



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

**ATTENDEES:**

Greg Beckstrom, Provo City  
Adam Cowie, Lindon City  
Chris Tschirki, Orem City  
Ben Bloodworth, Utah Department of Natural Resources  
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City  
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City  
Ty J. Hunter, Utah Division of Parks and Recreation  
Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources  
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery  
Steve Mumford, Eagle Mountain City

**ATTENDEES:**

Douglas Sakaguchi, Division of Wildlife Resources  
Sarah Sutherland, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

**VISITORS:**

LaVere Merritt, BYU Emeritus Professor  
Jim Price, Mountainland Association of Governments  
Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs Home Owners Association

**ABSENT:**

Utah County, State Division of Water Resources, Woodland Hills Town, Santaquin City, Springville City, Pleasant Grove City, American Fork City, Mapleton City, Genola Town, Division of Water Quality, US Army Corp of Engineers, Highland City.

**1. Welcome.**

Chairman Greg Beckstrom called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. He welcomed everyone to the March Technical Committee meeting and each person introduced himself or herself.

**2. Review and approve minutes from the February 22, 2010 meeting.**

Mr. Beckstrom asked for corrections of the minutes of the February meeting. Corrections: Mr. Lee Hansen said on page two, number three; it says, "Mr. Hewitson said Mr. Conly Hansen did not have an "e" in his name." He corrected it to say, Mr. Lee Hansen had corrected the spelling. Mr.

Beckstrom had a correction on page two, fifth paragraph to delete the words “and supplementation.” Mr. Mike Mills said on page three, on the second to last paragraph, to delete everything after the first sentence and corrected it to read, “Loy Fisheries had acquired larger equipment to increase catch and more mechanized equipment to improve efficiency. Mr. Chris Keleher moved to approve the minutes as corrected and seconded by Dr. Hansen, and motion carried.

### **3. Update on carp removal efforts.**

Mr. Mike Mills gave an update on the carp removal efforts. He said fishing had been slow due to the ice melting. Loy Fisheries was only able to fish two weeks prior and as the weather permits, will increase fishing. Mr. Beckstrom stated the lake was close compromise elevation and should remain at that elevation for about two months, and asked if Mr. Loy would be able to fish effectively at that level. Mr. Mills replied he would be able to fish effectively but it is difficult when the lake is higher, because the carp stay in the phragmites and vegetation. He is fishing in several open areas.

### **4. Update on phragmites removal efforts.**

Mr. Reed Price announced ongoing evaluation for the removal of invasive phragmites, which is identified as a high priority goal in the Master Plan. Utah Lake Commission; Utah Forestry, Fire, and State Lands; Wildlife Resources; and Utah County, along with the Saratoga Springs Home Owners Association were working on a long-term plan for the removal of phragmites around the lake. Some proven treatment and removal methods used in Northern Utah were being adapted for Utah Lake removal efforts. A difference between the two processes is the North does not treat in standing water, but Utah Lake has to.

An application for funding to purchase phragmites removal equipment through grants was not approved due to budgetary restrictions at the state level. Utah County has provided equipment but creation of fire breaks has taken a toll on the equipment. The ten-year removal plan separates the lake into different sections addressing a three-phase process in each section. This proven treatment showed a positive result of 85 percent being removed in year one, with retreatment for two more subsequent years. Lack of funding has caused the group to readdress the plan. Mr. Price requested communication if anyone knew of any funding avenues.

Mr. Hewitson asked what type of equipment was required. Mr. Price suggested something like a Ranger or Bobcat, which could provide the fire breaks needed to be in place before burning. The county equipment used matted down 20-30 yard-wide fire breaks. Equipment used in north Utah would be beneficial to the Utah Lake phragmites removal. He cited areas for phragmites removal in 2010 was around Saratoga Springs starting south of Pelican Point to the north ending at the outlet of Jordan River. Treatment plan for next year, 2011, would go from the Jordan River south around to the Lindon Boat Harbor.

Dr. Hansen asked if anyone considered maintaining fire breaks utilizing a herd of goats. Mr. Price said it was too thick for goats; however, after initiating fire breaks, using goats may be an option. Dr. Hansen suggested the Utah Lake Commission purchase goats rather than rent them.

