



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, March 19, 2012, 8:30 A.M.
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 211
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources and Chair
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Ben Bloodworth, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands
Neal Winterton, Orem City
Adam Cowie, Lindon City
Howard Denney, American Fork City
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City
Ty Hunter, Utah Division of Parks and Recreation
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery Program (JSRIP)
Sarah Sutherland, Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD)

ATTENDEES:

Dave M. Wham, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Douglas Sakaguchi, Division of Wildlife Resources

VISITORS:

Jim Price, Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG)
Bob Allen, MAG
Shaun Seager, MAG
Hilary Arens, DEQ
Karen Nichols, HDR Engineer
Loretta Markham, Lochner
Dave Graves, Provo City
Casey Serr, Provo City

ABSENT: Santaquin City, Springville City, Mapleton City, Woodland Hills Town, Vineyard Town, Utah County, Utah Lake Water Users, State Division of Water Resources, Utah Lake Water Users, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

1 **1. Welcome.**

2 Chairman Chris Keleher called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. He welcomed the Technical Committee
3 members and all visitors. Members and visitors introduced himself/herself, and their organizations.
4

5 **2. Review and approve minutes from the January 23, 2011 meeting.**

6 Mr. Keleher asked for discussion, comments, or corrections for the minutes of the meeting held on January
7 23, 2012. Mr. Keleher asked the words Mitigation Commission be capitalized throughout because it was a
8 governmental agency. It was motioned by Mr. Greg Beckstrom to approve the minutes as corrected; it was
9 seconded by Mr. Adam Cowie. The motion carried and it was unanimously approved. He complimented Mrs.
10 Green for the comprehensive, detailed minutes of each meeting.
11

1 **6. Report from DWQ on the Jordan River TMDL.**

2 a. Identify key issues and consider having the Executive Director draft a letter summarizing those issues that
3 the Committee feels should be considered in the Jordan River TMDL.

4 Due to time restrictions of the presenters, Agenda Item 6 was moved up on the schedule. Mr. Keleher
5 introduced Ms. Hilary Arens, Jordan River Basin Coordinator with the Division of Water Quality (DWQ), who had
6 presented to the Technical Committee in the summer 2011. Mr. Dave Wham from DWQ accompanied her. She
7 updated the Technical Committee on the Jordan River Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) study with key issues.
8 Mr. Keleher said Mr. Price would consider drafting a letter summarizing the issues the Committee feels should
9 be considered in the Jordan River TMDL.

10 Ms. Arens said the TMDL issue comment period was extended to 90-days and ends March 31. The comment
11 period is what the state requires before submission to the EPA. Contact information will be provided so
12 members can read the entire document and send in comments.

13 The Jordan River TMDL was explained. When a river is not meeting its beneficial uses, due to pollutants, the
14 state needs to figure how much of the pollutant can be put into the system and still meet the beneficial uses for
15 drinking water, recreation, wildlife, or fish. The pollutants come from a combination of nonpoint and point
16 sources. Nonpoint source pollutants are diffuse run off that has been initiated. Point sources are wastewater
17 treatment plants, industrial plants, and storm drains. The combination of the two sources creates the TMDL.

18 A schematic of Utah Lake running north to the Jordan River Basin and to the Great Salt Lake was shown. The
19 current impairments along the Jordan River were listed. The TMDL focus is on the dissolved oxygen impairment
20 (DOI), from 2100 South in Salt Lake where the canal takes 80 percent of the flow up to the Great Salt Lake and
21 the other 20 percent stays in the Jordan River. The DOI and/or pollutants causing DOI is excess organic matter
22 and decomposition associated with it. It is creating a higher demand of dissolved oxygen in the system than is
23 needed for the wildlife that lives within it. Because 80 percent of the flow is lost, the water slows down and the
24 gradient decreases in areas, and organic matter settles to the bottom. With management and flooding
25 circumstances in the lower Jordan River, the surplus canal takes away a large amount of water.

