



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
Monday, February 22, 2010, 8:30 A.M.  
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 211  
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

**ATTENDEES:**

Greg Beckstrom, Provo City  
Bruce Chesnut, Orem City  
Adam Cowie, Lindon City  
Howard Denney, American Fork City  
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove City  
Ben Bloodworth, Division of Forestry, Fire & State  
Lands  
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City  
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City  
Ty Hunter, Division of Parks and Recreation  
Jerry Johnson, Woodland Hills Town  
Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources  
Ann Merrill, Division of Water Resources  
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery Implementation  
Program  
Steve Mumford, Eagle Mountain City

**ABSENT:**

Genola Town, Highland City, Mapleton City, Santaquin City, Springville City, US Army Corps of Engineers, Vineyard Town, and Utah Lake Water Users.

**1. Welcome and introductions.**

Chairman Bruce Chestnut called the meeting to order at 8:43. He welcomed everyone and asked each to introduce themselves and their organizations as members of the Technical Committee.

**2. Conduct bi-annual election of the Technical Committee chair and vice chair.**

Mr. Chestnut stated the terms of the Chair and Vice Chair were for only two years, and he had served over two years. He said Mr. Reed Price would explain the by-laws and the process.

**ATTENDEES:**

Richard Nielson, Utah County  
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission  
Douglas Sakaguchi, Division of Wildlife Resources  
Sarah Sutherland, Central Utah Water  
Conservancy District  
Dave M. Wham, Division of Water Quality

**VISITORS:**

LaVere Merritt, Emeritus Professor  
Jim Price, Mountainland Association of  
Governments  
Chris Tschirki, Orem City  
Paul Goodrich, Orem City

Mr. Price had overlooked placing the Technical Committee elections on the agenda and handed out updated copies of the agenda. He described the membership of the Technical Committee as identified in the Interlocal Agreement as well as the process of conducting the elections for leadership positions to the Technical Committee members, as well as the responsibilities of the Chair and Vice-Chair. In the Interlocal Agreement, representatives of the Technical Committee are appointed by each member of the Commission, with a few positions assigned to other organizations that are stakeholders of Utah Lake, but are not members of the Commission. These organizations were deemed to have expertise and insight into Utah Lake issues that would be beneficial to discussion of lake-related issues. The Chair and Vice-Chair serve two-year terms and cannot serve successive terms. The leadership's responsibilities include conducting Committee meetings, reporting on projects, considerations, discussion, and recommendations to the Governing Board, and meeting with Mr. Price once a month to formulate the agenda.

Two participants who regularly attended Technical Committee meetings but were not "officially recognized as members" were Chris Keleher of the DNR and Mike Mills of the June Sucker Recovery Program (JSRIP). An application from the Department of Natural Resources requesting that the Governing Board recognize Mr. Keleher and Mr. Mills as members of the Technical Committee, which is a provision allowed by the Interlocal Agreement and bylaws, had recently been received and reviewed by the Executive Committee. Their recommendation supporting the request will be presented to the Governing Board at their next meeting. Mr. Price commented that because of the recommendation to support the request by the Executive Committee, these two individuals could be considered for the leadership roles. He asked for nominations for the Chair and Vice Chair positions. Because of his experience, understanding of the issues, and for continuity, Mr. Price suggested Greg Beckstrom be considered for Chairman.

Mr. Chris Keleher nominated Mr. Greg Beckstrom as Chairman of the Technical Committee, seconded by Mr. Lee Hansen. There were no further nominations. Mr. Hewitson motioned to close the nominations; seconded by Ms. Sarah Sutherland, and the motion carried. Mr. Beckstrom was unanimously elected to a two-year term as Chair of the Technical Committee.

Mr. Price then opened up nominations for the Vice Chair of the Technical Committee. Mr. Adam Cowie nominated Mr. Chris Keleher and was seconded by Mr. Doug Sakaguchi. There were no further nominations. Mr. Hewitson motioned to cease nominations; it was seconded, and the motioned carried. A motion to elect Mr. Keleher as the Technical Committee Vice-Chair was made by Mr. Chesnut and the motion was seconded. Mr. Keleher was unanimously elected to the position of Vice-Chair of the Technical Committee.

