



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
Monday, October 19, 2009, 8:30 A.M.
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 211
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Ben Bloodworth, FFSL
David Lifferth, Eagle Mountain City
Noah Gordon, Springville City
David Grierson, Utah Department of Natural Resources
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City
Norman Holdaway, Vineyard Town
Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources
Nathan Lunstad, Highland City
Ann Merrill, State Division of Water Resources

ATTENDEES:

LaVere Merritt, Emeritus Professor
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery
Richard Nielson, County Engineer
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission
Sarah Sutherland, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Chris Tschirki, Orem City

VISITORS:

Conly Hansen, Researcher, USU
Paul Goodrich, Orem City

ABSENT:

Mapleton City, Lindon Boat Harbor, Lindon, American Fork City, Woodland Hills, Genola, Pleasant Grove City, Vineyard, Santaquin, Utah Division of Parks & Recreation, Utah Lake Water Users, Mountainland Association of Governments, , Division of Water Quality, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

1. Welcome and introductions.

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman, Greg Beckstrom at 8:35 a.m. He asked everyone present to introduce themselves and state whom they represent.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from September 21, 2009.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for additions or corrections regarding the Technical Committee minutes from the meeting of September 21, 2009. Changes to the minutes were as follows: Mr. Chris Keleher stated on page four a vague statement he made and Mr. Dave Grierson's answer were not vital to the discussion of the nomination process and asked it be deleted. Mr. Dave Grierson stated on page two the words "under the direction of Mr. David Grierson," be deleted. Approval

of the minutes was motioned by Mr. Chris Keleher and seconded by Dr. LeVere Merritt and the minutes were unanimously approved as corrected.

3. Introduction of Project.

Mr. Reed Price, Director of the Commission, explained in an earlier meeting, Dr. Lee Hansen introduced a new process of anaerobic digestion which could be added to a waste water treatment plant to remove and lower phosphorous levels. Dr. Conley Hansen, of Utah State University, is an expert in this process and was present to comment on this concept. Mr. Price suggested if anyone was associated with a water treatment plant or was interested in what Dr. Conley Hansen said, they could contact him directly.

Dr. Conley Hansen, a Utah State University researcher, stated cities who owned a waste water treatment plant could save a lot of money through this special treatment process. He cited the Logan facility as an example, stating it was ahead of others in phosphorous removal. This has been done in Canada, California and other areas. After treatment, the remaining is gasses are conditioned which makes a high-quality natural gas substitute. He stated he would offer his professional services in lieu of payment if he worked through Lee Hansen. His main goal was to help in algae and phosphorous removal to help the lake environment. He will return at a future date to explain the process and offer his suggestions and services.

4. Report on carp removal efforts.

Mr. Mike Mills reported on the project of carp removal stating since September 21, 2009, there has been close to 350,000 pounds of carp removed from Utah Lake. He stated a lot of the harvested fish were used as food at a mink farm in Benjamin and the remainder of the fish were taken to the Bay View landfill facility on the west side of Utah Lake. He stated the workers would continue removing the fish. They had been working up to 80 hours a week and removing between 15,000 and 25,000 pounds of carp a day.

Mr. Beckstrom asked who provided the money to fund this project. Mr. Mills explained the money came from the Department of Environmental Quality. He said the funds came in June from federal grant money which the Division of Wildlife Resources and the June Sucker Recovery Program had applied for. He stated it was additional money which had not been expected, but helped to get the project started.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if the environmental assessment had been completed and Mr. Mills said the original comments had been returned from Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Chris Keleher had been integrating the comments into the environmental assessment. Mr. Mills explained there were several other steps in order to get the Fish and Wildlife Service to agree to the assessment, and then it will then go into a comment period. He hoped this study would be done by the first part of November. Mr. Price asked how long the comment period was. Mr. Mills replied it was 30 days, after which the Fish and Wildlife Service could release their Record of Decision and the money allocated for the carp removal would be available.

