



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
Monday, May 24, 2010, 8:30 A.M.
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 211
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove City
Ben Bloodworth, Forestry, Fire, and State
Lands
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City
Ty J. Hunter, Utah Division of Parks and
Recreation
Ann Merrill, State Division of Water Resources
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery

ATTENDEES:

Steve Mumford, Eagle Mountain City
Richard Nielson, Utah County
Sarah Sutherland, Central Utah Water
Conservancy District
Chris Tschirki, Orem City
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

VISITORS:

Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs HOA

ABSENT:

Mapleton City, American Fork City, Utah Department of Natural Resources, Utah Department of Wildlife Resources, Division of Water Quality, Genola Town, Highland City, Lindon City, Mapleton City, Utah Lake Water Users, Santaquin City, Springville City, US Army Corps of Engineers, Town of Vineyard, and Town of Woodland Hills.

1. Welcome.

Chairman Greg Beckstrom called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. He welcomed those members in attendance.

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

Mr. Jim Hewitson recommended changes to a paragraph on page six. Dr. Lee Hansen corrected his sentence to read, "He did not think the bridge would take any traffic off of Lehi Main Street." Mr. Beckstrom asked for clarification under Natural Resources Goal 4 - Air Quality. In the second paragraph, second to last sentence, it states "he asked if the requirement" and Mr. Beckstrom asked for clarification who was being referred to. The "he" referred to Dr. Merritt and the minutes were changed from "he" to "Dr. Merritt."

Dr. Lee Hansen moved the minutes be approved as corrected; seconded by Mr. Jim Hewitson; and motion was unanimously approved.

3. Update on carp removal efforts.

Mr. Mike Mills said the carp removal process had been slow for two months secondary to lake elevation and carp spawning in the shallow areas. With increased lake elevation, Loy Fisheries cannot utilize the nets in shallow areas, but they still remove about 50,000 pounds every two weeks in spite of the setbacks. Relating to the decrease, Mr. Mills explained studies show this is the worst time to fish but believes fishing will pick up towards fall when the lake starts to drop. The lake will be at compromise for six to eight more weeks with the spring runoff. Mr. Beckstrom asked what the 12-month goal was for harvesting the carp. Mr. Mills replied five million pounds per year. There should be acceleration of fishing beginning by summer's end or early fall. With Loy Fisheries upgrading to more automated equipment, Mr. Mills felt Loy Fisheries would meet the contractual goal as fishing conditions become better.

4. Update on phragmites removal efforts.

Mr. Price explained phragmites removal efforts were ongoing by creating firebreaks in Saratoga Springs. Along eight miles of shore line, 50 to 100 foot firebreaks were created to prepare for treatment.

He informed the Committee because of budget cuts, anticipated grant funds were not received. Mr. Price and Aaron Eager, County Weed Supervisor, met with the grant director in Salt Lake. They anticipate receiving some non-allocated funds from last year. With these anticipated funds, firebreaks, which were already created, can be maintained and the three-year process for phragmites eradication stays on schedule. He lauded Utah County for their man-power and equipment, which provides matching funds for receiving the grants. Mr. Price has suggested the Governing Board approve funding to assist in the removal efforts. With the budget cuts, Mr. Price said the phragmites group is reaching out to other funding sources. Mr. Eager will be presenting to the Governing Board on Thursday educating new members concerning the removal efforts.

Funding is needed to purchase equipment suitable for the Utah Lake environment in the removal process. One piece of machinery identified is made in Montana and is called the Land-Tamer, which is a boat on wheels. This equipment is ideal in creating fire breaks during the winter time and spraying in the summer time. Mr. Price will propose the Governing Board approve funding to purchase the equipment from the capital improvement budget. He noted the county equipment, not specifically made for this purpose, was taking a beating creating the firebreaks. The Phragmites Group will be meeting to determine a long-term removal plan and discuss ideas of how to proceed by reaching out to other funding sources.

Mr. Dee Chamberlain asked if the treatment included burning in the area. Mr. Price said the Phragmites Group planned on burning in the winter time. The phragmites mass needs to be dead, but it is not dry enough until November and/or December. Burning will generally occur between November and April during a specific window of time.

Mr. Hewitson asked if the new equipment could float on the water. Mr. Price replied yes. He said the equipment has eight wheels and can use tracks. The Land-Tamer would be ideal in working on the Saratoga Springs side with the hot springs. The Executive Committee had questions such as who would own the equipment, maintain it, etc., and, Mr. Price said Utah County has offered to store and maintain it. When the county is not using it, the equipment would be available to other cities as needed because funding technically came from member cities. Mr. Hewitson said Mayor Bert Wilson should be favorable.