26 DWQ's responsibility is to make sure the standards for different water quality beneficial uses are met. With
27 the low oxygen there is less fish and the species dependent upon them. The TMDLs that have been written for
28 the water systems in the US have been associated with excess nutrients causing the dissolved oxygen problems.
29 The findings are the organic matter comes from tributaries and storm drains; and is a coarse particulate organic
30 matter from trash, trees, limbs, and leaves. It breaks down into a fine particulate organic matter that is one mm
31 or less in diameter, and then goes to the dissolved organic matter. A lot settles out in the sediment, creating a
32 sediment oxygen demand. As it continues downstream, it breaks down. A model was created called the
33 QUAL2K, a six-day model used for the system of the Jordan River. Sediment oxygen demand was added because
34 of the time frame. It was found the sediment oxygen demand was piling up over time and was outside of the
35 six-day model. The sediment velocity of the system below 2100 South is slowing down, and depositional areas
36 occur. It is sediment and organic matter during flushing times when leaves and debris are swept into the
37 system. The TMDL team is trying to find a better way to measure the organic matter in the system. The
38 sediment oxygen demand (SOD) accumulates over a long period and is mucky, fine particulate organic matter.

39 The need is to reduce the organic matter loading the system by 38 percent. DEQ is in Phase I of the TMDL.
40 At present, it is not broken down between point/discreet sources and nonpoint /diffuse sources. There is not
41 have enough data yet to break it down between wastewater treatment plants or storm water allocation; or any
42 of the nonpoint sources, tributaries, or diffuse run off. DEQ does have enough information to do "bulk
43 allocations" to submit to EPA. A combination of point and nonpoint sources needs to reduce their inputs by
44 about 38 percent or about 1/3. It is obtainable but DEQ needs to learn more about specifics of the inputs before
45 they can make the clarifying statements about how much. In Phase I, DEQ is identifying the problem of organic
46 matter, paving the way for the study. There is an intense and targeted data collection phase, looking at the
47 different tributaries coming into the Jordan basin, the different points of location along the Jordan to see which
48 organic matter is loading into the system. After it is determined which tributaries have the most loading, then
49 those areas will be targeted utilizing the budget being funded by the state and the stakeholders. Phase II will be

1 behavioral and procedural changes. How do we get people to clean out their storm drains? How do we get
2 people not to put their grass clippings into the river? How do we get people to rake up their leaves throughout
3 the year and not only in the fall? Salt Lake City is taking steps to address the problems.

4 Mr. Neal Winterton asked where the DO standards came from and what the benchmark was that created
5 the standards. Ms. Arens said the Jordan River has a site-specific standard of 4.5 mg per liter, between April and
6 August, which is the critical time of year and has the most problems. She was not sure where the site-specific
7 standard arose. Mr. David Wham said the main base for the standards were all tied to the number of the
8 toxicological studies and studies of fish conducted across a wide range of areas. Mr. Winterton asked if it really
9 was site-specific for the Jordan River. Mr. Wham said it was close. Ms. Arens said EPA set the standards for
10 beneficial uses at a certain level and the state has to meet the levels or be stricter, if there is a reason. The
11 standard for other systems is 5.0 mg per liter. Even if it were not based on a site-specific standard, there would
12 still be impairments. Mr. Winterton asked if the data suggested DEQ/state would be able to do anything about
13 it. Ms. Arens said with the model using the 38 percent suggests if Jordan River reduced the organic matter by
14 that percentage, the standard would be reached. DEQ needs to take steps to reach the standard and to reduce
15 the amount of loading into the system, thus making it better. Although it is not nutrients going into the system
16 at this point, DEQ can see if there are other inputs affecting the dissolved oxygen. Mr. Winterton asked if the
17 studies indicate it is not nutrient. Ms. Arens said that presently the studies indicate it is organic matter.

18 Mr. Cowie asked what the phosphate levels were in the section of 2100 South. Mr. Wham said, he did not
19 know, but believed they were very high. Mr. Cowie asked why they were not listed as impairments. Mr. Wham
20 said they did not know the state standard for nutrients, so it was a secondary effect, and was high enough to
21 suggest an atrophic system. Ms. Arens addressed how the Jordan River TMDL looked at the Utah Lake system.
22 The model utilizes travel time and distance from sources, and how they affect the area below 2100 South. Utah
23 Lake is far away so it has less of an affect than the places that are closer. If Utah Lake is not changed, the effects
24 it has at 2100 South is very minimal; places closer to 2100 South are having more effect on the impaired section.

