

APPROVED 2/23/2009



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, January 12, 2009, 8:30 A.M.
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 212
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Bruce Chesnut, Orem, Chairman
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission
Greg Beckstrom, Provo, Vice-Chair
Adam Cowie, Lindon
Ann Merrill, DNR-Div. of Water Resources
Ben Bloodworth, Forestry, Fire & State Lands
Bob Fisher, Woodland Hills
Chris Keleher, Dept. of Natural Resources
Chris Tschirki, Orem
Dave Grierson, Forestry, Fire & State Lands
Dave Wham, Dept. of Environmental Quality
Deon Giles, Pleasant Grove
Doug Sakaguchi, DNR-Div. of Wildlife Resources

Jim Hewitson, Lehi
Jim Price, MAG
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs
LaVere Merritt, Consultant
Michael Mills, JSRIP
Nathan Lunstad, Highland
Richard Nielson, Utah County
Rick Cox, URS
Sarah Sutherland, CUWCD
Ty J. Hunter, DNR-Parks & Recreation

ABSENT: American Fork, Genola, Mapleton, Santaquin, Springville, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vineyard, Utah Water Users.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Vice Chair Greg Beckstrom called the meeting to order at 8:36 A.M. Chairman Bruce Chesnut asked to be excused as he had a priority assignment in Salt Lake City.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from December 15, 2008

Mr. Beckstrom opened discussion of the minutes from the Technical Committee meeting of December 15, 2008. Mr. Chris Keleher requested a grammatical change on Page 12 and moved to approve the minutes. It was seconded by Lee Hansen and the minutes were approved without objection.

3. Review and discuss "Section 5" of 12/30/08 Draft (previously Section 6 in 11/24/08 Draft)

Mr. Beckstrom summarized the objectives for the day's meeting. Focus would be on Section 5 of the Master Plan 12/30/08 draft (previously Section 6 in the 11/24/08 draft) and Appendix C: Implementation Strategies of the Utah Lake Commission. After those discussions the review of the entire document would be complete. Further discussion of any previous items discussed would follow.

APPROVED 2/23/2009

The Technical Committee would also decide what items would be forwarded to the Governing Board for their formal action at their next meeting on January 22. It is anticipated that will include the Executive Summary, Priorities of Goals and Objectives and, possibly, the Management Classification Map.

Mr. Beckstrom opened the table for discussion, questions and comments of Section 5.0 – Priority of Goals and Objectives, located on Page 41 of the 12-30-08 draft.

Mr. Price commented that Section 5 is a priority of goals and objectives for the Lake itself and not for the Utah Lake Commission, Forestry, Fire & State Lands (FFSL), municipalities, or any other division of state government.

Mr. Beckstrom asked Mr. Rick Cox, consultant, for clarification on what criteria were used to categorize the goals into High Priority-Immediate, High Priority-Long-term and Medium Priority categories. Mr. Cox replied that a review of these categories would be welcomed and asked if the Commission would determine the classifications of the goal. Mr. Price agreed that the Commission should evaluate each goal categorization and determine if they have been categorized correctly.

Mr. Keleher said that in the December meeting it had been suggested that a Gantt chart was requested to be created for this Section and affirmed that he thought it would be a useful tool to understanding the goals and objectives. There was support for that idea. Mr. Cox said he worked on creating a Gantt chart but found that there was not an interrelationship between the goals.

Mr. Keleher suggested that the Gantt chart focus on those goals specifically in Section 5. Mr. Lee Hansen commented that he felt the High Priority-Long-term goals suggest that they do not require immediate action by the Commission and, in effect, would thus never happen.

Mr. Beckstrom added that he has a hard time distinguishing between Long-term and Immediate goals. He asked how the order of the goals was identified in the list. Mr. Cox replied that he prioritized them from a spreadsheet. There was discussion on the order of the listing of the goals and it was suggested that they be sequenced in the order they appear in the text such as Land Use, Transportation, Natural Resources and Recreation. He referred to Table 5.2 on Page 44 and suggested that Transportation Goal 1 – Trails, and Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning be moved to Table 5.1-High Priority-Immediate Goals. Mr. Beckstrom said that all the goals in Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 seem to be long-term achievable goals with the exception of Natural Resources Goal 4 – Invasive Species.

Mr. Jim Price commented that a time horizon reference had not been established. There was discussion if the goals should all be listed together without breaking them into categories and in that discussion Mr. Dave Grierson commented that the priority of a goal can change depending on grant opportunities. He also said that he supported the Commission prioritizing the goals. Mr. Cox said that the goals should be prioritized in order of importance regardless of funding. Mr. Grierson said in reference to the FFSL perspective the goals in the Medium Priority list seem to be goals that are externally generated and can become High Priority depending on applications.

