



**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Monday, April 25, 2011, 8:30 A.M.  
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 212  
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

**ATTENDEES:**

Laura Ault, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands  
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City  
Adam Cowie, Lindon City  
Greg Flint, Santaquin City  
Dr. Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City  
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City  
Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources  
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery  
Steve Mumford, Eagle Mountain City  
Richard Nielson, Utah County

**ATTENDEES:**

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

**VISITORS:**

Rob Baskin, Supervisory Hydrologist, USGS.  
Jim Price, Mountainland Association of Governments  
Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs Owners Association

1 **ABSENT:**

2 American Fork City, Pleasant Grove City, Genola Town, Highland City, Utah Lake Water Users, Springville  
3 City, Utah State Division of Water Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Utah Division of Parks and  
4 Recreation, Vineyard Town, and Woodland Hills Town.  
5

6 **1. Welcome.**

7 Technical Committee Chairman, Greg Beckstrom, called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. He  
8 welcomed the Technical Committee members and visitors in attendance. He introduced Greg Flint, a new  
9 member to the Committee representing Santaquin City.  
10

11 **2. Review and approve minutes from the February 4, 2011 meeting.**

12 Mr. Beckstrom asked for discussion, comments, and/or corrections of the minutes for the meeting held  
13 February 14, 2011. He had a correction, page 7, line 14 change the word "with" to "without;" Mr. Chris  
14 Keleher corrected page 2, line 36, to read "Army Corps of Engineers." Dr. Lee Hansen motioned to approve  
15 the minutes of February 14, 2011, as corrected; it was seconded by Mr. Richard Nielson. The motion was  
16 unanimously approved.  
17

18 **3. Update from the Committee Chair.**

19 Mr. R. Price gave a report and updates to the Technical Committee:

20 **a. Legislative session:** There were two things during the last legislative session affected Utah Lake –

1 (1) *Phosphorous*: There was discussion about allowing phosphorus back into dishwashing detergents  
2 and then monitoring it. The proposal did not get past the subcommittee. DEQ was involved in the process  
3 explaining the industry had already made improvements to dishwashing detergents without the  
4 phosphorus. The Commission opposed adding phosphorus back into dishwashing detergent secondary to  
5 the Master Plan goal to limit the amount of nutrients in waste water coming into Utah Lake.

6 (2) *House Bill 137*: At their last meeting, the Technical Committee was not aware of House Bill 137  
7 sponsored by Representative Ken Sumsion, as it had not been made public at that time. The intent of the  
8 bill was to involve UDOT in a more official manner in reviewing proposed transportation structures that  
9 would cross sovereign lakes. The bill was briefly discussed at the last Governing Board meeting. Mr. Mike  
10 Styler, director of DNR, Ms. Chris Finlinson of CUWCD, and Commissioner Larry Ellertson had discussed the  
11 bill with Representative Sumsion. They felt it was a sound idea to involve UDOT officially in the review  
12 process to review the plans, design of the bridge, and assure proper maintenance plans are in place as well  
13 as the financial side. Financing has been a major question of the Technical Committee and Governing  
14 Board since the application's submission, and UDOT will have to determine if it is a financially viable  
15 project. After review, UDOT will make a recommendation to FFSL. When the bill was released, it was  
16 determined it was something the Commission could support, the bill passed, and UDOT/Transportation  
17 Commission is now involved in the bridge review process.

18 **b. Utah Lake Festival**: The Utah Lake Festival is the Saturday, June 4. The Commission has been  
19 working with the JSRIP to plan another fun event at the State Park.

20 **c. Field Trips**: Carin Green has been planning field trips as a reward for 4<sup>th</sup> grade classes who used the  
21 Commission curriculum materials created last year. Over 530 students will attend the events on  
22 Wednesday April 27 and May 4. Ten different activities are planned and the students will rotate every half  
23 hour. The Commission is excited about the field trips.

24 **d. Model Ordinance**: Work is completed on the model ordinance. American Fork went through the  
25 review process and adopted an ordinance for the protection of Utah Lake shoreline. Other cities are  
26 initiating the review process.

