Technical Committee Chairman, Greg Beckstrom, called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

**2. Review and approve minutes from the November 15, 2010 meeting.**

Mr. Beckstrom asked for discussion or corrections on the November 15, 2010, minutes. Mr. Chris Keleher had a correction, top of page nine, changing traffic transportation to read "mass transit." Mr. Lee Hansen said a sentence in the middle of page seven and reads "The desire to take a toll road is diminished when only a few miles are saved in cutting across the lake and time and money are not saved when it the bridge was located farther south, there is greater benefit." (This was sent via email, as Dr. Hansen did not remember the correction during the meeting). The correction reads, "Mr. Jackson answered Mr. Cowie's question about a different termination point for the Lake Crossing. The state requested a study pertaining to air quality impacts of the bridge. He had a meeting about a year ago the Utah Lake Commission Executive Committee, which had a representative from the state. They discussed the bridge development and toll in Saratoga Springs with numbers as well as reviewing the previous studies. If the bridge was brought further south to the Springville area, it does better in the modeling because it cuts distance and makes a shortcut more valuable. However, the further north the bridge is located, the distance cutting

across the lake is not saving very much in time, distance, or money, especially as a toll road. If the bridge were located farther south, the benefit would be greater. Mr. R. Price said a review team put together by FFSL had representatives from UDOT. MAG's presentation will be considered by FFSL along with the other issues they are trying to consider."

Dr. Hansen motioned to approve the minutes of November 15, 2010 as corrected, seconded by Mr. Jim Hewitson, motion carried and passed unanimously.

Mr. Beckstrom complimented Carin Green for the minutes during such a hard meeting. Mr. Price commented the minutes were originally 24 pages, and were condensed to ten.

### **3. Discuss comments received from Governing Board members regarding the Utah Lake Model Ordinance.**

Mr. Beckstrom explained the Governing Board reviewed the model ordinance documents in their November meeting, but wanted additional time to discuss the aspects of the ordinance with their city staff, councils, and to solicit feedback. Comments received by Mr. Price were summarized into one page. Mr. Price, Mr. Beckstrom, and Mr. Keleher reviewed the changes and after discussions with the Executive Committee, a few of the changes were deemed necessary. The updated model ordinance documents were dated January 20. Any comments for changes were redlined and incorporated into the documents. Changes that were not incorporated were deemed to be best addressed at the local level, not in the model ordinance.

The Technical Committee reviewed the recommendations. On page one, line 9, another purpose of the ordinance was added stating, "To preserve and improve the use water quality of Utah Lake." The change appears in both the accompanying document and the ordinance.

The second specific comment, on page one, line 19, regards concerns of how the Commission could support land acquisition or land dedication. Mr. Beckstrom said the preliminary evaluation was that those concerns were largely addressed in section 9.0 of the ordinance, which refers to the ownership of open land and recognizing the individual communities would handle this issue, and would vary from community to community. It would be difficult to modify section 9 of the model ordinance to address the specific concern.

On page two, line 33, the word, "source" was added, which is a Technical addition. Comments on page six, line 4, regarding discussion on street standards in a subdivision, questions regarding open farmland space, and issues regarding potential environmental contamination are best addressed by the local communities. After the model ordinance is finalized, communities may find portions overlap and duplicate existing standards, so they may decide to delete that section from this ordinance. It will be difficult to modify the ordinance to be ideally suited to address each in every community at greater levels of detail. On page eight, line 4, is a Technical glitch that was not caught the first time and some words are deleted to further clarify and not diminish the language. On page eight, line 33, were issues regarding insuring the trail accommodated for equestrian and non-motorized uses. On page nine, line 17, it was asked if the MAG trail standards document should be referred to as an exhibit.

The Committee understands the goal of the master plan to have a Utah Lake Trail circumnavigating the entire Utah Lake. There are formal plans for completion of a trail to connect the mouth of Provo River to Jordan River at the north end of the county. The county has taken the lead in preparing the plans and it will essentially be a county-operated and maintained trail. In the acquisition of lands, the county possibly has obtained the easement. Nothing formal has been reached regarding the other 3/4 length of the trail to go around the south eastern and western portions of the lake.