Mr. Ty Hunter said the county was looking at search and rescue boats where motors could be placed on the boats and then used for spraying. He asked if that was still an option. Mr. Nielson stated Mr. Eagar recommended that these boats could work in the phragmites removal, but the project was waiting for funding. Mr. Price said Mr. Eagar was a great resource and pursues all sorts of opportunities to help get rid of the invasive species.

5. Update on public outreach and education efforts.

Mr. Price said part of the Master Plan focus was educating the public to understand the value of Utah Lake. He was working together with the three school districts to create a curriculum to incorporate into the Utah studies for both 4th and 7th grade students. He cited the work already completed by the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program. They previously created a base-line for a curriculum and the materials to be used. The districts were impressed with the JRSIP resources, but wanted to refine them to make the curriculum age-appropriate. He noted the excellent opportunity the Commission now has in working with the districts in educating the children.

A study done by BYU students suggested a lot of ways to reach out to the public, i.e., creating pamphlets, utilizing social networking, and many others. Mr. Price is requesting money from next year's budget to use in the outreach program. He said an editorial plan is being considered to update the public about what is going on around Utah Lake and/or the history of it. A consultant who specializes in editorial plans would help write information and disseminate it to the social media sources such as Facebook, Twitter, and other avenues to utilize the available technology. The public outreach goal a continuous goal in trying to educate the public.

Dr. Hansen asked if the Commission had contacted the Bean Museum, which he felt would be a good resource for the public outreach program. Mr. Price agreed with his suggestion.

Mr. Price invited the Technical Committee members to the Utah Lake Festival on Saturday, June 5, 2010. The JSRIP, Utah Lake State Park, and Utah Lake Commission were hosting the sixth annual festival with a similar format as previous years. There are free hot dogs, popcorn, cotton candy, and water. There will be information booths from the different stakeholders around Utah Lake, fun activities for the children, fishing opportunities, and something for the entire family. There is a VIP tour on one of Jim Cross's boats in the morning for Commission Members and their families. Mr. Price had extended the invitation to the mayors, city councils, elected officials, state legislators, and others. He asked everyone to RSVP as soon as possible. A continental breakfast starts at 8:00 a.m. and the VIP tour begins at 8:30 a.m. He invited Mike Mills to help with the boat tour. Mr. Mills stated additional activities have been included and it should be a fun time for all to come and find out about the lake.

6. Update on the model ordinance process.

Mr. Price reported on the history of the model ordinance goal and reminded everyone the Commission had entered into a contract with Logan Simpson Design, who was the land use planner during the Master Planning process. The first model ordinance meeting was held in early May. The land planners of each municipal government which surrounds the lake, met to discuss what is to be accomplished in the ordinance. The meeting was well attended and shorter than anticipated. Good feedback and responses from all the cities had been received. The next meeting is scheduled for June 8 to process information received from land use planners after the kickoff meeting regarding trails and the existing regulations for development of lands adjacent to the lake. The regulations pertain primarily to open space recommendations, trails, development restrictions, wetlands, buffers, and a myriad of subjects. The ordinance will be given to the cities with a recommendation to adopt or adapt a similar ordinance by tweaking the model and making it compatible for each city's master plan. The hope is not much tweaking will need to be done with everyone working together on the land-use model ordinance.

Mr. Beckstrom encouraged each member of the committee to solicit an individual from their respective communities who will act in the city's behalf and give relevant input during the ordinance process. He felt with more municipal participation, the ordinance process would be more complete and easier for each city to implement the model ordinance.

Mr. Tschirki asked if an attendance list was available. Mr. Price said yes and if anyone had questions as to who represented their city, they can contact him.

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

Mr. Beckstrom explained during the March meeting, a straw poll was taken by the committee members regarding the high priority goals of the Master Plan. The indications for potential concern or favorable success in implementation of the high priority goals of a generic bridge crossing of Utah Lake were discussed. The first four items evaluated were:

1. Natural Resources Goal 7 – Water Quality.
2. Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning.
3. Transportation Goal 1 – Trails.
4. Recreation Goal 3 – Boating.

Mr. Beckstrom reviewed the history of the two proposals submitted to FFSL. Determining incompleteness in both proposals, FFSL requested additional information from each group be submitted with a deadline at within a few weeks. After an additional review, a decision by Forestry, Fire, and State Lands will be made to accept one of the proposals, or accept neither of the two proposals. After the decision, the proposal would move into an application process.

