



Technical Committee

Monday, June 21, 2010, 8:30 AM
Historic Utah County Courthouse–Suite 212
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Chris Keleher, Utah Department of Natural Resources
Doug Sakaguchi, Department of Wildlife Resources
Ben Bloodworth, Division of Forestry, Fire, and State
Lands
Dennis Carlisle, Genola Town
Adam Cowie, Lindon City
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Jim Hewitson, Lehi City

ATTENDEES:

Ann Merrill, State Division of Water Resources
Steve Mumford, Eagle Mountain City
Sarah Sutherland, Central Utah Water Conservancy
District
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

VISITORS:

Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs HOA
LaVere Merritt, BYU Professor Emeritus

ABSENT:

American Fork City, Utah County, Division of Water Quality, Highland City, June Sucker Recovery, Mapleton City, Pleasant Grove City, Utah Lake Water Users, Santaquin City, Springville City, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Utah Division of Parks and Recreation, Vineyard Town, Woodland Hills Town.

1. Welcome.

Chairman Greg Beckstrom called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. Review and approve minutes from the May 24, 2010 meeting.

Mr. Beckstrom called for comments or corrections of the minutes of the May 24, 2010 meeting. Dr. Lee Hansen motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Jim Hewitson, and the motion was unanimously approved.

3. Update on carp removal efforts.

Mr. Chris Keleher reported the progress on the carp removal. The fishing has been slow during the spring and early summer with the high lake levels. In the fall, more fish will congregate as the water cools. Mr. Beckstrom asked when lake levels decreased if more success was anticipated. Mr. Keleher said yes, the lake level and cooler temperatures in the fall would help. When he spoke to Mr. Bill Loy, the commercial fisherman, he said fishing was hit-and-miss during summer months with high lake levels, hot water temperatures, and the inundation of vegetation.

He announced the Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL) and the Division of Wildlife Resources were looking into purchasing property located near Lincoln Point. The property would initially be used as a hub and as a base for operations, as well as a facility for processing the carp and making it ready for market.

Mr. Beckstrom asked how big the parcel of land was. Mr. Keleher replied it was 19 acres. FFSL is preparing a counter offer to acquire the property from the land owners. Besides the short-term goal of a carp processing facility, it

could also be utilized for recreational access. The long-term goal is to utilize the land for research and monitoring of the lake. After purchase, the property will be developed including running power and water to the site. After that, a building would be erected to accommodate the fish processing.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if it was within the designated wildlife preservation area or if it was outside the area, to which Mr. Sakaguchi replied it was outside. Dr. Merritt asked if the state would own the land and Mr. Keleher said yes.

Mr. Price stated Mr. Reed Harris wanted to report on the property purchase to the Governing Board on Thursday. He believed a recommendation from the Technical Committee supporting the land purchase would be advantageous. Mr. Keleher said any letters of support from local elected officials or special district groups, like the Utah Lake Commission, are helpful. Mr. Price said he offered his personal support, but it would mean more if there was an official recommendation from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Chris Keleher proposed the Technical Committee support the property acquisition by the state for carp removal and fishing access and over the long term to develop a research facility for the lake; and it was seconded by Dr. Hansen.

Mr. Beckstrom called for discussion. Mr. Hewitson asked what would happen if the property were not purchased. Mr. Keleher said the program would continue as it is presently and the property would stay in private ownership status. The entire property is 46 acres, with the owners splitting a portion on the lakeside area to sell to the state. With development plans for the uplands, the state-owned property would not interfere with the owner's plans. Mr. Hewitson asked the location. Mr. Keleher said it was adjacent to the Lincoln Beach county property and was on the northwest side of Lincoln Point. Mr. Beckstrom asked if the property bordered the county property on the southeast, on the north by sovereign land, and on the south by the existing highway. Mr. Sakaguchi and Mr. Keleher concurred.

Mr. Price said the purchase of the land would help fulfill several goals identified in the Utah Lake Master Plan goals including facilitating carp removal, fisherman access, and possibly a research facility.