Mr. Beckstrom assumed the position as the new Chairman. He noted Mr. Chesnut's service to the committee and the length of his service. He acknowledged everyone's service as members, and stated the Technical Committee sustained the implementation of the Master Plan.

After assuming his role as Chairman, Mr. Beckstrom expressed gratitude to each member for the cumulative work they had rendered. He stated the various interests from the different communities and entities brought together a broad spectrum of representation. He then acknowledged Mr. Chesnut for his years of service and commented he hoped to sustain the open, thorough and civil discussions that were established by Mr. Chesnut and looked forward to working with everyone on the committee.

### **3. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from October 19, 2009.**

Mr. Beckstrom asked if there were corrections to the minutes of October 19, 2009. Mr. Lee Hansen stated there was no "e" in Mr. Conly Hansen's first name. Mr. Keleher noted a correction on page four and was corrected to read, "Mr. Keleher asked that if MAG determined the bridge was a regionally-significant project, then there may be air quality issues which would result in a federal nexus requiring NEPA compliance." Also, on page seven, second paragraph, his comment was corrected to read, "Mr. Keleher suggested a standard could be to not allow new projects which increase the levels of TDS and phosphorous." Mr. Mills' correction on the bottom of page five was corrected to read "The nomination

identifies phosphorous being an issue running off of the bridge as well as total dissolved solids.” With no further corrections, Mr. Beckstrom asked for approval of the minutes. Mr. Hewitson motioned to approve the minutes with noted corrections. This was seconded and the motion was unanimously carried.

**4. Report on carp removal efforts – Contract February to February.**

Mr. Mills announced the NEPA compliance documents were finalized and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USF&WS) had issued a final environmental assessment. With the final document in place, he was able to complete a contract with Loy Fisheries for removal of five million pounds of carp in one year. The contract was signed and began the first part of February. Mr. Bill Loy was hesitant to continue fishing without the document and budget approval. Mr. Mills explained weather is a determining factor in removing the carp. The best result for fishing has been in the winter through the ice. Mr. Price said fishing through the ice had basically stopped because the weather and melting conditions. He noted Mr. Loy was fishing near the Lindon Boat Harbor. According to Mr. Loy the best place to fish are the marinas and inlets, and he was trying to get to the Goshen Bay, but it was touch and go at present.

Mr. Hansen inquired where the carp were being distributed. Mr. Mills explained the majority were being used as food for a mink farm in Benjamin. He said the mink farm had increased their storage capacity and had requested more fish. Other various disposal avenues were being utilized. An uncommon usage came from the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) requesting ten tons to entice eagles for the annual eagle watching event at Farmington Bay.

Mr. Chesnut asked the timeline of the fishing contract. Mr. Mills stated the duration was 12 months, from February to February. Mr. Beckstrom asked what the value of the contract was. Mr. Mills stated it equaled 20 cents a pound and paying some money towards transportation of the fish, and this totaled \$1,040,000. Mr. Beckstrom asked if the five million pound goal was reached, was the contract completed; and Mr. Mills answered yes. Prior to the contract, Mr. Beckstrom asked where the monies came from. Mr. Mills stated it came from a variety of sources. Mr. Beckstrom asked how many pounds were caught before the contract. Mr. Mills said the first removal began in October 2008 and went through April 2009 totaling 1.5 million pounds, the majority in February 2009. In September 2009, fishing began again and went through January 2010 for another 1.5 million, totaling three million pounds already being harvested. Mr. Mills emphasized five million pounds needed to be caught each year in order to make continual progress towards the goal. He felt it was a pilot fishing program prior to the contract signing. He encouraged everyone to look to the future of the project. He stated in order to show success, removal efforts needed to be continuous.

