



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, September 23, 2013, 8:30 A.M.

Historic County Courthouse, Suite 211

51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah 84601

ATTENDEES:

Chairman, Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Vice-Chairman, Richard Nielson, Utah County
Kim Struthers, Lehi City
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Neal Winterton, Orem City
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Greg Flint, Santaquin City
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP)
Jason Allen, Division of State Parks

ATTENDEES:

Hilary Arens, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Carl Adams, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Trent Bristol, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL)
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

VISITORS:

Bill Pope, HDR, Inc.
Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs Home Owners Association
Brianna Binnebose, Survey Consultant
Larry Ballard, Citizen

ABSENT:

American Fork City, Lindon City, Mapleton City, Vineyard Town, Woodland Hills Town, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Division of Wildlife, Utah Lake Water Users, Division of Water Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

1 **1. Welcome.**

2 Chairman Chris Keleher called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. He welcomed the members and visitors to the
3 meeting. He asked each person to introduce him/herself to the group.
4

5 **2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Commission (ULC) Technical Committee (TC) minutes from April 22, 2013.**

6 Mr. Keleher asked if there were any questions, comments, or corrections on the minutes from April 22, 2013. Mr.
7 Price said Mr. Kim Struthers from Lehi had attended the April 22 meeting, and his name should be added.

8 It was motioned by Mr. Richard Nielson to approve the minutes as amended and corrected; and it was seconded
9 by Mr. Kim Struthers. The motion carried and the minutes were unanimously approved as corrected.
10

11 **3. Brief updates on Utah Lake issues, projects, and priorities.**

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

13 **a. Lake Level** – The lake is low at 3.5 feet below compromise level with the current elevation at 4,485.6 feet.
14 With the low level, there were visible sandy beaches around the lake, but the valley and lake needed more water.

15 **b. Utah Lake Symposium** – Is scheduled for October 15, 2013 at the UVU Library Auditorium from 9 a.m. until
16 mid afternoon. The agenda is being decided with topics ranging from carp removal, recreation, Utah Lake survey, and
17 others. When the agenda is finalized, it will be forwarded to TC members and colleagues who might be interested in
18 learning more about Utah Lake.

1 **c. Phragmites** – Through funds provided by FFSL and ULC, Cross Marine was able to smash down 300 treated
2 acres of phragmites in the Saratoga Bay and near the Lindon Marina. It was an expensive process. The smashing
3 down of phragmites speeds up the bio-decomposition process. The preferred way to bio-degrade is burning, but it has
4 proven to be difficult. Mr. Neal Winterton asked if the smashed area was previously treated for phragmites. Mr. Price
5 said yes, as it was sprayed two years prior with a fire break of 75-100 feet along the edge. With the lake at a low level,
6 Mr. Cross was able to smash it down to speed up the decomposition. Mr. Dee Chamberlain said they have a better
7 view and he can see across the lake; completely changed from the previous year.

8 Almost \$200,000 in grant funds was received for initial and follow-up treatment on other areas on the lake. The
9 focus for FY2014 is 1000 acres on the south end of the lake between Lincoln Beach and Provo Bay with helicopter
10 spraying being done in August. County crews will work in the areas through fall and winter. Mr. Winterton asked
11 if there was a higher success rate with the lower water level. Mr. Price said the lower level helped with smashing.

12 **d. Carp removal** – The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) put additional funding towards carp removal and it
13 continued during the summer. ULC will continue pursuing dedicated spending from the state legislature. The survey
14 gaged the public's attitude towards carp removal and their interest in other lake issues.

15 **e. Nature Center/Research Facility** – The National Parks Service (NPS), who acted as consultants, is preparing a
16 document. When the draft is completed, it will be forwarded to the nature center and research facility
17 subcommittees to review. An outreach event will be held where the public will be invited comment on the ideas
18 collected from the process. Potential partners will then be approached for construction funding and ongoing
19 maintenance. Mr. Price has been approached by several people with their perception of ideal locations for the center,
20 but it has not yet been decided.

21 **f. Permitting private docks** – Over several months, FFSL has been working on a draft proposal. It will be
22 reviewed by a subcommittee of ULC and community members on Tuesday, September 23, 2013 at 9 a.m. in room 319.
23 The proposal is for citizens who want a private dock on Utah Lake. The draft is considering a permitting process to
24 allow docks. After the review, suggestions and recommendations will be given to FFSL.

