



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, January 23, 2012, 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
Neal Winterton, Orem City
Adam Cowie, Lindon City
Greg Flint, Santaquin City
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City
Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources

ATTENDEES:

Ann Merrill, State Division of Water Resources
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery
Richard Nielson, Utah County
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission
Douglas Sakaguchi, DWR

VISITORS:

Bill Pope, HDR Engineering
Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs HOA

ABSENT:

American Fork, Mapleton City, Pleasant Grove City, Vineyard Town, Woodland Hills Town, Utah Division of Parks and Recreation, Utah Lake Water Users, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Department of Environmental Quality, and US Army Corps of Engineers.

1. Welcome.

Chairman Greg Beckstrom called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. He welcomed the Technical Committee members and all visitors.

2. Conduct bi-annual election of the Technical Committee chair and vice chair.

Mr. Beckstrom conducted the biannual elections for the Technical Committee Chair and Vice-chair. He said it was hard to believe the Technical Committee had existed for over four years. The leadership of the Technical Committee are elected to serve two-year terms. Mr. Reed Price chaired the leadership nominating committee. Mr. Beckstrom nominated Mr. Chris Keleher, Vice-chair to become the Chair of the Technical Committee for the next two years. He opened the floor for any additional nominations. There were none. Mr. Richard Nielsen seconded the nomination. For nomination of Vice-chair, Mr. Beckstrom nominated Mr. Richard Nielson. He opened the floor for additional nominations and there were none. Mr. Adam Cowie seconded the motion. The voting was unanimously approved for Mr. Keleher as Chair and Mr. Nielson as Vice-chair of the Technical Committee.

Mr. Beckstrom said he felt transitions are healthy and strengthen organizations such as the Technical Committee. He has learned over the years no one is indispensable and one person can make a difference. He was grateful to Mr. Reed Price as Executive Director of the Utah Lake Commission for his ongoing service. He said Mr. Price has made a difference in his role supporting the efforts of the Commission, the Technical

1 Committee, and the Master Plan development. Mr. Keleher will do well as chair with his great level of
2 knowledge, passion, and familiarity for protecting and promoting the interests of Utah Lake.

3 Mr. Price voiced his gratitude to Mr. Beckstrom for the work he had done over the past 4.5 years. Mr. Price
4 was a member of the study group representing Orem when he met Mr. Beckstrom. He found Mr. Beckstrom to
5 be a well-organized, well-versed person who is able to see both sides of different issues and can argue the
6 different viewpoints. Mr. Price looked forward to working with Mr. Keleher and Mr. Nielson.

7 Mr. Keleher thanked Mr. Beckstrom and appreciated working with everyone on the Committee. He is
8 looking towards making the Lake a better place than it has been in the past. It has been a neglected resource
9 for a long time but the Technical Committee is the group that will change that by promoting it and making it
10 better. Mr. Keleher has a passion for Utah Lake, spending a lot of time working and having fun with his family
11 at the Lake.
12

13 **3. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from November 14, 2011 meeting.**

14 Mr. Chris Keleher asked for discussion, comments, or corrections of the minutes for the meeting held on
15 November 14, 2011. Mr. Beckstrom corrected page 5, line 43, saying it was Mr. Jim Price who gave the
16 information. Mr. Keleher had corrections on page 2; line 17, that Mr. Ben Bloodworth is with FFSL. The other
17 corrections on his presentation will be given to Mrs. Green to incorporate into the minutes for clarity of the
18 information. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

19 Mr. Beckstrom moved the minutes be approved as corrected, and it was seconded by Mr. Hansen. The
20 minutes were unanimously approved with the noted changes.
21

22 **4. Report from June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program.**

23 Mr. Mike Mills said the carp removal continued with a great fall season. Loy Fisheries removed two million
24 pounds in two months, which is the most effective time to date. Since the first part of December and over the
25 last two months, it has been rough for carp removal as the lake continues to freeze over and thaw again
26 causing very limited fishing, but they knew winters would be slow for fishing. Mr. Bill Loy, the commercial
27 fisherman, is anxious to keep fishing. He has fished in open water, while the southern half of the lake was
28 frozen doing the best he can. The total poundage removed since initiation is seven million pounds, which is
29 encouraging. They plan to pick things up as soon as possible.

30 Mr. Jim Hewitson asked what the removal percentage was. Mr. Mills said over 75 percent needs to be
31 removed and currently, removal is between 15-20 percent, so it will keep going. If JSRIP were in a situation
32 where fishing couldn't continue, they would quickly lose the progress they have made.

33 JSRIP has another project currently in a NEPA-process preparing a draft environmental impact statement
34 (EIS) for a project to restore a delta at the mouth of Provo River affecting the last 1.5 miles before it enters the
35 lake. Some newspaper articles caused a lot of negative exposure recently. The delta project was started in
36 March 2010 with a public meeting with 50 people showing up. Two additional meetings were held and the
37 maximum attendance at either meeting was about 35 people. On January 12, 2012, a workshop was held at
38 the Utah Lake State Park and 150 people came. The capacity of the meeting room exceeded quickly and people
39 were turned away. So, another workshop meeting was scheduled for January 26 at Lake View Elementary from
40 7-9 p.m. The purpose was to focus on what would happen on the 1.5 mile of the lower part of the existing
41 Provo River Channel if the project went forward and a delta was created. Five different concepts were created
42 ranging from filling the channel in, which is the least popular option, to leaving it as it is with some water going
43 down. Another concept would be to create recreational ponds, a very small stream, and other ideas, none
44 guaranteed to be the final one. A mix/match piece of each option could be used in the final decision. JSRIP is
45 gathering input for this project as it is generating the most interest and controversy of any project.