25 She gave the link for more information, her contact information and reminded the Technical Committee the
26 comment period closed March 31. She asked for questions.

27 Mr. Cowie asked why the timelines were spread out to 2028. Ms. Arens said it was to understand more, as
28 it is the most complicated and complex TMDL study the state has done and wanted it done right the first time.
29 DEQ will start to understand what is having the most influence on the organic matter in the next seven years.
30 Mr. Wham said it was spread out for data collection and setting up protocols. A whole new monitoring network
31 might be set up to understand the sources before discussing reasonable reductions, cost effectiveness, etc.

32 Mr. Sagaguchi asked what the water quality was like in the surplus canal below 2100 South. Ms. Arens said
33 there are no standards for the surplus canal, so there were no impairments. He asked if there was a sediment
34 problem in the surplus canal or if it got flushed out with high flows. She said because it was not a depositional
35 area, with much more flow, and there was not the sediment oxygen demand. He asked as it flows into the
36 Jordan River below 2100 South if it was limited by water rights downstream. She said they were looking to
37 working with Salt Lake City Public Utilities to see if modeling and targeted flushing events could be done at
38 strategic times throughout the year to see if it will make a difference.

39 Mr. Hansen said he didn't know what the surplus canal was or where it was going. Ms. Arens said it was
40 part of an historic flood prevention system in Salt Lake City. The city is constantly trying to manage what is going
41 down the Jordan River and what is going out in surplus by being able to account for summertime flash or storm
42 events, or spring runoff from the tributaries. Using the surplus canal helps take some of the flooding pressure
43 off of the city. Mr. Hansen said he did not know if it went into the Jordan River or out of the Jordan River. Ms.
44 Arens said it goes into the Jordan River and splits.

45 Mr. Howard Denney asked if enough BOD sampling was done over the years to compare it to the newly
46 imposed storm water regulations over the last several years and to see if there was a BOD demand on the river
47 water. Mr. Arens said they haven't been sampling for organic matter specifically, but DEQ has BOD they can use
48 in a surrogate mix. Mr. Denney said his point was over the past several years, the storm water input should
49 have improved dramatically going into Jordan River. Ms. Arens said she could look at the data and get back to

1 him. The different cities have done efforts in the past recent years and the efforts are not ignored. Some storm
2 water managers have specifically asked how to do more, such as more street sweeping, etc. and making their
3 efforts more efficient. Mr. Denney said they would have to say if it has made a difference in what they have
4 done so far and is a good indication it can make further differences.

5 Mr. Hansen asked about the leaf litter coming from wild plants growing along the river as opposed to human
6 activities. Mr. Wham said they are currently gathering that data but there is no way to identify sources, what is
7 contributing the most, where, and what time of year, etc. Discussion will occur to determine what actions can
8 be taken, if any. Mr. Hansen said phragmites is a huge producer of organic matter along the shoreline.

9 Mr. Greg Beckstrom asked if there was any defining correlation between the DO levels and the flow
10 volumes in the river. Ms. Arens said yes, in the upper section the flows are more of a gradient nature, there is
11 more movement, and less depositional areas. With a more dynamic river system, they are not getting the
12 dissolved oxygen. He asked if they would evaluate the possibility of proactive management of the diversion to
13 provide minimal flows into the Jordan River. Ms. Arens said that was part of the next phase, looking at
14 increasing the flows to the lower Jordan and then have flushing events. The overall management was to work
15 within the confines of the two things such as water rights downstream and the flooding issues of Salt Lake City.
16 Mr. Beckstrom asked if actual water diversion rights came out of the surplus canal. Ms. Arens confirmed his
17 understanding. The problem has been identified and DEQ now has to address it. Mr. Wham said it was
18 identified early on but there are so many constraints, that people are not willing to work towards them.