25 **g. Point source discharge permit limits for POTWs** – ULC is assisting DEQ with educating officials on point source
26 discharge permit limits for POTWs. Permit changes may come in the near future, specific to phosphorus. ULC will
27 work with DEQ in reaching out to city administrators and POTW management to help understand the potential
28 economic impacts of the permit requirements. With the information, the municipalities will be ready to defend
29 themselves, be engaged in the process, and understand potential regulations from DEQ when the process is
30 concluded. Mr. Carl Adams of DEQ said there has been discussion regarding new ammonia limits in the form of
31 nitrogen for discharging facilities. They have been focused on phosphorus as a concern and the limiting nutrient for
32 algae growth. EPA is releasing new ammonia restrictions, which are lower than in the past. Mr. Price asked how
33 stringent the regulations would be. Mr. Adams said it is quite a bit lower than past guidelines. The process to achieve
34 the lower numbers could become expensive. Research is still being conducted and the information gathered may be
35 factored into the final numbers. There will also be technology-based standards of one total phosphorus and ten total
36 nitrogen. The timeline for nutrient standards, which have been high on EPA's list nationally and in the intermountain
37 west will be announced in the near future. He explained outside of total maximum daily load (TMDL) there are new
38 ammonia limits.

39 Mr. Price said Mr. Walt Baker, DEQ Director, asked ULC to facilitate a meeting for city administrators, mayors, city
40 councils, and others to be given an opportunity to become aware of the limits. Mr. Lee Hansen felt TC should be made
41 aware there was evidence Utah Lake may be nitrogen-limited rather than phosphate-limited. Mr. Adams said it has
42 been studied quite extensively. Mr. Keleher said the treatment plants could challenge the standards by doing their
43 own scientific analysis. He asked Mr. Adams if he anticipated this occurring. Mr. Adams said the costs associated with
44 upgrading, that weighs in on the balance, would be a hard case to prove for Utah Lake.

45 **h. Adopt the Shoreline Program** – A program patterned after "Adopt a Highway" Program was developed by a
46 BYU student. His ideas were presented to FFSL who has management responsibilities for the lake. They were excited
47 with his plan and are moving forward. Agreements are being drafted. ULC will be ready to engage groups when they
48 come forward and show them areas needing focus. As shoreline is opened up, help from the public is needed to keep
49 the lakeshore clean.

1 i. **@geneva Project** – There is a new development going in Vineyard Town with the property purchased by the
2 Anderson Geneva group. ULC will be working with Vineyard and the developers as plans move forward to build the
3 property. It will be a master-plan community, mixed-use with residential, commercial, and UVU-oriented projects.

4 j. **Westside connector transportation project** – Mr. Greg Beckstrom said Provo in the final planning stages,
5 currently being engaged in right-of-way acquisitions. The first phase will be a fill project from South University Avenue
6 interchange to west of 500 West. After survey work and property owners giving right-of-way acquisition, road
7 construction may begin within six months.

8 Mr. Price called for additional questions on the summary.

9 Mr. Beckstrom asked for updates on carp removal. Mr. Mike Mills said it was a successful, productive summer
10 being attributable to the lower lake level and having concentration of more fish being susceptible to the seine-
11 techniques. Each month during the summer season over 400,000 pounds were harvested. They are now over 12
12 million pounds removed since the start of September 2009. Mr. Beckstrom asked if there was any progress from the
13 original calculation several years ago. Mr. Mills said Utah State University repeated carp seining done in 2005 to
14 assess the carp population. It shows a very dramatic difference from February 2005. Seining was repeated the end of
15 August. That data will be analyzed and returned by end of 2013 to confirm the findings. When the initial assessment
16 was done in 2005, the lake was lower than in 2013. JSRIP would like to get another data point to corroborate the
17 information showing there has been a reduction. If they go on the present information, JSRIP can report carp removal
18 has been productive.