The Technical Committee’s analysis will lay a baseline for present and future issues to be considered when a specific proposal is put forth for review by the state to the Interdisciplinary Team. The discussion results will help the Governing Board understand what the Technical Committee believes are the critical issues with a bridge crossing proposal as it relates to compliance or noncompliance of the adopted Master Plan. He stated he would like to cover four more topics from the straw poll. The goals he selected for review were indicated as critical concerns or goals, which can possibly be fulfilled with the implementation of a bridge crossing Utah Lake.

Mr. Beckstrom directed the group discussion and asked everyone to be precise. The specifications need to include concerns either perceived as unavoidable and/or look for areas of mitigation. He invited everyone present to participate in the discussion with their thoughts and opinions, which will help determine if the goals would enhance or challenge the generic bridge crossing proposal. He said Mr. Price would read each specific objective and goal to be discussed as it is outlined in the Master Plan.

1. Land Use Goal 7 – Public Safety Coordination and Land Use Goal – Received 5 positive and 5 negative votes; and,

Mr. Price read, “Illegal activities and misuse of resources within the Utah Lake Master Plan Area are minimized by law enforcement and other appropriate use restrictions.”

2. Land Use Goal 6 – Illegal Activities and Misuse of Resources – Received 2 positive and 6 negative votes.

Mr. Price read, “Public Safety agencies coordinate and cooperate through interagency agreements, to assure public safety and protection of natural resources in and around Utah Lake.” This objective relates to both Land Use Goal 6 – Illegal Activities and Misuse of Resources; and Land Use Goal 7 – Public Safety Coordination.

“Objective: Law enforcement at Utah Lake will be enhanced, given that the current level of policing at existing recreational areas (and along other reaches of the lakeshore) is inadequate. As additional recreation development and other activities occur, the need for patrolling and law enforcement personnel will increase. Commission members will commit the resources necessary to ensure that Utah Lake is a safe and secure place to recreate and that lakeshore development and facilities are secure.

Utah Lake Commission members will enter into an interagency agreement or agreements to provide for public safety at the lakeshore. Due to the number of jurisdictions with Utah Lake management

responsibilities, as well as the shared interest in the lake and associated developments and facilities, the members of the Utah Lake Commission will enter into a cooperative agreement to provide resources for adequate safety and property protection for lake visitors and facilities.”

Mr. Beckstrom stated Land Use Goal 7 had a split opinion from the March evaluation with equal numbers for compliance/noncompliance of the goal. He coordinated the discussion on the two goals simultaneously and asked for detailed concerns of how a bridge would either challenge or promote the successful implementation of either of the two goals.

Mr. Steve Mumford initiated the discussion with his concerns stating with more people there is more visibility. However, on the reverse side, with the increased visibility there is more likelihood for misuse and vandalism. Law enforcement has said that with more visibility around the lake, misuse of resources, vandalisms, etc., would be less. He gave an example of dumping trash in the hills of Eagle Mountain, and how dumping would decrease if there was more visibility.

Dr. Hansen said the bridge would be a private roadway and asked which law enforcement would have jurisdiction for any kind of traffic enforcement or other things on a bridge. Mr. Hunter commented the bridge owners would have to provide their own private EMS or contract with a public safety department. Whoever won the contract would define the terms enforcement. He had concerns with private enforcement compared to a municipality. Mr. Price asked if the law enforcement issue was either a pro or con, or just an issue that needed to be addressed by a project proponent. Mr. Beckstrom stated on private streets, a police department has authority to deal with dangerous or criminal situations, such as on a private parking lot. He felt EMS personnel would also respond as needed secondary to prior agreements between the cities and county. He said the Technical Committee should recommend some type of public safety plan be in place before an approval. Mr. Hunter strongly recommended a public safety plan be in place and the details of such a plan can be worked out within the Law Enforcement Executive Committee of the county.

Mr. Price asked if a crossing was built on the south end of the lake and it was a public facility, which agency would be responsible for emergency response. Mr. Hunter said as a public facility it would be in unincorporated lands and the county would have jurisdiction. Mr. Nielson stated contracts for emergency response were already in place with each of the fire and ambulance departments covering the various geographical areas around the county. Mr. Hunter said the enforcement district stops at the lakeshore. He said Saratoga Springs is the only fire and EMS entity who presently has a boat. He again believed the information should go before the Law Enforcement Executive Committee to give an official statement of what they would require and then enforce it.