The intention of the attachment of the Utah Lake non-motorized standards dated November 28, 2005, has been included as a reference so that in the future when Mountainlands and/or Utah County decides it needs to be updated or revised, it can be done without each individual community having to revise or amend the ordinance. They will not need to go through the legislative process of revising their

development ordinances to avoid any inconsistencies with development standards if the standards are used as a reference. This informational document will give people pictures of what the trail is going to be like without having each individual community adopt it legislatively into their ordinances.

Dr. Hansen asked if there is a possibility of asking the county to notify the cities when changes are made in the document. Mr. Beckstrom said the county deals with seven communities, Provo, Orem, Lindon, American Fork, Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Vineyard. He asked Mr. Richard Nielson to explain the process and methodology how the county was going to interact with the seven communities regarding the trail, assuming communities will be linking their municipal trail system into the county trail system at some locations, and the type of anticipated communication with the communities regarding the trail.

Mr. Nielson said the trail layout was completed a few years ago from Provo River all the way to Jordan River. The communities were asked for input on the alignment and were given a copy of the document when everything was done. If the communities needed a copy, the county would provide the document. He suggested the document prepared by URS two years ago be given to every Utah Lake stakeholder and if there are any concerns with the alignment or trail cross section, they could be addressed in the Technical Committee. Mr. Price said when trails are proposed, the Commission would become involved to check and make sure MAG's trail standards, and the county's expectations are current.

Mr. Tschirki asked if some of the money was going to come from MAG for the trail. Orem had done a couple of trails with MAG and they regulate the standards. Mr. Nielson said when developments begin in areas where the trail would be established, the various communities should be contacted so the ordinance's trail corridor is preserved. Mr. Beckstrom said the primary ordinance objective was to preserve a corridor alignment for construction of a trail at some future time, even though funding may not be in place. The ordinance's effect would be in terms of preserving the corridor in particular with Saratoga Springs as developments extend along the west side of the lake. Provo, Springville, Orem, or where development occurs along the lakeshore area or near the shoreline, and development is not part of a formal trail system, there are still corridors preserved so a trail system will ultimately go all the around the lake. Mr. Price said between the Jordan River and Provo Boat Harbor there is a corridor, but 3/4 of it is not yet built.

Dr. Hansen asked if there was any response from Saratoga Springs on the document, as he knew the city council had taken no action on it. Mr. Price said he did not get any feedback. The Commission suggested not having any action taken other than encouraging the city to have an internal review by their staff. He asked Councilman Cecil Tuley, Saratoga Springs Governing Board representative, to talk with Mr. Jim McNulty to see if they had any comments because he had been involved in the process and understands the community can tweak it as needed. Dr. Hansen said he tried to contact Mr. McNulty but had not had any response.

Mr. Beckstrom reminded everyone when the Commission approves the model ordinance it is not a true adopted ordinance, but just a suggestion or recommendation. It is anticipated due to the nature of the development standards and the ordinance format in each community that some massaging of existing ordinances would be needed to meld the model ordinance into each community's ordinances.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if anyone had any concerns with the added red-lined language in the ordinance or companion documents or if there were some additional revisions or amendments needing discussion.

Mr. Tschirki said on page six, section nine, line 31, the word "be" should be deleted. Mr. Price said he would like know if anyone had any comments concerning the fifth purpose proposed by Commissioner Larry Ellertson to improve the use and water quality of Utah Lake as the suggestion was not really covered specifically in any of the previous four uses.

Dr. Hansen asked how the word "use" should to be interpreted. Mr. Price said using the lake for recreational or other activities. The purpose of the ordinance was to create a buffer to allow public access and use the shoreline along on Utah Lake. Dr. Hansen questioned if the wording should be the "use of" and

“water quality of.” Mr. Hewitson asked if it was not covered in any of the other goals. Mr. Price said water quality was not addressed at all in the previous four and asked what the Committee felt.

Mr. Tschirki asked if the questions were answered about the second point on line 19. Mr. Beckstrom said section 9.0, concerns the ownership of land, discusses the options communities have, whether it should be acquisition, dedication, or whether it is maintained by private ownership. As each community has mechanisms or policies already in place, more in-depth detail is not necessary for the model.