19 Mr. Winterton asked about the status of the Provo River delta project. Mr. Mills said, from May 2012 to May
20 2013, JSRIP met on a monthly basis with a landowner group. JSRIP started over, addressed all concerns and there
21 were compromises. Since May 2013, a draft environmental impact statement is being prepared. It should be released
22 to the public for comment by the end of 2013. There will be more information forthcoming in December.

23 **4. Utah Lake survey results presentation and discussion.**

24 The survey results were presented in an Executive Summary. Mr. Price asked for questions, feedback, and any
25 comments during the presentation. He introduced Ms. Brianna Binnebose, who worked with Mr. Price on the survey
26 project. In May, she graduated from the University of Utah with a Masters of Public Policy and had interned with FFSL.
27 She analyzed the statistical data. He thanked TC for helping in the survey process.

28 He gave the history of the questionnaire. It was geared to look at the Utah Lake Master Plan (ULMP) to identify
29 the goals and objectives that would benefit from public input. The public didn't need to give input on objectives such
30 as ULC being a communication and coordination group. However, things related to recreation and land-use
31 preservation was a good focus to see what the public feels. With TC's help, the ULMP was evaluated and goals and
32 objectives were identified with possible specific projects. A survey based on the ULMP information was initiated.
33 After several survey revisions, three different versions were administered.

34 First, a phone survey was considered. A random phonebook sample with people was prepared. When initiated, it
35 took an hour to get one response. To get a meaningful sample size, it would take too long.

36 Second, another was a printed hard-copy. The Utah County Treasurer provided a list of 2000 randomly selected
37 Utah County addresses. It was a property tax list, so people from other states and counties were included. ULC
38 wanted to focus their efforts on the public opinion of Utah County. The addresses were sorted and mailed to
39 residential addresses. Because it was solely property tax owners, the survey did not hit the renter population. It gives
40 a general feel for Utah Lake and the improvements needed. About 1482 copies were mailed and after three weeks,
41 339 responses were returned, at 24 percentage rate.

42 Third, a targeted survey was sent to the TC, Public Advisory Group (PAG) and other stakeholders of the lake, asking
43 them to respond. It was an electronic, web-based survey through "SurveyMonkey." Different links were created to
44 tell who replied to each particular survey. There was a link on the website for people who frequented the website and
45 asked to respond. The targeted survey had 64 responses and the website survey had 16 that allowed ULC to take the
46 random data and compare it with people who utilize the lake.

47 Ms. Binnebose said it was a long survey with questions where people were able to select more than one response.
48 Each of the individual responses became its own answer. A difficulty was noted when the survey results were being
49 returned. Email electronic versions of the survey allowed only predetermined numbers; the paper respondents had

1 more flexibility with responses. For example, the survey asked them to choose five, and paper survey could choose
2 ten if desired. To work around the problem, each answer was given a number and then tallied up by how many
3 numbers were received noting the number of responses, with each answer becoming its own response. A one was
4 given if picked and a zero if not. The data input was labor intensive.

5 Mr. Price went through the results, responses, and the frequency data. TC members were invited to ask
6 questions. Mr. Keleher asked about the renters and asked if the respondents' age was asked. Renters are younger
7 and he wondered if they missed the youth component. Ms. Binnebose agreed with Mr. Keleher, stating the youth
8 component was lost. Demographics of age, gender, income, education level, and household members were asked,
9 and the majority of respondents were in the 50 years and above category showing higher incomes being homeowners.
10 ULC may send out another survey reaching the renter/younger population, as well as trying to expand it in the
11 electronic form. It is easier to control the electronic form with amount of responses and people would have to do
12 what is asked. Mr. Price said the manual data input into the computer for 336 responses took some time.

13 The gender showed 240 responses were male and 162 female. The age group divisions are 18-24 with five
14 responses while 61 between the ages of 25-34. Because the oldest group was 65+, if it was broken down into more
15 age groups, it would be a little more normal. Mr. Beckstrom asked if there were enough numbers of data to
16 differentiate what the results were. Ms. Binnebose said they separated quite a few responses by survey type, trying to
17 see how the survey mode was distributed. An appendix of the overall group will show a more detailed table. The
18 paper surveys had a slightly older age group. Each response was not broken down by age group, but if beneficial, it
19 could go into the report and the results can be a little more in-depth. Mr. Beckstrom said if there were a significantly
20 different result in the age group, it would lend emphasis to the need to do a future survey again trying to get a more
21 balanced age group. But, if the data is consistent across age and the results are comparable across the age group, it
22 may not be important.