19 Mr. Hansen asked if they had data on whether it was more of a problem during high or low water years that
20 would give insight into water flow. Ms. Arens said the database used to get the present information was
21 through 2009. As 2010 was a high water year, DWQ did not see the impairments as in previous years. Mr.
22 Keleher said it is interesting Utah Lake is impaired but a portion of the Jordan River that is not. He asked if it got
23 aerated when it came out. Mr. Wham said yes.

24 Mr. Keleher said Mr. Price would put together a comment letter from the Commission and was interested in
25 getting information from the Technical Committee members on key issues on the Jordan River TMDL as it relates
26 to Utah Lake. Mr. Keleher said they were up against a challenge and appreciated DWQ's efforts. Ms. Arens said
27 if there were more questions, she would be happy to answer them.

28 29 **3. Report from June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program.**

30 Mr. Mike Mills stated since the last time he updated the Technical Committee, action on the lake picked up
31 and they had a good harvest during February/March removing over 500,000 pounds in a six-week period. The
32 spring slow period is coming when the carp tends to scatter. Removal efforts will continue but with a decrease
33 in effectiveness. In terms of the total removed, JSRIP is well over seven million pounds being removed.

34 The NEPA project of the Provo River Delta Restoration Process continues to play out in the media. Work on
35 the project continues. JSRIP continues to meet with stakeholders and land owners in the area working on the
36 draft EIS with an expected release at the end of 2012.

37 Mr. Beckstrom asked if the seven million pounds was for two years. Mr. Mills said it was from February
38 2010 to present. Mr. Beckstrom asked the annual projected goal and Mr. Mills said five million pounds. Mr.
39 Beckstrom asked if there was a plan to re-evaluate the population to see if seven million pounds had actually
40 put a dent in the overall population. Mr. Mills said the evaluation plan is connected with the ecosystem
41 monitoring Mr. Keleher previously presented with a better method of assessing the fish populations. Criticism
42 has arisen JSRIP is monitoring how much is taken out but not monitoring the overall effect on the population.
43 The reassessing will see if a difference is being made and where the population was being reduced.

44 Mr. J. Price said in a recent article it mentioned removing a total of 40 million pounds of the carp population.
45 Mr. Mills said the total goal was removing 35 to 40 million pounds of carp at Utah Lake over a seven year period.
46 Mr. J. Price asked where it was going. Mr. Mills said mink farmers were taking a lot and some was going for
47 composting. The future most promising use is making it into fish meal and a huge demand for fish-derived
48 protein. Fishmeal uses are significant for agricultural needs, as well as the fish and food industries and plays an
49 important role in all three. This greatly outnumbers the demand in agriculture.

1 **4. Report on private dock lease process.**

2 Mr. Ben Bloodworth reported two public meetings were held the Commission helped facilitate. The first in
3 Saratoga Springs had almost 50 citizens show up who wanted his or her own personal docks and the second held
4 in Provo had only one person. FFSL is presently in the process of deciding what will be done. They are working
5 on safety and other issues. Standards are being developed which will include the rule about depth, water
6 needed, and not crossing or interfering with the neighbors' ability to do something similar. It will be difficult to
7 build to standards that meet all the requirements because of the water depth of the lake, movement of the ice
8 in the winter, pulling the dock into the lake far enough to reach the required depth. Mr. Hansen asked if there
9 was any indemnification if something was built and then banned. Mr. Bloodworth said no. They hadn't involved
10 the AG office, but requirements such as requiring individuals to bond might be implemented. With the public's
11 input completed, standards can be started.

12
13 **5. Report on proposed agricultural protection area.**

14 In late February, Mr. Keleher informed Mr. Price of a proposed agricultural protection area on the property
15 JSRIP was considering for the delta restoration project. He wanted to make the Technical Committee aware of
16 the proposal and get feedback. He showed the area identified on a map. The property owners have proposed
17 the protection area to the Utah County Commission to enforce an agricultural protection area, which would
18 make it agricultural (AG) land forever. The proposal was made on February 23, and the County Commission has
19 120 days to respond. If they don't respond within 120 days, it automatically becomes an AG protected area.
20 The request was submitted to both the Utah County Planning Commission and the Agricultural Area Advisory
21 Board. Both groups will recommend to the County Commission whether the area should be granted the
22 designation or not. The Utah Lake Commission Governing Board will probably review the proposal at the April
23 Governing Board Meeting. The Technical Committee leadership found many policies and guidelines in the Utah
24 Lake Master Plan that can be supported by either the AG protection area or the JSRIP proposal to restore the
25 river delta. Mr. Price's opinion was the AG proposal was an effort to thwart the efforts of JSRIP moving forward
26 with the study to determine if it is feasible to restore the delta. Different areas of the Master Plan are
27 supportive of either proposal.