Mr. Beckstrom asked how much the needed equipment would cost. Mr. Price said about \$150,000 to purchase two pieces of equipment. The first piece would function like a Snow-Cat and the other was an aquatic/land unit (like a boat on wheels). Mr. Chris Tschirki asked if there was a plan for the phragmites growing in the water. Mr. Price said through this learning process, they were adapting the procedure from northern Utah to use around Utah Lake, but their process might not be as effective with the phragmites in standing water. Northern Utah has leaf litter to sustain a fire and help carry the burn, whereas Utah Lake does not have any. Utah Lake may have

to consider mechanical removal of the phragmites, which increases the cost. Dr. Hansen asked if they tried spraying in the standing water. Mr. Price replied yes, but removal of the dead biomass was necessary in order to allow the chemical to reach the new growth. He said to date; there has not been a successful burn. Dr. Hansen asked if the ice from Utah Lake had flattened the phragmites and Mr. Price said no as the phragmites was too thick for the ice to flatten.

**5. Update on public outreach and education efforts.**

Mr. Price updated the Technical Committee on the RFP for creating a model ordinance for lands around Utah Lake, which addressed several different issues identified in the Master Plan. The submissions ended on March 12. A team consisting of Greg Beckstrom, Chris Keleher, Bruce Chestnut, Dean Olsen, and himself would evaluate the proposals and make a recommendation to the Governing Board to select one of the firms. The firm awarded the contract would help Utah Lake Commission create model ordinances for high priority issues identified in the Utah Lake Master Plan, including a trail ordinance, recommended buffer zones, etc. Mr. Price notified the Technical Committee that each city's land-use planner would be involved in a series of planned meetings to prepare and develop these various ordinances. He said municipality representation was needful and important so each urban area had adequate representation for their city. The time lines from the submissions ranged from eight weeks to five or six months. Mr. Sakaguchi asked how many companies submitted proposals. Mr. Price stated three firms including Logan Simpson Design, which had helped in the Land Use Planning Process during the Master Plan; Epic Engineering, with an office in Heber; and Landmark Design, out of Salt Lake City. The RFP advertised twice in newspaper public notices with additional invitations sent to nine other potential firms.

**6. Continue discussion on the effect a lake crossing would have on the goals of the Utah Lake Master Plan.**

Mr. Beckstrom reviewed the proposal of a crossing over Utah Lake. He stated Department of Natural Resources (DNR) with the Department of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL) had received a proposal for a bridge crossing by Utah Crossing, Inc. FFSL had advertised a Request for Proposal for alternate uses of the sovereign lands along the corridor crossing Utah Lake from Saratoga Springs near Pelican Point to Vineyard (Orem 800 North) alignment. The deadline for alternate proposals is March 31. DNR will review all proposals submitted according to the specific criteria in the RFP. At that point, DNR can select one of the proposals and ask for a formal submission and application or they can choose to do nothing.

The Technical Committee's objective is to attempt to identify goals and objectives of the Master Plan with potential to fulfill the goals and those with potential to create conflicts or mitigating factors. Because of the breadth of the goals and the in-depth discussion from February's meeting, Mr. Price utilized a new approach. A ballot was prepared to vote on the individual goals. The committee would vote on the high priority goals and their perception if a lake crossing would either support or inhibit the Master Plan goals.

Mr. Price explained the ballot had two columns: the first was a lake crossing would support the goals and the second column would inhibit the goals. Committee members would identify their interpretation of the goals as it pertains to a lake crossing and vote accordingly. After voting, the results would help the Committee focus their discussion on pertinent issues or conflicts and help the Committee stay on course.

Mr. Beckstrom explained they could leave some goals blank and it was not required for committee members to determine if every listed goal had potential for compliance or conflict, but

to identify those pertinent goals that may have the greatest impact/conflict or compliance. He asked members to make sound judgments on the goals and to be selective in their decisions.

After voting, Mr. Beckstrom tallied the results from 12 participating members (see attached ballot sheet and ratings; page 9). He suggested a process for the evaluation, initially focusing on the goals identified with highest negative votes and then highest positive votes. He listed a possible order as follows:

1. Natural Resources Goal 7 – Water Quality receiving a unanimous 12 negative votes.
2. Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning received 7 positive votes and 4 negative votes.
3. Transportation Goal 1 – Trails received 9 positive votes and 1 negative vote.
4. Recreation Goal 3 – Boating received 9 negative votes and none on the positive side.

