



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, June 20, 2011, 8:30 A.M.
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 211
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Ben Bloodworth, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands
Chris Tschirki, Orem City
Greg Flint, Santaquin City
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City
Ann Merrill, State Division of Water Resources

ATTENDEES:

Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery
Richard Nielson, Utah County
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

VISITORS:

Jim Price, Mountainland Association of
Governments
Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs, HOA

1 **ABSENT:**

2 American Fork City, Eagle Mountain City, Genola Town, Highland City, Lindon City, Mapleton City, Pleasant
3 Grove City, Springville City, Vineyard Town, Woodland Hills Town, Central Utah Water Conservancy District,
4 Utah Division of Parks and Recreation, Division of Wildlife Resources, Department of Natural Resources,
5 Department of Environmental Quality, Utah Lake Water Users, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
6

7 **1. Welcome.**

8 In the absence of Mr. Greg Beckstrom and Mr. Chris Keleher, Mr. Reed Price, Executive Director, called
9 the meeting to order at 8:38 a.m. He excused Mr. Greg Beckstrom who said he would be late. Mr. Price
10 welcomed members and visitors to the meeting.
11

12 **2. Review and approve minutes from the May 23, 2011 meeting.**

13 Mr. Price asked for discussion, comments, or corrections to the minutes of the meeting held on May
14 23, 2011. With no corrections, it was motioned by Mr. Richard Nielsen to approve the minutes of the
15 meeting held on May 23, and it was seconded by Dr. Lee Hansen. The motion carried and it was
16 unanimously approved.
17

18 **3. Update from the Committee Chair and Executive Director.**

19 Mr. Price updated the Committee on the status of the Utah Lake Festival. After he announced the
20 Festival would be held the first week of June at the last Technical Committee meeting, he and Mr. Mike
21 Mills discussed the elevation of the lake and hazards it might propose. Discussions with Ty Hunter and
22 Committee members determined it would not be safe to hold the Festival. The decision was to cancel the
23 event for the public's safety and lack of adequate parking. Another meeting was held to consider
24 rescheduling the Festival later in the summer. The unknown status of the lake level, safety issues,
25 schedules, and parking situation resulted in the decision to hold the scheduled event next year.

1 Mr. Mills said the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) was disappointed when they
2 chose to cancel the Festival. A lot of effort and planning had already gone into making it a great event. The
3 lake level being up, the jetties under water, parking, and not enough room to accommodate the usual type
4 of crowd contributed to the decision. Mr. Price said the Festival was fortunate to get coverage out of the
5 cancellation and bring attention to the lake. They had scheduled Big Buddha from Fox 13 to cover the
6 festival and when it was cancelled, they still opted to highlight the lake instead. The Commission and Lake
7 received good coverage from the broadcast.

8 Dr. Hansen asked if an alternate venue could be used in the future. Mr. Price said there is no venue
9 close to the Lake except the Utah Lake State Park that can accommodate the amount of parking needed
10 unless the Commission and JSRIP contracted with buses to shuttle people in, but the Commission does not
11 have funding to do it. Dr. Hansen asked about the Saratoga Springs Marina visited during the Utah Lake
12 Tour. Mr. Price said Saratoga Springs had an event on the same day. Dr. Hansen concurred stating there
13 was an event but it was held only one weekend, and scheduling shouldn't be difficult. Mr. Price said the
14 idea of having different events at the marinas as well so people will not just focus on Utah Lake State Park.
15 But to have an event at the five different public marinas would be a logistical issue. The Commission is
16 considering expanding events to other marinas. Dr. Hansen said the Festival is a good thing, but suggested
17 it should be expanded in the future if possible.

18 Mr. Price said the Commission was on line to create curriculum for seventh grade students. Seven
19 instructors of seventh grade will help write the curriculum at the Provo School District offices in the middle
20 of July. If any ideas on courses seventh graders study related to Utah Lake should be included in the
21 curriculum, Mr. Price can be notified. Dr. Hansen asked if the Commission was in contact with the Alpine
22 School District. Mr. Price yes, he was in contact with the curriculum directors from Alpine, Provo, and Nebo
23 School Districts. The directors had screened and provided names of seventh grade teachers who are
24 interested in helping. Dr. Hansen made a suggestion of talking to someone from the Boy Scout Program to
25 discuss environmental science and other merit badges. Mr. Price said in the past it had been discussed and
26 the Commission should follow up. Dr. Hansen said he would provide contact information.