Mr. Beckstrom asked what indications the fishing company had given to increase the magnitude of the carp removal. Mr. Mills stated Loy Fisheries had acquired larger equipment to increase catch and more mechanized equipment to improve efficiency. Mr. Chesnut said fishing in the future was based on available funding. He asked if JSRIP would like to see funds for a five to seven year project. Mr. Mills said yes because five to seven years would be needed to effectively have an impact on the carp. The present funds received from the US Fish and Wildlife Services (USF&WS) needed to be matched at a 2:1 ratio with a non-federal source. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) had been the main source for the matching funds. He explained JSRIP had already applied for another million dollars from the USFWS in order to continue funding. If this grant is obtained, this could cover JSRIP carp project through year two. Mr. Chestnut asked the funding was a year-to-year situation. Mr. Mills said that currently it was, but he hoped to get away from that model.

Mr. Johnson asked how many pounds of carp were in the lake. Mr. Mills estimated a total population of 7-8 million at an average weight of 5.8 pounds. Mr. Johnson asked if harvesting would diminish towards the end of the goal with the decrease in the carp population. Mr. Mills stated methods were going to change as diminishing returns progressed. Other states which had similar projects paid a higher price per pound to reach the goal and continue fishing. He explained a food web study done previously showed a lot

of predation on the small carp in the lake. Natural changes would occur as the carp population diminished and natural wildlife would become more aggressive, with channel catfish being the main predator on the small carp. After the planned program is completed, maintenance program will be implemented on an incremental basis, to remove several hundred thousand pounds of carp to sustain the reduction efforts. Through all these efforts JSRIP plans to keep pushing the carp population down.

Mr. Hansen asked if JSRIP planned to introduce or increase the population of other fish species. Mr. Mills replied that there were no plans, stating Utah Lake already had a lot of predator fish. When the caught fish are brought in, there are large-sized walleye and white bass, which is the second predator fish in the lake. As these predator fish numbers increase, they also would devour the small carp. It was his belief Utah Lake had enough species present without introducing new ones.

Mr. Price commented his aunt, who lives in the Chicago area, had said the carp removal efforts on Utah Lake had been in the Chicago media recently. Mr. Price felt this media exposure was a compliment to what was being achieved. Mr. Mills stated after the USFWS released the environmental assessment, the New York Times had an article on Utah Lake and the removal of the carp, and this article had generated a lot of interest. He said media exposure will only continue to spread and grow.

#### **5. Report on bridge proposal development.**

Mr. Price reported on the progress of the bridge proposal. He reviewed the bridge proposal's history to the new members of the committee including describing the application and nomination processes, public comments, and the decision that would come from Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL). FFSL and the Utah Lake Commission are now reviewing and addressing the public comments. He reported Dave Grierson, Planner with FFSL, reported the division had chosen the competitive bid route to see if there were other specific-use proposals to utilize this specific stretch of sovereign land. Mr. Grierson was preparing an RFP announcement for competitive bids to run in the newspapers. The RFP would be released in the near future.

Mr. Price stated despite the recent television and newspaper announcements; the bridge construction was not a few months away. Mr. Price said the media reports were incorrect and the proposal was still undergoing a review process. The Technical Committee will begin a process to evaluate the goals and objectives of the Master Plan and determine if this bridge proposal would help achieve the goals or have a negative impact.

Mr. Chesnut asked what the timeline for the RFP was and Mr. Price stated a preliminary copy he reviewed showed March 31, 2010 as the deadline. Mr. Sakaguchi remembered initially Orem and Saratoga Springs City were opposed to the proposal of the bridge. Mr. Chesnut clarified Orem wanted more information about traffic generation, origination numbers, impacts, and other information before giving support. Mr. Price explained Anderson Development and Vineyard had expressed support for the bridge. However, former Mayor Parker of Saratoga Springs was opposed to the bridge and disagreed with information submitted by Utah Crossing, Inc. concerning the landing points. As a mayoral candidate, Mia Love had campaigned in support of the bridge; however, since being elected no official decision has come from Saratoga Springs. Mr. Hansen concurred. Mr. Price noted a lot of improvements needed to be funded by Saratoga Springs City and currently money for the projects were not available. The Executive Committee is requesting MAG to become more involved in determining how the bridge impacts the long-range transportation plans, especially as it is currently only identified as a vision project.