46 Four separate alternatives for the delta will be analyzed in the draft EIS, which may be released in the fall of
47 2012. There is a lot of time for public involvement and input. In addition to public meetings, several meetings

1 were held with stake holders and cities, as well as with business owners and land owners down on the lower
2 Provo River. These meetings will continue.

3 Mr. Cowie asked him to explain the background and purpose for the project. Mr. Mills said the lower mile
4 and half of the Provo River has been channeled and dredged so much that it is very deep and has high levees on
5 each side, one with a trail. Thousands of June sucker come up the Provo River to spawn and lay millions of
6 eggs. The larval fish come down the river and hit the back water, which is essentially an arm of Utah Lake that
7 backs up into the lower Provo River channel. We start to lose the larval fish by cold water, starvation, or are
8 consumed by predators. This situation prevents millions of larval fish from going into Utah Lake where they
9 have a chance to survive and it is a major impediment to the June sucker recovery. The whole purpose of the
10 project is to fix the situation. Two years ago, JSRIP looked at different ideas and ways to change the Provo
11 River. The different alternatives will create a large delta similar to Hobbie Creek, but 10-20 times greater.

12 Mr. Cowie asked if the Provo River Trail would stay in place. Mr. Mills said every concept identified would
13 leave Provo River Trail in place. The area of the present river is a nice place where people go to canoe and the
14 trail gets all kinds of use. Presently, it is not a river and does not function as one, which creates the problems
15 for the June sucker. The alternative concept is to create a small channel through the region, a small stream
16 about 5 cfs so the trail would still be next to water, although not near the present size. Mr. Cowie asked if Utah
17 Lake Commission or the Technical Committee had any position on this. Mr. Mills said in February 2010, the
18 Mitigation Commission with Mark Holden came and presented to the Governing Board. Mr. Price said there
19 are many goals and objectives in the Master Plan relating to recreation and to the recovery of June Sucker. If it
20 had to be decided today, the Commission would be supportive of JSRIP efforts. The Executive Committee said
21 when residents are complaining the politicians are listening. The Commission will wait until the complaining
22 dies down and concerns are addressed, which is exactly the process they are going through.

23 Mr. Mills said the cities have been informed all along. Utah County and Provo City are both cooperating
24 agencies on the NEPA, which does not mean they are project proponents or they agree but they are providing
25 input and can review documents ahead of time. JSRIP presented to the Utah County Commission and Provo
26 City Council, and will continue to present. At present, it is inappropriate for the Commission to take a stance
27 because details are not decided and are still at the start of the planning process. JSRIP is does not have an
28 option, and are going to continue with the planning. In the end, a no-action alternative could be selected. To
29 just ignore the project and let it go away doesn't get JSRIP closer to June sucker recovery. We need analyze all
30 the facts and do something.

31 Mr. Keleher said it is important to note the motivation behind the June sucker recovery program is to do
32 what is possible and necessary to recover the fish. At the same time through the process, the reason JSRIP is
33 looking at the lower Provo River is for ways to improve or enhance recreational opportunities for the public.
34 Through the process, there are opportunities to benefit the public and options for recovery.

35 Mr. Mills said if a delta were created, there would be a vast array of recreational opportunities -- many
36 more trails, nonmotorized boat ramps for kayaking or canoeing would be installed, and new parking areas,
37 possible bird watching observation towers, and/or a small nature center could be created with a boardwalk
38 nature trail feature. Those aspects were not discussed at the meetings because the public wants to talk about
39 the June sucker and to leave the river alone.

40 Mr. Jim Hewitson asked why the original dredging was done. Mr. Mills said for flood control and was done
41 multiple times over the last century to try and lower the channel. They had poor perspective as the bottom of
42 the channel has an elevation of 4480, which is nine feet below compromise level. The Provo River doesn't have
43 a big bearing on what happens in the lower 1.5 miles. Mr. Hewitson asked if any flood control would be
44 incorporated into the delta system. Mr. Mills said if the delta project moved forward, it would involve levees
45 and working with the local communities. The levees would need to be at an elevation of 4095. The project
46 area is within the 100-year FEMA Flood Plain Maps. If a project were completed, he didn't think it would
47 change the FEMA maps, as the levees would control water.

1 Mr. Beckstrom related an analogy of a new/used car mentality. Mr. Beckstrom said the public never
2 becomes energized at the time the proponents of the project would like them to become energized -- it is
3 always too early or too late. The NEPA process is focused on the scientific environmental/technical aspects of a
4 project, which provide for public input and public response. There is nothing in the process to create a format
5 for the public policy question of, "This project is technically feasible, environmentally sensitive, and financially
6 doable, but is it good public policy?" The public and Mitigation Commission, the proactive lead agency, are
7 talking. The public is not interested in what mitigation has to say because they don't think the public policy
8 question is being addressed. The Mitigation Commission is frustrated the public won't participate in a focused
9 manner on the specific aspect of the NEPA process with the basis the public policy question is not relevant at
10 this point. It has already been addressed, which is the perception of most of the Mitigation Commission or it
11 will be addressed at another time. The analogy is "We are taking away your used car, and we are going to give
12 you a brand new, loaded car with all the bells and whistles. It will be much better than the old one you are
13 used to that sputters and has poor gas mileage you used to drive around." They don't understand. Why would
14 someone want to keep a used car when he is being offered a brand new limited edition vehicle? That is the
15 perspective between the proponents and the members of the public who have concerns of the project.