Mr. Price said if the question is what support would be available from the Commission, the Commission has limited financial means to purchase easements or land acquisition. The Commission can offer political support or support in applying for grants, but the Commission has limited financial means. Mr. Nielson said a lot of the area is unincorporated and may be annexed into the cities at a future time. To get the cities away from the “takings issues,” the cities can do an annexation agreement making it a condition of the agreement that it becomes a voluntary action between the land owner and the city for easement and there are no issues.

Dr. Hansen asked if it would be good to include Mr. Nielson’s recommendation in the document. Mr. Price asked for further clarification on annexation agreements. Mr. Nielson said the agreement process was used when he worked for Spanish Fork City and worked well, making it an incentive for the landowner.

Mr. Price asked Mr. Beckstrom where the recommendation should be put. Mr. Nielson said it should be a suggestion where there are open spaces and trail abutment zones, and possible city incorporating annexation agreements and Mr. Tschirki suggested under section 9. Mr. Beckstrom said the item should be addressed locally in each individual community with their annexation ordinances or policies and was not sure if it should be included in the model ordinance. He suggested adding language to the companion document pointing the annexation recommendation agreements as an option for the communities to consider and incorporate into their other policies.

Mr. Keleher asked if there were other mechanisms the Committee might want to identify or employ to acquire the area identified for this purpose. Mr. Beckstrom said he did not have a lot of experience with the issue of taking land, but ultimately it becomes one of proportionality of costs of financial impact associated with the take or forfeiture on the impact value of the property relative to the value of the overall development of the project. The trail is as well as other avenues require acquisition of the land including utilities, parks, and street issues. Most communities optimally have some experiences in resolving these issues in their ordinances and policies, which address the acquisition.

Mr. Beckstrom said he did not think another motion was required, but should approve the documents and forward them to the Governing Board. Barring any issues or surprises, it is anticipated the Governing Board will take action on these documents at their meeting on Thursday and approve the documents.

Mr. Tschirki asked who was reviewing the ordinance from a legal perspective and what attorneys were involved. Mr. Price said Jim Carter, the Utah Lake Commission consultant, is an attorney has reviewed the ordinance. If each community’s legal counsel reviewed the ordinance during this stage, there would be multiple legal interpretations. Mr. Carter’s legal experience with planning and consulting experience is all that is needed. The Commission will recommend the municipalities go through an internal review. Mr. Beckstrom said they anticipated attorneys from each community would be involved in the final review before any ordinance or version of the ordinance was formally adopted. Mr. Price said the Commission was providing the municipalities an ordinance that was 90 percent complete, and tried to identify and address the critical issues. Mr. Tschirki asked what the Governing Board’s feelings were regarding the maintenance of the trail and the 50-foot buffer area. Mr. Beckstrom said the portion of the trail between the Provo and Jordan Rivers would largely be a county function. Maintenance on the rest of the trail will evolve as it is built. Ideally, when a trail is around the entire circumference of the lake it will be operated and maintained in the same fashion as Provo River segment.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for any other comments. He said the principal function of the actual trail ordinance is to insure that a corridor is preserved for a trail as development occurs. He said the model

ordinance would be helpful as each community considers how to incorporate it into their own operating and development regulations. He acknowledged the expertise of the Technical Committee.

**4. Presentation from Dave Wham with an update on water quality issues in Utah Lake long-range transportation plan.**

Mr. Beckstrom said the Commission was created and has been in place for almost 4 years. It was at the time the Commission was formally being created there was a TMDL study being conducted. Part of Mr. Wham's update is to discuss the TMDL process as well as the other things DEQ is doing with Utah Lake. Mr. David Wham was prepared to give the report on DEQ's plans as it pertains to Utah Lake and water quality issues, and to bring the Technical Committee up to date.

Mr. David Wham said there was not much status change with the TMDL process. It is in a holding pattern awaiting results of the carp removal efforts which has far reaching impacts on the lake. With changes anticipated in the next few years, DEQ did not proceed with full TMDL load reductions, allocations, etc., or removal.