27 **e. Jordan River Commission**: The Jordan River Commission was created in 2010 and modeled after Utah  
28 Lake Commission with a similar scope and goals. They hired an Executive Director named Laura Hansen.

29 Mr. Beckstrom thanked Mr. R. Price. He added several members of the Technical Committee attended  
30 the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program Annual Assessment Meeting held in Salt Lake earlier in  
31 April. It was an informative meeting. There was discussion about the June sucker recovery program  
32 including related issues and impacts associated with Utah Lake.

#### 33 34 **4. Review draft bridge position statement.**

35 Mr. Beckstrom asked Ms. Laura Ault to give an update to the Technical Committee of the process and  
36 progress of the bridge review.

37 Ms. Ault said the legislative session caused UDOT to become more actively engaged in the process. She  
38 stated HB137 passed. In order for FFSL to approve an application, there must be a positive  
39 recommendation from UDOT Transportation Commission. The project proponent has to enter into an  
40 agreement with UDOT on the bridge design, maintenance, and agree UDOT will oversee the construction  
41 and/or hire a consultant to oversee construction issues to assure it meets UDOT's standards. The  
42 Transportation Commission will review the design and it must be more than a conceptual design. The  
43 agreement is to make sure the bridge is constructed to the right specifications. There will also be a  
44 financial liability and assessment. FFSL cannot move forward the positive recommendation until there is an  
45 agreement in place from the Transportation Commission. FFSL can continue with their part of the analysis  
46 at the same time if the project proponent gives FFSL the information they need to analyze.

1 The Resource Specialist Team has returned most of the comments and FFSL is working to compile the  
2 comments to give the proponent so they can provide more needed information. After receiving the  
3 answers, the specialists will review the information they receive.

4 Ms. Ault recently met with Mr. Harward to talk about the proposal. A timeline couldn't be given to him  
5 because it depended on UDOT. A joint meeting will be held with UDOT to discuss what different parts of  
6 the application is to be approved. FFSL would like UDOT to look at navigational hazards prior to approval to  
7 insure the designs do not cause navigational hazards. FFSL does not want to approve the bridge and then  
8 find out it is not big enough for a sailboat to go under it. They should have their rule, which should be  
9 published by the next Transportation Commission in May. After the publication, there is a 60-day public  
10 comment period on the application. Mr. Beckstrom asked her if UDOT in Salt Lake or Provo was handling it  
11 and Ms. Ault said the Salt Lake office with Linda Hall of Transportation Commission is helping draft the rule  
12 and Randy Arc is working on the agreement.

13 Mr. Beckstrom stated the Technical Committee has a copy of three documents. The first is a two-page  
14 resolution, the second is a single-page document of questions and issues, directed to the proponent and  
15 are mainly technical issues to be answered prior to approval of a bridge. The third document is the policy  
16 questions and issues that need answers.

17 He explained the Committee would comment on the three documents. If there are issues or questions  
18 not addressed as part of the bridge or not identified in the two documents, they need to be added. The  
19 two documents will be attached and referenced to the resolution when it is submitted to the Governing  
20 Board. The board will formally adopt the resolution at their meeting this week. Since the original draft, an  
21 additional "whereas" was added at the request and recommendation of the Executive Committee. It reads,  
22 "Whereas recent legislation directs the Transportation Commission to review plans for construction of a  
23 highway facility over sovereign lake bed lands." The additional whereas showed the Transportation  
24 Commission is involved in the process.

25 Mr. Beckstrom said he would like the Committee to capulate the issues to be worked through and  
26 resolved. He would like the Governing Board to feel comfortable endorsing the resolution concerning the  
27 bridge proposal. He asked for discussion, questions, or comments.

28 Mr. Chris Keleher said after the questions and issues are addressed, they may trigger spin-off  
29 questions, depending on the answers given. He wanted clarifying language stating further questions may  
30 spin off the answers given.

31 Mr. R. Price said in the "Therefore" section of the resolution, number two says, "Utah Lake Commission  
32 maintains a neutral position on the proposal and will not take a position until both identified questions and  
33 public policy issues have been addressed." This includes making sure adequate and sufficient information  
34 is received and reviewed prior to making an informed recommendation. In composing the document, Mr.  
35 R. Price made the questions as broad as possible and did not want to narrow the scope of the proponent.