16 Mr. Mills said it seemed like the question coming up the most is "Why save the June sucker?" We ask,
17 "Why follow the endangered species act?" As federal agencies participate in the June sucker program and the
18 creators of the Central Utah Project (CUP), there is no choice because JSRIP can't violate the endangered
19 species act and they have to obey the law -- the rules have been laid out. In order to continue to have full use
20 of the CUP, sufficient progress needs to be made toward the recovery of the June sucker. They have done a
21 very good job of making progress. The uncertainty is what would happen should JSRIP fails to do that, and it is
22 a concern of why the June sucker program was initially created.

23 Dr. Hansen suggested JSRIP quickly respond to the negative press with positive action, which would have a
24 different impact as he felt the public had a lot of misinformation. He recommended the response be
25 countered, shifting the focus from the fish and law to the positive aspects of what is offered, that JSRIP is not
26 trying to destroy what is there, but is trying to make it better, with an explanation of recreational opportunities
27 and other beneficial aspects. This in turn would address some of the public policy issues. A quick response can
28 dispel the perceptions of the public. Mr. Mills said JSRIP is behind and was caught off guard as public outreach
29 was planned to take place later. He felt it would be a long process to combat the misinformation and negative
30 perception. The strategy to get the right information out would be a three-to-four month process with a series
31 of news articles and releases, and information aimed at getting the truth out. He felt there might be more
32 press that is negative. Dr. Hansen asked if JSRIP is the right agency to get the information out to the public or
33 should another agency provide the information. JSRIP focus is the June sucker and so another professional
34 agency could put the positive twist on the delta project. Mr. Mills said a different agency was a good idea.
35 They have a media consultant and relations firm helping them, but having the information come from another
36 source would help as people see JSRIP as the bad guy. Dr. Hansen asked if the County Commission would be
37 amenable to this or some other group of that nature, though he does not know who it would be.

38 Mr. Keleher said the focus is part of the NEPA process. Public outreach and people who are opposed to the
39 change don't understand and their perceptions are wrong. The June sucker program partners are conducting
40 the NEPA process and looking for public input for the lower area. The primary need is for June sucker recovery
41 but within that need, there is an opportunity to do a lot of positive things.

42 Mr. Beckstrom said as far as the Commission was concerned, it would be approached similar to the bridge
43 issue. When the time comes, the Governing Board will look to the Technical Committee for input. The
44 appropriate time for that is before the draft EIS becomes a public document, though it is difficult to have public
45 open discussion until the EIS is made public.

46 Mr. Mills said a few members of the Provo City Council have the impression their input never makes a
47 difference with the NEPA process. The reputation of the agencies involved in the June Sucker program and the
48 NEPA process has changed projects for JSRIP in the past. The Mitigation Commission modified or restored the

1 River up through Heber Valley with significant changes between the Draft EIS and the Final EIS based on public
2 input. The input JSRIP has received has made some changes to the concepts JSRIP is considering of the lower
3 river channel. They are investigating for a location to minimize the impacts on the land owners and business
4 owners. It is still a viable project, but where the impacts will be minimal.

5 Mr. Keleher called for further questions and there were none.
6

7 **5. Report on Phragmites Removal Efforts.**

8 Mr. Price reported the phragmites removal team (PRT) had sprayed the Saratoga Springs area and the
9 results will be seen in the spring. PRT crews have been out smashing down the phragmites to get rid of the
10 biomass. They have been unable to drive on it with the Land Tamer, so the crews are working on the
11 shorelines. PRT is hoping the ice movement will take the dead phragmites down. A grant request for \$55K was
12 presented at the Utah Watershed Restoration Initiative (WRI) group to purchase and apply the chemicals near
13 the Utah Lake State Park around the Provo Airport Dike and into Provo Bay, approximately 750 acres. PRT has
14 received this grant over the past three years with \$15K the first year, \$20K the second, and \$30K in 2011. Mr.
15 Keleher asked how many acres are being targeted and Mr. Price replied 750 acres, depending upon the grant.
16 The project would be scaled back if the full grant is not received.

17 Dr. Hansen asked if PRT would be spraying again in Saratoga Springs. Mr. Price stated spot spraying would
18 be done, hoping to get 80-85 percent of the regrowth closer to the shore, which should be easy to reach. Dr.
19 Hansen said the areas have a lot of dead trees in them and contributes to the problems. Mr. Price said there
20 are crews removing the Russian olive and tamarisk. Mr. Dee Chamberlain replied he had seen them near the
21 park. Mr. Price said they cleaned out a large section at the Saratoga City Marina. PRT was supposed to move
22 and begin work in the bay area near Eagle Park. Mr. Chamberlain said other residents had seen them working
23 there. Dr. Hansen said an area on the north end of the Saratoga Springs Marina needed treatment. Mr. Price
24 said PRT is unable to get to some areas to treat presently. PRT is treating a broader scale to focus on the
25 progress to get support to pool additional funding and get resources elsewhere to treat other problems.