27 Mr. Price reported on the phragmites removal efforts. Mr. Aaron Eagar, Utah County Weed Supervisor,
28 and Mr. Price will inspect spots treated in the pilot project area, between Lindon Boat Harbor and Vineyard.
29 They will look at the phragmites growth on the west side of the lake and the Saratoga Springs area
30 preparing for treatment in August and September. He invited Mr. Bloodworth to join them. Mr.
31 Bloodworth said he was in Lindon last week and was surprised at the positive changes. Mr. Price
32 anticipates the same thing will happen on the west side of the lake. The Commission will keep the
33 Committee and others posted on the progress. In two to three years, "after photos" for Saratoga Springs in
34 will show the difference as they move forward on the project.

35
36 **4. Report on lake level and the compromise elevation.**

37 Mr. Beckstrom arrived and Mr. Price turned the meeting over to him. Mr. Beckstrom announced
38 explanation of the lake compromise elevation.

39 Mr. Price said he receives questions on what "compromise elevation of the lake" means. He gave a
40 history and term definition. When pioneer settlers arrived, they created and made Utah Lake into a
41 reservoir, which flowed into the Jordan River. An agreement was made setting the compromise elevation
42 of Utah Lake. After selecting the elevation, a stone monument set at the north end was made to mark the
43 level. If the lake level reached the monument height, they released water from Utah Lake. Knowing water
44 should be stored, reasons given for releasing water were because land owners around the lake did not
45 want excessive water particularly along the east side where the lake is shallow. Several inches increases
46 the depth of the lake and moves inland taking their land.

47 Weather patterns caused flooding at Utah Lake in 1983, so the initial compromise elevation was
48 forgotten and the monument fell into disrepair. As the floods occurred, it was confusing what should

1 happen. A lawsuit was filed and eventually after 18 months, a new compromise agreement was
2 established in 1985, which set the compromise elevation at 4489.045 feet above sea level. The elevation
3 agreement was between land owners, water rights users, and others who determined once the lake gets to
4 4489.045 feet the gates at the Jordan River will be fully opened to allow water to be released until it is back
5 down to the agreed elevation, and then the gates will be closed.

6 A forgotten part of the compromise agreement stipulates if flows at the 2100 South gage station on the
7 Jordan River reach 3400 cubic feet per second (cfs), then the gates should be closed. If the gates are
8 adjusted downward, the 3400 cfs at 2100 South can be maintained, but it would increase flooding at Utah
9 Lake. Mr. Nielsen said the 3400 cfs includes the flow up to 2100 south. Mr. Price concurred. He said the
10 flows coming from all the tributaries into the Jordan River add to the 3400 cfs. Even if Utah Lake is not
11 putting a lot of flow into the Jordan River, the easiest solution is to close the gates at Utah Lake in order to
12 alleviate flooding in the Jordan River area but that action exacerbates the flooding in Utah County. Mr.
13 Nielsen has kept track of the Jordan River flows and the lake elevation. The lake elevation has maintained
14 over the past couple of weeks, at about 2.2 feet above compromise elevation. In 1983, it was nearly six
15 feet above compromise. Lessons learned in 1983 and the improvements made, including the creation of
16 Jordanelle dam, have helped the problem. Mr. Price asked for compromise elevation questions.

17 Mr. Hewitson asked for numbers of the compromise elevation measurement again. Mr. Price said
18 4489.045 feet above sea level. Mr. Tschirki said he noted the flows at the surplus canal at 2100 South
19 exceeded 3900 cfs and steadily increased throughout the rainy day, but were presently back under 3400
20 cfs. Mr. Beckstrom said the increase was largely rain-induced. Mr. Nielsen said almost three weeks prior
21 he talked to the state engineer when the last rain event spiked it up over 3400 cfs. The state engineer's
22 view was if the elevation rise was rain induced for one to two days, they would not mess with shutting the
23 gates. The lag time takes 24 hours before flows at 2100 South would change, so rather than adjust up and
24 down, the state engineer looks at it from a reasonable standpoint. Mr. Scott Baird, Salt Lake County Flood
25 Control and Mr. Jeff Niermeyer at Salt Lake City, agreed with the state engineer.

