



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, March 24, 2014, 8:30 A.M.
Historic County Courthouse, Suite 211
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah 84601

ATTENDEES:

Richard Nielson, Utah County
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery Implementation
Program (JSRIP)
Chris Keleher, Dept. of Natural Resources (DNR)
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Neal Winterton, Orem City
Jordan Cullimore, Lindon City
Kimber Gabryszac, City of Saratoga Springs
Dale Goodman, Vineyard, American Fork
Jason Allen, State Parks/Recreation
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

ATTENDEES:

Sara Johnson, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Trent Bristol, Forestry, Fire, & State Lands (FFSL)
Tyler Murdock, Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL)

VISITORS:

Bill Pope, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs Owners Association
Lee Hansen, Citizen
W. Russ Findlay, Department of Interior (DOI)
Ryan Clegg, CB Technologies
Chris Schulz, Utah Lake Marina
Mark Holden, Mitigation Commission

ABSENT:

Lehi City, Santaquin City, Springville City, Mapleton City, Woodland Hills Town, Department of Environmental Quality, Utah Lake Water Users, Division of Water Resources, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers.

1 **1. Welcome and Introductions.**

2 Chairman Richard Nielson called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. He welcomed members and visitors to the
3 meeting. Each attendee was asked to introduce him/herself to the group.
4

5 **2. Review and Approve the Technical Committee Minutes; January 13, 2014**

6 Mr. Jason Allen moved to approve the minutes for January 13, 2014. Mr. Lee Hansen seconded the motion, and
7 voting was unanimous in favor.
8

9 **3. Update on Utah Lake Issues, Projects and Priorities**

10 Mr. Reed Price reported on recent projects, issues, and priorities facing the Utah Lake Commission.

11 **a. Carp Removal**– A field trip was held at Utah Lake prior to the legislative session. Board members, legislators,
12 local television stations and others attended. A short documentary was filmed by one of the local stations and was
13 viewed by PETA. They sent a letter of concern to the JSRIP concerning the inhumane suffocation of the carp. A
14 respectful letter of response was written by Mr. Henry Maddox. Mr. Keleher said PETA made some suggestions to
15 correct the problem but they are not feasible.

16 The ULC requested \$2 million in funds for the next three consecutive years from the legislature. This funding
17 would make it possible to remove 75% of the carp from the lake in 7 years. Instead they were able to appropriate

1 \$500,000 from the Endangered Species Mitigation fund, of which \$200,000 would need to be matched by other funds.
2 The ULC is applying for a grant through the Division of Water Quality, and is working with Mr. Mills of the JSRIP and
3 other potential partners to acquire the needed funds. These efforts would total \$700,000 for carp removal at Utah
4 Lake.

5 **b. Phragmites**– The ULC has applied for a grant of \$150,000 from the Utah Department of Agriculture invasive
6 species mitigation and a \$50,000 grant from the Water Shed Restoration Initiative. These funds will allow us to begin
7 treatment on approximately 500 acres of phragmites in Saratoga Springs. Mr. Greg Beckstrom asked if the grants
8 would allow for continued treatment in other areas around the Lake. Mr. Price said they would not be able to remove
9 the biomass on all of the previously treated areas, but that it would be removed in strategic places around the lake.

10 Mr. Nielson said the County Commissioners recently approved all the part-time phragmites crew workers to be
11 hired as full-time employees.

12 Mr. Dale Goodman asked if there were plans to treat the east side of the lake. Mr. Price said the east side of the
13 lake was the first area to be treated. Treatment has also taken place around the Utah Lake State Park and in Provo
14 Bay. He mentioned that there were ownership issues in Vineyard south of Center Street in the Powell Slough area, but
15 that they would be addressed in the next few years.

16 **c. Nutrient Permit Limits**– In November 2013 a meeting was held to discuss the new permit limits that the DWQ
17 is planning to impose on phosphorous and nitrogen for POTWs and potentially storm water discharge. Mr. Price said
18 he has been working with POTW managers and Salt Lake County POTW representatives to begin conducting research.
19 He will be meeting with Mr. Theron Miller and POTW managers later in the day to see if the Salt Lake and Utah County
20 groups can join their efforts in verifying that the state limits and upgrades on WWTP are necessary.

21 Mr. Mark Holden asked if they were just looking at nutrient loading at Utah Lake or if they were also looking at
22 input at the Provo River as well. Mr. Price said that the discussion has been on all of the contributions. The main
23 question they need to answer is how much phosphorous and nitrogen is bio-available, and will limiting WWTP have
24 any net benefit to the Lake.

25 **d. Dock Amendment**– Mr. Price asked Tyler Murdock for an update on the Dock Amendment. Mr. Murdock said
26 the amendment has been drafted, will be reviewed by their legal counsel and the ULC, and will then be ready for
27 public review.

28 **e. Outreach**– Fourth grade field trips have been scheduled for April 23, May 1, and May 8, 2014. The application
29 deadline was March 21, 2014. The Utah Lake Festival is scheduled for Saturday, June 7, 2014 from 10 am to 2 pm. The
30 festival will offer a lot of booths and activities for families to enjoy, as well as boat rides and the Second Annual Boat
31 Show. Mr. Lee Hansen reminded everyone that June 7th is free fishing day in Utah.