Mr. Beckstrom directed the discussion to be specific and include concerns either perceived as unavoidable and/or look for areas of mitigation.

### **1. Natural Resources Goal 7 – Water Quality - Received unanimous 12 negative votes.**

Mr. Keleher stated mitigation for phosphorous and total dissolved solids (TDS) was an issue, but he felt there were more concerns beyond these chemicals. At prior meetings, members had evaluated and discussed issues with phosphorous and total dissolved solids (TDS). Mr. Hewitson questioned what would happen if an accident with a major spill on the bridge occurred. Mr. Tschirki expressed his feelings concerning snow removal using salt, sand, sediments, and other debris. Dr. Merritt believed the phosphorous and TDS should be highlighted and receive reasonable attention; however, he felt the lake already had high amounts of these chemicals. Quantities added from both natural and man-caused sources on a regular basis cause super saturation with phosphorous and high quantities of TDS in the lake. A decision of the amount of phosphorous and/or TDS allowed should be stated. He\*\*\* asked if the requirement should be a hard and fast rule. Dr. Merritt believed any additional amount would be minimal compared to what already is in the lake.

Mr. Hewitson asked if the salt used to de-ice roads is TDS. Dr. Merritt replied in the affirmative. Mr. Price asked how the expected amount of salt used to deice the bridge compared to the amount of salt used to deice upland roads, which eventually ended up in the lake. Dr. Merritt said it depended on the pathway. In Provo, it is a higher percentage with the amount of drains, gutters, and drainage ditches. Mr. Price said everything on the bridge will end up in the lake and wanted to relate those figures to other sources of drainage (cities, run-off, etc.). Mr. Tschirki commented over time tons would end up in the lake if everything used to treat the snow and ice removal went into the lake. Mr. Price wanted the run-off into the lake compared to run-off trapped in the soil.

Mr. Keleher agreed and stated if the Commission were looking to improve water quality, then any addition would be degradation to the water as a whole. He said the burden of proof for water quality should be on the applicant to assure the quality is not diminished from the runoff. As a mitigating factor, part of the application process could state none of the runoff would end up in the lake in order to maintain or improve the level of water quality or require a treatment plant for the runoff. Mr. Mumford asked if FFSL can impose these requirements and Mr. Keleher said yes.

Dr. Merritt felt there were legitimate arguments for stopping the impact or allowing a minimal impact. He said it came from a credibility standpoint. He did not think an agency should take an anti-degradation stance to prevent what might be an insignificant problem. He felt that if agencies use a rule to prevent what is an insignificant problem, the agency/program would suffer over time. He believed there were other concerns more important than anti-degradation relating to phosphorus and TDS, which should be addressed. Mr. Keleher questioned when the Commission should draw the line on allowed chemicals. He agreed credibility as well as integrity should be part of the deciding factors for allowing or disallowing the chemicals. He said this is the first opportunity the Commission has a chance to do something which affects Utah Lake. He concurred with Mr. Tschirki on an anti-degradation

position at this point for the Commission. He felt this decision was an important step in the Commission's development.

Dr. Hansen stated it might be beneficial to state that the bridge does not benefit the water quality of Utah Lake, rather than stating all of the potential problems that might arise. Mr. Mumford expressed the impact should be zero if they mitigate it completely.

Mr. Beckstrom said the Technical Committee might not have the opportunity to make this call, but can make a recommendation and not policies. He stated in the future the Technical Committee could discuss it internally and forward a recommendation to the Governing Board as the Committee's goal was to identify areas of concerns and the issues involved.

Dr. Merritt stated the Technical Committee needed to be careful not to give the impression that there are limitations. He is in favor of giving careful attention to reasonable reductions of these chemicals. Even if the overall impact is not a big concern, there can be programs to mitigate and reduce unwanted chemicals in the lake. Mr. Hewitson felt a decision pertaining to the salt on the concrete bridge should no salt on the bridge.