36 Mr. Beckstrom said those involved in the Development Project Review at the municipal level wrestle  
37 with these issues all the time. If a question requiring submission of a plan or a response to some particular  
38 issue or development, their responses are not always adequate and additional issues are raised. If a  
39 specific question is asked, there is a risk of narrowing the focus and the answer is not as broad as needed.  
40 He said language stating the Commission recognizes when responses are given or plans are submitted there  
41 may be details, issues, and more questions that arise. He suggested adding a sentence stating such.

42 Dr. Hansen asked for clarification on the policy document, under planning, fourth bullet, why the  
43 investors would be gone. Mr. R. Price said it asked if the investors would be gone after an extensive review  
44 process identified the proposed alignment as the most beneficial. If a study takes five years to determine  
45 the original alignment was correct, would the investors still be there or the investors be gone and are no  
46 longer willing to build it as a private venture. Since this is the proposed alignment there are questions  
47 concerning if it is the correct one. A concern has been raised if we should go through a lengthy process of  
48 determining if the proposed bridge is needed now and the best alignment. Dr. Hansen said it was missing a

1 few words. He recommended replacing the word “after” with “if” before the phrase “an extensive review  
2 process identifies it as the best alignment.” Mr. R. Price agreed.

3 Mr. Steve Mumford wanted confirmation the questions were definitely going to be addressed prior to  
4 FFSL making their determination/final decision or if there are questions to consider and Utah Lake  
5 Commission still has a neutral stand by the time FFSL makes their decision. Mr. Beckstrom said the  
6 Commission couldn’t dictate to FFSL what is done, but he assured Mr. Mumford the questions would be  
7 addressed. Through the resolution and attached list of questions, it is certain the Commission is laying  
8 down a marker saying, “if these questions are not adequately answered, it will be difficult for the  
9 Commission to support any such bridge crossing of the lake.” Mr. R. Price said the last “Therefore” of the  
10 Resolution states Utah Lake Commission calls upon other municipal governments and planning  
11 organizations to become engaged in the review process, and these questions should be addressed prior to  
12 FFSL’s decision. Mr. Mumford said there is good chance Utah Lake Commission will never get to a negative  
13 recommendation but the fact the list is there, now the list will be used for evaluation. Mr. R. Price said he  
14 saw the Commission working with FFSL and the desire is to make a decision at the same time.

15 Mr. Beckstrom said in the final analysis, the approval of this project is at the state level, and will require  
16 a formal revision or amendment as to what they refer to as their management plan for Utah Lake as a  
17 sovereign land. The document is the same document as Utah Lake Master Plan, the language of the Master  
18 Plan document is any revisions to the plan will take place in a simultaneous or coordinated fashion.

19 Mr. Jim Price said Utah Lake Commission is making specific recommendations to the Transportation  
20 Commission as they begin their review of what needs to be done to approve or disapprove this project.  
21 Mr. R. Price said issues are identified. If they fall under an area they would study they should consider it.  
22 Ms. Ault said it would not hurt to forward the list to the Transportation Commission so they understand  
23 where the Utah Lake Commission is coming from because a lot of work and effort was put into the list. Mr.  
24 R. Price said he was planning on forwarding the information as a statement to the Transportation  
25 Commission. Mr. J. Price had a concern of getting bogged down in a bureaucratic entanglement. He  
26 suggested the Technical Committee forward the questions to the Transportation Commission and formally  
27 make it clear the concerns of the Utah Lake Commission. Mr. J. Price said although there is a lot of overlap,  
28 unless the communication is formalized and directed, it doesn’t take place. Mr. Beckstrom said the  
29 expectation is UDOT’s review will be a technical review, in addition to factoring in policy questions, such as  
30 navigational and recreational needs.