32 **4. Presentation and Discussion on Provo River Restoration Project by Mark Holden.**

33 Mr. Holden said he would give an overview of the Provo River Delta Restoration Project. The draft EIS is available
34 at the www.provoriverdelta.us website.

35 Three joint lead agencies are associated with the Central Utah Water project. (1) Utah Reclamation Mitigation and
36 Conservation Commission. (2) Central Utah Project Completion Act Office – U.S. Department of the Interior. (3) Central
37 Utah Water Conservancy District. In 1999, the Joint Lead Agencies made commitments to “participate in the
38 development of a Recovery Implementation Program for the June sucker.” In 2002, the June Sucker Recovery
39 Implementation Program was established.

40 There are two main goals: (1) Recovering the June Sucker. (2) Allow continued operation of the existing water
41 facilities and future development of water resources for human use in the Utah Lake Drainage Basin.

42 Mr. Holden said that all future development of the CUP (Bonneville Unit) is contingent upon the JSRIP making
43 “sufficient progress,” as stated in the EIS. If sufficient progress is not made, it means the program is not meeting its
44 requirements. Mr. Price asked who determines if sufficient progress is made, and if there are any penalties for not
45 making sufficient progress. Mr. Holden said it is the responsibility of Fish and Wildlife Service to determine progress.
46 He said that in extreme situations when sufficient progress is not made, the federal government or court system could
47 take over the operation of facilities. He said the June Sucker has been brought back from the brink of extinction and a
48 lot of good progress has been made since the JSRIP began.
49

1 He said the main recovery program elements include (1) non-native control (carp removal) (2) habitat restoration
2 (3) water management (4) hatcheries and stocking (5) research (6) awareness and stewardship.

3 He also listed four main conditions for downlisting the June Sucker from the endangered status to threatened
4 status. (1) the Provo River flow is essential for June Sucker spawning and recruitment (2) habitat in the Provo River and
5 Utah Lake has been enhanced and/or established to provide for the continued existence of all life stages (3) nonnative
6 species which present a significant threat to the continued existence of June Sucker are reduced or eliminated from
7 Utah Lake (4) an increasing self sustaining spawning run of wild June Sucker resulting in significant recruitment over
8 ten years has been re-established in the Provo River.

9 Mr. Holden said the June Sucker must be able to recruit naturally, without hatchery supplementation in order to
10 achieve recovery. The June Sucker lives most of its life in Utah Lake. They swim up the Provo River to spawn. Their
11 eggs incubate and develop. The larvae drift and are susceptible to predators. Many of those that are not eaten will
12 settle at the bottom of still water areas and starve because of their inability to swim.

13 Mr. Holden said the major issues that need to be addressed include the existing Provo River channel, keeping trees
14 alive, minimizing land acquisition, agriculture, airport safety, nuisance species control, economic impacts on
15 businesses, recreational opportunities, and public access. "Alternative B" has been identified as the agency and
16 landowner preferred option and encompasses about 310 acres. They have been working with landowners to make
17 revisions to meet their needs. Images were shown to illustrate where waterways would be changed as well as
18 changes to water elevations. Alternates "A" and "C" were displayed to show comparisons between the project areas.

19 He said preserving the existing river corridor is a key project element. They want to maintain aesthetics of the
20 area as well as recreational activities. The lower Provo river level fluctuates with the Utah Lake level and there is no
21 minimum flow guarantee. By 2016, depending upon funding, they are hoping to deliver water to the Provo River at a
22 rate of 10 cfs minimum flow, but that it would range between 10 to 50 cfs. They will also implement aeration to
23 increase dissolved oxygen levels. He displayed images of efficient aeration tools.

24 They have systems prepared to handle mosquito and vegetative issues. Surveys have been conducted for the past
25 two years to characterize the existing bird community. They feel that alternative B would be the safest for birds and
26 result in fewer bird-aircraft strikes. They will continue to monitor bird abundance and flight patterns in the study area.

27 Comments can be sent to Richard Mingo by May 7, 2014 by email at rmingo@usbr.gov or mailed to Richard Mingo,
28 Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, 230 South 500 East #230, SLC, UT 84102-2045. There is a
29 public review of the draft EIS on May 7, 2014. A final environmental impact statement will be ready by late 2014. A
30 record of decision is expected between late 2014 or 2015. If the decision is to proceed with the project, the land
31 acquisition will happen no sooner than 2015. Construction would begin no sooner than 2016 or beyond.

32 Mr. Holden asked if anyone had any questions about the project. Mr. Hansen asked about their plans to keep the
33 phragmites under control in the Delta area. Mr. Holden said they recognize that phragmites is a big concern, and
34 some of the areas have already been treated. They plan to cooperate with the ULC to monitor and aggressively treat
35 and manage the phragmites.