26 Mr. Bloodworth asked if the gates were easily closed. Mr. Nielsen said the gates were easy to close.
27 Mr. Tschirki said he was looking at the agreement and it specifies the Utah County Engineer, the State
28 Engineer, and a flood manager. He asked who the manager was. Mr. Nielsen said it was Mr. Scott Baird of
29 Salt Lake County. Mr. Tschirki asked if the three (Utah County, Salt Lake County, and the state engineer)
30 made the decisions. Mr. Nielsen said the consultation occurs between the Utah County Engineer, Salt Lake
31 City Flood Manager, and the state engineer, but it did not say the county has to agree his decision.

32 Mr. Beckstrom said when the TMDL issue was discussed by Ms. Hilary Arens last month the TMDL was
33 closing the lower end of the Jordan River north of 2100 South. She said roughly 80 percent of the water
34 gets diverted into the surplus canal and 20 percent goes down the historical channel. He had been
35 monitoring and observing the flows at the gage stations, and was a 99:1 ratio. He asked if it was normal or
36 if something different was occurring this year.

37 Mr. Bloodworth says the natural flow of the channel stays about the same year round. In terms of the
38 overflow, it is more. It is still showing most of the water in the surplus canal. Mr. Beckstrom said the gage
39 station is relatively accurate, with low double digit flows in the original Jordan River channel such as 10 cfs,
40 and it was the normal flow for that section of the River. Mr. Bloodworth said it is a little low. Mr.
41 Beckstrom said it seemed low.

42 Mr. Nielsen said the surplus canal at present is showing 3460 cfs but the Jordan River at 1700 South is
43 showing 21 cfs, up from where it has been, around 10 cfs. Mr. Beckstrom said it seemed as if those were
44 typical flows in the Jordan River. He did not know how DEQ ever expected to get desirable oxygen levels in
45 the channel irrespective of what is being done upstream.

46 Mr. Nielsen reported there were no significant flood issues in the county over the past month. There
47 was an issue with American Fork and the boat harbor with water coming out of the channel. The road had
48 to be closed down to the boat harbor and American Fork closed the harbor because of the flooding. He

1 expected water will flow over the road for a couple more weeks. Mr. Beckstrom asked what the estimated
2 flows were in the American Fork River. Mr. Nielsen said around 600 cfs.

3 Mr. Hewitson said they had not had any problems of flooding in Lehi. They had been keeping the
4 canals clean and open, which helped quite a bit. Mr. Beckstrom asked how the flows were in Dry Creek and
5 if it was the main channel. Mr. Hewitson said it was the waste ditch. Mr. Beckstrom asked how the flows
6 were compared to 1982. Although Mr. Hewitson was not there in 1982, he said the flows were about the
7 same as last year.

8
9 **5. Discuss draft Transportation Commission rule establishing guidelines to consider when reviewing a**
10 **proposed plan to construct a highway facility over sovereign lakebed lands.**

11 Mr. Beckstrom said the members received an electronic copy of the proposed rule. An outline
12 prepared by Mr. Price of the draft transportation rule was available. A review had taken place with Mr.
13 Price, Mr. Keleher, and Mr. Beckstrom, as well as discussion with the Executive Committee. The objective
14 was to identify questions to be considered by the Transportation Commission regarding the proposal. The
15 Technical Committee would address concerns, recommendations, or modifications to the document that is
16 out for public review.

17 Mr. Price summarized the progress of the Rule established by the Transportation Commission and
18 released on June 1. The state legislature had passed House Bill 137 (HB-137), which formally involved
19 UDOT in the review process in the current application, which is to build a bridge across Utah Lake. The bill
20 covers any highway facility over any sovereign lake beds in Utah. HB-137 was in reaction to the current
21 application FFSL has been reviewing. The Commission, Division of FFSL, and Department of Natural
22 Resources felt it wise to include UDOT in the process and utilize their expertise to answer the many
23 questions Utah Lake Commission and others have. FFSL believes UDOT has the expertise and experience in
24 answering the questions. The draft rules were released on June 1. The Commission expected to have a 60-
25 day comment period, but it was only 30-days, necessitating the meeting of the Technical Committee. The
26 Technical Committee can see if the rules address issues the Utah Lake Commission feels are important. In
27 past meetings, the Technical Committee helped the Governing Board come up with a neutral position. The
28 Technical Committee identified issues to help achieve objectives identified in the Utah Lake Master Plan, or
29 made it difficult to accomplish the objectives identified.

