



**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Monday, February 25, 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  
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City  
Sarah Sutherland Johnson, Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD)  
Hugh Van Wagenen, Lindon City  
Kim Struthers, Lehi City  
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City  
Greg Flint, Santaquin City  
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery Program  
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

**ATTENDEES:**

Ann Merrill, Utah State Division of Water Resources  
Doug Sakaguchi, Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR)  
Ben Bloodworth, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL)

**VISITORS:**

Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs Home Owners Association  
Creighton Omer, HDR Engineering, Inc.  
Mitch Paulsen, Bear Lake Regional Commission (BLRC)  
Christy Jensen, BLRC  
Jennifer Hansen, FFSL  
Larry Ballard, Citizen

**ABSENT:**

American Fork City, Mapleton City, Orem City, Springville City, Vineyard Town, Woodland Hills Town, Utah Division of Parks, Utah State Division of Water Resources, Utah Lake Water Users, and Department of Environmental Quality.

1 **1. Welcome.**

2 Chairman Chris Keleher called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m. He welcomed the members and visitors to  
3 the meeting. He asked each person to introduce him or herself to the group.  
4

5 **2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Commission (ULC) Technical Committee (TC) minutes from October 22,**  
6 **2012.**

7 Mr. Keleher asked for discussion, comments, or corrections of the minutes for the meeting held on August  
8 20, 2012. He had several editorial corrections pertaining to the wording of the history of carp removal. After the  
9 meeting, he will submit the changes to Mrs. Green. There were no other corrections.

10 It was motioned by Mr. Richard Nielson to approve the minutes as amended/corrected; and it was seconded  
11 by Mr. Lee Hansen. The motion carried and the minutes were unanimously approved.  
12

13 **3. Reports and discussion on various Utah Lake issues.**

14 **a. Invasive Species:**

15 **i. Carp** – Mr. Mike Mills reported carp removal was going well with the first two weeks of February  
16 boasting over 300,000 pounds, the most poundage harvested since beginning. Fishing has occurred through the  
17 ice at the southern end of the lake. The grand total at present from the initiation of harvesting is over 10 million

1 pounds. Fishing is sporadic each spring usually with a 4-6 week period waiting for the ice to break up starting  
 2 around the boat harbor. Mr. Price asked if Mr. Bill Loy, the commercial fisherman, had been fishing every day.  
 3 Mr. Mills said he had for the past ten days. Mr. Beckstrom asked for an overall assessment of the carp removal.  
 4 According to Mr. Mills, Utah State University ran out of money doing research to assess the carp population and  
 5 other ecological parameters. An amendment to the contract was approved recently to complete the work with  
 6 no ongoing funding. Mr. Keleher said once the analysis is finalized, the group would present to the Technical  
 7 Committee about the end of April/May. Mr. Beckstrom asked about the ongoing funding status for carp removal.  
 8 JSRIP is half way through a \$500,000 contract with another \$500,000 available when the present contract is  
 9 completed. Mr. Beckstrom asked if there was a projected time frame. Mr. Mills said through December 2013.

10 Mr. Price said tentative options for long-term funding for achieving Utah Lake Commission goals and projects  
 11 was being reviewed. The Governing Board directed him to approach the legislature in joint efforts with  
 12 DNR/JSRIP leading the effort to request funding from the legislature to fund a carp processing facility on the  
 13 south end of Utah Lake. He had been working with the new legislators assigned to serve on the Commission. An  
 14 appropriation request was put in for almost \$3 million to fund construction, purchase equipment, and extending  
 15 the utilities to the facility. Monies were also asked to cover the operations shortfall with approximately \$2  
 16 million for the construction/equipment of the facility and \$1 million to cover shortfall. He recently testified  
 17 before the Natural Resources Subcommittee. Mr. Beckstrom asked who the legislative leader was. Mr. Price said  
 18 Representative Mike McKell, a newly-elected legislator from Spanish Fork, is the vice-chair of the Natural  
 19 Resources Subcommittee. When testifying, he noted the request was one of the priorities of Utah Valley  
 20 Chamber of Commerce and Utah County Council of Governments. Support was broad but convincing the  
 21 legislature was the challenge. Mr. Hansen asked who would operate the facility. Mr. Price said interested parties  
 22 in carp processing have approached leaders, but there was no incentive for them to construct a facility. If  
 23 constructed, the facility would be leased to conduct the carp processing, but there is no contract at present. If  
 24 money is appropriated, it is DNR's responsibility to get the facility constructed, and ULC will facilitate where  
 25 needed. Mr. Keleher said a competitive bid proposal would be advertised for construction. Mr. Hugh Van  
 26 Wagenen asked if a site was chosen for the facility. Mr. Price said Goose Point in the Goshen Bay area. Mr.  
 27 Keleher said FFSL has sovereign lands available.