DEQ is chiefly aware of the large infrastructure costs put on municipalities around the lake if future reduction is implemented. Because of the uncertainty in Utah Lake, what would happen if the nutrients were reduced, what a good nutrient level was, etc., and the anticipated changes, DEQ is still in a holding pattern. DEQ wants to step up their monitoring efforts on the lake as they have sketchy monitoring data, with limited resources, and so are monitoring on an every-other-year basis. From April to October, Utah Lake is monitored for general chemistry, algae, etc. With the algae sampling, DEQ is trying to get a good baseline to establish what conditions are in the lake so if changes were seen with the carp removal project, they would be able to document the changes. DEQ met with Utah State University personnel who do extensive monitoring with a dedicated station on the Great Salt Lake. Using their example, DEQ is seeking to establish a dedicated station on Utah Lake for the monitoring, and is looking at resources to come up with a strategy accomplish their goal.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if DEQ has other sources for finding money other than just directly through the state. Mr. Wham said EPA appropriated some money to do the general state-wide monitoring and DEQ will target some of it on Utah Lake. DEQ uses a small portion SUVMWA grant monies for this purpose of monitoring. (SUVMWA money is part of a loan for purchasing land for a future wastewater plant in the south part of the valley.)

DEQ did additional studies on the sediment of the lake. One of the unanswered questions of the lake is the internally recycling and how much. A lot of nutrients are coming from wastewater plants and tributaries. This leads to the question if the inflows are reduced, a huge internal nutrient cycling might overwhelm any reductions; at least in short-term impacts into the lake. DEQ needs to know what kind of mineralogy there is because it matters how much phosphorus there is. Some basic mineralogy samples were taken and about 60 percent of the samples from 12 sites taken were carbonated minerals. It varies from site to site, but generally the 5-8 percent involved was followed by clay mineralogy and the rest with made up with silica and feldspars. These sites were sampled with the gravity cores and the samples were captured in depth, brought up intact, and then taken it to the lab. The samples are also utilized with a sequential extraction procedure. With the sediment sample, DEQ wants to know how much is loosely bound, how much is calcium carbonates, etc.

Dr. Hansen asked how much carbonate he had. Mr. Wham said in the mineralogy it was 50 to 60 percent. With water rinses to start, we see how much comes off and then how much phosphorus comes off, and then use a weak acid and/or stronger acid. Each of these tests are associated with a mineralogy of whether it is iron bound, calcium bound or we can make inferences on what forms might be available.

The third interesting item was in column tests with varied pH and dissolved oxygen tests. There were nutrient fluxes with getting the sediment column in the field, taking it to a lab, and doing some tests. DEQ was worried about the column effects and the logistics, transportation, and laboratory effects. He had

been working with Dr. Goel and his students doing some sediment oxygen studies on the Jordan River, and others have been doing these where they have the sediment oxygen chambers. During the past summer, the sediment chamber tests were done with pH and dissolved oxygen. The samples were taken and the nutrient fluxes coming off were measured in the different conditions. In Provo Bay a good nutrient flux with ammonia and phosphorus were revealed coming off on the lower pH. It was an innovative approach to do it in situ instead of laboratory to try to get a feel for how many nutrients are going in.

Dr. Hansen said he interpreted the main problem was much of the lake bottom was heterogeneous and varied tremendously from one location to another, and so it was difficult to get an overall picture of the lake. Dr. Hansen had done some research of his own. Mr. Wham said Dr. Hansen's sample sites were targeted near the sewage outfalls. The deep lake sites were consistent in the middle of the lake. He cited Provo Bay with the flow in and out of the bay and the fine sediments that have more clay mineralogy and not so much of the calcium carbonate. Dr. Hansen said they found quite a bit of phosphate associated with the clay mineralogy. Mr. Wham asked if it was with extraction and Dr. Hansen confirmed. He said the indications were that clay was being precipitated in certain areas of the lake. Currently Greg Nielsen was running bottom core samples and is doing age-dating on those. It turns out from preliminary data that the sedimentation of the lake is quite a bit lower than anticipated. Dr. Hansen hoped together they could determine some sort of sedimentation rate.