30 The most pertinent sections in the outline were numbers five and six, which discusses the preliminary
31 information UDOT is asking of the project proponent to determine if they will actually be able to complete
32 the project. If Mr. Harward passes the preliminary review, UDOT would request the project proponent
33 provide information for a final review by the Transportation Commission. Mr. Price identified what each
34 requirement is (in section five and six of the rule), and identified the questions Utah Lake Commission
35 suggested be answered at the bottom of page two of the outline. Issues the Commission requested be
36 dealt with are areas that could be strengthened by the rules to insure the project proponent address them
37 or not be included at all. Mr. Beckstrom said the key thing in the legislature's direction is UDOT should be
38 involved in the process, but the final decision still rests with FFSL, who will make the decision whether or
39 not a permit is granted for the construction of a bridge facility, such as at Utah Lake. They have said FFSL
40 cannot approve such a permit unless the Transportation Commission/UDOT, after their review has given
41 their required approval. FFSL is looking into the other issues, which they are required to do in their permit
42 process. It is conceivable FFSL could get UDOT's approval, but with FFSL's authority and jurisdiction they
43 could still determine issuance of a permit is not warranted and can be denied. Mr. Ben Bloodworth of FFSL
44 concurred.

45 Transportation Commission's responsibility is two-fold. First, evaluate the technical engineering design
46 of the structure, assuring it is sound and consistent with current engineering standards; and, second,
47 financial viability of the project and the proponent of the project. The project financing, funding, and
48 revenue plans are provided by the proponent to show that it will be a self sufficient, sustainable, viable,

1 financial project. Also, the applicant/proponent of the project should establish documented financial
2 papers for himself, his partners, or others who may be involved showing there is sufficient money to
3 finance and guarantee completion, as well as operation and maintenance of the facility.

4 A number of issues identified in terms of impact of the lake are environmentally-related, recreational
5 issues, and other issues, and are indirectly addressed because the applicant has to show compliance to
6 environmental permitting requirements. The Technical Committee needs to be careful not to jump to
7 conclusions that those issues are not going to be reviewed or they are not important. They will be
8 reviewed primarily by FFSL in their permitting process review. If issues the Technical Committee has raised
9 have not been included in the review, it does not mean they will not be reviewed and are not an important
10 consideration before FFSL grants the final permit. UDOT's jurisdiction is primarily with engineering and
11 financial feasibility of the project.

12 Mr. Bloodworth said from FFSL's perspective, it puts the decisions for the technical side, especially the
13 construction itself in the hands of those who can. Mr. Price said the Executive Committee had a couple of
14 questions and so he contacted UDOT. He asked UDOT what areas would be covered by FFSL's review or by
15 UDOT's review, such as what plans are in place to limit the chances of hazardous spills, whether it was a
16 maintenance or environmental issue, and what UDOT's recommendation was. He spoke to a woman at
17 UDOT who suggested to not limiting the comments. Submitted comments will be reviewed by the
18 Transportation Commission and they will determine if it is a legitimate concern to add to the rule or if it
19 should be addressed by the FFSL review process. She said not to make assumptions one side or the other
20 would decide. If it is a concern, we should suggest UDOT address a particular issue and they can make the
21 determination, but Utah Lake Commission needs to voice their concerns. Mr. Bloodworth said by the same
22 token, he did not want the assumption made it would only be considered by one side and not the other. If
23 it is felt it is something FFSL should look that, then UDOT may want to look at it as well. Mr. Beckstrom said
24 there might be overlapping or evolution of the process in terms of defining the boundaries between FFSL
25 and UDOT in the ongoing process.

26 After the Technical Committee's discussion, Mr. Beckstrom said Mr. Price, as Executive Director, would
27 prepare a document to be forwarded as a formal response from the Utah Lake Commission by the end of
28 the week. He opened the table for questions, comments, and discussion.