23 Mr. Price explained the demographic graphs outlining the number of people and ages living in each household.
24 Another was the education level with many advanced degrees, bachelors, associates, with a few high school diplomas,
25 and a few less than high school. Employment was another factor with 105 respondents retired was 27 percent, 49
26 percent were full time employees, part-time was 39 percent, and 26 percent were unemployed. In housing 384
27 responses own their home, and 11 rented. On the income, 88 respondents were making over \$100,000 in household
28 income, 72 respondents made between \$75,000 to \$100,000; 87 made between \$50,000 and \$75,000; 60 made
29 between \$25,000 to \$50,000 and 17 made less than \$25,000.

30 Zip codes showed Saratoga Springs residents responded the most, followed by American Fork, and Lehi. Mr.
31 Winterton asked if respondents in each of the city's zip codes were added together. Mr. Price said no, but it could be
32 done. He appreciated the insight. Ms. Arens said pertaining to the age analysis and retirement, more people are able
33 to recreate who are in an older category and have more time to respond. Ms. Binnebose said they would have more
34 disposable income, more grandchildren, and use the lake.

35 Mr. Price continued with the question of how many times a year the household visited the lake, and it showed
36 most people get to the lake at least once a year while some still don't get there at all. For the most part, the
37 population goes to Utah Lake at least once, which is not frequent. Some go out above seven times. Another
38 indication the renter population was missed was seeing most people have visited the lake for over 20 years, which
39 points to an older population responding.

40 Activities done on the lake are motor boating as the most frequent, followed by water skiing and wakeboarding.
41 Other activities noted were fishing with 140 responses, walking and jogging on the trail system, picnicking, swimming,
42 and passive boating. The lake is being used for a wide range of reasons. The most used access point is Utah Lake State
43 Park, followed by American Fork Boat Harbor, Lindon Marina, Saratoga Springs City, and Lincoln Beach. Looking at the
44 smaller access points, there is the airport dike road, Sandy Beach, Vineyard Beach. This information will be utilized to
45 let ULC know which areas the public want to improve to make a little more appealing and more accessible to
46 encourage more attendance. Ms. Arens asked if the marina where most people access the lake takes any information
47 about where the party is from, if it is local or out of state. Mr. Jason Allen said they started taking information
48 secondary to the Wildlife Resource requirements for the quagga muscle. Ms. Arens said it might be interesting to look
49 the data over a week. Mr. Allen said they were compiling it to use. He asked if ULC would like the information and
50 Mr. Price said it would be helpful.

1 The main reason people don't come to the lake is the perception the lake is dirty. There were 98 comments for
2 the reasons given which will be included in the appendix. Other responses are they prefer other lakes or reservoirs,
3 they don't have time to recreate on the lake, felt the fees were too high, or facilities are not well maintained.
4 Respondents were asked to select all the reasons including the lake is dirty and smelly, the beaches are terrible, there
5 are no natural fish, too many people at the marinas, need more launching places, shoreline is dirty, don't own a boat,
6 and man-eating carp.

7 The survey asked the respondents to rate the amenities on a scale of 1-5, meaning one does not meet the needs
8 of their household, indicating they desire more of a particular amenity available to them, to a five meaning they are
9 satisfied with what is being provided. They were also asked to indicate if they felt the amenity was not needed in their
10 household. The most popular one was sand beaches, with looking at the 1-3, with 227 respondents indicating it would
11 be nice to have a beach on Utah Lake. On motor boat launches, fewer people indicated their needs were being met
12 and they were able to get out on the lake, which indicates the number of marinas is probably adequate. With a
13 growing population, one of his recommendations is to keep track on this particular issue because as population grows,
14 the marinas will get busier. ULC needs to prepare for future motorboat launch areas.

15 Other responses showing there should be improvements included picnic areas, again looking at 1-3, showing their
16 needs were not met. A good number of people suggested picnic areas were needed as well as playgrounds and trails,
17 again, looking at 1-3. Those who felt their needs were met were less than those who felt they weren't. All responses
18 were summarized in a graph. The top five amenities most important to the household were restrooms, and as
19 improvements are made, ULC needs to assure more restrooms are provided. The more interesting amenities are sand
20 beaches, picnic areas, parking, trails, and motor boat launches, which it is important but the needs are being met and
21 so both needs should be looked at together. Many feel their needs are being met and fewer felt more were needed.