28 He asked if Mr. Mills had anything to add from the JSRIP or DNR perspective. Mr. Mills agreed with Mr.
29 Price's assessment the proposal came about in response to JSRIP's efforts and plan for the delta project. JSRIP
30 has chosen not to comment on the proposal. As the EIS is prepared, agricultural impacts of the farmland will be
31 considered and are already recorded. The application for the AG area doesn't change the process and JSRIP will
32 continue forward regardless how the proposal plays out.

33 Mr. Denney asked if anyone checked to see if the area has the federal designation of prime farm land. Mr.
34 Price said he didn't know. Mr. Beckstrom asked the practical significance of setting aside the debate on the
35 vote. Mr. Keleher cited an example of people moving into developments where farmers lived and the new
36 residents want to have the farmers moved out. The act was set in place to protect the farmers so they can carry
37 on with their business. Mr. Beckstrom asked if it was an actual state law and not a county planning regulation.
38 Mr. Keleher said yes. Mr. Winterton asked how many AG protection areas exist near the shoreline of Utah Lake.
39 Mr. Price said he did not know. Mr. Winterton said it was common for the LDS church to put the designation on
40 their land. Mr. Beckstrom asked the governmental entity given the authority or responsibility to make the
41 determination. Mr. Keleher said it was the County Commission but for future condemnation purposes, the
42 Advisory Board and the County Commission need to approve a condemnation. Mr. Beckstrom asked if the
43 Advisory Board was a state entity. Mr. Price said it was similar to a Planning Commission. Mr. Winterton said
44 AG protection is very strong. Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD) challenged it. There is no
45 appeal to the Ag Board when it is the AG Board's decision. CUWCD took it to the State Legislature to get the
46 appeal power back to the Commission and it was denied.

47 Mr. Beckstrom said it suggests the Agricultural Advisory Board is not a decision-making board but is an
48 Advisory Board of the County Commission. Mr. Winterton said it was the challenge of the condemnation, not
49 putting it into protection. The County Commission actually makes the decision based on recommendations. Mr.

1 Beckstrom said if a property achieves AG protection designation, which is apparently granted by the county,
2 does the restriction apply to the property owner or if the property owner changes his mind, does he have any
3 restrictions imposed. He cited when a zoning designation is applied, zoning does not change with transfer of
4 ownership. The AG protection designation is under control of the property owner and if he chooses to ignore or
5 change it, he can do so. Mr. Winterton said he was correct. Mr. Keleher said the initial intent was to protect the
6 mink farmers from governmental entities who have condemnation power.

7 Mr. Hansen asked if the County Commission could make a decision on not to make a decision, and if met
8 within the required 120 days. Mr. Price said he was not sure and believed they had to make a yes/no decision.
9 They can say no and bring it back when they are done. If a decision one way or the other is not made, it
10 automatically goes into force. Mr. Keleher asked if it was on the Governing Board agenda in April. Mr. Price
11 confirmed it was. Mr. Keleher said if anyone had any thoughts on the proposal, Mr. Price would appreciate their
12 input. From a Commission standpoint, it is hard looking into the Master Plan study area because both uses of
13 agricultural protection and habitat restoration are listed. It is not the right time for the Commission to take
14 sides. Mr. Hansen said it sounded like the recommendation the Commission needs to make to the County
15 Commission say, "No, not at this time," rather than not give any recommendation. Mr. Beckstrom said it looks
16 hard to achieve because the decision might be harder than the bridge. Mr. Hansen said it automatically happens
17 if a decision is not made. Mr. Keleher said the DNR submitted a comment letter to the County Commission
18 asking them not to make a decision in support at this time until the planning process was done for NEPA. Mr.
19 Ellertson told Mr. Price the 120 days ends on June 11, so time is available to evaluate it. Mr. Beckstrom said he
20 wanted to understand the designation. Mr. Keleher said to study the act; Mr. Price will send the link.