29 Mr. Tschirki asked if it was a two-pronged approval approach with FFSL and Transportation
30 Commission. If both are reviewing things, he asked if FFSL says yes and Transportation Commission says
31 no, what would be the final answer. Mr. Beckstrom said they both have to agree, and if either says no, it is
32 not approved. Mr. Tschirki asked if they have to agree on any particular issue or on those issues outlined in
33 the rule. Mr. Beckstrom said they have to agree on the final decision. The Transportation Commission has
34 to forward a formal document to FFSL with their approval, and if FFSL does not get approval from the
35 Transportation Commission, the proponent cannot proceed forward. Once they get the document from
36 the Transportation Commission, FFSL still has the responsibility to make the final decision. If the
37 Transportation Commission says no, the process is done. If the Transportation Commission says yes, FFSL
38 still has other issues to address. Mr. Tschirki asked if it would be funneled through the Transportation
39 Commission, and if they were the point of contact with the applicant. Mr. Price said just with the design
40 and the maintenance. Mr. Beckstrom said FFSL is still the primary source of contact. Mr. Bloodworth said
41 it was still a current application through FFSL and UDOT is an enhanced part of the reasoning of how it
42 works out. Mr. Tschirki wanted clarification FFSL is the point of contact with the applicant. Mr. Beckstrom
43 said the real final decision is made by FFSL, but are limited based on an approval by the Transportation
44 Commission. Mr. Beckstrom said the process hadn't changed, legally or structurally other than the
45 legislature has given the Transportation Commission a more clearly defined role in the process.

46 Dr. Hansen was concerned about the quality of the proposal, which has been hard to determine. For
47 example, on the existing proposal FFSL asked for a traffic study. Dr. Hansen felt it was poorly done and
48 inadequate. He asked what happens if something poorly done comes in and UDOT declared it was not

1 adequate and needed to ask for more. Mr. Beckstrom said it is one reason UDOT was given the
2 responsibility to define the process. There are a lot of technical, traffic and other issues FFSL theoretically
3 has the responsibility to review, but did not have the needed level of confidence. The state has expertise in
4 the Transportation Commission and the Department of Transportation was formally assigned the
5 responsibility to play the role and provide the support to FFSL in the review process. In the Transportation
6 Commission/UDOT, there is expertise to say if the traffic study is done sufficiently well and consistent with
7 normal practices for doing this type of a study. If it is deemed not to be of quality, the project is not
8 approved or is delayed until there is something approved by the Transportation Commission.

9 Mr. Bloodworth said it is streamlined. The new way is the applicant is dealing with someone who
10 knows about the issues, and it makes it even more streamlined because of the timeliness. Oftentimes,
11 applicants think FFSL is trying to put time lag in and they question whether we need the information we are
12 asking for. In the new way, that aspect is taken out. UDOT can say provide us with the information and it
13 makes the review system smoother.

14 Mr. Price said looking through some of the things being requested, the current applicant will say they
15 have done it and submit it. It was reviewed by us and we have felt it is inadequate. Dr. Hansen said that is
16 the reason he was asking about the quality. If the applicant submits a traffic study, does UDOT have the
17 authority to say it is inadequate, and something better is required? Mr. Bloodworth said he believed this
18 rule gives them that ability. Mr. Price said he noted language should be added to make sure UDOT has the
19 authority to determine the quality of the submitted information. Dr. Hansen only saw the outline. He
20 asked that language be included that says the project must meet some kind of standard.

21 Mr. Beckstrom said that one of the sections in the review of the proposal is 940-5-7, in part, “the
22 Commission review of the proposed highway facility over sovereign lake bed lands, the Commission will
23 consider the public interest to assure the proposed plan is feasible, financially viable, and that the facility is
24 safe by meeting current engineering standards.” It is part of the overall rule, and both the Transportation
25 Commission and FFSL understand the nature of the project. A legal challenge from opponents could be the
26 explanation pertaining to technical liability or compliance with professional standards in the preparation of
27 the traffic study.

28 Mr. Price said in his conversation with UDOT after the Executive Committee meeting there was
29 misunderstanding pertaining to 5.1.g.i.a., the Preliminary Design and Engineering at 30 percent. Some in
30 the Executive Committee thought a preliminary design and report showing 30 percent design would be
31 required during the preliminary review and the qualifications of financial resources. In subheading ii, it
32 states “proof that the proposer has sufficient funds to pay for the items listed in the comprehensive
33 development budget.” The proponent is required to come up with a budget of what would be required to
34 create all of the items of A through H and prove they have sufficient funds to pay for those. It does not
35 mean they need to have 30 percent preliminary design done in the preliminary phase, but show they can
36 pay for it and then 30 percent of the design. He clarified with the UDOT spokeswoman they were not sure
37 what would be required in the final design, but she was certain it would not be a fully completed drawing
38 of every section of the lake. He stated 30 percent is a common standard. The proponent is asked for proof
39 of funding for an expensive preliminary design. The designs will not be required in the preliminary stage,
40 but proof they could fund them, when required, is what is being requested. Dr. Hansen asked if it meant
41 FFSL was left in a position of having to say yes or no to a project where they do not have all the design
42 information. Mr. Beckstrom said it was largely the standard practice, as they issue permits for any activity
43 on the sovereign lands. They don't have 100 percent complete construction building permit drawings
44 ready to be associated with a project, and they are applying the same standard here as they would with
45 every other processed permit. However, this project will be required to have a higher level of design work
46 completed prior to the issuance of the permit because they need to have enough of a design done. They
47 need to create a good construction cost estimate for purposes of establishing financial coverage and the
48 financial commitment needs to be verified. A sufficient amount of detail of the review needs to be given to