Dr. LeVere Merritt asked where the most productive fishing location for carp was located and if it was in the shallows. Mr. Mills told the group it was in the southern part of the lake, both in Provo Bay and Goshen Bay areas. He said it was positive overall but the crews have moved around a lot trying a lot of different areas on the lake. Mr. Jim Hewitson asked Mr. Mills when the estimated 75 percent of the carp would be removed from the lake. Mr. Mills replied this milestone would be reached within about six years.

Mr. Price told the Technical Committee about a carp removal process video. He felt it would be valuable for the members to see the carp removal video and asked if it could be put on line for members or other interested parties to watch. Mr. Mills replied the video would be put on YouTube to allow everyone to see it. Mr. Price will notify the members by email when the video is online.

Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Mills for a review of the day-long Utah Lake Symposium. Mr. Mills reported the Symposium was well attended with about 100 people and the overall results of the symposium were successful. A wide range of presentations included: Updates of the recovery program; presentation of the food web model; boundary-line settlement between sovereign and private lands; an example of phragmites removal on the Great Salt Lake with a similar project in place around Utah Lake; Mr. Price presented information concerning the Commission; and presentations focusing on the bridge proposal. Mr. Mike Donahue, the keynote speaker, had been a consultant during the Master Plan Process and was invited back to relate his experience and success in working on the Great Lakes and his group's ability to acquire large amounts of federal funds used for Great Lakes' projects. Mr. Price reported the Symposium had been recorded by Channel 17 (Provo) and after it is edited, a link or the schedule would be sent to members of the commission.

Dr. LaVere Merritt said on the following morning, Dr. Sam Rushforth, as part of the Utah Valley University science lecture series, gave an informative hour-long historical review of the Lake and some of the features it offers. Mr. Price recommended Mr. Rushforth come to the first meeting of 2010 when the new governing board takes over. Mr. Price suggested a possible special session be held just for new members of the Governing Board in order to learn about the Lake.

4. Discuss the proposed bridge crossing of Utah Lake.

Mr. Beckstrom explained the history of the bridge proposal with Utah Lake Crossing. He said Mr. Leon Harward gave a presentation two months prior showing a bridge across Utah Lake with termination points located at a spot north of Pelican Point in Saratoga Springs to a point in Vineyard, which would ultimately connect into Geneva Road, 800 north and I-15 in Orem. The following month Mr. David Grierson of Forest, Fire and State Lands (FFSL) presented the procedural process concerning the Utah Lake Crossing Proposal. (Mr. Beckstrom suggested the Technical Committee read the comments posted on the FFSL website.) He reported the nomination process could potentially end in a lease between Utah Lake Crossing and FFSL/State for the sovereign land portion of the lake which would be utilized in the bridge crossing. Mr. Price informed the group that based on the design of the project; the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) had issued a letter stating no permit was required from the Army Corps of Engineers. With the ACOE letter of declaration, Mr. Beckstrom stated the FFSL process would be the primary review process for the proposed bridge. He stated another critical part of the review would be done by Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), which is the major transportation planner within the Utah County Mountainland area. He said MAG would be doing modeling and evaluation to see if the bridge would be a regionally-significant project. After MAG study and determination is made, then air quality impact evaluations would be conducted. These studies could have an impact on the bridge proposal.

Mr. Beckstrom stated he was aware of the various conflicts members of the Committee had representing a group, an agency, individual municipalities, or just personal opinions. He stated the primary focus of the Commission was pursuing implementation of the Utah Lake Master Plan with the stated goals and objectives. He said several cities had already taken a position on the proposal, for example, Eagle Mountain had passed a resolution in support of the proposal, while the incumbent mayor of Saratoga Springs had expressed concerns for the proposal.

Mr. Beckstrom clarified his perceptions on the role the Technical Committee would play in helping the Governing Board and FFSL during the review of the proposal, including:

- Identification of concerns from public comments;
- Evaluation of validity of the comments;
- Research the feasibility of the concerns;
- Appraisal of the technical issues related to the bridge proposal; and
- Expectation of a resolution which states Utah Lake Commission's position.