28 *ii. Phragmites* – Mr. Price said the Phragmites Removal Team (PRT) was moving forward. County crews,  
 29 hard-working personnel, have been on the north end of Utah Lake taking the two Land Tamers and driving over  
 30 100 acres to speed up the bio-decomposition. Mr. Dick Buehler had recommended Mr. Price and Mr. Ben  
 31 Bloodworth discuss utilizing Mr. Jim Cross, his personnel, and his large mower machine. Money was available to  
 32 split between Utah and Bear Lakes. Mr. Bloodworth asked if Mr. Cross were available. Mr. Price said yes, but  
 33 dates needed to be scheduled. With the additional money, Mr. Cross could help expand the area of treating  
 34 phragmites. Over 750 acres each were treated on the north and on the east side near Utah Lake State Park. It is  
 35 hoped ice floes toward the north or east would help in knocking phragmites down. It is difficult to burn with air  
 36 quality, inversions and the close proximity to civilization. PRT is planning on applying for two grants in 2013.  
 37 Treatment is focused on the south end of Utah Lake between Provo Bay and Lincoln Beach. Utah Reclamation  
 38 Mitigation Conservation Commission and PRT have been in touch with land owners, and are targeting to treat  
 39 about 1000 acres. The Commission would be at over 3,000 acres of an estimated 6-7,000 acres along the lake,  
 40 about half-way through projected treatment areas. Mr. Bloodworth said crews have cut in some fuel breaks so it  
 41 can be burned and FFSL will be returning in the next few weeks. Mr. Price said pump house personnel is  
 42 concerned the newly purchased pumps would be plugged up with the phragmites biomass. Plugged up screens  
 43 would make it difficult to pump. PRT hopes to do something to assure clogging doesn't happen. Mr. Chamberlain  
 44 asked if burning would take place in the bay at Saratoga Springs. Mr. Price said probably not. They hope Mr.  
 45 Cross and his machine can expand the work and smash down the phragmites in Saratoga Bay.

46 **b. Utah Lake Nature Center:** Mr. Price said ULC applied for and received a National Parks Service Grant  
 47 (Recreation, Trails, and Conservation Assistance) and had been working with Ms. Marcy Demillion from the Salt  
 48 Lake office. The grant request asked NPS to help ULC through a review process to create a conceptual design for  
 49 a nature and/or research facility on Utah Lake. The ULC Master Plan identifies a center on Utah Lake and is a  
 50 medium priority goal. When opportunities arise on medium priority goals, he works on them. Orem City also

1 pursued the grant, but Mr. Price suggested he apply for it on behalf of the Commission, as Orem sits on the  
2 Board. The National Park Service will work with the Commission to develop a conceptual design of the facility,  
3 inclusions, and the best location. After getting something tangible, ULC can take it to the stakeholders or  
4 potential partners for help. A kickoff meeting for the Center will be held on March 28 at 1:30 in the Ballroom of  
5 the Historic Courthouse. Over 40 stakeholders from recreationists, government, and different groups have been  
6 invited to attend and express support and ideas for such a facility, and are seeking potential funding partners.  
7 Depending on the feedback received at the meeting will determine how ULC moves forward. Mr. Hansen said  
8 American Fork City has expressed interest in getting it near their boat harbor and a willingness to put in the  
9 water, power, sewer, and amenities. Mr. Price said ideal locations are near American Fork boat harbor, near  
10 Lindon boat harbor, near Powell Slough access in Orem or near Utah Lake State Park, or perhaps on the south  
11 end of Utah Lake. Interest is for easy access coming from I-15 and another is proximity to a lake shoreline trail.  
12 An ideal is for the facility to become a hub for the shoreline trail. Besides the area, they would look at the cost of  
13 land, or it would be better if someone was willing to donate land, but if none is donated, sovereign lands are still  
14 available.