22 The next question asked was what type of changes would be made to the amenities that are used by members of
23 their household. Choices included more of the amenity, the amenity to be better or improved, or less or fewer of the
24 amenity or are your needs not being met. Restrooms should be better or improved, as well as a significant number
25 say more are needed. Sand beaches they want better and improved, and more of them because there are being used
26 by the public. There should be better and improved picnic areas with more garbage receptacles. This stated list of
27 amenities came from TC responses. When reviewed, it was to be an open ended question, but TC recommended
28 options to get responses, so a list was created of the main amenities the lake already provided or should provide.

29 Question 10 rated the physical condition of the areas as used by the household. It was good to see a lot of the
30 population has a fair to excellent opinion of the lake, meaning ULC is making some headway because years ago the
31 public perception seemed to be a lot less. Only 56 responses felt it was in poor condition.

32 Respondents could indicate their level of support for a list of actions including adopt a shoreline program, carp
33 removal, phragmites removal, continue to develop trails, develop camping facilities, develop a dog park, develop a
34 resort, research facility, nature center, to enhancements of the those stated, to acquiring property for open space,
35 passive activities, and active activities. Responses could be they were neutral on making the improvements, they were
36 supportive of them, they were somewhat supportive, or not supportive. The top ones were things ULC is currently
37 completing including restoring the shoreline through removal of invasive plants such as phragmites with 246 being
38 very supportive of the effort; few were not supportive of it. Carp removal was heavily supported with 280
39 respondents suggesting it should be pursued. Developing new beaches was discussed with 172 responses very
40 supportive of developing new beaches; a similar number were supportive of enhancing existing beaches. Creating an
41 Adopt a Shoreline program was also very supported. Ms Arens asked what kind of research facility was considered.
42 Mr. Price said the idea of a research facility was presented. He said it was disappointing not to see much support for
43 the nature center and research facility. ULC is moving through a process to create one and the survey tells the
44 committee they need to educate the population of the benefits of such a facility would be. Mr. Winterton asked the
45 type of facility it would be. He asked if it was a monolithic structure costing millions of dollars or if it would be a nice
46 place to work at. People become afraid when you talk about research facilities.

47 The survey asked how valuable the respondent thought the lake was commercially, environmentally, and
48 recreationally. Most felt it had great recreational and environmental value, but not sure of commercial value. The
49 carp removal effort is the only commercial value. As improvements are made to the lake, it will benefit the economy
50 in a different way other than in terms of resources that can be marketed or sold. The next question was to select up

1 to three activities at Utah Lake they felt funding could be allocated. The largest was carp removal efforts, with 234
2 supporting it, and then improvements to wildlife habitat, with shoreline restoration efforts the third one. Others were
3 to improve and maintain existing amenities and expand amenities to develop better access to them.

4 The preferred funding was user-fees or legislative appropriations, as the two most palatable ways to fund
5 improvements to Utah Lake. The less popular were an increase in sales tax, increase in wastewater fees, or an
6 increase in property tax. About 42 people didn't feel they should fund any part of Utah Lake.

7 The question talked about sales tax, which is contradictory to the previous question. It explained what a sales tax
8 is and asked how they would vote for an increase of 1 cent on a \$10 purchase. About 152 said they would vote in
9 favor of it for funding improvements at Utah Lake. Concerning a tax increase, 106 people said it didn't matter how
10 they would vote because they said they would vote in favor; some would want more information before they would
11 vote and would want to know what improvements would be made, and 63 people said they did not support increased
12 taxes for improving the lake. A few would vote against any tax increase.

13 Mr. Price said as the survey was discussed, if 50 cents per household per month were assessed, a million dollars
14 could be raised. It would cost each household about \$6.50 a year. The majority of people were willing to pay between
15 \$1-9 a year, which fits into the number being evaluated. About 81 people would be willing to pay between \$10-24 a
16 year; 47 people would be willing to \$25-49, and 92 people said they did not want to pay anything at all. It shows
17 support from people willing to pay to make improvements at Utah Lake.