31 Mr. David Wham said there were secondary impacts due to the primary effects that would not occur  
32 except for the bridge construction. He believed the reason the bridge was being proposed was for real  
33 estate deals, which would change the dynamics on the west side. If the proponent went through NEPA,  
34 there would be a policy issues, and felt there should be an evaluation of those types of impacts. He was  
35 concerned about the impact on growth on the west side. Mr. Beckstrom said those who do land and  
36 population forecasts are projecting growth is inevitable on the west side of the lake. The unprecedented  
37 growth caused a major impact on the use of Lehi Main Street. Mr. J. Price said based on current land and  
38 projected land-use patterns, MAG is showing by 2040 there will be a population on the west side of the  
39 lake a crossing will become a necessary piece of the transportation system. Mr. Wham said if it were a  
40 public project, MAG would go through adequate diligence for impacts and assessments. Mr. J. Price said if  
41 it were a public project, it would be a billion dollars in public money and there would definitely be a NEPA  
42 process. Proper mitigation requirements would be in place, even though it is a private project for a semi-  
43 public purpose. A new process including the Transportation Commission, UDOT, and FFSL will hopefully  
44 address many of those impacts like a public project, but are not nearly as extensive.

45 Mr. Beckstrom said Mr. Wham’s issues largely focused on the timing question. The secondary impacts  
46 are related based upon the analysis of the people responsible for doing the work and the growth that will  
47 take place. Mr. J. Price said from MAG’s perspective, the current proposal is far ahead of where it needs to  
48 be by at least 20 years. It doesn’t mean the bridge shouldn’t be allowed to occur because it is ahead of its

1 time or because it is not public money and it is a private venture. Mr. Beckstrom said most of the impacts  
2 alluded to were environmental. The question is some of the resource agencies responsible for doing the  
3 review should expand their evaluation beyond the direct impacts of the bridge with secondary impacts of  
4 the growth, which will be accelerated by the construction of a bridge. Mr. Mumford asked whose land this  
5 is on both sides. Mr. Beckstrom said Vineyard on the east side and Saratoga Springs on the west.

6 Mr. J. Price said a lot of the secondary impacts are going to be regulated, mitigated, or even dealt with  
7 by Saratoga Springs. If the secondary impacts show there is not enough water or infrastructure for their  
8 growth to take place, then the bridge is ahead of its time and may fail as an investment.

9 Mr. Sakaguchi asked on the one-page Utah Lake Proposal questions how the project will be financed.  
10 The project is defined as a double bridge project, but it will be financed in first and second phases. Mr. R.  
11 Price said the intent was it should be looking at both projects. Mr. Sakaguchi asked what assurances were  
12 in place to assure for the additional phase of the bridge. Mr. R. Price said the entire financial is under  
13 consideration, but not specifically detailed. Mr. Sakaguchi said what if there was private financing available  
14 to do the single bridge, but in 10-15 years later it becomes a state-burden to build the second bridge. Mr.  
15 R. Price agreed. Mr. J. Price said that issue is under the review of the Transportation Commission. Mr.  
16 Beckstrom said if the bridge was successful; the money would be there to build the second phase. Mr. J.  
17 Price said in order for it to be successful and get enough people crossing it, the tolls have to be low to make  
18 it successful enough to build the second bridge; the demand is still there, from the public perspective. Mr.  
19 Beckstrom said he hoped there would be a public agency to oversee the financing.

20 Ms. Ault said it is under the lease terms they are already planning. Mr. Beckstrom said he preferred  
21 having one public utilities commission-type group be established to oversee the private operation. Dr.  
22 Hansen said the document did not seem to cover issues if the bridge financially failed. If the bridge is built,  
23 but fails financially; what happens? Ms. Ault said it then becomes the property of the state according to  
24 the legislation; if it is abandoned by the project proponent it becomes state property. Ms. Ault said the  
25 project proponent under UDOT's agreement would have to fund construction up front of the entire bridge  
26 because the last thing that anyone wants is the half-built bridge. UDOT is assuring FFSL they are doing  
27 everything to make sure the bridge is built and will be finished, whether the proponent finishes it with  
28 these funds or whether UDOT taxes for the funds, the bridge will be finished.