Mr. Johnson asked if the Technical Committee had made any recommendations from the Governing Board, or if the decision was still open. Mr. Price stated more discussion and evaluation of the concerns was needed before any recommendations are made. He reiterated the Commission does not support or oppose the project and until the issues are studied, a recommendation would not be forthcoming. After the Technical Committee makes a recommendation to them, the Governing Board will have the final decision.

**6. Discussion on the bridge proposal's affect on the goals of the Utah Lake Master Plan.**

Mr. Price explained that the Technical Committee would begin to evaluate the effect a bridge or crossing of Utah Lake would have on the ability to achieve the goals and objectives of the Utah Lake Master Plan. A crossing might assist in achieving some goals, and inhibit others. Prior to this meeting, Mr. Price had taken the High Priority Goals of the Master Plan and given each goal a preliminary score using a scale of -2 to +2. Looking at the broader issue of any lake crossing, and not at the one that is being proposed, he evaluated and determined whether he felt the goal would be either benefited by or negatively impacted by a crossing of Utah Lake. Each identified goal was given a ranking number: zero being neutral (neither hindering nor benefitting the high priority goals); ranking of -1 to -2 would identify a definite negative impact on the goals; and a +1 or +2 would contribute to achieving the goals. These rankings could then be applied to specific proposals such as the Utah Crossing, Inc. proposal

Mr. Beckstrom stated this preliminary dialog would a fruitful preparation for the Committee in formulating a specific recommendation to the Governing Board either for or against Mr. Harward's proposal. He wanted the issues, comments, thoughts and concerns on the record prior to addressing the specific bridge proposal. Mr. Hansen clarified the discussion be considered and limited to bridge crossings.

Mr. Sakaguchi addressed the first high priority goal, Natural Resources Goal Number 4, Objective N.4.1. He said a crossing of Utah Lake would bring aquatic invasive species which would attach themselves to objects in the water. These could be brought in by boats, barges, or equipment. Disinfecting these items would prevent the invasion. However, with the magnitude of the required building machinery, he felt these would definitely bring invasive species in. He suggested ranking it a negative rather than zero, as Mr. Price has suggested.

Mr. Merritt stated the invasive species, i.e., mussels; flourish best under constant current. With the bridge multiple tiers, the mussels would have a favorable habitat and flourish. Mr. Price felt this concern could be mitigated by cleaning of the equipment and requiring quarantine for a required number of days. Mr. Merritt felt it could be done and should be done. Mr. Beckstrom believed this was public education awareness and asked what was already in place to combat this problem. Mr. Hunter stated it was through a public education-type approach. He supported the suggested requirement, but said self-certification would be needed, completed on a daily basis, and have routine inspections of the decontamination of the boats and machinery. With the commercial scale of boats coming to build a crossing, they should be responsible for their own decontamination; however, DWR should monitor the inspections. Mr. Keleher felt the score should be a negative unless the application states they will address and fund the decontamination.

Mr. Price commented his scale may be too narrow and could be expanded from a -5 to +5, and if expanded, this impact would possibly rank as a -2. Mr. Beckstrom suggested describing reasons for the negative interpretations raised and these be communicated to the proponents. He also agreed enlarging the scale and/or color coding.

Mr. Price asked if any negative ranking should be based on any foreseen ability to mitigate concerns or issues. Mr. Wham asked if the Committee's discussion was only concerning primary or involved secondary impacts, such as growth. Mr. Price agreed all impacts should be addressed if they involve the Utah Lake Master Plan.

Mr. Wham vocalized a concern his department wanted addressed. He felt FFSL should ask for an impact assessment. The proponent should be responsible in assessing all impacts and providing mitigating measures, but so far, Utah Lake Crossing has skirted this request. Mr. Beckstrom believed primary and secondary impacts should be evaluated, but mainly the Technical Committee should address the impacts associated with the Utah Lake Master Plan. Mr. Wham countered the transportation across the lake would lessen the shore-line, open up additional growth patterns on both sides of the lake requiring more infrastructure, and present additional costs to the municipalities. Mr. Goodrich believed MAG should do an