18 The survey asked what ways they learned about Utah Lake. Many hear about it from family, friends, and
19 neighbors, the newspaper being effective, and TV. The 84 comments will be in the appendix.

20 It was asked if the respondent belonged to any sporting, wildlife, or environmental group with an interest in Utah
21 Lake and 34 of them responded yes, including the Utah Water Ski Club, Utah Valley Earth Forum, Timp Club, Nature
22 Conservancy, Bonneville Cycling, Boy Scouts, and Utah Outdoors.

23 Ms. Binnebose summarized the discussion and the issues found. The big struggle was the older age group being
24 most of the representatives. Another thing was what the age groups of people were. Some young people didn't
25 respond because it was a paper survey. She suggested arrangements be made to potentially reach out to universities
26 or schools in Utah County such as UVU or BYU to involve and encourage the younger demographic to participate. There
27 would also be a fair amount of the renters representing students living off the campus for the 2-4 year institutions. A
28 way to try to expand the response in the future would be to resubmit the survey after more feedback is obtained and
29 more agencies have had a chance to discuss it. There was a difference between the email and paper survey, and
30 mostly it was the age difference. Most of the people responded to the paper survey seemed to be 45 or older. Mr.
31 Allen asked how the overall on-line survey compared to the paper survey. Ms. Binnebose said she was comparing the
32 difference, and based on the suggestions, they could run the exact same analysis between the age groups to
33 differentiate. They took the mean reported score and compared them. There were statistical differences between
34 the survey type and primarily the differences between paper and mail, were because of the two bigger sample sizes
35 taken. Age, education, and others were based on their responses to financial questions. Fifteen questions were
36 evaluated that included visits, why they were voting against tax increase, participated in user groups, etc. She
37 reiterated involving UVU and BYU to encourage the younger population.

38 Mr. Price said the recommendations were based upon the responses of the survey. These efforts should be
39 directed towards maintaining existing beaches as well as creating new beaches, efforts to continue the carp removal
40 program should be a priority, efforts to continue the phragmites removal program including ongoing maintenance of
41 the removal should be a priority, improving access to the lake including existing access points and creating additional
42 access points was widely supported. Examples of access improvements supported by the survey include construction
43 of new and maintenance of existing trails, creation of overnight camping facilities, creation of picnic areas and
44 playgrounds, which are improvements ULC can make.

45 For water quality efforts, there were a lot of people who expressed an interest in water quality or cleanliness.
46 They felt the lake should be dredged. Efforts should be made to explain the existing water quality is good, assure
47 them it is clean, and not fear it. There should be communication of the consequences of large scale dredging.
48 Although logical, there are dangers in doing so. ULC needs to make the public aware it is not a cut/dry situation when
49 it comes to dredging. Despite the perception from the public there are adequate motorboat launches, as the
50 population grows, ULC needs to consider providing additional motor boat launch areas. There should be increased

1 communication to the community. Comments indicated they are not aware of what to do at Utah Lake. As the public
2 is alerted to what activities can be done, it will increase their support for making the improvements. Another
3 recommendation is if the Commission moves forward finding a way to fund the projects, ULC needs to assure
4 transparency in efforts to fund these goals and help the community understand it is being done in a wise way.

5 Final recommendation is to reach out and encourage participation in user groups that frequent Utah Lake. They
6 are the ones who primarily benefit from improvements to Utah Lake. ULC can get them to be a catalyst for public
7 support. Those are the basic recommendations. He asked if there were things that should have more focus on or
8 reserved for a future survey to engage the public's interest in the future. It is up for questions, and comments.