29 Mr. Beckstrom said the first question on the policy document under financing is what is adequate  
30 financing. Everyone feels a minimum threshold for adequate financing is not to have a half-built bridge,  
31 and that enough money be in the bank in one form or another to complete the project. There are also  
32 issues regarding adequate financing of operations and maintenance. Ms. Ault said it was all contained in  
33 the legislation HB137, under construction and maintenance, which will be in the financial package.

34 Dr. Hansen asked if the bridge is one UDOT would want and it goes to the question of is it the best  
35 alignment? Mr. Mumford hoped the Transportation Commission could respond for UDOT on those types  
36 of questions. Mr. J. Price said they would. There are two parts to the question with the first of what is the  
37 best alignment and is it the best one for what purpose. There are no answers at present. Mr. Beckstrom  
38 suggested people talk to UDOT. If they were in a position to speak openly, they would say they rarely get  
39 the transportation project exactly where they want it, and they take the best project, which is compliant  
40 with the environmental regulations and financial limitations and realities.

41 Mr. Wham asked if there was a specific alignment issue request. Ms. Ault said the application received  
42 is for a specific alignment. Mr. Beckstrom said there is the present alignment, the no-build alignment,  
43 which are the only two that are under consideration right now. For a third alignment to come up, there  
44 needs to be an entity that believes there is some place better than the first two. Ms. Ault said FFSL has an  
45 application and the only thing that can be said is the proposed alignment is not the best. Mr. Beckstrom  
46 said FFSL might not be able to say anything, but the resource agencies involved could say something. FFSL  
47 cannot formally propose a different alignment, but the resource agencies involved with the potential  
48 impacts is not restricted from saying to look at another alignment location.

1 Mr. Beckstrom referenced Dr. Hansen’s question of “is it the bridge UDOT wants?” The answer is  
2 maybe not because of, environmental and financing issues, which are the same ones that dictate other  
3 project requests. Mr. Jim Hewitson asked what the “no build alignment” was. Mr. Beckstrom said the  
4 impacts are of a greater magnitude and so intolerable no bridge should be built at all. Ms. Ault said the no-  
5 build question is being analyzed; either construction of the proposed bridge will be allowed or no build at  
6 all. Mr. J. Price said it is this one or none. Mr. Chris Tschirki asked if they are leasing enough land for both  
7 the first and the second phase. Ms. Ault said the application is for the first phase only, but she would  
8 check. The width of the application was for the one way in each direction not the full build-out of the  
9 project.

10 Mr. Beckstrom thanked everyone for the discussion. He asked for any additional input. The  
11 corrections suggested were made, but a formal vote was not needed. He appreciated everyone’s input and  
12 his or her continued involvement in the project.

13  
14 **5. Presentation from Rob Baskin, Supervisory Hydrologist, USGS about his research on Utah Lake,**  
15 **specifically on earthquake faults found in Utah Lake.**

16 Mr. R. Price introduced Mr. Rob Baskin, hydrologist from Utah State University. They have occasionally  
17 worked together over the past several years. Mr. Baskin is an expert on Utah Lake with an unmatched  
18 passion for studying lake sediments. He has a deep understanding of Utah Lake, as well as deeper  
19 freshwater, salt water, and others all over the nation. He has done considerable research. He is here to  
20 report on his research on earthquake faults in the lake.

21 Mr. Baskin said Utah Lake is a fascinating place. There is a lot of information gleaned from studies,  
22 reports and on line. He felt his role as a scientist was to make sure those who make decisions are aware of  
23 the information and they have enough scientific data to make the informed decision. He reported on  
24 historical information about Utah Lake including the original name was Lake Timpanogos. It is the largest  
25 freshwater lake in Utah, averages 9.5 feet in depth with a maximum depth of about 14 feet. There are  
26 some locations where it is about 63 feet deep. Utah Lake is eutrophic where more organic matter is  
27 generated than consumed. It is prone to wind-generated mixing. The wind mixes up the lake because the  
28 bottom is above wave-base. The energy that is transported into the waves from the wind stirs up the  
29 bottom and that is why it looks muddy. It is a man-made reservoir but without the dam, it is likely it would  
30 be a dry area or swampy in 900,000 cubic feet of water.