Ms. Merrill asked who would be in charge of plowing, de-icing, and other things on a bridge. Mr. Hunter said the owners of the private facility. Mr. Price said if it were a state or county road, it would fall on the state or county. Mr. Beckstrom stated the private agencies would contract with UDOT or other municipalities to provide the services. Mr. Tschirki asked if an agreement were established, would most people believe the bridge was a positive thing. Mr. Price said some did not understand the goal and the burden would be mostly on the public safety agencies to respond to anything on the bridge. Mr. Hunter believed the bridge might invite more speeding and other violations. Mr. Nielson said if an accident occurred on the bridge, it would be a challenge for EMS responders to get people and equipment to the scene, and there would be no cross streets to divert traffic.

Mr. Beckstrom gave an example of an accident in Provo Canyon having the same defined difficulty. Mr. Nielson felt there were different challenges on a bridge compared to the canyon. Mr. Hunter said there was congestion, but in the canyon shoulders on the road could be used for people to go around and these are not be available on a bridge.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if more visibility on the bridge were available, would it create more problems or have a positive effect to reduce them. Mr. Hunter believed more visibility was a good thing relating it to his

experience with the Utah Lake State Park. He said the park itself invites a lot of people to the park. The visibility relieves some problems but starts others, such as reducing and/or increasing trash dumping.

Mr. Deon Giles asked about truck hauling and what would be allowed to go across the bridge, including smaller trucks. Mr. Beckstrom said FFSL should address the issue and then make a recommendation. Mr. Price commented balancing the risks versus potential risk would be the factor, noting the risk is already there, but how high should the risk be. Mr. Hewitson believed law enforcement should enforce regulations for the bridge and not let the owners have carte blanche on enforcement.

Mr. Beckstrom said there are regulations how things can be transported on public thoroughfares, such as I-15, state roads, highways, Redwood Road, I-73 through Lehi, etc. He asked if the requirements for transporting hazardous materials across a bridge or on public highways or roads were in place. Or should different conditions or specifications be required to transport these hazardous materials across a bridge. He said the committee should articulate what the specific differences are to either prohibit or have additional requirements regarding hazardous waste on the bridge as opposed to other transporting facilities in the state. Mr. Giles said it needed to include transporting toxic materials or chemicals. Mr. Beckstrom clarified the requirement should say hazardous materials, not hazardous waste. Mr. Price suggested making it so hard to transport the materials across the bridge that the driver would want to go around the bridge.

Dr. Hansen noted cleaning up a spill under the bridge would be difficult. In contrast, if a spill occurred on land, it can be relatively contained and removed. Mr. Giles remarked that if a spill occurred EPA would have jurisdiction over the lake versus the land. Dr. Hansen said the difference between lake and land is to protect the population when on land. He asked what could be done to put a regulation in place to maintain a spill to protect Utah Lake. Ms. Sarah Sutherland said the Utah Lake Commission should recommend strong requirements transporting across the lake since the purpose of the Commission is to do whatever it can do to preserve the lake. Mr. Hewitson said the owners of the bridge might not want the hazardous material on the bridge and if the liability were given to the owners, they would regulate it themselves.

3. Natural Resources Goal 2 – Fishery – Received 8 negative votes.

Mr. Price read, “The fish community is proactively managed to recover June sucker, support a compatible recreational fishery, and control undesirable or incompatible species (e.g., carp).

Objectives:

“1. June sucker: The Commission will support June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program efforts and promote public and member agency education on program benefits. (Supports Specific Vision Statements 12, 13, 14, 17, 27 and 29)

“2. Compatible Recreational Fishery: The Commission will coordinate with Utah Division of Wildlife Resources through the public Utah Lake Fish Forum to facilitate the management and promotion of a recreational fishery that is compatible with June sucker recovery.

“3. Control Undesirable Species: Control of Carp and Other Undesirable Fish Species. The Commission will support efforts to reduce populations of carp and other undesirable fish species in the interests of improving habitat and increasing populations of native and other desirable species.”

Mr. Beckstrom said the straw poll showed no indication the goal would be supported by a crossing of Utah Lake. There are indications of widespread concern a bridge would challenge achieving this goal. He wanted specific issues documented from the fishery standpoint, which would be challenged or threatened by a bridge crossing.

Mr. Mills noted one of the big issues is water quality. Anytime water quality has impacts, it affects the fishery. He said constructing a bridge crossing might create a habitat, most likely for predatory fish. The hard structure associated with pilings, the foundation for the bridge, and the shading would be attractive for bass-type species. Those were just two concerns he had for construction of the bridge.