26 Mr. Neal Winterton asked what efforts were made to reestablish beneficial vegetation. Mr. Price said
27 native seeds were present, with hard stem bulrush in the pilot project site, and the seeds revegetated on their
28 own, but a lot of the area PRT wants to keep open. A goal is to re-establish native trees such as cottonwoods.
29 Restoration efforts were done last year, but high water washed some of the work away. More caution was
30 being used, based on what the water level will be and what can be transplanted.

31 Dr. Hansen said phragmites doesn't seem to invade areas where a lot of willows are located, so willows
32 might be a good replacement. Mr. Bloodworth said if there is well-established vegetation then it could work.
33 Dr. Hansen felt it might not be a shade issue, because willows have a huge amount of surface root. Mr.
34 Bloodworth said he has seen reed canary grass outcompete phragmites, but did not want to use it either. Mr.
35 Chamberlain said in Saratoga Bay pockets of cattail and willow together had been invaded.

36 Mr. Bloodworth said the Division had purchased a boat-type vehicle called the Truxor for phragmites
37 removal. It has a cutting blade on the front and a rake attachment on the back. The goal is to collect enough
38 phragmites to take to a company and see if it is useable for pelletized fuel. The company wants a two-three
39 ton sample and with the Truxor, DWR will have the equipment to gather the amount needed. Mr. Bloodworth
40 said burning is still a potentially viable option in some areas with possibly burning on the ice. Burning an island
41 of phragmites down at the pump house might be the easiest way to remove it there. The pump house
42 personnel is worried the dead phragmites might clog up the pumps. FFSL is trying to mitigate the clogging from
43 occurring. Mr. Price said the ideal situation would be not to use the pumps depending on the water level.

44 Dr. Hansen said he read the pump house facility would be replaced. Mr. Price said yes. Mr. Keleher asked
45 for a pump house update at a future meeting. Mr. Price concurred and suggested Perry Smith, Manager of the
46 pump house, could do the update. Mr. Bloodworth said he would be the most knowledgeable person. Mr.
47 Beckstrom asked what agency operated the facility. Mr. Mills said Utah Board of Canal Presidents. Mr.
48 Bloodworth said the land under it is owned by Salt Lake County. Dr. Hansen asked if a museum facility could be

1 established there, with the history, there is museum-quality features. Mr. Price said they plan on preserving a
2 lot of the area, but the upgrade is for efficiency.

3 Mr. Keleher asked if there were additional questions of phragmites. There were none.
4

5 **6. Report from Santaquin on wastewater discharge plans.**

6 Mr. Keleher asked Mr. Greg Flint of Santaquin to update the Committee on the wastewater discharge issue.

7 Mr. Flint said the final count with the absentee ballots was close enough for a recount. Utah County did
8 the recount, very meticulously and reversed the decision with three votes more for both MBR bonds.
9 Technically, they both passed, but the opponents did not accept it. Santaquin City and opponents are in a legal
10 battle. Although it passed, it is currently going to 4th district court decision. The opposition citizen group has
11 submitted some documents and the city has responded to those. There is a 30-day wait period and Santaquin
12 is waiting for the court to recount the votes. The court could say Santaquin followed all the procedures or they
13 didn't follow them, which is procedural. It will be up to the city council that has newly elected members.
14 Information from the Technical Committee will be given to the new council. Depending on the decision, some
15 of the options will be reevaluated, including using Utah Lake.

16 Mr. Price gave the background of the Santaquin water discharge situation. The election was to see if
17 money could be used to build a new wastewater treatment facility. If the bond didn't go through, they still had
18 issues regarding wastewater treatment they needed to address, and considered discharging to Utah Lake. They
19 came to the Utah Lake Technical Committee for advice and understanding of what needs to be done or if they
20 were forced to consider that option. Mr. Price wanted Mr. Flint to report so the Technical Committee is aware
21 of the progress and if further input was needed. He asked Mr. Flint to keep the Committee updated with the
22 court decision.

23 Mr. Keleher asked for more questions. There were none.
24

25 **7. State of the Lake presentation by Reed Price, Executive Director.**

26 Mr. Price, Executive Director of Utah Lake Commission, gave his "State of the Lake" address and updated
27 the Technical Committee members of plans, goals, and projects of the Utah Lake Commission in 2011 and those
28 proposed in 2012.

29 The history of the Utah Lake Commission began as the Utah Lake Study Committee in 2004 when the
30 mayors of the county got together in a Council of Government (COG) meeting. They looked at how they could
31 work together to improve Utah Lake. The state was heavily involved in the management of Utah Lake and
32 jointly agreed to work together on Utah Lake. The idea of forming a Commission to coordinate the activities
33 between the state, local municipalities, and other large stake holders of the lake emerged. In 2006, they
34 created a draft of an Interlocal Agreement, which was reviewed by the municipalities and state agencies. The
35 state passed a concurrent resolution in the 2007 legislative session allowing the state to work directly with
36 municipalities. Governor Huntsman signed it on March 9, 2007 at the Utah Lake State Park with the first official
37 meeting on April 19, 2007. Currently the Utah Lake Commission consists of 13 municipal governments, with
38 many shoreline members who recognize the Lake as a regional resource, the Central Utah Water Conservancy
39 District, and state representatives from the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of
40 Environmental Quality and the Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands and a State Representative.