Mr. Price said Dr. Merritt's sedimentation rate study was the only one of which he was aware. Mr. Wham said they had inconclusive results from age-dating in the past.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if the differences between Provo Bay and the lake area outside of Provo Bay were in sediment mineralogy or in the water quality. Mr. Wham said there were definitely differences in the water quality and sediments are different. With divers in the water and walking around, there seemed to be a lot more organic material there, with enough methane coming off of the bubbles just by walking around. Sediments were more noticeable in Provo Bay in regards to the organic materials. Dr. Hansen said they found something very indicative of that and it was iron sulfate and pyrite in Provo Bay and will only form under anaerobic or anoxic conditions. Mr. Beckstrom asked when they are describing the differences if they are describing them as different or are concluding one is more preferable or desirable than the other. Mr. Wham said desirable preferences. Provo Bay is certainly more nutrient rich and has higher levels of algae than the rest of the lake. It is less acceptable although the algae are food for fish and is related to dissolved oxygen deficits. If there were to be a problem with nutrients, it would be in Provo Bay. Mr. Sakaguchi said because Provo Bay is so productive, there were higher growth rates, and the food was more abundant for the young fish. When Mr. Sakaguchi did studies in the early 1980s, Provo Bay had more organics and more vegetation, and was different from the rest of Utah Lake, which was mostly silt bottom.

Mr. Mills said the June Sucker program had a study in 2004, showing a mass migration with fish having sonic pucks or radio tags. The migration was out of Provo Bay from anoxic conditions moving out into the main lake. Dr. Hansen said when they were sampling in late summer they saw no sign of any fish activity in the Provo Bay, it was far more productive than the rest of the lake with more food resources. Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Wham if the TMDL processes were on hold with the evaluation of the biomass impact associated with carp removal going on for over six years, if they were just gathering more baseline data evaluations. Mr. Wham said yes, unless there were indications something is changing in the lake that would necessitate reopening the TMDL.

Mr. Wham noted DEQ underwent an analysis of all the major wastewater plants in the state and looked at several scenarios of nutrient reduction. Various nutrient reduction scenarios of nitrogen and phosphorus combinations, starting from one that is one mg/l down to lower levels were evaluated. DEQ evaluated the financial impact on the various plants of implementing the actual needed processes to get to the different scenario levels. The report is available on DEQ's website. Essentially the wastewater plants around Utah Lake are in good shape to go to the first tier of nutrient removal. The study was undertaken because of a movement towards national nutrient standards. Currently secondary wastewater treatment

standards for BOD and TSS are being discussed and adding a level that can be achieved at a reasonable cost. DEQ's director wants to see what the estimated costs would be.

Mr. Tschirki asked if DEQ also looked at capital improvements and/or the ongoing maintenance. Mr. Wham said yes to both. Mr. Beckstrom asked if Mr. Wham could provide the report or the link to the report. Mr. Wham will forward it to Mr. Price who will send it to the members of the Committee.

Dr. Hansen said the discussion brought up questions of the bridges steel pilings. He did not know the depth the lake became anaerobic, which could put a lifetime on the steel pilings if there is no mechanism in place for protecting them from corrosion. He did not see any indication from the engineering information. Mr. Price said the pilings were supposed to go deep. Dr. Hansen said the pilings could get into the anaerobic zone and be subject to the sulphate corrosion, which is possibly different from the circumstances described in previous bridges they built. Mr. Beckstrom said this issue would be evaluated.

Mr. Beckstrom thanked Mr. Wham for the update and said the Committee appreciated the work he does. He asked Mr. Wham to send the link to the site so it can be made available to the Committee and the members can access the information.

##### **5 Brainstorm ideas for fun, interesting stories to report on about Utah Lake for our public outreach effort.**

The Commission is creating a new website, which will be more interactive. A goal is to have frequent and interesting updates and facts of Utah Lake such as what people can do at Utah Lake, history, etc, and to keep people informed about Utah Lake. The consultant is asking for ideas about winter fun on Utah Lake. Mr. Price wanted to brainstorm with the Technical Committee about ideas to continue an ongoing communication with the public. He asked for any ideas of what might be fun or any interesting stories that can be communicated to the public.

Mr. Price cited ideas already provided. The Committee gave the following subjects or ideas to be considered:

1. Canadian geese population around Utah Lake, where they are feeding farms at Saratoga Springs.
2. Stories on seasonal birding, migration of the birds, noting a rare bird citing around Utah Lake. It was suggested rather than one story, have multiple stories of birds including the wintering bald eagles, herons, ospreys' orioles, etc.
3. The rare species of garter snakes around Utah Lake.
4. Archeology of Utah Lake, contacting Dr. Joel Janetski, coordinating archeological sites.
5. History stories of Saratoga Springs Resort, Pelican Point, murders, Utah Lake Monster.
6. State park history and purpose.
7. Pony Express trail.
8. Get older citizens together and take oral histories of the lake.
9. Historical flooding of the lake.
10. Geological history of the lake, including Lake Bonneville (Greg Nelson at BYU, expertise with a website and model of how geology formed.) Mr. Hewitson has a map of Lake Bonneville.
11. Faults under the lake.
12. Water quality in the lake.