15 **c. Docks on Utah Lake:** Mr. Bloodworth said FFSL has been evaluating boat docks around the country and  
16 figuring out the best way to handle private docks. By early March, a document should be in place for internal  
17 review, and then bring it to Technical Committee so members can evaluate and comment on it. It is anticipated  
18 to have a minimum group of private citizens/HOA come together for a community dock with a certain number of  
19 slips on it, but the number has not been determined. Dock owners will have to be adjacent upland owners or  
20 associated with an HOA. Strict limits on size, design, construction materials, and other criteria will be enforced to  
21 bring docks into alignment. Another part is the actual dock commitment to the Master Plan. Mr. Price said Mr.  
22 Ryan Nesbitt, former sovereign lands planner, was asked by FFSL to continue help as a contract employee.  
23 Discussion of how the dock criteria could be inserted and amended into the Master Plan had been discussed. His  
24 recommendation to FFSL is when they are ready to propose the amendment to follow the outlined procedure  
25 submitting it first to the Executive Committee, then Technical Committee for review. It would then go through  
26 the public review process. The Governing Board would make a recommendation to FFSL, and both Master Plans  
27 would be amended. The process is straight forward. The Technical Committee will be asked to participate and  
28 offer advice. Mr. Price suggested amending the plan by inserting another goal into the recreation section stating  
29 the goal is to have docks on Utah Lake, refer to a new appendix to the Master Plan, and outline the process. It  
30 would even have requirements for construction, location, number of people to own/have a dock, and other  
31 necessary stipulations.

32 Mr. Beckstrom asked if it was being put into the Master Plan because it is a convenient place to document  
33 the decision and the process. Mr. Bloodworth said the current plan does not address the issue at all, and  
34 FFSL/ULC wanted it addressed, rather than under a guise.

35  
36 **4. Discuss process for determining specific projects to achieve the goals and objectives of the Utah Lake**  
37 **Master Plan for the following categories.**

38 Long-term funding for the Utah Lake Master Plan Goals and Objectives has been discussed. ULC has received  
39 various grants that helped accomplish several of the goals and objectives of the Master Plan, but more progress is  
40 desired. TC brainstormed ideas of how it could get long-term funding. In the discussion, it was recommended all  
41 the goals and objectives of ULC Master Plan be looked at to determine what is needed and what specific projects  
42 in the plan ULC wants to accomplish. All of the objectives in the plan were put into categories. These include a.  
43 Land Use, b. Recreation, c. Education/Outreach, and d. Environment. The other category is non-goal-related,  
44 coordinating and supporting negotiations, and thus does not have a funding need. ULC has moved forward on  
45 the Land Use objectives. A group participated in a brain-storming session to figure out what projects could be  
46 pursued to help achieve the land-use-related goals. Several ideas of potential projects were discussed. Mr. Doug  
47 Sakaguchi shared feedback and information from the Utah Lake Fish Forum, a group of lake users who had a wish  
48 list of things they would like to see occur on the lake, and it was a good jumping point for ULC. There has been  
49 communications drafted to send out to many more groups with an interest, particularly in improving the access  
50 around the lake, securing legal public access, and improving current access points. Once the wish lists are

1 obtained and compiled from the groups, the necessary funding needed to accomplish the goal can be attached.  
2 When the entire processes for all four categories are complete, it will be taken to the Governing Board with price  
3 tags and the ways to consider for long-term funding mechanisms to make the goals happen. Mr. Price sent an  
4 email to lake stakeholders asking them to review the access points and let ULC know how to make them better  
5 for their group and the general public. Wording included, “What access points does your group use? What needs  
6 and wants would be most beneficial? Are you aware of any potential funding sources to make the suggestions a  
7 reality? Are you willing to volunteer your time to make these a reality?” He hoped they would answer the  
8 questions and provide Mr. Price with the wish list for the lake. ULC will then work hard to make the  
9 improvements a reality.

10 The Utah Lake Master Plan gives a summary of the goal. The first one is to secure more access points where  
11 it will be beneficial for the public. Mr. Price is asking the Technical Committee and other lake stakeholders to let  
12 him know what their interests are. Another wish is improving access points. There are currently 30 legal access  
13 points. It was recommended prioritizing the access points, what the needs are at those locations, and  
14 improvements needed to show ideal use. DWR went through a procedure creating a Utah Lake access map,  
15 summarizing, and adding to them as requests come in.