41 The purposes as spelled out in the governing documents of the Commission are fivefold:

- 42 • Encourage and promote multiple uses of the lake. We want the lake to be used many different ways.
- 43 • Facilitate communication and coordination. It was difficult to get parties with responsibilities talking to
44 each other before the Commission was formed. When something is happening, the Commission can
45 get the responsible parties together to assure there is adequate communication and coordination of
46 the activities.
- 47 • Promote resource utilization. The resources of the lake should be used, some areas of the lake should
48 be protected, and development should occur in appropriate areas.

- 1 • Maintain and develop recreation access to encourage multiple uses of the lake.
- 2 • Monitor and promote responsible and economic development. It is difficult to balance and encourage
- 3 economic development as well as promote preservation.

4 The Interlocal Agreement required a Master Plan with directions the Commission should follow. Studies for
5 the Master Plan began in February 2008. The Plan focuses on five different areas: land use, shoreline
6 protection, transportation issues, natural resources, recreation, and physical facilities. After 18 months of
7 working heavily with municipalities, FFSL, DEQ, and the state, the Master Plan was adopted on June 26, 2009.
8 The Master Plan also doubles as the FFSL Comprehensive Master Plan, so FFSL and Utah Lake Commission are
9 trying to accomplish their goals and objectives.

10 The Master Plan with several appendices has the plan, vision, goals, and objectives to accomplish.
11 Appendix A lists feedback received from the public. Appendix B is a statement of current conditions when the
12 Lake was studied at the Master Plan began. Appendix C has implementation strategies that takes the key
13 objectives the Commission can accomplish immediately and strategizes ways to accomplish the goals. It
14 provides information on working towards long term goals. Appendix D applies primarily to the long-term goals,
15 explaining how sovereign lands are to be managed according to law.

16 The implementation strategies were the focus of the Executive Director's report. The Master Plan has 18
17 high-priority goals with 36 objectives. The 13 medium priority goals are not actively being pursued, but when
18 an opportunity arises then they can be pursued. Goals can apply to state agencies, municipalities, and/or goals
19 that apply only to the Commission. The Commission's main goals, where it is the lead agent, will try to
20 accomplish their goals. For other identified goals, the Commission acts as cheerleader behind the scenes
21 encouraging state agencies or municipalities to act on their responsibilities.

22 In 2011, eight tasks were identified with implementation strategies for the Commission. The first was land-
23 use regulation policies. The goals identified were to create a model ordinance and finalization. The model
24 ordinance was finalized and adopted. It recommends a buffer, creates flood-based development restrictions,
25 and recommends the need for a lake trail with established trail standards. The Commission and its consultant
26 have worked with cities to review, adapt, and encourage implementation of the ordinance. American Fork has
27 adopted an ordinance, and Provo, Springville, and Utah County are tweaking the document to fit their overall
28 plans. The Commission has reached out to other shoreline cities and it is just a matter of becoming a priority.

29 On the coordination and communication task, goals identified are Utah Lake Commission be a forum to
30 facilitate discussion about the lake among jurisdictions -- cities that are side-by-side, between the state and
31 municipalities, and within the resource agencies. The Commission needs to facilitate any discussion needing to
32 occur or to be beneficial. In 2011, we held the regularly scheduled Governing Board and Technical Committee
33 meetings. With specific topics, subcommittees are convened. By way of coordination, Mr. Price participated
34 on a visioning process Provo City conducted. He made them aware of what needs to happen at Utah Lake, and
35 to put it in their vision statement. After the visioning process, a Sustainability Committee was created and Mr.
36 Price became a member to insure the lake's goals and interests.

37 Santaquin was assisted in 2011 with their wastewater treatment plant problem. The Commission
38 continues to assist Santaquin as they seek solutions to their wastewater treatment issues. If a discharge to
39 Utah Lake is needed, the Commission can help them decide the best way to resolve it. Saratoga Springs citizens
40 were concerned about an old canal running the length from Pelican Point north to the Jordan River. It was
41 made in 1930s during the drought year when they needed to get water to Salt Lake County, but it has not been
42 used since. It has become overgrown with invasive species and stagnate water. We have begun working with
43 the Saratoga Springs citizens, army corps of engineers, and FFSL to get them together to find solutions.

44 Another goal is enhanced law enforcement around the lake, which is a medium priority goal. There are
45 issues the lake faces at the access points including vandalism and general riff-raff.

46 With the transportation planning, the goal is to have continuous participation in the planning activities so
47 the Commission can voice issues, concerns, and ideas it has when transportation routes are planned that might
48 affect Utah Lake. Legislation was passed last year that required the Transportation Commission review

1 financial feasibility of any project that would be proposed on any sovereign lake beds, specifically to the current
2 proposal for Utah Lake and the Commission was involved in the review of those rules. Two roads in Provo
3 including the West Side Connector connecting University Avenue in South Provo to the airport area and the
4 Lake View Parkway in Provo connecting Center Street that runs parallel to Geneva Road and north to Orem,
5 relate to the transportation planning. The Commission's interest is the trail planning.