Mr. Price asked if any further ideas came up to submit them to him via email, for electronic brainstorming.

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

Mr. Price stated the newly purchased Land Tamer for phragmites removal would be here in February. This machine will smash down the phragmites and when lake level rises, it will increase bio-decomposition rate and open up the shoreline for the public. The Land Tamer will be tackling the area next to Geneva Steel and then moving to Saratoga Bay and next to the city's marina for the 2011 project.

Mr. Hewitson asked if the phragmites group was getting any results from the burning. Mr. Price said one of the reasons the Commission purchased the vehicle was because the right conditions needed to be in place to burn. But, with the weather patterns unstable, the air quality standards and other requirements, burning is difficult. If the right conditions are met, it will burn well after it gets going.

Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Mike Mills for an update on the carp removal. Mr. Mills said it had been tough the past couple of months. When the lake froze before Thanksgiving, they tried fishing through the ice, but then it thawed, and they have been fighting bad ice conditions ever since with fluctuating freezing and thawing. Mr. Price asked if they were fishing through the ice at present. Mr. Mills said off and on. It is not as full scale because they can't get the heavy equipment out to the area, but are doing what they can. Mr. Price said last year they had stations and progressed between the stations from day to day. Mr. Mills said with the big trailers, etc. and it was not going as well this year. The problem is the lake gets extremes with highs in the teens, then over 40 degrees, and then changes.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for an update on the bridge proposal from Mr. Ben Bloodworth, asking about the status of the bridge proposal and evaluation. Mr. Bloodworth said the 45-day comment period just closed and they received 200-250 comments. After legal evaluation, more information was obtained to inform the public. Within a few weeks, the whole application will be posted and another 45 days will be opened for public comment. After full disclosure, the public can make better informed comments.

The ID team compiled a large list of questions to send to Mr. Leon Harward to answer. Mr. Price asked if another meeting had been held. Mr. Bloodworth said he didn't think so. He also informed the Technical Committee there were rumors that Representative Ken Sumsion was pushing through some legislation on the bridge. Mr. Price said the Commission was watching closely so they could respond appropriately on the Commission's position. Mr. Bloodworth said to pay attention to the website and to see the entire proposal.

Mr. Price said he, Mr. Beckstrom, and Mr. Keleher have talked about working on formalizing the Commission's position on the issue. Mr. Beckstrom said if Representative Sumsion's bill came to fruition, the Governing Board needs to consider in it in the February meeting. They may want input from Technical Committee, and it would be one thing the Committee would definitely need to talk about.

Mr. Sakaguchi asked if Mr. Leon Harward had recent meetings with the cities involved in the proposed termination points. Mr. Bloodworth said after the MAG's presentation, the termination point at 800 North in Orem shows it to be a poor site secondary to traffic conditions on the freeway. Mr. Beckstrom concurred stating the group's traffic modeling suggested it would be better and have a more positive traffic impact and utilization if the east side connection point was between Orem and Provo as opposed to 800 North in Orem, which would create real negative traffic impacts at 800 North.

Mr. Hewitson asked which way members of the Governing Board were leaning on the issue. Mr. Price said most of the Governing Board participates on the regional transportation planning Committee, and they understand what MAG is saying. It becomes a political question. Would we put up with some traffic congestion and have someone build it for the taxpayer or do we want to have the taxpayer fund it in the future when it is needed more. Mr. Beckstrom said his understanding was if it was going to be done, the Governing Board wants it done in the right way by addressing any environmental issues adequately including the best possible location.

**7. Confirm that the next meeting will be held at the Historic County Courthouse Suite 212 on Monday, February 14, 2011 at 8:30 AM.**

Mr. Beckstrom reminded the members of the Committee that the February meeting was moved one week ahead due to the scheduled meeting falling on holiday of President's Day. Therefore, the Technical Committee would meet on February 14, 2011, at 8:30 a.m. in room 211.

**8. Adjourn.**

Mr. Beckstrom adjourned the Technical Committee Meeting at 10:05 a.m.