Mr. Cowie questioned if privately-funded projects are required to contain the storm water and treat it, stating municipalities are required to pre-treat the storm water. Mr. Beckstrom said he understood the project whether privately or publicly-funded are subject to the same requirements; but he did not know if the state had a zero salt policy and private roads would not change requirements in terms of the permitting process. Dr. Merritt stated for large tank spills or other occurring accidents, a contingency for emergency response should be in place.

Mr. Mumford quoted "the lake features high quality water," but with the pollutants already in the lake, he asked what real quality of water the Commission is looking for. Mr. Beckstrom stated it was a goal. Dr. Merritt said it was high quality relative to the use designation with only the phosphorous and TDS being out of compliance. Dr. Hansen asked what was going into the lake in terms of oil, grease, and heavy metals. No answer was given.

## **2. Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning - Received 7 positive votes and 4 negative votes.**

Mr. Beckstrom continued the discussion on the next goal was identified as being impacted by a bridge across the lake. Mr. Keleher expressed his concern the present proposal did not consult the Commission in the transportation planning of the bridge. He stated if the Commission were involved from the beginning, more discussion of the location and the best placement for the bridge would be different. He believed in all aspects, as it relates to the lake, the Commission should be involved. Mr. Beckstrom asked if his statement pertained to the planning process done by the proponent or by MAG. Mr. Keleher clarified it was the planning process done by the proponent in relation to the entire Master Plan. Dr. Hansen concurred stating the proposal pre-empts the Commission's ability to carry out one of its functions with transportation planning. Mr. Keleher felt the only positive from the present situation is the learning curve the Commission is undergoing to apply to future projects. Dr. Hansen said if the Commission approves this bridge proposal, a standard is set and criteria for evaluations on future decisions are established.

Mr. R. Price stated in the initial stages, the Commission was attempting to address those questions, had sought, and received funding for an EIS study, but budget cuts from the state prevented the study from moving forward. After the legislature took the funding, Mr. Harward got serious about his proposal. Mr. Price agreed the proposal fell into the Commission's jurisdiction. He again asked the discussion focus on a broader perspective with other potential projects.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if there was a positive comment on this goal. Mr. Price stated this proposal got the Technical Committee discussing a lake crossing, which is included in MAG's vision plan. We will have addressed many of the concerns should another proposal come up in the future. Mr. J. Price stated an idea of a crossing has been around for many years but with no specific proposal and/or location. He agreed the proposal already presented bypasses the plan, but MAG is prepared because of its own

vision plan. He stated MAG, the Commission, and municipalities have been thinking of a crossing for a long time.

Mr. Keleher agreed the Commission was prepared, but quoted Medium Priority Goal, 3.2 – Transportation, which states “Utah Lake Commission will consider studies to determine the need for feasibility of a cross-lake transportation corridor.” He stated if the present proposal is approved then there is no need for this objective. Mr. Cowie believed the Committee was discussing this goal already. Mr. Keleher said it was not, because the Committee is not evaluating the need, but is looking at how the bridge proposal jives in the Master Plan. Mr. Hewitson stated there was a difference between “a bridge” and the present proposal. A bridge should come before the transportation planning committee, not pre-empt it. Mr. Tschirki continued he felt the Commission was reacting to a specific proposal rather than as instructed to look at the broader perspective, which creates two different concepts that generate two different discussion points, one of which precludes planning. Mr. J. Price said the third concept is the timing of a bridge. He said MAG knows there is a need, but asked about timing. He said it is in the nebulous future but no one knows the timing. He told the Committee to consider the questions: “Do we need it now?” and “Does it make sense now?” He expressed MAG does not see a need for it, but they will not stand in the way if the bridge goes in. Mr. R. Price asked if he was speaking specifically to a particular project or a broader perspective. Mr. J Price explained any project as there was not a need for a crossing at present.