6 The access development long-term goal is to improve existing access, acquire additional access, and make
7 sure interpretive direction signage are in places that allow people to get to access points. In 2011, the
8 Commission increased access with the phragmites removal. Over a mile of shoreline between Lindon Marina
9 and south to Vineyard area was restored with PRT's efforts. The shoreline has been opened up and it is
10 rewarding to see more use of the shoreline. Saratoga Springs will see fruition in a couple of years when their
11 shoreline opens up.

12 Another implementation strategy task is natural area preservation, which are long-term goals. Expansion
13 of the preservation areas has been identified. One of the areas is the development of Powell Slough Wildlife
14 Management Area. Another task is to conduct lake level studies. In 2011, the model ordinance creation and
15 subsequent adoption will help make this goal possible in the future. The phragmites removal is helping to
16 restore shoreline to a more natural condition that helps in the implementation task.

17 A lot of the effort last year was towards outreach and educating the public. Several goals identified include
18 promoting the lake in our region and developing outreach events. The Commission wants to promote
19 understanding of the impact of invasive species and prevent infestation of aquatic nuisance species, specifically
20 the zebra mussel. Another task the Commission is addressing is coordinating research and establishing a
21 research facility. Throughout the previous year, the Commission's efforts included executing the public
22 outreaching plan. The annual Utah Lake Festival was cancelled when the lake level rose to 2.5 feet above
23 compromise and it flooded the venue. A new website www.Utahlake.gov was launched and is updated weekly
24 with fresh stories about Utah Lake. School curriculums have been created for the fourth and seventh grades. It
25 is being used by fourth the grade teachers and students. The final outreach focus was the establishment of the
26 Utah Lake Research Group working with Chris Keleher.

27 Another 2011 task was phragmites removal and control. The Vineyard/Lindon project was completed with
28 Russian olive and tamarisk remaining that will be removed. The shoreline will open up in the area allowing
29 better access. Treatment in Saratoga Springs began in 2011. The Utah County Weed Management Control
30 employees provide the bulk of work to remove phragmites. FFSL and DWR are working with Commission in
31 supporting coordination roles to assure everyone is focused. The Land Tamer was purchased in 2011. The
32 vehicle allows the Commission and the county to get into tight areas to do work.

33 The next area for treatment of phragmites is the Saratoga Springs Owners Association's private marina.
34 Treatment with a helicopter covered an area from the Jordan River and down to Eagle Park in Saratoga Springs.
35 Vegetation removal of the Russian olive and tamarisk removal make it difficult to get access on the trail with
36 heavy machinery. The Commission's focus is on easily accessible areas near the city marina and up near Eagle
37 Park. The Commission is anxious to see results on the west side.

38 Expanding and managing the recreational task around the lake includes a need for additional marinas,
39 improving existing beaches, identifying areas for more beaches, and make improvements allowing better
40 hunting and fishing as well as improve mosquito abatement. In 2011, the Commission worked with Boy Scouts
41 of America to identify areas around the lake to be procured and made into Cub Scout Day camps for cub scouts
42 as well as week-long camps for Boy Scouts or High Adventure Camps. The ultimate dream is to have several
43 camps around the lake, camps to sail across the one and camp for a few nights and go to another and circle
44 around. The Scouts are anxious to find something and the Commission is anxious to assist them in finalizing the
45 goal by finding land owners who are willing to work with them. The Commission improved recreation with the
46 phragmites removal by improving beaches and their efforts also aided mosquito abatement.

47 The Commission's goals for year 2012 were presented. The land-use regulation task will follow up with the
48 model ordinance and get shoreline communities to adopt it to assure adequate protections are in place, as

1 development gets closer to the lake. The Commission is working with Saratoga Springs and FFSL on creating a
2 shoreline master plan to manage their shoreline development. A lot of the shoreline is not developed, but
3 planning should be done before it is developed. Other communities such as Vineyard, Provo, Orem, Springville,
4 and Lehi could create a vision from what they would like their shoreline to look like. FFSL received requests
5 and are now going through the process of evaluating private docks on the lake. The Commission will assist
6 them in the public review process.

7 In the coordination and communication task, Mr. Price wants to be more visible at City Councils and tell
8 them all about the Commission. He will ask to speak to Councils and explain in 15-minute presentation the
9 Commission's goals. He will be presenting at the Provo and American Fork City's councils. Discussions among
10 stakeholders will be facilitated. If Santaquin's wastewater is still an issue with litigation, the Commission will
11 step up and help them understand impacts it might have with Utah Lake, and weigh in on issues. The
12 Commission is supportive in the communication with sovereign lands boundary negotiations.

13 The law enforcement task will continue to identify issues and work with agencies to address the law
14 enforcement and specifically with state parks and their issues.

15 With the transportation planning task, Mr. Price will be attending the Regional Transportation Committee
16 and MAG meetings more frequently to assure the Utah Lake Commission is aware of issues. Regarding the
17 bridge proposal, he said FFSL has not heard from the project proponent since September or October of last
18 year, even though it used to be more frequent and they are unable to reach him. The Commission doesn't
19 know where the process is at present. The Governing Board is awaiting further information for the proponent
20 to give to FFSL. At present, Utah Lake Commission is not a proponent or an opponent of the project. It is
21 recognized there may be a need for a transportation corridor from Utah Lake in the future, but when and
22 where are all questions to be answered.