Mr. Price reminded the committee the proposal is still in the nomination process which will determine if the bridge is a good project for the lake. If Utah Crossing is invited to apply for a permit, then the information which is compiled and provided from the Technical Committee could be used towards FFSL's requirements, the conditions and the issues to be addressed in the application process. If the determination for the bridge is positive, any concerns or ideas which are discovered and listed from the Technical Committee as well as from the general public during the comment period would be addressed by the group in the application process. He stressed this was an important time for the Technical Committee to identify issues which may arise if the application is invited to continue and as a result, these areas would be addressed.

Mr. Chris Tschirki asked if MAG would be independent of the Commission and if the Commission would work directly with FFSL. Mr. Price stated in the affirmative. He stated the Transportation Subcommittee would regroup and may join with MAG to consider the transportation concerns. The Commission will consider separate issues which the Technical Committee would list.

Mr. Keleher asked the level of authority MAG had in relation to FFSL. Mr. Beckstrom explained just as Utah Lake Commission has very little, if any legal authority, MAG as a political body comprised of mayors and county leaders, is also a political body whose opinion carries significant weight. Therefore, if MAG takes a position on the proposal, either favorably or unfavorably and adopts a resolution, FFSL would give serious consideration to MAG's evaluation of the proposal situation even though it would be absent of any significant legal authority.

Mr. Chris Keleher asked if MAG determined the bridge was a regionally-significant project, there may be air quality issues would result in a federal nexus requiring NEPA compliance. Mr. Beckstrom stated it could create potential federal regulatory issues. Mr. Richard Nielsen asked whether a project is publicly or privately funded, if the air quality could stop the project. Mr. Price replied in the affirmative.

Dr. LaVere Merritt felt the Commission should focus more on the problems, advantages, and disadvantages associated with the project. He stated because members were representing other groups or agencies it would be a juggling act because of individual feelings and strong opinions. Overall, he felt the Commission needed guidance to generate a list of issues or concerns for the best outcome.

Mr. Beckstrom stated the objective of the Technical Committee is to see if the Committee can clearly identify issues of concern or questions that fall into two categories. He stated the first category would be more significant than those which fit in the second. He stated the first group would include issues which reach across the broad categories including ecological, transportation, or financial, and/or other impacts. If clearly identifiable concerns or impacts are not able to be mitigated in the evaluation, this would constitute a basis for saying no to the proposal.

The second category for concerns would be anticipated questions and/or fears of the public, such as earthquakes, safety, etc. He stated studies would need to be conducted to deal with those concerns or fears to insure they are avoided or adequately mitigated in the course of the development and construction of the bridge. He suggested as the Committee identifies concerns or issues into the two stated categories. He believed this list could be achieved through open discussion, comments or questions. He stated Identification of these issues would represent potential concerns with goals and/or objectives which are identified in the Utah Lake Master Plan. The identified items would then be used by the Governing Board in evaluating if the proposed project supports or is inconsistent with the goals and objectives in the Utah Lake Master Plan.

Mr. Jim Hewitson asked for a summary of the goals of the Master Plan. Mr. Price stated the goals addressed land use issues, recreational issues, transportation issues, natural resources, and public facilities. In regards to the transportation issues, he stated the goals and objectives of the plan consisted of creating trails, access points, and other goals. He reminded the committee that as a body, the Commission will study out the proposal and make a recommendation when they feel they have received and reviewed enough information. He stated the Commission is neither a proponent nor opponent. Identification of

concerns could be the effects on the natural resources because there is a conservation element in the Master Plan. Another area addressed is the promotion of recreation and if the project could possibly inhibit the recreation. The final area would be meshing the land use.

As a refresher of the goals and objectives of the Master Plan, Mr. Beckstrom referred the committee to sections three and four of the Master Plan stating Section Three had the vision statement.