1 environmental issues and questions are being asked for impacts. A definitive answer to a number of the
2 environmental questions can't be answered until the basic 30-percent-level design information is done.

3 Dr. Hansen said what generated his question are the issues of some geophysical issues involved in
4 putting in a bridge. In building a highway on land, you can solve those problems as they progress, but with
5 a bridge, it would not work. Mr. Price said he asked what studies will be performed to understand
6 geotechnical issues of the lake. He did not realize full scale plans would not be required and it is industry
7 standard. Dr. Hansen said it was all right as long as the issues are addressed.

8 Mr. Beckstrom asked if Mr. J. Price had any comments and wondered if MAG was doing any
9 independent review or feedback on the rule. Mr. J. Price said they were reviewing the rule, but as far as
10 having particular feedback, they don't have any yet.

11 Mr. Beckstrom said they would be working on this over the next few days and planned on having a
12 document to the Transportation Commission by the end of the week. He asked if any other thoughts or
13 questions came up, to contact Mr. Price directly. No formal action was needed by the Technical Committee
14 on the matter other than having any issues coordinated through Mr. Price.

15 Mr. Hewitson asked if 30 percent is the actual completion number, over 30 percent, or was it known
16 what FFSL would look at. Mr. Beckstrom said the short answer was they didn't know. His understanding of
17 the 30 percent number is not clearly defined of what constitutes 30 percent. It is generally considered a
18 level of detail sufficient to be able to answer the key questions associated with the project, which primarily
19 are costs and impacts. Enough level of detail should be available for the resource specialist team dealing
20 with a number of environmental issues to be able to say yes, this will be acceptable and this will not be
21 acceptable.

22 Mr. Price said it should be pointed out an even more critical review will be done by his investors. Mr.
23 Beckstrom said both the Transportation Commission and FFSL would not give a blanket yes or no. In both
24 cases, it will be a conditional approval of some form. Mr. Price read, "The commission reserves the right to
25 require or permit the proposer to submit revisions, verifications, or supplemental of the proposal of the
26 review process." This means the proponent may need to provide more information, or answer new
27 questions that arise. Mr. Hewitson asked if the 30 percent meant minimum. Mr. Beckstrom said the 30
28 percent is a balancing act of the governmental agencies dealing with private projects, in getting them to
29 commit enough resources to the project so the public agency is comfortable approving it. Also, 30 percent
30 is not requiring them to commit so much money to the project that it becomes perceived as unreasonable
31 or punitive, and the public agency ultimately ends up denying the project. It is not an easy line to walk and
32 that is what is being struggled with in the process.

33
34 **5a. Other discussion items.**

35 Mr. Beckstrom asked what the status was on carp removal. Mr. Mills said they were proceeding with
36 the removal, but it has been slow progress because of the high lake level, which makes it more difficult to
37 get carp. The fishermen are moving fish as they can. Dr. Hansen asked if the carp still went to landfills.
38 Mr. Mills said very few were going to landfills, but most were going to the farmers in Utah County.

39 Mr. Tschirki asked about the proposed Utah County Flood Management Plan. Mr. Nielsen said the
40 commissioners were still talking about it and had some discussion with the various mayors. The
41 Commissioners are looking at the plan and making a decision whether the county should move forward or
42 not. Several mayors want to move forward and a few mayors have not wanted to do it. The county is
43 trying to work through the issues to make sure everyone is comfortable with what is happening.

44
45 **6. Confirm that the next meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 18, 2011 in Suite 212 of the Historic**
46 **Utah County Courthouse.**

1 Mr. Beckstrom stated the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for July 18. Unless there was
2 something important which arose, the meeting may be cancelled. The 30-day review process demanded a
3 meeting be held in June and so there may not be a meeting in July.

4

5 **7. Adjourn.**

6 Mr. Beckstrom adjourned the meeting at 9:14 a.m.