21 Mr. Sagaguchi said Mr. Beckstrom asked if there were other places around Utah Lake with AG protection.
22 When he attended a public meeting for the Lakeshore extension, some displayed maps showed AG protection
23 areas east of Powell Slough. A couple of parcels between Powell Slough and Utah Lake were not under Ag
24 protection. Mr. Beckstrom said he was trying to understand the distinction between an agricultural protection
25 designation and conservation easement that exists on a number of properties in the area. Mr. Keleher said once
26 the advisory board designated it as AG-protected, they have the power to overrule and Mr. Beckstrom said it
27 sounds like it has never been done.

28 29 **7. Report from Provo City on Westside Connector and Lakeview Parkway.**

30 Mr. Price introduced Mr. Dave Graves in charge of the Westside Connector connecting the University
31 Avenue exit in South Provo to Center Street; and Mr. Casey Serr, in charge of the Lakeview Parkway that
32 connects Center Street north to Orem.

33 ***Provo Westside Connector:*** Mr. Graves gave the five-year history of the Provo Westside Connector project,
34 including an EIS. The Connector runs from the University Avenue I-15 interchange out to the airport. In spring
35 2007, the environmental firm Biowest headquartered in Logan headed up the work. As it progressed, a lot of
36 different input was received. There were workshops, public meetings that were organized into a stake holders'
37 forum with a selected group consisting of property owners, city council, planning commission, and agencies and
38 private citizens. Project purpose needs, an alignment screening, and selection process were assessed. The
39 consultant evaluated and screened the nearly 20 alternatives submitted. A draft EIS was published in June 2010.
40 A lot of negotiations with the federal agencies were completed through the document refinement process. In
41 October 2011, the final EIS was issued for publication and public comment. On January 3, 2012, the record-of-
42 decision from the Federal Highway Administration was given. The purpose of the project was two-fold. The first
43 purpose was to improve the system linkage between I-15 and the Provo Airport in a manner to support the
44 planned residential and planned commercial airport developments. The second purpose was for a connection of
45 economic viability between the East bay business area and retail center on the Westside area.

46 In the final process, two alternatives met the purpose and nature of the project. An alignment along 1860
47 South was selected.. The difference between the two was the existing freeway interchange connection rather
48 than trying to bridge over I-15 and tie into somewhere else on University Avenue. The preferred alternative
49 impact was about 5.4 acres of wetland property, the majority of the area is three acres at the interchange area.

1 The ultimate roadway build out will be a five-lane section and have a bicycle/pedestrian pathway along the
2 south and west side of the road as it goes west of the airport. Three locations along the project will have pull-off
3 and parking areas where people can walk the trail or access other areas along Provo Bay. The majority of the
4 roadway will be built on four to six feet of fill, so it will be elevated from existing properties. Someone asked if
5 the local access road was for private property use. Mr. Graves said on the south side of the road there would be
6 several privately-owned properties, for either farm or agricultural-type accesses. There are several detention
7 pond areas along the roadway to serve the needs of the road and will help with the water quality before it
8 enters into Utah Lake and Provo Bay.

9 In January 2012, the Corps of Engineers began working through the process. A decision is anticipated from
10 them by May 1. An RFP for project design is in the process. It will include environmental right-of-way and final
11 engineering design. Right-of-way acquisition phases will be in the July/August time frame. Initial construction
12 with some grading for the project will begin in September/October.