Mr. Paul Goodrich stated in the production of the Master Plan, FFSL, UDOT, and MAG were utilized. He stated in a recent meeting with UDOT and MAG, UDOT said the roads which would connect to the bridge and to other state facilities were to be private roads and not state roads. As a result of UDOT's statement, their decision brings into play other approving agencies such as Vineyard, Saratoga Springs, and Orem. Because the road is deemed a private road, and not a UDOT or state road, an approval process outlined by the municipalities would be involved. The developer would need to go through a site plan approval process, planning commission, and possibly city council for each municipality depending on their procedures. With the road being private, he vocalized the importance of having a linear approval process where state lands and municipalities approve concurrently, creating a linear approval process. If a concurrent process were in place, everyone's final approval would happen near the same time, rather one approves at one time and another approves at a later time.

Mr. Beckstrom stated several entities may be involved with legal rights to approve the project. With several approving entities, if anyone of them said no, to a certain degree, it would not matter what the others said. Mr. Beckstrom understood the intent of a concurrent process but felt it was somewhat interpretive. He stated he believed there would be simultaneous discussion between the affected parties including FFSL, UDOT, MAG and local communities, as well as the group proposing the bridge.

Mr. Keleher asked if the communication from the cities would be independent or come through the Commission. Mr. Price stated one of the Commission's purposes is to facilitate communication and the commission was taking a primary role in making sure everyone knows what the other is thinking.

Mr. Beckstrom stated the key communities of Saratoga Springs on the west side and Vineyard on the east side, which extends beyond the private road into Orem, will have an opportunity to directly address the proposal. He believed where a private facility, state road, or a local road interacts with the structure, the key communities will have direct authority to approve or stop the proposal if it is contrary to the entity's interests.

Mr. Goodrich voiced concern about toll booth placement -- directly on the bridge or located prior to the bridge. Depending on the booth location, it could prohibit direct access to the lake by requiring a private toll to a public lake. Mr. Tschirki asked about fishing opportunities along the bridge. Mr. Beckstrom replied it was not in the plan but it could be a possibility.

Mr. Beckstrom stated there was concerns about ecological and environmental issues such as impact on the fish, water quality run off associated with snow melting techniques, air quality impact pertaining to traffic with the infrastructure running across the lake, the wetlands, and the impact associated with the traffic... Some of these concerns may be mitigated, such as assuring the bridge is built correctly or constructed in an appropriate way. Dr. Lee Hansen asked about truck traffic on the bridge, with diesel fuels, if trucks should be restricted or even allowed to cross the bridge. If the trucks are allowed, should they be permitted to transport hazardous materials? Mr. Tschirki listed the concern of what types of materials should be allowed to be transported. He stated cleaning of the structure is imperative including snow removal, sweeping, and where the waste products would be dispensed. Mr. Richard Nielsen agreed asking about what salt and sand materials would be used.

Mr. Price added concerns for safety when fog comes in off of the lake. He asked if a condition of restricting traffic if the fog or visibility is less than 200 feet or some agreed number.

Mr. Mills asked about water quality. He reminded the group of phosphorous treatment and wastewater. The nomination identifies phosphorous being an issue off of the bridge as well as total dissolved solids. Mr. Mills said with these two elements Utah Lake does not currently meet the standards for its beneficial uses.

He stated the Commission should have an independent study because the lake already has issues with dissolved solids and total phosphorous. He said the commission needs to take action to make the Lake better and not contribute to the problem.

Mr. Tschirki listed a concern of the touch-down locations and how it would interface with the wetlands. Mr. Beckstrom said the proponents' intention was to bridge the wetlands as well as the open water. Therefore, no construction, other than potential pier construction, would be built.

Mr. Tschirki added a concern of where the pylons would actually touch down on the bottom.

Mr. Ben Bloodworth stated that according to the preliminary Corps of Engineers letter, there were actually more wetlands impacted than expected. As the Corps letter read, unless they reduce it, they are going to have to get more than a general permit which would be an individual permit for Corps standards on greater than five acres. Mr. Price added in the letter they concurred with the number of wetlands identified, but the letter they released last week stated no permit was required. He believed this was mitigated by going over the 5.4 acres.

Mr. Bloodworth listed a concern of shady impacts of the bridge on the affected wetlands, as things could not live in the shade.