31 In 1884, the first chemical analyses were done on Utah Lake. In 1903, they started regulating the lake.  
32 In 1906, USGS did a water supply paper that discussed ground water contributions to the lake. There was a  
33 water-study paper done in 1910 that discusses the waters of Utah Valley inflows from Hobbles Creek. The  
34 first biological study was done by Cottam in 1926, from the University of Chicago. The first systematic  
35 research was in 1933. However, interest in Utah Lake suddenly dropped off the map. There are no  
36 documented studies on Utah Lake between 1933 until the 1960s.

37 During the 1960s, the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) wanted to work on the Goshen Bay Dike, where they  
38 wanted to dike off from West Mountain/Lincoln Beach, to the west shore and make Utah Lake deeper and  
39 to get rid of all salty stuff found in Goshen Bay. A lot of studies were done, but most were not published.  
40 The BOR has a lot of studies that are not public. Also in the 1960s, the USGS came back and did further  
41 studies, through the 1970s and into the early 1980s which is their last report.

42 Brigham Young University’s engineering department, through Brimhall and Merritt, started working on  
43 hydro-geology of Utah Lake with emphasis on Goshen Bay. The Goshen Bay Diking project was still alive in  
44 people’s mind. It never occurred through a lot of boreholes in the lake, etc. BYU started doing water  
45 chemistry of the lake and are continuing through this year. In the 1990s, they contacted Mr. Baskin and  
46 were interested in the springs coming into the lake, wanting to control the water because of the high salt  
47 content. They wanted to find out if they could somehow stop the spring water from coming into the lake,  
48 primarily for salinity control issues. Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) did a clean lake

1 phase one study. There is also a Provo River Delta study and the June sucker recovery program is working  
2 on studies on the lake.

3 Mr. Baskin has done research pertaining to locating springs coming into the lake, chemistry, and volume.  
4 The second was a study to locate various springs. Through research, the studies showed why springs are  
5 located where they are and why they are warm, the source of the water, the quality of the water, how the  
6 springs are connected, and this allows us to estimate the dissolved solids content coming into the lake.

7 He has used a Thermal Infrared Multispectral Scanner (TIMS) using temperature to discover the springs  
8 entering into Utah Lake from underneath. He used a plane and flew above the lake to see springs from the  
9 air. He utilized a boat with meter equipment to identify the location of the springs. He used time, theory,  
10 and physics application in finding hot springs and other vital information for Utah Lake. He has dived into  
11 the lake and found springs at least 63 feet deep. He couldn't go any farther because of the heat of the  
12 springs. He studied the water chemistry at the springs around Lincoln Point and Bird Island. He explained  
13 there was an experiment to plug springs with grout to stop them flowing into the lake. They tried this on  
14 an old well, but the well kept filling up. The seismic study looked at the sub-bottom of the lake for  
15 travertine deposits and faults. Some of the faults were discovered through echo or acoustic means.

16 Through his and other research, Mr. Baskin discovered the history of the lake, the faults, various hot  
17 springs, chemistry, other vital information pertaining to Utah Lake. He showed graphs and pictures of his  
18 findings as well as the published information from the studies. He showed examples and pictures of  
19 travertine structures. Travertine structures are deposits of calcium carbonate. The lake is not laying  
20 sediment flat, possibly secondary to liquefaction. Liquefaction is a disturbance of the sediments by a  
21 sudden movement, like an earthquake. He found a springs coming up from 7.5 meters, and it is at least 45  
22 feet deep and still has disturbance. There are some huge springs in the lake.

23 Dr. Hansen asked if it was coming in from the east side, but Mr. Baskin said it was the west side of the  
24 lake. Dr. Hansen asked how big the hole was. Mr. Baskin said he went down into the lake to get a water  
25 sample, but his vision was not very clear.