16 Links to all the points are available on the DWR web page. The information to the public is available to the  
17 public of what exists and they can weigh in on how to make it better. It is hoped they respond with their  
18 expectations and express their feelings of the access points, so ULC can optimize the information to make it  
19 useful and better. After the information is obtained, ULC will identify how much it would cost to make  
20 improvements, and approach the Board, who is looking at the long-term funding mechanisms and possible  
21 partners. The Utah Lake Master Plan suggests preservation areas around the lake they would like to put into a  
22 protective status as valuable wetlands. The Utah Reclamation Mitigation Conservation Commission is particularly  
23 interested in areas at the south end of the lake.

24 Mr. Price asked for discussion and questions. He asked for ideas on how to best reach out and get feedback  
25 for the purpose of various lake stakeholders.

26 Mr. Hansen said Mile Marker 19 ownership maps indicate there is no legal access because it is all across  
27 private property. Mr. Nielson said a good share of Mile Marker 19 goes down across BLM land, with a little  
28 stretch owned by the LDS church. Discussion was had with private landowners over a two-mile area and it was  
29 disputed whether it is open access to the public. He noted Mile Marker 21 has a DWR easement from 1950s  
30 (registered under State Fish and Game) and it has about 2.5 acre parking area at the lakeshore. Mr. Keleher  
31 asked Mr. Price to incorporate the list of access points onto the website. Mr. Price said the DWR website already  
32 has the list, but it would be good to recreate it on ULC website.

33 Mr. Bloodworth said when the special interest groups send in responses for improvements on the lake,  
34 capital projects on sovereign land could be listed. With the proposed projects suggested, FFSL could put them on  
35 paper to discuss funding with FFSL and other sources, with the actual projects on sovereign lands mapped out.  
36 Mr. Price asked what special interest groups ULC should contact. It was suggested all members of the Public  
37 Advisory Group (PAG) be contacted. Mr. Hansen said Boy Scouts Council, Mr. Keleher suggested sailing clubs or  
38 other like groups. Mr. Price said this would be shared with the Public Advisory Group (PAG). Mr. Price said PAG  
39 would be utilized in the recreation area. There will be overlap with the groups participating throughout the  
40 process. The PAG representatives seemed energized and excited to participate. Mr. Hansen asked if it could be  
41 brought out at the Outdoor Expo in Salt Lake. Mr. Price agreed it was a good idea. Mr. Kim Struthers suggested  
42 the Audubon Society for bird watchers. He asked if the access was just for boat access. Mr. Price said no, but any  
43 type of access to the lakeshore. Mr. Hugh Van Wagenen said one access in Lehi has a park at the end of West,  
44 North Lake Park. Mr. Hansen asked if Cabella’s might have an interest in the Lake access, or for a possible source  
45 of funding. There might be some sport store affiliation. Mr. Price made notes. Mr. Chamberlain asked if Mr.  
46 Price would be sending the email to the Saratoga Springs Home Owners Association. There is some undeveloped  
47 land next to Eagle Park and they may be able to get something to increase the size of the park and parking area.  
48 Mr. Price reaffirmed the information he has received is what he was hoping for with ideas and potential  
49 partnerships, as it is easier to partner than to justify proposed funding.

1 Mr. Sakaguchi asked if the letter could be sent out to the communities, such as Parks and Recreation of each  
2 city. Mr. Price said he would send it to the recreation departments and copy the elected officials who sit on the  
3 Board. Mr. Bloodworth suggested doing a less-detailed flier version for the public and it could be handed out at  
4 the state park/marinas. Mr. Sakaguchi said if a flier version were created, DWR would have a booth at the Sports  
5 Expo and the flier and response sheet could be handed out. Mr. Scott Root would be the contact person for the  
6 expo. Mr. Price said this is a wish list for Utah Lake and there are no promises everything will get done. If ULC  
7 does not know what is desired, then improvements cannot be made. Mr. Sakaguchi asked if people had  
8 suggestions, should they contact Mr. Price directly. Mr. Price said yes, by email.