There was discussion on the significance in prioritizing the goals. Mr. Jim Price said it denotes focus. A medium priority may become a project if proposed, but the high priority goals are the ones the Commission will actively seek to accomplish with available resources.

Mr. Richard Nielson commented that from a County viewpoint in looking at the Immediate Goals one would focus on the Invasive Species goal, but because the Trails goal is classified as a Long-term goal it would be easy to put that goal out of mind.

The Implementation Plan will sort out the tasks involved with each goal.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the goals be sorted into two tables. One table would have about 10-12 goals that would be intense focus goals. The other table would still be important goals but not of immediate focus. Mr. Keleher remarked that in this instance a Gantt chart would be helpful.

Mr. Dave Wham commented that in developing funding plans to obtain grants it is critically important to identify high-priority needs.

APPROVED 2/23/2009

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that the Technical Committee take the time for everyone to select their top goals and identify those as high-priority goals. Mr. Bob Fisher added that no more than six goals should be selected by each member. Mr. Ben Bloodworth introduced himself as new to the Committee, filling in for Mr. Barry Tripp who retired at the end of December, and commented that the goals have multiple objectives and those objectives may be achieved at different times. Discussion continued on the interrelation of the different goals.

Mr. Price questioned how to identify the high priority goals without a time horizon. Mr. Grierson clarified that the plan was originally set as a ten-year plan.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that everyone select six goals that they feel are the most important things to focus on in the next ten years without them necessarily being achievable. As an example he cited Invasive Species which could be a High Priority goal which would give it focus, but probably not completed within a short time frame.

Mr. Ty Hunter said he felt the Commission has good momentum and that some goals need to be achievable within a short time frame or the momentum could be lost. Short successes are needed to keep momentum.

Time was then taken for all to make their selections and the results were tabulated.

According to the tabulations the following goals were ranked as high priority goals with the number of votes in parentheses:

- Natural Resources Goal 4 – Invasive Species (17)
- Land Use Goal 4- Land Acquisition and Management (13)
- Land Use Goal 1 – Coordinated Land Use Planning ((9)
- Transportation Goal 1 – Trails (9)
- Natural Resources Goal 2 – Fishery (8)
- Natural Resources Goal 7 – Water Quality (8)

The next two goals with the highest number of votes were:

- Recreation Goal 9 – Public Outreach (7)
- Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning (6)

In the list of thirty goals, fourteen of the goals received 0-1 votes which it was agreed would put them in a category of Intermediate or Medium Priority Goals. There was discussion on how to group the goals that received five votes, just under Transportation Goal 2 with six votes. Land Use Goal 2 – Mixed Land Uses and Land Use Goal 7 – Public Safety Coordination both got zero votes.

Mr. Hansen commented that he felt there was a fair amount of duplication in the goals and that some goals will automatically happen if others are accomplished.

Mr. Beckstrom summarized that the following goals that received virtually no consideration included:

- Transportation Goal 3 – Multi-objective Road System
- Natural Resources Goal 3 – Educational Opportunities
- Natural Resources Goal 5 – Lake Level
- Natural Resources Goal 9 – Research and Monitoring
- Recreation Goal 2 – Destinations
- Recreational Goal 4 – Beaches
- Recreational Goal 5 – Hosted Campgrounds
- Recreational Goal 6 – Hunting
- Recreational Goal 7 – Events
- Recreational Goal 8 – Recreation-Related Economic Development

APPROVED 2/23/2009

Mr. Fisher questioned whether those goals should be deleted. Mr. Keleher stated the some of the goals that didn't get any votes may be because research may be needed to be done before that goal can be achieved. An example given was the Lake Level Management goal that is considered an important goal, but few people understand how to achieve that goal. Mr. Cox agreed that all the goals should be retained as they have all been considered important to some people during the Master Plan process. Mr. Wham pointed out that in selecting his six choices he sometimes had to choose between two goals the goal that had to be accomplished first before the second important one could be achieved. Mr. Hansen said he also chose Invasive Species with the thought that the Fishery goal would be accomplished following success with the Invasive Species goal.