Mr. Beckstrom asked when speaking of predatory fish, if Mr. Mills was relating it to only the June Sucker predators. Mr. Mills clarified stating top-level predators would utilize the hard pilings of the bridge. These could include bass or other sports fish or other species such as carp. He said the impacts from the top level predator population are greater from the bridge construction. He noted in the construction phase when drilling for pylons, the drilling would disturb the lake level sediments and increase the impact on the endangered species, directly related this to the June sucker. The Fish and Wildlife Service commented on the Utah Crossing proposal and made it clear it would be in the best interest for someone to obtain a take permit if they wanted to move forward with the construction of this facility.

Mr. Beckstrom asked how Mr. Mills perceived how the taking would most likely occur. Mr. Mills replied taking is to harm, harass, shoot, disturb, kill, or a variety of activities. If the service could prove the construction resulted in a change of behavior of June sucker, there could be a case made that a take had occurred. In order for a private individual to obtain a take permit under the endangered species act, they need to have a habitat conservation plan, which would involve securing some type of holding and making improvements to that holding to benefit the endangered species. In the case of June sucker, this would require acquisition of lake shore front or shoreline property and enhancing it to benefit June sucker. This would be a costly process but not as much as the penalties associated with the taking of the endangered species. Mr. Ben Bloodworth gave an example the builder could take a certain number June sucker if they have a plan for improving their habitat.

Mr. Price stated other projects had been done around the world, but asked if research shows driving of the pylons affects fish. Mr. Mills replied a lot of research and studies had been done with different strategies. Research suggests disturbances such as sound waves associated with driving the piling, causes problems. There can be steps taken during the construction process to minimize the effects, but there are definitely impacts on the fish. Mr. Price asked if the impacts were beyond causing the fish to move elsewhere and change their spawning habits. Mr. Mills replied it could result in death to the fish. He noted there is documentation of driving pylons resulting in fish mortality. Mr. Bloodworth said if tapping on an aquarium glass, causes the fish to jump. There is a definite sound as it travels through water, which can affect the fish, and related it to an auditory canal. He gave the example that if the bass were turned up on a stereo, it would kill the fish in the aquarium.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if there was a difference between the noise associated with construction activities and the noise associated with permitted recreational activities on the lake such as boating, water skiing, etc. Mr. Mills said there is definitely a difference in the magnitude. He said he has been near when they have driven the pylons and his car shook; but a boat driving by does not make the car shake. He said the magnitude is a vast difference.

Mr. Bloodworth said a lot depended on the species because there are places around the nation where the Fish and Wildlife Service does not allow jet skis and other things because of the noise issues, which could have an effect as well. Mr. Price remembered someone saying the proposed facility and any other facility which may be built would provide a habitat for fish but did not know if it was a positive or negative. Mr. Mills said a designed facility conjured up six to eight pilings in the lake bottom and then a structure, and underneath the structure would be attractive to the fish. Some sport fishing groups may not be considering the impacts the top level predators have. He suggested they have modeling done to show how a structure would increase predator population. Mr. Beckstrom asked if it was possible to modify the design of the bridge such so it would be less inviting to threatening species and more inviting to the desirable species. Mr. Mills said however, if the bridge were built would be attractive to the predator fish.

Mr. Hunter said the pylons would be a habitat for the predators as well as the prey by providing shade, shadows and other things. Mr. Mills explained one aspect of a fish cannot be changed and expect all the fish to remain the same. He again recommended modeling exercises to evaluate the best solution, such as if the prey and predator population would increase with building a bridge.

4. Recreation Goal 9 – Public Outreach – Received 6 positive and 2 negative votes.

Mr. Price read: “Public perception of Utah Lake is improved by ongoing and effective public outreach and education about its value, uniqueness, and by making positive improvements to the lake.

“Objective - Public Outreach Plan: The Commission will develop a plan for public outreach, promotion, and education to enhance public perception of Utah Lake. In conjunction with the educational goal (Natural Resources Goal 3 – Educational Opportunities) discussed in the natural resources section of this Plan, the Commission will develop a comprehensive communications plan that promotes appropriate recreational uses; educates the public about the history, characteristics, and natural resources of the lake; and supports appropriate commercial development. The plan will include provisions for on-going communication (e.g., Commission website updates, city newsletters, periodic newsletters, event advertisements) and other similar techniques.”