36 Mr. Hansen then asked three more questions. (1) Is it possible to dredge the lower Provo River to eliminate the
37 low spots in the river? (2) Is there any way to flush the river during the low water periods? (3) Is it possible to consider
38 high-flow, low-pressure pumps instead of aeration? Mr. Holden responded by saying that dredging the river caused
39 part of the problems we are facing today. They looked at the possibility of filling in the deepest parts of the river to
40 increase water flow, but feel it may impact recreational opportunities. The cost of pumping air into the river has been
41 estimated at the annual cost of \$3000.

42 Mr. Winterton asked when the river was most recently dredged. Mr. Holden said it had been dredged in the
43 1980's. Mr. Beckstrom said it is a mystery why the river has not had more debris and sediment fill in. FEMA did a
44 flood plain analysis study in 1986, and there have been virtually no changes since then.

45 Mr. Schultz asked if accommodations had been made in the lower dam for June Sucker and other fish species to
46 spawn. Mr. Holden said spawning would occur in the new channel and delta area.

47 **5. Discussion and Invitation to the Governing Board Strategic Planning session on Thursday, March 27**

48 Mr. Mills said the upcoming Governing Board meeting and strategic planning session would be held on March 27,
49 2014. Both Mr. Mills and Mr. Price encouraged the Technical Committee to attend.

1 **6. General comments and ideas for future discussion.**

2 Mr. Mills asked if there were any items to discuss. Mr. Allen said they received a request to set up a temporary
3 cable wakeboard park at Utah Lake State Park. Cable wakeboarding is simply wakeboarding while being pulled by an
4 overhead cable skiing system. He said it is popular back east and in Europe. It would require exclusive use of the outer
5 marina. He said that most cable wakeboarding parks are on private land, but that the developer has financing to do it
6 on public land. Mr. Allen feels it would be a unique opportunity for Utah and would be the only wakeboard park in the
7 state. The developer would have to comply with the regulations set by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and would
8 not be allowed to construct any permanent structures at the beach. He hopes that this opportunity would attract
9 more of the college age crowds to the park.

10 Someone asked how this would financially benefit the Utah Lake State Park. Mr. Allen said it would offer the
11 public another recreational activity, and that the Utah Lake State Park would get 2% of the income generated from
12 sales.

13 Mr. Beckstrom suggested improving the beach on the south side rather than the east side of the inlet.

14 Mr. Hansen asked how much of an effect this would have on picnicking. Mr. Allen said it would still allow for
15 swimming activities and day use activities.

16 There was some discussion on the restricted boat access area, which was marked with a yellow line on the map.
17 Mr. Ryan Clegg said he believes the placement of the restricted boat area is intended to keep the wake at a minimum
18 for the cable ski riders.

19 Mr. Keleher asked how the system would be powered. Mr. Allen replied that it will be powered by electricity from
20 existing outlets in the area.

21 Mr. Murdock asked if they would designate an area for non-motorized access such as kayaks? Mr. Allen said they
22 would make this option available.

23 Mr. Winterton asked who is responsible for making the final decision on this project. Mr. Allen indicated that he
24 would make this decision with input from State Lands. An RFP would outline the basic minimum requirements and the
25 opportunity would then be opened up for public bid. He said the winning bid would have a temporary 5 year contract.

26 Mr. Chris Schultz said this would be a great amenity for the Utah Lake State Park. Mr. Allen said he has spoken
27 with county tourism, and they would like to make activities like this available to “fan tour” groups. Mr. Clegg said a lot
28 of people would enjoy viewing this type of activity at the lake, but he did not think a lot of people would get off a fan
29 tour bus and participate. He questioned liability. Mr. Allen said the liability is covered as part of the RFP.

30 Mr. Price asked if it is possible to use the site during the winter months. Mr. Allen said there are winter options if
31 the location is right.

32 Ms. Gabryszac said that this group has also approached the City of Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain about
33 having a facility of this type in their city.

34 Mr. Clegg asked what admission is to Utah Lake. Mr. Allen said it is \$10.00 per carload.

35 Mr. Hansen asked if we have showering facilities in the beach area. Mr. Schulz said he was planning to request to
36 have outdoor showers put in at the Utah Lake State Park. Mr. Clegg suggested that a spray station could be installed.

37 Mr. Clegg asked about the depth of the lake in this proposed area. Mr. Allen responded by saying it is shallow, and
38 only 3’ at the deepest point, and has never been dredged. The lake level will affect this operation more than any other
39 at Utah Lake.

40 Mr. Mike Mills said the JSRIP is planning the annual assessment meeting on April 15-16, 2014 at the Department
41 of Natural Resources Building in SLC. Everyone is welcome to attend.

42
43 **7. Confirm the next Technical Committee Meeting Scheduled on Monday, April 21, 2014.**

44 Mr. Mills said the next scheduled meeting is on Monday, April 21, 2014, at 8:30 in Room 211 in the Utah County
45 Historic Courthouse.

46
47 **8. Adjourn.**

48 Mr. Allen motioned to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Gabryszac seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in
49 favor of the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 10:18 a.m.