Mr. Beckstrom stated one of the concerns the Technical Committee should address would be an evaluation of the magnitude of the TSS and phosphorous impact. He believed there were TSS impacts on Utah Lake associated with Utah Lake State Park recreational and boating activities. He asked about the reality of the expectation of having zero impact on the lake. If so, there would be similar issues with other proposals such as for the additional treatment plant facility that was being proposed by south Utah County. He stated population growth around the Lake alone was going to have impacts. He said there are impacts with storm water runoff from existing streets and traffic which occurs on existing roads around the county and go through storm drain systems and discharge into Utah Lake. He felt there should be some evaluation of the magnitude of impacts of the population growth and water runoff.

Mr. Keleher felt the Committee did not have expertise to do an impact study. He also stated the Commission needed to set a standard especially for environmental conditions of the lake so there would be no more impairment on the Lake. He stated with new projects, the Commission should set a standard and address things already impairing the Lake.

Mr. Goodrich stated the runoff produced on the land should not be compared to the runoff from the bridge. The storm systems from existing streets go through storm water systems where debris and sludge and other things are collected. He further explained if the developer correctly discharges waste water from the bridge, it would be worse than what is going into the Lake from the streets. He stated although we did things 50 years ago, it was a wrong attitude to continue to do so.

Mr. Hewitson felt the Commission needed to look at the good the bridge would bring with transportation. He said Commission should not have tunnel vision but look at the whole project. He did not feel the Commission was to be an environmental watchdog. Mr. Keleher said the Commission should balance the impact issues with the good the bridge can bring. He said his interpretation of the Master Plan established the Commission as an environmental watchdog.

Mr. Beckstrom stated efforts regarding phosphorous and TSS had been discussed by experts and they have not been able to come up with an effective standard. He asked how non-experts could set a standard when experts could not. He agreed in some capacity the Governing Board does have some environmental watch dog roles, but as elected officials, they may be reluctant to set standards when experts in the TMDL process cannot set a standard. Mr. Tschirki stated the TMDL process was specifically looking at runoff from lands and from treatment facilities.

There was discussion concerning the phosphorous and TDS discharge that enters into the Lake from waste water treatment or storm water systems. The municipalities have permits under NPDES requirements.

Mr. Beckstrom stated to comply with the regulations, the developers would need to get an NPDES permit from the State Division of Water Quality which regulates the permitting process and this could be a condition if the bridge were to become a reality.

Mr. Goodrich reminded the group the reason “Awake the Lake” was adopted was because the old rules were not being followed and were not implemented but this could be turned around in this project. Mr. Keleher felt that as this was the first big project the Commission was involved in, and the voices of concern were evident, if the Commission did not set a standard, no one else would. Mr. Beckstrom agreed, but asked what the standard should be and on what basis. Mr. Keleher suggested a standard could be to not allow new projects which increase levels of TDS and phosphorous.

Mr. Beckstrom replied if there is a standard of zero impact as a policy, then any number, whether it be one or 100, any number bigger than zero is unacceptable. Dr. Hansen asked what would happen when the elected officials weighed cost versus benefits and no way to quantify the cost. Dr. Hansen asked about quantification of the listed concerns. He stated the Technical Committee did not have information to justify the numbers, such as a traffic study. He stated people can estimate some numbers to justify their projects; but in reality studies should be done.

Mr. Beckstrom cited two different ways weight the benefits over the impacts. He stated there were impacts which are not weighed against the benefits, such as a causeway and the negative impacts it would have on the Lake. In this case, if the Utah Crossing cannot make it work financially and comply with what UDOT has clearly identified for structural and geotechnical requirements to make sure the bridge is going to be structurally sound and safe over a period of time, then the bridge would not be approved. Another view of impacts over benefits is some of the public who oppose the bridge and state it is unacceptable and intolerable because of a visual scar on the beauty of the lake. Mr. Beckstrom felt the visual impact of the structure fits into weighing the impacts versus the benefits.

Mr. Keleher stated the role of the Technical Committee was to provide the best information to the Governing Board in order to make an informed decision. Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Keleher for clarification. Mr. Keleher clarified his understanding of the role of the Governing Board was to make decisions based on the information received from the Technical Committee. The Board needed to understand the issues and get as much of the information the Technical Committee could provide. He felt if there were questions pertaining to a listed concern, there is insufficient evidence or information to make the determination, the Board should know that also.