Mr. Beckstrom said half of those who took the straw poll believed this goal to have a positive effect and only a few to have a negative effect. He asked for comments from the Committee. Mr. Mumford said on the positive side, if there were a trail system around the lake, improved recreational access or other projects would have a positive public outreach result and would be effective. Negative effects specific to the lake are the impact on the environmental aspect, which may be negatively affected.

Mr. Mills said Utah Lake has a history of being abused by the citizens and the inhabitants of the valley. An argument can be made Utah Lake is being abused by putting a bridge across it and trying to get people over it. It falls on the Commission to make sure the Lake is not being abused in the process. He stated just because a bridge exists does not make the public respect the lake more. He said he drives through I-15 through Lindon every day. He does not have any more appreciation nor care for the city anymore, so a bridge may not increase the awareness and respect for the lake.

Mr. Beckstrom said this could be related to Provo Canyon. As people drive through Provo Canyon, they have an appreciation for the beauties and vistas of the area. People who bike or hike also have a greater respect for the canyon. On the opposite side, he felt a number of other people who are fishing the river, hiking, or biking on the trails of the canyon feel the highway and noise is a huge negative on the canyon. This same analogy could be related to the bridge. Those driving on the bridge may have a greater appreciation and understanding for the lake, while boaters or anglers believe the structure has a negative impact. Dr. Hansen disagreed stating it was quite a different comparison. Provo Canyon has a lot to see with rock structures, trees, and all kinds of nature. Driving across the lake on a bridge is nothing but water. He said he had been on the long bridges in Florida and all that is seen is lots of water for a long ways.

Mr. Mumford asked if the real public outreach goal in the Master Plan was to help understand the lake’s history, proper use of the lake, environmental aspects, or recovery efforts. He felt if a bridge was added it would change the public outreach efforts to a degree and not necessarily have a negative effect. Mr. Beckstrom said he voted for the positive. He said to get people to understand Utah Lake they need to recognize the lake. Some residents are more or less oblivious to the existence of Utah Lake. More people driving across the lake are going to have more people acknowledge Utah Lake as a part of our county and neighborhood. If people have driven across the lake, public education has a slightly greater chance of success. Mr. Hunter concurred stating a conveyance center or information center on either or both sides may help in the outreach program. If the visitors have a point of contact with personnel, they have an opportunity to learn more. He gave the example of Antelope Island or various dams. These areas get a lot of traffic and people want to learn more. With a visitor’s center, there can be federal partners and some state partners to help. This would be more positive and bring more awareness to the lake.

Dr. Hansen asked if the suggestion was for a park or location on the bridge for the information. Mr. Hunter said either would be good. You could start small and have interpretive signs on both ends explain the information and importance of Utah Lake, its history and other things. He said having someone explain these things is the most effective way to educate. Dr. Hansen said he had seen this on the bridges in Seattle and these were a success with fish ladders, public parks, information, and documentation.

Mr. Beckstrom said the Committee would try to complete the discussion in their June meeting. Then Mr. Price, Mr. Keleher, and he would summarize the thoughts, ideas, and results with the positives and negatives noted in a document. The Technical Committee would review them for any input prior to being presented to the Governing Board.

8. Other items.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for other items. Mr. Price reported Mr. Dave Grierson, the sovereign lands planner with Forestry, Fire, and State Lands, had passed away in April. Mr. Grierson was a vital part of creating the Master Plan of Utah Lake Commission and key contact for FFSL. He had been battling cancer for several years. Losing Mr. Grierson is a significant loss and the Commission and Division are both saddened by his passing.

Mr. Chamberlain stated the Saratoga Springs Home Owners Association (SSHOA) was planning on dredging their marina and entrance. The SSHOA are putting a dredge plan together with the Corps of Engineers. Mr. Beckstrom asked if it was a maintenance operation or enlargement. Mr. Chamberlain replied it was mainly maintenance. Mr. Mills asked if it was going to be incorporated with the plan to heighten the dikes around the marina. Mr. Chamberlain said he was not sure because he was speaking about the home owners' association marina and not the city's. Mr. Price concurred it was the SSHOA marina to which Mr. Chamberlain was referring, not the city's marina, stating they are two different marinas. Mr. Chamberlain said they were working on the city marina entrance since last week.

9. Confirm that the next meeting will be held at the Historic County Courthouse Suite 212 on Monday, June 21, 2010 at 8:30 AM.

Mr. Beckstrom reminded everyone the next meeting would be held at the Historic County Courthouse on Monday, June 21, 2010 at 8:30 a.m.

10. Adjourn.

Mr. Beckstrom adjourned the meeting at 10:08 a.m.