Mr. Hewitson stated Lehi would like to get traffic off of the east/west route on the north end of the lake. In a discussion with the Lehi City Council, they believed it was at least a four-lane road, not two-lanes. He said the present alignment might not take traffic out of Lehi. Dr. Hansen concurred stating why several were pushing for a traffic study to answer all the questions, particularly pertaining to the Saratoga Springs side. Addressing the present proposal termination points has people driving “out of their way” to get to the bridge. The bridge will not alleviate the traffic problem in Lehi. Mr. Hewitson said it was shorter if you do not go through Lehi Main Street. Ten years prior, MAG had done a study on the long-range traffic situation, and it found three collector roads would lower traffic use particularly on Main Street. The Pioneer Crossing is the first of those roads.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if it is a privately-funded road when compared to a publicly-funded operation do the needs issues change. If the crossing is a privately-funded project, how does it compare to using taxpayers’ money? How do we address a “free bridge” from the public dollar standpoint? He presented an analogy of the same project compared to a recreational facility. Dr. Hansen stated the recreational facility met the overall vision of the Master Plan and would benefit the lake, but he could see no benefit from a bridge across the lake. He believed it was an unfair comparison. Mr. Tschirki agreed saying \$100,000 for a newly developed park on the west side would benefit the lake more when compared to a half billion dollar bridge. Mr. Beckstrom stated he was comparing \$100,000 for a park to a free bridge.

Mr. Tschirki asked at some point if the private bridge would become public. He questioned financing the bridge and asked if Mr. Harward had over half a billion dollars in the bank to build the bridge or if it was half built and he could not continue it, would UDOT would have to save the bridge.

Mr. Beckstrom stated the discussion had digressed into financial, which was a separate issue from the transportation planning. He agreed if the money were not there, there would be no bridge. Mr. Keleher commented on the private dollars spent, stating if Mr. Harward were to get funding to build the bridge and he did build it, the bridge still crossed public land regardless of where the money comes from.

### **3. Transportation Goal 1 – Trails - Received 9 positive votes and 1 negative vote.**

Dr. Hansen stated that he had the single negative vote for this goal. He said if the transportation crossing the bridge were correct, then people who use the trails for walking, biking, bird watching, etc., prefer open areas, not along trails along major highways. This would deter the trail use rather than enhance it. He stated he did not like to see increased traffic along the trails.

Mr. Hewitson stated the only advantage he saw was the potential of building more trail heads to get better access to the lake. Mr. Mumford asked if the Committee was talking about pedestrian or biking trail heads. He felt people would bike across the lake for recreational or other purposes. Mr. Hunter concurred on the positive aspect of a crossing over Utah Lake. He cited the benefit of the causeway going from Syracuse to Antelope Island. The causeway benefited by creating more traffic, more events, and more uses. He said the Committee needed to ask questions such as, “Are the vistas what the Commission wants them to be?” “Is the recreational enjoyment going to be what is happening?” “Are we open for all multiple uses?” “Is a crossing going to benefit this goal?”

Mr. Beckstrom stated he voted on the positive side because of the money. He saw an opportunity to extract more money for other proposed projects such as establishing a bike trail or improving trails around the lake. He felt additional revenue would be a benefit. Mr. Keleher asked if money was the main reason for his positive take. Mr. Beckstrom said it was a selling point. He felt evaluating some of the mitigating offers were legitimate and offset the less than ideal facility. It is a matter of perspective of how individuals look at the mitigation offers. Mr. Beckstrom stated issues and arguments come with almost every type of proposal. He stated he should have used a resort rather than a park in his previous analogy. As a private resort, there would be mixed feelings utilizing the sovereign lands and the same issues would come up concerning the needs and mitigation standpoints. Mr. J. Price stated in response to the trail being ancillary that the trail is to be a full lane width, so could be converted to a vehicle lane if needed.

**4. Recreation Goal 3 – Boating - Received 9 negative votes and none on the positive side.**

Mr. Hunter stated any type of crossing would create funneling and would divide the lake in half. He felt some boaters might go through the elevated part of the bridge and others would not. This maneuverability brings the safety factor of navigation to the forefront. He said under certain circumstances the sailboaters may not want to navigate through the bridge, and then if they did, they might not be able to get back. In another perspective any type of structure placed in the water would cause problems by people running into it whether the weather is calm or stormy. Many people brag of Utah Lake as a recreational resource. The lake measures 13 miles at the widest point and the 23 miles at the longest point. Sailboaters are extremely concerned because they do not want to have the lake cut in half. Mr. Mumford asked how many sailboats use the lake. Mr. Hunter said many do and it is increasing. Dr. Hansen agreed because activity from Saratoga Springs was increasing very rapidly.