9 Mr. Allen said it could be labor intensive, but asked if it was considered to put staff in place for people to take
10 surveys at the existing marinas and around the lake. Mr. Price said it would need to be condensed to possibly five
11 simple questions. They could work together to create a survey, and begin asking questions now and taking zip code
12 data, and analyze it at some future time. Mr. Winterton said people want to use the lake quickly. If the survey were
13 handed quickly, they wouldn't mind filling it out and returning it on their way out. People want to get on the lake, not
14 take a survey when they arrive. Ms. Arens said if there was an incentive, like a prize, they might participate. Ms.
15 Binnebose said collecting emails and sending it to the person would be less expensive. People could do it at their
16 leisure and not on the spot. Mr. Allen said they have an existing email database with reservations, and it could be a
17 possibility. Mr. Hansen said if that avenue were taken, it would have a very biased population. Mr. Allen said yes, but
18 it is something that needs to be considered. Ms. Binnebose said it would help better inform what improvements
19 actually need to be done. Mr. Price said he liked the biased groups because they are the ones that utilize the lake, and
20 they would express their wishes. Mr. Winterton said if ULC could tap into the Dedicated Hunter Program, there would
21 be a lot of volunteer man-hours.

22 Mr. Hansen said he was surprised the interest in fishing at the lake is so low. He wondered if the fishermen did
23 not get surveyed. Mr. Allen said that with all the people who come into the park, ULC could still collect a wide
24 sampling from fishermen and recreational users, campers, day users, etc.

25 Mr. Adams asked if there was any way to tease out the public's knowledge of how Utah Lake is situated pertaining
26 to where the tributaries are, etc. Mr. Price said it was not a focus of the survey. Mr. Adams said he would encourage
27 this goal as it has been proven nationally the community needs a deeper understanding of the place and the nature of
28 the water. Mr. Hansen said a question worth pursuing would be why the people think the lake is dirty. In order to
29 change it, you need to know why the perception exists.

30 Mr. Larry Gardner said if you go to Lincoln Beach, there are signs stating not to eat the fish because they are
31 tainted. Another perception is the bugs and mosquitoes just swarm people, and it is not good.

32 Ms. Binnebose said another comment was trash at the lake. She said they were able to pick up these feelings
33 from the comments. Each section had open-ended comments. At the end general overall feelings on the survey, Utah
34 Lake, and other feelings were gathered. Mrs. Carin Green prioritized the comments into pro, con, or neutral and these
35 will be included in the appendix of the final copy of the survey report.

36 Mr. Keleher asked if the results would be used to guide the direction of the Utah Lake Commission, and
37 implementing the Master Plan. Mr. Price said his recommendations are going to propose to the Board they focus on
38 these areas. Some are already addressed, but to use it as leverage for legislators and other stakeholders for funding
39 the improvements to show public support is there for projects to be done, and convince them it is worthwhile for the
40 quality of life in Utah County, and begin to establish the partnerships to make the improvements a reality. Mr. Keleher
41 suggested in addition to the present recommendations, adding future refining surveys might be helpful to guide the
42 Commission's plans.

43 Mr. Hansen asked when the location for the nature center would be discussed. Mr. Price said after the finished
44 report of what the nature center and research facility should have, will help determine where to locate it. Mr. Hansen
45 said one reason he brought it up was pertaining to the West Side Connector as development was moving fast. He
46 cited a piece of property where nothing will be located. Mr. Price said that location, Orem's industrial park area, and
47 just north of Utah Lake State Park are three locations being evaluated.

48 Mr. Keleher called for further comments on the survey. There were none. Someone asked for a full copy of the
49 findings of the survey. Mr. Price said when it is complete, it will be made available. The results will be presented to
50 the Governing Board and it will be distributed as soon as possible. Mr. Winterton asked if the Executive Summary was

1 a draft or needs revision. Mr. Price said it was a draft, but it won't change a lot. Suggestions will be added to consider
2 doing more surveys to gage public interest in the future.

3
4 **5. General comments and ideas for future discussion.**

5 Mr. Keleher asked if there were any ideas for future discussion, studies, or special presentations. Mr. Price said
6 October 21 at 8:30 in Room 211 a representative from the Army Corps of Engineers is scheduled to present the corps'
7 role when proposals affect Utah Lake.

8
9 **6. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 21, 2013.**

10 Mr. Keleher said the next scheduled meeting is on Monday, October 21, 2013, in Room 211 in the Utah County
11 Historic Courthouse.

12
13 **7. Adjourn.**

14 Mr. Greg Beckstrom motioned for the meeting to adjourn; it was seconded by Mr. Nielson. The motion carried
15 and voting was unanimously in favor. Mr. Keleher adjourned the meeting at 10:20 a.m.