Mr. Beckstrom reviewed the number of votes for each goal. Others not previously mentioned in Table 5.1 were:

- Natural Resources Goal 1 – Natural Areas (6)
- Land Use Goal 3 – Land Use Buffer (5)
- Land Use Goal 6 – Illegal Activities and Misuse of Resources (3)

Those listed in Table 5.2 not previously listed include:

- Recreation Goal 1 – Public Access (5)
- Recreation Goal 10 – Insect Control & Public Health (2)

In Table 5.3 the other goals receiving votes not previously listed was:

- Land Use Goal 5 – Sovereign Lands Boundary (5)
- Natural Resources Goal 8 – Integrated Resource Management (2)

Mr. Keleher stated that he felt Natural Resources Goal 8 should be a High Priority Goal. It was further discussed to have one table of goals with a priority of 1-31.

Ms. Ann Merrill suggested that the goals be categorized into two tables. The first table would be Immediate Goals and would be sequenced according to the vote taken. The second table would list Long-term Goals. Mr. Fisher suggested the category titles be changed. Mr. Sakaguchi suggested the second table be listed in the order that they appear in the Master Plan document.

It was agreed that the first group would be named Immediate Goals and the second group will be termed High Priority Goals. The goals in the Immediate Table that received the same number of votes will be listed in the order that they would appear in the document. It was clarified that every goal that received at least two votes would be included in the Immediate Table.

There is a third group of goals that were rejected from the 11-24-2008 draft.

In summary, three groups of goals will be forwarded to the Governing Board; Immediate/Urgent Goals and Long-term goals (in terms of focus), and the Goals that have been rejected.

4. Review and discuss "Appendix C: Implementation Strategies of the Utah Lake Commission" of the 12/30/08 Draft

Mr. Price commented that in the Master Plan an amendment process is defined. He requested that the Commission make it possible that Appendix C be written so that the Appendix can be changed in the future without going through an amendment process. Mr. Keleher suggested that the Appendix be prefaced at the beginning with language stating it is a "living" document.

Mr. Cox said that the Appendix will be referenced as not requiring a Master Plan amendment.

There was discussion on the grouping of the strategies in the Appendix. Mr. Cox said the objectives were grouped into tasks because so many of them were overlapping between the goals. Mr. Keleher requested a detailed explanation be expanded before the tables. Mr. Price said one benefit of the strategies being listed by tasks enables the Commission to act on the objectives that have been identified with a lower priority.

Mr. Beckstrom pointed out that some of Table 2 was missing from the November draft in the December draft. It was a word processing error and will be corrected.

Mr. Wham requested further explanation of the tasks. It was stated that objectives are not prioritized but support the goals of differing priority.

There was discussion on Tier One tasks and if they should be prioritized and mirror the high priority goals. Mr. Cox pointed out that Tier Two tasks are associated with medium priority goals and objectives and are those that the Commission is not going to take an immediate lead on.

Objectives are described in detail in Section 4. Mr. Hewitson requested clarification that the tasks are a way to accomplish the objectives. Mr. Cox reviewed the organization of Table One. In response to Mr. Hansen it was answered that the purpose of the Implementation Plan is to help the Commission focus their resources in achieving objectives. Mr. Hewitson asked how those achievements will be tracked when they are completed. Table Two does have a target date for completion of some of the tasks.

Ms. Ann Merrill questioned how it was determined in Table Two what the percentage of hours the Executive Director would spend on each task. Mr. Cox and Mr. Carter estimated that determination.

Mr. Beckstrom commented that he was of the opinion that this document would be more of a tool for the Executive Director. Even though it will be an Appendix in the document he recommended this document not be forwarded to the Governing Board this month. Mr. Price said that he understands this Appendix to be more of a tool for himself, but he expects the Technical Committee and Governing Board to have input as to where to focus and that would determine how he allocates his time.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested Tier One and Tier Two be re-evaluated to be consistent with the goal prioritization that was modified today. Mr. Wham said that the objectives that got the highest votes in the exercise today are not specifically visible in Tier One.

Mr. Keleher remarked that the Implementation Plan would be easier to understand if the structure was more consistent with the rest of the document. Mr. Cox said they had difficulty in doing that because the Commission's role varied within some of the objectives. Discussion of the organization of the Table continued.

Mr. Keleher voiced that the structure of the Table is confusing. Ms. Sarah Sutherland gave the example that Lake Level Studies is listed in Tier One but on the list of priorities it is listed as a medium priority.

Mr. Hansen suggested that the objectives that are associated with high priority goals could be bolded in the Table. Ms. Sutherland suggested that it might help if Tier One and Tier Two had different titles which would distinguish them from the Master Plan. There were several comments that it would be helpful if the Tier One tasks were correlated with the Tier One goals list and the Tier Two tasks would be correlated with the Tier Two goals that have been established.