Mr. Hunter continued the bridge could also bring capacity issues. The closer the sailboats are to each other, the more safety issues may arise. Putting a bridge across the lake would shrink the usable portion of the lake and restrict some sailboats. Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Hunter how many sailboaters utilized the Provo Boat Harbor and if he saw quite a few coming from Saratoga Springs. Mr. Hunter said about 40 sailboats regularly use the lake and dock at his facility. Dr. Hansen stated sailboaters were departing from Saratoga Springs, Lindon Harbor, and other locations.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if the measurement at the elevation of the bridge at 50 feet in the middle for clearance would be adequate. Mr. Hunter asked Mr. Harward at what point the 50 feet clearance was being measured. It is assumed that it is off of the compromise elevation of the lake. Mr. Hunter said at least one sailboat could not go under the bridge because of extensions on their boat, making the height about 55 to 60 feet. The rest of the sailboaters could navigate the 30 foot height, but in any type of rough water would stay away from the structure and/or not use the other side of the lake. He said there were a lot of unknowns on this goal.

Mr. Beckstrom stated the Technical Committee is trying to get a handle on the concerns, questions, and problems on any type of proposal. Dr. Hansen quoted from the Interlocal Agreement that stated, “To maintain and develop recreation access, encourage enhancement of public access for recreational facilities, and trails, roads, docks, ramps, beaches, marinas, education outreach efforts.” The bridge

limits those possibilities. He said the Commission should be encouraging sail boating on the lake; however, the bridge discourages it.

**7. Other items.**

There were no other items to consider.

**8. Confirm that the next meeting will be held at the Historic County Courthouse Suite 212 on Monday, April 19, 2010 at 8:30 a.m.**

Mr. Beckstrom informed the Committee next month's meeting was Monday, April 19, 2010. Mr. Price reported the Governing Board meeting for April is scheduled for Friday, April 23 rather than Thursday April 22. The meeting would entail a bus field trip around Utah Lake with stops along the route so municipal representatives could talk about their city. He invited members to join the tour.

**9. Adjourn.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.



**Which of the goals in this column do you feel will be supported by a lake crossing?**

**Which of the goals in this column do you feel will be inhibited by a lake crossing?**

<u>Tally</u>	<u>Goals</u>
2	Land Use Goal 1 – Coordinated Land Use Planning
	Land Use Goal 3 – Land Use Buffers
2	Land Use Goal 4 – Land Acquisition and Management
	Land Use Goal 5 – Sovereign Lands Boundary
2	Land Use Goal 6 – Illegal Activities and Misuse of Resources
5	Land Use Goal 7 – Public Safety Coordination
	Natural Resources Goal 1 – Natural Areas
	Natural Resources Goal 2 – Fishery
	Natural Resources Goal 4 – Invasive Species
	Natural Resources Goal 7 – Water Quality
	Natural Resources Goal 8 – Integrated Resource Management
	Natural Resources Goal 10 – Water Savings
7	Recreation Goal 1 – Public Access
	Recreation Goal 3 – Boating
6	Recreation Goal 9 – Public Outreach
	Recreation Goal 10 – Insect Control and Public Health
9	Transportation Goal 1 – Trails
7	Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning

<u>Tally</u>	<u>Goals</u>
2	Land Use Goal 1 – Coordinated Land Use Planning
7	Land Use Goal 3 – Land Use Buffers
4	Land Use Goal 4 – Land Acquisition and Management
	Land Use Goal 5 – Sovereign Lands Boundary
6	Land Use Goal 6 – Illegal Activities and Misuse of Resources
5	Land Use Goal 7 – Public Safety Coordination
6	Natural Resources Goal 1 – Natural Areas
8	Natural Resources Goal 2 – Fishery
7	Natural Resources Goal 4 – Invasive Species
12	Natural Resources Goal 7 – Water Quality
	Natural Resources Goal 8 – Integrated Resource Management
	Natural Resources Goal 10 – Water Savings
	Recreation Goal 1 – Public Access
9	Recreation Goal 3 – Boating
2	Recreation Goal 9 – Public Outreach
	Recreation Goal 10 – Insect Control and Public Health
	Transportation Goal 1 – Trails
4	Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning

**\*\*Six goal categories had at least two votes on both sides of the issue.**