26 He said there is lots of information to be used to examine the history of Utah Lake and locate important  
27 features in the lake that make a difference in chemistry and the quality of water in Utah Lake. Bob Spall of  
28 Utah State University was working on a circulation model for the lake. The State of Utah DEQ is doing  
29 nutrient loading and total dissolved solids (TDS) content studies. BYU is still doing the budget tables. Mr.  
30 Wham said it was inflow, outflow, and water balance models from 18 months. There is a new gage on  
31 Hobble Creek to quantify some of the inflow into the lake. Mr. Baskin said he considered himself as science  
32 support and works for the people of science. He volunteered his information to anyone who wanted to  
33 study the lake. He said the lake is a vital source for Utah and what it means to everyone including water  
34 storage, food source, generates power, waste dump, moderates the climate, and provides jobs. There is  
35 quite a bit of data and understanding of particular aspects of Utah Lake compiled from studies and reports.

36 Mr. Beckstrom asked if Utah Lake was sinking or filling in with sediment and/or are the two in balance,  
37 and if Mr. Baskin observed anything from his evaluation data collection. Mr. Baskin said Utah Lake was  
38 sinking, but could not address if it was in balance, but with the new information, it could be determined.  
39 There are techniques, which can be used to look at the rate of deposition in the lake. Information is now  
40 available that can be used for a variety of different purposes rather than just last earthquakes, and when it  
41 is going to happen again.

42 Mr. Wham asked, if people were looking at things like environmental, and other data, sedimentation  
43 rates. Mr. Baskin said he gathers all the information he can maximizing the equipment while he has use of  
44 it. He collects everything he can while studying the lake.

45 Mr. Sakaguchi asked how deep his sonar could penetrate. Mr. Baskin said it depended on the  
46 characteristics of the sediment in the lake. If there was a lot of gas as organic matter decays, it generates  
47 methane and can wipe out the signal almost immediately. Generally, sonar goes 80 to 100 meters of

1 penetration using the system. More expensive instruments could be used that can go deeper, but are  
2 costly.

3 Mr. Cowie asked if there was a possibility for a tsunami on Utah Lake. Mr. Baskin said Utah Lake had a  
4 completely different fault-type system. Japan has a system where one thing goes over the other and as it  
5 does, it pushes a big wall of water up. In the western United States away from the Wasatch Mountains and  
6 it will break and drop down. Dr. Dinner is looking at the maximum amplitude or magnitude of the  
7 earthquakes, their recurrence, how often they will strike, whether Utah is overdue, and when the last one  
8 was.

9 Dr. Hansen commented Greg Nielsen at BYU ran recent age-dating on cores he has taken. He asked  
10 what the phosphate deposition in the lake was. Mr. Baskin said it has been going on for a long time and  
11 there is phosphoric formation, natural sources of phosphate. He said further studies with different  
12 equipment could be done.

13 Mr. Beckstrom asked if anything was learned about the chemical contribution of the springs relative to  
14 the surface and if it was anything significant. Mr. Baskin said the springs play a small role in terms of the  
15 total contribution to the lake. However, they run all the time, with a constant supply, 365 days a year, they  
16 are not diverted for lawn irrigation. He said the springs do have not a major role but enough of a  
17 contribution to the lake chemistry they need to be looked at in terms of a chemical balance.

18 Mr. Beckstrom thanked Mr. Baskin for the presentation and the information he had shared with the  
19 Technical Committee.

20

21 **5a. Other Business.**

22 Mr. Beckstrom asked for additional business items, or anything that should be brought to the  
23 Committee's attention.

24 Dr. Hansen asked if the Land Tamer was working. Mr. Price said yes and was doing a good job. The  
25 Governing Board will be briefed about the phragmites removal project and the Land Tamer. It was too late  
26 to use it on the ice when it is best to smash the phragmites.

27

28 **6. Confirm that the next meeting will be held in Suite 212 of the Historic Utah County Courthouse on**  
29 **Monday, May23, 2011 at 8:30 AM.**

30 Mr. Beckstrom reminded the members the next meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 23, 2011, at  
31 8:30 a.m. in Room 212. On the agenda will be a presentation from DEQ regarding the TMDL they are  
32 conducting on the Jordan River.

33

34 **7. Adjourn.**

35 Mr. Beckstrom adjourned the meeting at 10:17 a.m.