Mr. Beckstrom reiterated newer standards and regulations should be adopted to effectively accomplish the goals and objectives of the Utah Lake Master Plan. He stated compliance with the Utah NPDES regulations seemed reasonable unless some unique situation warranted a different standard applied to this project.

Mr. Goodrich stated there was an extreme lack of information on the various areas which needed to be discussed by the Committee. Mr. Beckstrom concurred and suggested a bullet-point list be compiled and also points of detailed information which needed to be acquired in order for the Governing Board to make their decision. Mr. Nielsen stated after evaluation of the goals and objectives of the master plan, the Technical Committee should list the positive aspects of the projects and list the concerns or negatives, with information to make an informed decision.

At present, Dr. Merritt agreed the Committee would spend too much time in discussion. He felt the most beneficial direction the Committee should take would be in reviewing the Master Plan; identifying the pertinent items and address those that are relative. Mr. Price asked if items not in the Master Plan should be addressed. Dr. Merritt said the Committee could list them, but stated the Board needed a list which would be beneficial in the decision-making process. With the Master Plan as a guide, the Committee can identify things which need to be addressed and if the Governing Board wanted opinions from the Technical Committee then the Committee could offer their opinions.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested if there was favorable consideration for the application a list of conditions, some in the form of questions stating, “If approved to move forward to an application process, as part of the

application process you need to submit studies or reports providing the following information, or “We need answers to the following questions and information?” Or “How are you going to address the listed concerns?” Mr. Price stated the suggestion to go through the goals and objectives of the Master Plan and identify the ones that have either a negative or positive relation to the stated project. Then the Committee will identify individual concerns which may or may not apply to those goals and objectives. The Committee could then give immediate information to the Board about the Master Plan guidelines and state the pros and the cons, and supply other concerns as they arise. Mr. Beckstrom felt a broader scope should be applied at present and refine through subsequent filtering at a later time with prioritization for consistency of the Master Plan.

Mr. Grierson stated there was a deadline for public comments but not a deadline for the Governing Board’s recommendation and that FFSL was not in a hurry to make a decision. He suggested waiting until all the comments from public meetings and public hearings were obtained. After the comments are received, then individual concerns can be addressed including water quality, air quality, and other specialist agencies before a position is formulated. He stressed the importance of the role and partnership of the Utah Lake Commission in this process as well as support from all of the entities, such as the governor’s office, public, as well as the applicant.

Mr. Beckstrom reminded the members there was a public hearing scheduled one week from Thursday at 6:00 p.m. on October 29, 2009 in Room 2500 in the Health and Justice Building. A four-hour block of time has been scheduled for public hearing of the Governing Board. The group expects to hear significant input from the public and other entities at that time. He also noted that FFSL will be holding a public meeting on November 11, 2009, from 6-8 p.m. at Saratoga Shores Elementary School in Saratoga Springs. This would provide plenty of opportunity for public input.

Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Grierson when the Interdisciplinary Team would be formulated and involved in the process. Mr. Grierson stated he needed to get a better idea from his supervisor, Dick Buehler. The Committee discussed the difference between the nomination and the application. Mr. Grierson said that main difference is legal. When the applicant is in the application process, FFSL can require the applicant to fund studies which would be needed. Mr. Beckstrom stated in order to help FFSL, the Committee can further identify the other questions, such as the origin and destination, traffic impact information and other sorts of questions the Committee feels are essential to responsibly and meaningfully evaluate the nomination and application.