13 Mr. Sagaguchi asked him to relate the mitigation proposal on the project. Mr. Graves said the mitigation
14 proposal showed it would be approximately 1100 West on a 20-acre site. There will be wetland restoration and
15 enhancement, and would mitigate the 5.4 acres from direct impact of the project. Mitigation was a combination
16 of different ideas. The city would complete the restoration and monitoring would be required by the Corps. In
17 the future, there is a possibility of turning the property over after the wetland area is established and
18 functioning. In addition, there are plans to mitigate some direct and indirect impacts in the area. The Provo Bay
19 area is an environmentally sensitive area. Properties are being identified and two different proposals are on the
20 table, with either one or a combination. One proposal identifies about 50 acres of property south of the
21 roadway alignment. The project team/Provo City would acquire the property as a preservation measure so
22 development could not occur on that property. The other idea being considered is the possibility of approaching
23 property owners to buy out development rights. The second is a little more difficult because there are no
24 assurances of actually having ownership. The project has identified about 85 acres of property south of the
25 roadway alignment where they would possibly buy the development rights. The whole point of the mitigation is
26 to discourage future development south of the roadway alignment.

27 Mr. Winterton asked if they studied the interruption of drains going into Utah Lake and made provisions to
28 continue it through the project. Mr. Graves said yes. As the project goes through final design, it has identified
29 all the surface drainage channels, and they will be left open to flow and are not restricted. The road is not being
30 built as a dike, but it is allowing existing features to continue to function. Mr. Winterton asked if they tried to
31 analyze the underground drains put in by farmers to water their properties. Mr. Graves said yes. The fill drains
32 will function with some modifications and the existing hydrology flow will continue.

33 Mr. Hansen asked where the mitigation areas were located and if the areas could be used for the phosphate
34 removal of a wastewater treatment plant. Mr. Graves said the designed drainage basins would do some
35 removal. After the project is constructed and completed, he was informed the water quality analysis would be
36 better when than it currently is today. Mr. Hansen wondered about the wastewater treatment plant. Mr.
37 Graves said the treatment plant would not go through the same area because it is east of I-15.

38 **Lakeview Parkway:** Mr. Serr said initially the Lakeview Parkway and trail was called another name. In 2011,
39 by Resolution, the Provo City Council created the Westside Connector, which is a roadway west of everything
40 built in Provo. Public meetings were held early in 2011. For three months, Mayor Curtis and Councilwoman
41 Sherrie Hall Everett took time to visit with neighborhoods objecting to the proposed project. Through the
42 process, it was renamed the Lakeview Parkway and Trail. The proposed final design is due out this summer and
43 will have alignments designed and ready for construction. The project received monies from the Utah County
44 sales tax totaling about 2.5 million dollars in 2009. The funds will go towards the design plans for the alignment
45 and if monies are left, they will begin to acquire some right-of-way preservation from willing sellers.

46 The build-out is similar to the Westside Connector with a five-lane section with solid asphalt in the center
47 and planter sections. A trail would be on the west side and used for multi-use purposes. The screening process
48 took 13 alternatives down to two to meet the environmental screening. Two alignments went back to the
49 public. The final decision coordinated with the proposed delta project. Alignment was shifted away from the

1 current roadway where a private business property owner used for years, and the alignment allows avoiding
2 sensitive bog areas. He showed the alignments for the Westside Connector and Lakeview Corridor. After the
3 Orem City Council provides their input and adopts their Master Plan, the final design will be completed and is
4 planned for July 2012. There are three homes will be affected by the alignment. Construction will be
5 determined by funding.

6 Mr. Keleher asked if the trail followed through the same alignment the whole way. Mr. Serr said yes. The
7 trail would pick up from the west side connector and continue to the Provo boundary. There has been
8 discussion with the county. They have a trail that would converge from the Utah Lake planned trail and be
9 adjacent to the Lakeview Parkway. Mr. Denney said the trail systems also connects through the I-15 University
10 Avenue Interchange along Provo's 1860 South and up on to the Bonneville Shoreline trail.

11 Mr. Price said construction was based on funding. He mentioned the Lakeview Parkway is in the MAG 2040
12 plan and it meant the trail might not be built for dozens of years. Mr. Graves said the trail would be built at the
13 same time as the roadway, so both are dependent on funding. Mr. Price asked if priority was given to the
14 Parkview Parkway in MAG's 2040 vision or if it would be bumped up. Mr. Graves said he believed it was in their
15 Phase I plan but was not sure of the years involved, but was probably in the next ten years, which was confirmed
16 by Mr. J. Price of MAG.