Mr. Price interjected that the Master Plan is also the management plan for FFSL and for the Lake Commission and the Division of Water Quality. Each entity should have its own implementation plan. He suggested that the Commission designate who has the chief responsibility for every goal.

Mr. Ty Hunter agreed that the titles should be changed to something that has no correlation to the document in order to avoid confusion. Mr. Price said this document describes how the Utah Lake Commission will be involved in accomplishing the appropriate goals and objectives for Utah Lake.

It was agreed that Mr. Price and a few members, by invitation, will consult together and discuss some options. Mr. Grierson said the FFSL will create its own implementation plan but will benefit from the decisions made by this document.

5. Review and consider recommending approval to the Governing Board of portions of the Utah Lake Master Plan.

Discussion was held on what sections of the Master Plan will be forwarded to the Governing Board for their approval at the January 24 meeting. The Management Classification map issues still need to be

APPROVED 2/23/2009

resolved. Mr. Beckstrom requested that if anyone had other changes that need detailing or wordsmithing of other issues to forward them to Mr. Price.

One item for consideration is if the Governing Board should have an advertised Public meeting or if they will adopt the Master Plan in one of their regularly scheduled meetings. Mr. Cox understood there would be a public hearing and he had relayed that information to those people who attended the last Open House.

The summary of the remaining timeline is at the January 22 Governing Board meeting the Executive Summary and the Prioritized Goals will be presented for review. Based on the feedback and modifications from the Board at that meeting, a final draft will be completed on or about January 30. That draft will be circulated to the Technical Committee as well as to some others. It is anticipated that at the Monday, February 23 Technical Committee meeting a formal vote will be taken to recommend the final draft to the Governing Board for approval and adoption. It will then enter into a 45-day review plan for public comment that is required by FFSL. Depending on how efficient that is and with consideration of the comments received it is anticipated that sometime in April or May the Governing Board and State Officials will have a meeting/ceremony and the document will be formally adopted.

It was discussed that having a public hearing at a 7:30 A.M. Governing Board meeting may not be the best choice and that the public hearing should be held in the evening. Suggestions will be discussed by the Executive Committee and they will make a recommendation to the Governing Board next Thursday. Mr. Price said if the State needs more time to review the final draft document then the schedule will have to be adjusted.

Mr. Keleher said it would be helpful to identify the lead jurisdiction in Section 5 for each objective. Mr. Price volunteered to determine those leads. He will put the lead jurisdiction in parentheses following each objective. Mr. Grierson will collaborate with Mr. Price.

Mr. Price acknowledged that Mr. Hansen had sent him an email about access points. Mr. Hansen said his concern is that public access is the key to everything about the Lake and it has to be an important focal point for many goals to be achieved. Mr. Price questioned how the Commission can strategize and overcome the restraints for access on the west side. Mr. Grierson replied that there are some access points on the west side that need improvement. The pressure is not there right now for improvements. Mr. Hansen said in the future the additional access points will be needed.

Mr. Beckstrom referred to Page 27 of the December 30 draft, Objective L-3.2 – Flooding-based Development Restriction. He reviewed that the language had been changed from an elevation based restriction to restricting development outside the FEMA 100-year flood plain. The Flood Hazards map is located in the Current Conditions Report as Map 2.4. It was asked if it is possible to distinguish from that map what is referred to as the 100-year flood plain. Mr. Cox said that it wasn't but that each community has access to the FEMA maps. Mr. Merritt said there would be parties that would not be comfortable with the reading of the map. Mr. Ben Bloodworth suggested changing the wording in the opening sentence of the Objective to read, "Residential and commercial and industrial development in the Plan Area ~~will~~ should be located outside FEMA 100-year floodplain." That change was accepted.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that following the Land Use meeting held last week there was discussion via email regarding delineation of the classifications of areas in Provo Bay. Mr. Grierson had commented that originally the map designated Provo Bay as a potential protection area in its natural state with some exceptions for existing leases. Those leases include Hobble Creek restoration, airport runway extension, and an agricultural lease. With the classifications on the current map some of the management actions that the Department of Natural Resources is anticipating in Provo Bay such as wetland mitigations, phragmites control or some other invasive species control, may not be allowed in that Classification of Provo Bay. Mr. Grierson suggested that the Classification be changed to Class 3 instead of Class 5 which may allow those uses to occur. He conferred to Mr. Cox that he would put together some language that

APPROVED 2/23/2009

would allow the Provo Bay area to be in the orange classification with a wildlife protection stipulation which would allow some development activities.