9 The listed land-use goals have different subcategories of access, planning, or preservation, and status for the  
10 goals including beginning, ongoing, and future. After land-use, the next focus would be on recreation. Groups  
11 will be asked for their thoughts on how they can improve recreation on Utah Lake, then education, and finally  
12 environmental goals of the Master Plan. It is anticipated it will take six to eight months to go through the process  
13 to present to the Governing Board at the end of the year. It won't be a fast procedure as ULC wants to give  
14 people adequate time to put serious thought into it.

15 Mr. Keleher said the Governing Board will concurrently look at different options for long-range funding and  
16 the two divisions will converge in about a year. Taking the Technical Committee list, the Governing Board can try  
17 to sell the funding mechanism to the public, showing the items needing funding, and the tangible products  
18 resulting from the funding.

19 Mr. Hansen said he noted the Nature Center is not listed in the education section. Mr. Price said initially the  
20 goal was a research facility but it was expanded to include a nature center because it would have broader  
21 support as a nature center and research facility. It was an easy way to incorporate both of them.

22 Mr. Larry Ballard asked about Objectives L4.2 and L4.3 on land use, and if Mr. Price could elaborate on  
23 acquisition of sensitive and non-sensitive lands. He was interested in who would buy the lands, how much land  
24 ULC is looking for, what impact would it have on private property owners, etc. Mr. Price said when the goal was  
25 created it was recognizing the Central Utah Project Completion Act and the Utah Reclamation Mitigation  
26 Conservation Commission. They have a wetland preservation area already identified on the south end of Utah  
27 Lake and it has been identified as an area they would like to preserve. As private property becomes available, the  
28 Mitigation Commission would want to purchase the land from private owners. When the thought of acquisition  
29 of sensitive lands arose, it was agreed there should also be acquisition of non-sensitive lands for creating greater  
30 assets to the lake. If a specific project were to happen, it would be good to see a goal stating acquisition of non-  
31 sensitive lands. It was inserted to give greater reason to purchase non-sensitive lands for the purpose of access  
32 to the lake. Mr. Keleher said with the trail system they were thinking about purchasing land from landowners for  
33 all types of facilities around the lake, if deemed beneficial. Mr. Ballard asked if it was a TDR program, or would  
34 there also be cooperation with NGOs, etc., reaching out. Mr. Price affirmed his understanding.

35 Mr. Keleher said it was a complicated and complex process and it will definitely take some time, effort, and  
36 energy. There is a small group working on the land use, and others are working on the additional categories,  
37 recreation, education, outreach, and environment. He questioned working on a few areas at the same time. If  
38 any group or Committee member has an interest, they should speak with Mr. Price to get involved. Mr. Price  
39 thanked those who have expressed an interest and taken part thus far.

40  
41 **5. General comments and ideas for future discussion.**

42 Mr. Keleher called for comments or ideas for future agendas. Mr. Price reminded everyone this year's field  
43 trips were being planned for April/May. He expressed appreciation for those who participated to help the  
44 students. Mr. Beckstrom asked about a Utah Lake Symposium. Mr. Mills said it would be pushed back until the  
45 fall before another is planned.

46 Mr. Chamberlain said the October minutes mentioned the water quality studies were done. He asked if any  
47 information or report was given. Mr. Price said DEQ would be the best to respond. They had been working with  
48 DEQ to get a water quality monitoring station at the lake. The board approved funding to partner with them and  
49 USGS, but ULC is waiting for DEQ to move forward. A better report will be forthcoming next month. Mr. Hansen  
50 said he understood the USGS report on the geology and the lake bottom was out. Mr. Mills said Mr. Rob Baskin

1 presented to his group, and released his report. Mr. Baskin had done the sonar transects back and forth across  
2 the Utah Lake bottom, and the findings were released in January. Mr. Price said Mr. Baskin had also met with  
3 FFSL about creating a bathymetric map for sailors/boaters for the depths of the lake. Mr. Hansen said TC should  
4 review the report.

5  
6 **6. Confirm the next Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 25, 2013.**

7 Mr. Keleher confirmed the next Utah Lake Commission Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for  
8 Monday, March 25, 2013 at 7:30 a.m. in room 211 of the Historic County Courthouse. He asked members to  
9 make suggestions for future agenda/discussion items be submitted to Mr. Price or Mr. Keleher.

10  
11 **7. Adjourn.**

12 Mr. Beckstrom motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Keleher adjourned the meeting at 9:33 a.m.