17 Mr. Denney asked what was done to identify or mitigate archeological sites in the area. Mr. Graves said
18 some historical sites were listed. The rest of the alignment does not hit any archeological sites. Mr. Denney
19 asked if they missed the old corn mounds and Mr. Serr said they were west of the mounds. Mr. Graves said the
20 Westside Connector project identified two to three areas where potential cultural resources were. A
21 memorandum will be included as part of the reconstruction document and requires extensive effort to identify
22 and deal with any archeological resources along the area.

23 Mr. Beckstrom asked the total wetlands impact for the Lakeview Parkway. Mr. Serr said the shift in the
24 alignment did increase the total acreage of wetlands from 1.7 to 2.3 acres, which is everything north of the River
25 and south of the bench. Mitigation has not been identified. There is clearance from the Corps for the identified
26 wetland areas as part of the design process, so the Corps is okay with the wetlands identified in the field. Once
27 the design is final, the peak issues will be addressed. Lightweight construction techniques or other methods will
28 be used to get through those areas and will be part of the design.

29 **8. Other items.**

30 Mr. Keleher asked for further business items.

31 Mr. Ty Hunter said on April 21, there is a co-sponsored clean-up called "Comcast Cares" day at Utah Lake
32 State Park. The four-hour cleanup service project goes from 7 a.m. to 1 p.m. Registration is at 7:00 a.m.
33 Refreshments, lunch, and T-shirts will be provided. Application deadline for the needed volunteers is March 31.
34 Comcast gives a per-volunteer donation to a nonprofit group and so the Alumni Chapter of Utah Lake State Park
35 will keep the money until enough is received to build another pavilion at the park. He provided volunteer
36 applications for friends, family, and everyone. The Reel-in and Recycle Program, with the Rocky Mountain
37 Anglers, will put recycling bins throughout the park to help prevent litter. The link is www.stateparks.utah.gov,
38 under the volunteer tab. These service hours will provide opportunities for the dedicated hunters.

39 Mr. Sagaguchi informed the Committee that west of the Springville interchange, UDOT has been working on
40 the freeway and Hobble Creek Bridge. The week prior some water was put under the new Hobble Creek Bridge
41 and that goes into the lower Hobble Creek Wildlife Management Area. The water now comes through a newer,
42 larger bridge structure and directly into the wildlife management area.

43 Mr. Bloodworth said UVU hired a new fluvial geo-morphologist who is interested in local projects. She has
44 wanted to work in Jordan River area. She is looking for projects her students can do including collecting data,
45 etc. She is trying to build a GIS database utilizing the GIS information and not just creating maps.

46 Mr. Hansen asked if Mr. Baskin's sonar maps of the lake bed sonar had been released. Mr. Price said he
47 would check with Mr. Baskin, as some maps used were not yet public. He had been working with Mr. Baskin and
48 Mr. Todd Frye to get USGS to make a bathometric map.
49

1 Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Bloodworth if there was any truth in a discussion stating responsive
2 communication from the bridge proponents should be within a certain time or they have to go back to square
3 one. Mr. Bloodworth said there were internal discussions about creating some rule, but nothing had been done
4 and it would have to go into rule. There were things with the bridge FFSL has never encountered before.
5 Usually FFSL is the one that takes too long to respond and where the time limits are. There is not any 30/90/120
6 day deadline to hear back from an applicant. The subject has been discussed but it has not made it to
7 application for rule. Mr. Beckstrom asked if FFSL is in a waiting pattern for the bridge proponent to respond and
8 if they have heard anything. Mr. Bloodworth said yes they were waiting, as far as he knew there was nothing
9 new. Mr. Price said a letter was received in January 2012, stating they were working on it.

10
11 **9. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 23, 2012.**

12 Mr. Keleher reminded the committee their next meeting will be held in Suite 212 of the Historic Utah County
13 Courthouse on Monday, April 23, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.

14
15 **10. Adjourn.**

16 Mr. Beckstrom motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Hansen seconded the motion. The voting was
17 unanimous. Mr. Keleher adjourned the meeting at 10:12 a.m.