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) would like Provo Bay to be a protected area because of mitigation lands around it and sensitive species that habitat there. They would like the opportunity to manage those areas. Mr. Michael Mills questioned if it would be easier to simply change the classification definitions. Discussion continued.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for clarification that if an area is designated as a Classification 3, what review process would be required for an applicant with a proposal.

Mr. Grierson answered that in a Class 3 area the DNR would look to see if the request conforms to the plan. If it does then they go through the notification process. As far as Utah Lake, that would mean the notification of three groups; Resource Development Coordinating Committee (RDCC) in the Governor's office, adjacent leasees, and the Utah Lake Commission. Mr. Price would be notified for the Commission and he would determine whether the proposal should be presented to the Governing Board for their support or recommendation. If it does not conform the applicant can either drop it or petition to change the plan amendment to allow it to go through a classification change. The DNR likes to do it this way because it is a public process.

Discussion continued and included future expansion of the airport and transportation plans that cut across a portion of Provo Bay. Mr. Beckstrom stated that ideally Provo Bay could be classified as a Class 5, but with considerations. Other possibilities were analyzed such as classifying Provo Bay as a temporary Classification 4. The fact that public opinion was strong for Provo Bay to be protected was emphasized.

Mr. Grierson suggested classifying the bottom south two-thirds of the Bay as Classification 3 with restrictions which would allow for restoration work and mitigation. North of that line could be classified temporarily as Classification 4. An analysis could be done and the area could eventually be reclassified as applications are submitted and then put through a resource analysis and a public process. One difference between classifying the entire Provo Bay as Classification 4 or by distinguishing it as a Classification 3 with cross-hatching, that would identify that special considerations must be taken in that area, would be public perception. Mr. Keleher suggested that a buffer along the north shore could be designated as a Classification 4. Following discussion Mr. Beckstrom volunteered to work on the classification of Provo Bay and designating the northern part of the Bay as Classification 4 and the southern part as Classification 3 and Mr. Grierson volunteered to help determine where the line would be drawn. Mr. Hunter expressed that a line that parallels the shore would be more acceptable.

Mr. Beckstrom suggested that by a motion be made for the Committee to recommend to the Governing Board for formal approval the Executive Summary on Pages 1-3 in the same fashion as they approved the Visioning State and the Broad Vision Statements.

Mr. Keleher suggested that the word "supports" in some of the policy statements be reviewed as it has been determined in the past sometimes implies financial connotations.

Mr. Wham requested that the Natural Resources Policy 11 language be amended to be closer to the language in the Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) Resolution.

It was moved to forward to the Governing Board the Executive Summary for their consideration and approval as they have done in the Fall on the Vision Statements of the Overall Vision Statements and the Policy Statement that is in the Executive Summary with the one amendment that the Natural Resources Policy # 11 will be expanded to include the language in their August, 2007 Resolution. Mr. Wham seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Section 5 will also be forwarded with the following revised goal prioritization:

1. Natural Resources Goal 4 - Invasive Species
2. Land Use Goal 4 - Land Acquisition and Management

APPROVED 2/23/2009

3. Land Use Goal 1 - Coordinated Land Use Planning
4. Transportation Goal 1 - Trails
5. Natural Resources Goal 2 - Fishery
6. Natural Resources Goal 7 - Water Quality
7. Recreation Goal 9 – Public Outreach
8. Transportation Goal 2 – Transportation Planning
9. Natural Resources Goal 1 – Natural Areas
10. Land Use Goal 3 – Land Use Buffers
11. Land Use Goal 5 – Sovereign Lands Boundary
12. Recreation Goal 1 – Public Access
13. Land Use Goal 6 – Illegal Activities and Misuse of Resources
14. Recreation Goal 3 – Boating
15. Natural Resources Goal 8 – Integrated Resource Management
16. Natural Resources Goal 10 – Water Savings

These goals will be described as Immediate or Urgent Goals. The remaining fourteen goals will then be considered Long-term or Intermediate Goals. Appendix D will also be forwarded.

Mr. Grierson moved to approve the prioritization of goals. It was seconded by Mr. Hansen and approved unanimously.

The Management Classification Map will not be referred to the Governing Board at this time.

6. Confirm that the next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday, February 9, 2009.

It is hoped that the Technical Committee members will receive the final draft of the Master Plan before the next meeting that will be held on February 9, 2009.

7. Adjourn.

It was moved to adjourn and without objection the meeting was adjourned at 12:06 P.M.