23 In 2012, the Commission wants to make the lake more useable. In meetings with JSRIP attended by Mr.
24 Robyn Pearson of the Division of Natural Resources, a lot of comments are Utah Lake is not useable because it
25 is not accessible and a person needs to know where to go. The Commission wants to continue to work with
26 agencies to make the lake more useable. The Commission will work with Boy Scouts, FFSL, and DWR to
27 improve the Lake access. Mr. Price's goal is to improve existing access points making them more conducive and
28 utilized, and at the same time working on phragmites removal.

29 For the 2012 natural area preservation task, the Commission will work with DWR to identify the needs of
30 the Powell Slough Wildlife Management area including further study for public access points.

31 In public outreach, the Commission wants to create a demand for Utah Lake. We want people to think, "I
32 can't believe this resource is in our back yard!" By enhancing the public perception through the outreach and
33 events plan, this task can be accomplished. The Commission can work with The Chamber and Visitor's Bureau
34 to highlight the Lake. The Visitor's Bureau approached us with an opportunity for a national bass fishing
35 collegiate fishing tournament. They want to hold a regional tournament at Utah Lake that would be filmed and
36 eventually televised. This may be a good avenue to promote the Lake and the goals at the lake. We will also
37 continue with the website updates, curriculum create field trips, and the Utah Lake Festival.

38 In 2012, the phragmites control task is expanding to the 750 acres contingent upon the grant application
39 approval. Treatment would go from Utah Lake State Park south into Provo Bay to open up a lot of that
40 shoreline. Expanding and managing recreation ties together with access development in trying to create better
41 access and to encourage more use.

42 Mr. Price highlighted the long-range goals the Commission is working to attain. The Utah Lake Trail,
43 specifically connecting segments between the Jordan River Parkway and Provo River Parkway trail, is one
44 target. Several segments have been completed and it is hoped to complete all of them. The eventual long-
45 range goal is to have a trail completely around the lake. The Commission is working with Utah County, MAG
46 and municipalities to get back to the model ordinance, as development gets closer to the lake. If the ordinance
47 is in place, it would encourage developers to add trails and help the Commission accomplish the goal.

1 Water quality is a goal for the Commission. A TMDL study is waiting for further research to be done in
2 order to understand the phosphorus issue at Utah Lake, but funding is an issue. The Commission works
3 regularly with DEQ and DWQ to assist where needed. If point sources are identified, we are willing and able to
4 advise them or assist them, as with Santaquin.

5 Dr. Hansen asked the Committee members if they were aware of an informal shooting ATV range on the
6 west side. Mr. Price asked if it was up on the foothills. Dr. Hansen said part is on the west side of the highway
7 and part is on the lake side and asked who patrolled the area. Mr. Nielson said the Commissioners have been
8 working with the Sheriff's office and BLM to try to address both areas and find a solution. Mr. Cowie said
9 Lindon City had been working with Vineyard and is regularly patrolling the new trail area put in by the county,
10 and asked if Mr. Nielson was aware of it. He said in the past there have been problems. It was near the Lindon
11 marina, which technically is outside the jurisdiction but the Lindon police chief and city council asked Lindon's
12 officers to patrol the area so there is a heavier presence there. There was male solicitation happening all hours
13 of the day and had driven other people off who were trying to recreate. Lindon does not want it to proliferate
14 into Lindon once the Lindon Heritage Trail is connected. It will have a direct access at some future date. He
15 wanted to inform the Committee Lindon is paying attention down there.

16 Dr. Hansen asked if the Symposium were available for the general public use on a website or any record
17 made of the meeting. Mr. Mills said there was no recorded information. He asked what particular aspect they
18 were interested in. Dr. Hansen said the archeological area and the diving presentation.

19 Mr. Keleher said there were PowerPoint presentations available. Mr. Mills said archeology of Utah Lake
20 was fascinating with many articles in review journals. He suggested working with the presenter, Dr. Allison.
21 The other one was presented by Robert Baskin, USGS, who surveyed the lake bottom with an acoustic series.

22 Mr. Keleher said it is something from the Utah Lake Commission perspective in the outreach goals in
23 teaming up the June Sucker Program and UVU, in recording the proceedings. The symposium is held every year
24 and some great presentations result from the Symposium. Dr. Hansen said he didn't know if the entire set of
25 presentations would need to go out, but a general kind of public-oriented information would be helpful.

26 Dr. Hansen said asked in the removal of tamarisk, if there was anything further being done with the beetle.
27 Mr. Bloodworth said no. He heard it was illegal to bring any viable controls of any kind into the state because
28 of the situation of the beetle. The state and Utah County might put the beetle in a place to start another
29 colony. All the ones around the lake were lost and the reasons are unknown. Mr. Bloodworth felt it might
30 have been the spiders there. Mr. Beckstrom asked what the problem was with the beetle. Mr. Bloodworth
31 said they were not permitted for federal lands, and they moved onto federal lands. There were no direct
32 releases on federal lands but they moved onto the federal lands. The federal government got concerned with
33 endangered species, the southwestern subspecies of the southwestern fly catcher. The only habitat remaining
34 in some areas is the tamarisk. The beetles removed their habitat and they lost nesting sites, with repairs of this
35 endangered species. There was a throwback on the federal level about the beetle. AFUS passed legislation and
36 the beetles couldn't be moved anywhere in the state, and it was illegal for anyone to pick up a beetle to move
37 it to a different bush. It was illegal to bring any bio-controls into the state, no matter what or how effective..