Mr. Keleher said the alignment was a big issue and the placement of a bridge was an important factor. He believed that the applicant was avoiding the federal rules and regulations. Dr. Hansen told the group other alignments were suggested by Mayor Parker of Saratoga Springs. Mayor Parker felt placement farther south opened up quite a bit and would be much easier for the placement of the road contrary to Eagle Mountain. Dr. Hansen stated the land on the west side of the lake was owned by Mr. Leon Harward and that possibly some financial issues were involved. Mr. Beckstrom reminded the Committee of the elements Utah Crossing used to evaluate placement of the bridge included land ownership, environment, wetlands, transportation, tying into the intermodal facility, which is going to be built at 800 North, and other criteria. Mr. Harward stated he had made a conscious attempt to preemptively avoid wetlands. Another factor he utilized was economics, i.e., shorter alignments. Therefore, the longer the bridge, to build it is more expensive. Other criterion he articulated was avoiding building institutional or political land/ownership opposition. Mr. Harward had given reasonable consideration to the alignment until someone could give reasons and a better location. Mayor Parker’s contention for a bridge across Utah Lake would be to tie into the Provo City Airport which raises economic and environmental issues.

Concerning public benefits, Mr. Beckstrom cited two reasons the bridge would be a public benefit, the first is that it is free and the second is an ongoing revenue stream which can be used to specifically benefit Utah Lake-related projects. Mr. Goodrich felt public benefit should be included on the list as well as public access to the lake.

Mr. Beckstrom stated an Origin and Destination study should be included.

Mr. Price stated he would go through the goals and objects and identify specific goals which would be associated with the bridge project and send them to the Technical Committee to respond to stating any negatives and positives. He felt understanding how this project related to the Master Plan, both pro and con would be beneficial. Those brought out in the public hearing could then be added to the Technical Committee's bullet list. Mr. Goodrich concurred stating Mr. Price could begin with a framework for the Technical Committee to follow. He also felt that the list would be more complete after the public hearings and incorporating what the public presented.

Mr. Grierson restated the Technical Committee could be used to weed out the comments on the FFSL site and those brought up through public hearings which may warrant further study.

Mr. Hansen added another point of concern was the mode of transportation across the lake. He asked if cars or people needed to move across the lake. He stated he felt there were more efficient methods for an east/west corridor which had less environmental impact than the bridge.

Mr. Beckstrom again encouraged members of the Technical Committee to attend the Public Hearing next week to speak, listen or observe what is said. He asked that everyone spread the word among their groups and coworkers.

(List of discussed bullet items on last page.)

6. Other Business.

Mr. Price informed the members that BYU students are designing a public relations outreach program and were given contact information of the Technical Committee, Governing Board, Public Advisory Group and other people who attended stakeholder meetings. He said the students may contact the members via phone, but primarily use email. He asked those who are contacted to be prepared to answer questions accurately, quickly, and honestly as possible when they are contacted.

Mr. Price told members of the committee to consider filling the role of Chairman and Vice-Chairman. He reminded everyone the Governing Board and Technical Committee would be nominating and electing a new chairman and vice-chair. The by-laws stated the chairmen cannot be re-elected for consecutive terms. He stated that if it was a position they were interested in, they should communicate to him prior to January their desires to be nominated.

7. Confirm the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, November 16, 2009.

Mr. Price announced the next meeting was scheduled for Monday, November 16, at 8:30 a.m. in Room 211. With past meeting history, the committee is anticipating no official meeting in December. He stated the Governing Board was not anticipating a meeting unless there were specific issues relative to the FFSL bridge review process.

8. Adjourn.

The Technical Committee adjourned at 10:33 a.m.

**ACCUMULATED LIST OF
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CONCERNS
FOR UTAH CROSSING, INC.**

- Legitimate concerns or comments versus fears.
- Potential for public access (placement of the toll booth).
- Public (UDOT) versus private roads.
- Air quality.
- Construction activity pollution.
- Truck traffic (what can cross; fuel; bio-hazard; types of materials).
- Storm water; runoff.
- Cleaning of structure (de-icing [sand, salt], sweeping).
- Fishing off pier or platform.
- Fog (safety, restriction).
- Independent review of TDS and phosphorous impacts (zero impact).
- Shouldn't do anything to increase impacts of TDS and phosphorous.
- Mitigation of wetlands.
- Specific information needed to make better decisions.
- Origin and destination study.
- Traffic studies.
- Public benefit.
- Consider alternatives modes other than a bridge.