air quality impact analysis considering Utah County inversions and other air quality issues. Mr. J. Price reported the study was already completed, showing traffic and air quality impacts would be minimal. Mr. Bloodworth felt the bridge would be a vector bringing negative land-invasive species from the east side of the lake to the west side, and vice-versa.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for discussion on Land Use Goal 4 – Land Acquisition and Management. Mr. Goodrich was concerned about public versus private roads. The Committee discussed the benefits and negative impact of public versus private roads and who had jurisdiction, e.g., UDOT, Orem, etc. Mr. Beckstrom questioned whether the Committee could stipulate revenues obtained from the lease of the bridge could go to a specific purpose, such as land acquisition for open spaces along the shoreline. Mr. J. Price wondered if there was a goal to purchase land for public use. Mr. R. Price said sections around the lake had been identified, and if they became available, they would be purchased. He stated with any lake-related development, the Commission would like to see open spaces incorporated into the planning.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for discussion on Land Use Goal 1 - Coordinated Land Use Planning. Mr. Beckstrom expressed his interpretation the goals and rankings should be evaluated if it would make it easier or harder for the Commission to implement the identified goals. These could be applied to any proposal.

Mr. Goodrich vocalized concern the proponent of the project had not communicated with the affected local municipalities. In defense of Mr. Harward, Mr. Price said he had tried, but some mayors put off him off until the impacts of the bridge were understood. Mr. Hansen believed a negative rank should be given until further information, such as a traffic study, is completed. Mr. Goodrich said the Commission should have origin and destination, traffic, and impact studies completed, but lack of communication prevents the Committee from making informed decisions.

Mr. Price said the Executive Committee had requested MAG be contacted to help evaluate impacts on the regional transportation plan. Mr. Merritt believed scoring the impacts should wait until further information is obtained, stating the Technical Committee wants better communication sooner rather than later.

Mr. Price noted all sides are hesitant: the municipalities are reluctant due to lack of impact studies, Utah Crossing is hesitant because of the proprietary information and cost, and the Commission is cautious because the public waves caused by the project in relationship to the Commission's established goals.

Mr. J. Price asked why the cities had not required the impact studies. Mr. Goodrich stated the proponents had not made an application with the cities. He believed Mr. Harward and his business partners were waiting for approval from the state, and will then try to force the cities' hand for approval. He suggested to Mr. R. Price the Commission act as a coordinator and facilitator to bring the five entities (Orem, Vineyard, Saratoga Springs, MAG, and the Commission) together for a discussion. He stated UDOT pulled out of the process stating it was a private project.

Mr. J. Price asked for the Commission's perception of MAG's role in the process, and Mr. R. Price replied it was much like the Commission's, and should make a recommendation to the state. Mr. Beckstrom added the Executive Committee was looking to MAG for significant input on the transportation elements of the project, and whether it inhibits or has little impact. Mr. J. Price said without an O&D study, it would be hard to answer that question and strongly suggested requiring one. Mr. Goodrich reminded the Committee the Commission should remind the municipalities it should be a coordinated effort to decide rather than a separate decision from each entity.

To save discussion time, Mr. Keleher asked if the Committee could go through the goals and submit their comments and suggestions to Mr. Price prior to the next meeting. Mr. Price concurred and asked everyone to have their comments on the High Priority Goals back to him the first week of March. He would then consolidate them and send them out to the Committee for review.

Mr. Merritt reminded everyone the Committee should concentrate on the Master Plan goals and not address any peripheral issues, such as the bridge. He stated if the Committee focused on the primary goals, they could make greater and more rapid headway on the issues.

**7. Other items.**

No additional items were noted.

**8. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, March 22, 2010.**

Mr. Beckstrom confirmed with everyone the next Technical Committee meeting would be Monday March 22, 2010, at 8:30 a.m. in Suite 211. The primary item would be the discussion of the high priority goals and the impacts.

Mr. Beckstrom explained scheduling of the Technical Committee meetings were held on the fourth Monday, just prior to the Governing Board meeting on the fourth Thursday. Mr. Price said the meeting schedule was found on the Utah Lake Commission website but he would send out an email with the year's planned meetings and locations. Mr. Price announced the upcoming Governing Board meeting for February was cancelled.

**9. Adjourn.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.