38 Mr. Sakaguchi asked if it was state legislation or federal, and Mr. Bloodworth said it was all federal, coming
39 through the Fish and Wildlife Services.

40 Mr. Keleher said one thing Mr. Price could do is to look at goals that are strictly Commission activities and
41 start getting a working budget together for those. Then look at individual agency goals of the Master Plan, and
42 get an idea of what kind of costs are required and start working toward soliciting funds towards making those
43 future goals happen.

44 **8. Other discussion items.**

45 Mr. Keleher asked if there were more questions or other items to discuss.

46 Mr. Hewitson said he heard on a radio broadcast the oxygen level in the Jordan River was either high or
47 low. Mr. Keleher said the TMDL process for the lower Jordan River is looking at the high levels of organic
48

1 matter in the river itself and it is creating high oxygen demand and decreasing oxygen concentration for it. It is
2 similar to the Utah Lake TMDL. Mr. Dave Wham or someone else could give a water quality update on the
3 TMDL status. He asked why they disconnected the Jordan and Utah Lake TMDL studies, and prioritized one
4 over the other. Dr. Hansen asked what the source was for the organic problems. Mr. Keleher said it was a lake-
5 form of algae. Mr. Bloodworth said when they saw the canals were transporting it from the lake that feeds into
6 the streams and into the Jordan River, they get it from Utah Lake water but downstream. Mr. Beckstrom said
7 the theory was it is tail water discharge. Mr. Bloodworth said some of the places where it increases is where it
8 will head down a canal and/or it hits a creek, and then dumps and they believe it is lake algae. Mr. Keleher says
9 if the dots are connected, Utah Lake has a TMDL for high nutrient loads, high phosphorus which perpetuates
10 algae growth. TMDL and Jordan River are trying to figure out how to deal with this high organic load, which is
11 actually coming out of Utah Lake.

12 Mr. Beckstrom asked what the lifespan of lake algae was when it gets transported out of the lake. Mr.
13 Keleher said it was dying and that is why it is organic. Mr. Beckstrom asked if it would be better if it stayed
14 alive or was the dying affecting it. Mr. Keleher said Mr. Dave Wham would be the person to ask. Dr. Hansen
15 said it sounded as if nutrients coming from Utah Lake are feeding algae in the river. Mr. Bloodworth said it was
16 part of it because nutrient loads were coming from Emigration Canyon. Mr. Keleher stated it might be possible
17 to get Mr. Wham to come in the future. Mr. Price said the Technical Committee had Hilary Arens six months
18 ago, but concurred Mr. Wham could give a brief update.

19 Mr. Bloodworth stated the FFSL is producing a brochure about sovereign lands of Utah Lake so the public
20 can have an idea what is allowed and not allowed according to state law and sovereign land rules, and it may
21 address the dock issue. Mr. Bloodworth reported on the state of the bridge proposal. He said the only new
22 development is FFSL is still waiting and has not heard anything. FFSL decided to look at trying to establish a
23 new rule to set a limit for the applicant to respond to FFSL's requests. Stress had been placed on FFSL to
24 respond to the applicant. FFSL is looking at putting a limit on how long they will wait without hearing anything
25 before the application process has to start over. It has been about five or six months without any answers to
26 the questions. Mr. Bloodworth understood the Transportation Commission had not heard either.

27 Mr. Bloodworth had complaints from the public about four-wheeler use at Goshen Bay. Those complaining
28 thought it was on sovereign lands and they shouldn't be allowed, which is correct. But the four-wheelers are
29 on lands adjacent to the sovereign lands. He did not know who owned them and asked if anyone knew. It was
30 suggested BLM or it was Mitigation Commission land. He got conflicting stories of who owned the land or
31 managed it. He asked if anyone had any ideas as to ownership/management to notify him by email. Mr.
32 Nielson said to look at the GIS. Mr. Bloodworth said on the GIS BLM owns it and when he had contacted the
33 BLM real estate guy, he did not know.

34 Mr. Bloodworth asked who is mapping the GIS layer for settlement boundaries at the county. The
35 boundaries that are done are supposed to be recorded by the county in the internet, and wondered who
36 actually was doing it. He was finding some significant errors. He assumes the GIS map has the errors, but he
37 didn't have the metes-and-bounds to check them. He was trying to figure the ownership around the Pump
38 House to get permission to burn phragmites, but the settlement boundary was several hundred yards out into
39 the middle of the lake. Mr. Nielson said it was through the county recorder's office.

40

41 **9. Confirm that the next meeting will be held in Suite 212 of the Historic Utah County Courthouse on**
42 **Monday, March 19, 2012 at 8:30 AM.**

43 Mr. Keleher reminded the committee their next meeting will be held in Suite 212 of the Historic Utah
44 County Courthouse on Monday, February 13, 2012 at 8:30 a.m. rather than on the holiday of February 20,
45 2012. However, if no key issues or follow up items need to be discussed, it may be cancelled until March 19.
46 Mr. Price will send out an email to notify the committee members of the decision pertaining to the meeting.

47

48 **10. Adjourn.** Mr. Keleher adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m.