Mr. Hewitson asked if another boat harbor would be included. Mr. Keleher said yes for carp removal efforts. A boat ramp exclusive for carp removal is planned. Evaluation for another boat ramp would be determined in the future. With no further questions or comments, Mr. Beckstrom called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Update on other lake-related projects.

Mr. Price updated the Committee on Utah Lake projects:

a. *The Model Ordinance:* A group of city planners and the Commission is meeting with Logan Simpson Design to create a model ordinance, which would outline what the Commission feels would be appropriate measures to take to preserve, protect, and develop the shoreline of Utah Lake. The ordinance will be easily incorporated into the cities' code. Action items for the next meeting include review of a draft of the model ordinance with input received from the committee. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 2, 2010 in Room 212.

b. *Budget:* The final budget for the Commission will be approved at the Governing Board meeting on Thursday. He explained money was budgeted for several outreach efforts including website redesign, etc. Money is appropriated to hire a consultant who would assist in creating an editorial campaign to educate the public about Utah Lake through social networking, messages on the website, city newsletters, inserts, etc. He explained members might be contacted for their expertise. A brainstorm session as a Technical Committee will be held to decide interesting things to inform the public. The Commission is trying to gather a library of interesting information in order to create a buzz or energy regarding Utah Lake.

c. *Utah Lake Festival:* The Festival wrap-up evaluation was held and it was estimated over 4,000 attended the Festival, which was up from 2500. The Festival is getting so large that the park is quickly arriving at capacity. The Utah Lake Festival Committee is deciding how to address the growth, which may require additional budget commitments.

Mr. Hewitson asked Mr. Price the reasons for the increased attendance. Mr. Price said because of continued word-of-mouth advertising that it is a fun, free activity at Utah Lake for families. He noted the day of the Festival was the first good weather weekend of the year, so when people got out and they found out about the Festival.

d. *Phragmites:* The Commission is working with the county to continue removal efforts.

e. *Wakeboarding Area:* Several years prior, a group gave a presentation on putting a wakeboarding facility somewhere on Utah Lake. The Technical Committee had suggested the group work with state parks to put it in their

harbor. Mr. Ty Hunter of Utah Lake State Park said discussions are ongoing with the proponents. It looks like this project may be completed with continued negotiations. Parks and Recreation is amenable to the facility.

f. Access Pamphlet: Mr. Doug Sakaguchi, of the Division of Wildlife Resources, handed out a community fishing pamphlet as an example to show the group an example of the possible Utah Lake access pamphlet. The pamphlet would show access points along Utah Lake, directions to get to the access, photos of the access areas, amenities, and activities located there. If desired, there is space for a Commission logo, if the Commission contributed to the project. The Commission may want to write a page of the purpose and projects of the Commission.

Mr. Price asked the current scheduled budget, the funding costs for the pamphlet, and the number planned to be printed. Mr. Sakaguchi said it was a small budget to get started. The Division hopes to partner with others such as Cabella's, Sportsman, and/or even Walmart for funding because it could hold advertisements for the sponsors. He said the funding would determine the numbers printed. Pamphlet distribution could be through Sportsman and Walmart stores in Utah and Salt Lake Counties. A map similar to one developed by Forestry, Fire, and State Lands for access points may be used to show overall access locations on the lake, with individual access point pictures and other information.

Mr. Price stated in his communication with Chris Crockett, a Dedicated Hunter, a volunteer was going to help design the pamphlet. Mr. Sakaguchi said someone in the outreach office would design the pamphlet for the Division. Presently, outreach is going around the lake to take pictures for use in the pamphlet. Mr. Bloodworth said he attended a tour of the lake to find all the access points to assure identification. Mr. Beckstrom believed the Commission may participate financially, but a proposal and budget to present to the Governing Board would be appropriate. He said the pamphlet was a great idea and would support several of the goals and objectives of the Master Plan.

5. Continue discussion on the effect a lake crossing would have on the goals of the Utah Lake Master Plan.

Mr. Price reviewed the history and process of the two proposals FFSL had received for a specific nomination to use sovereign land across Utah Lake. First was Mr. Leon Harward's group, called Utah Crossing, Inc. The group is proposing a bridge crossing from Pelican Point to about 800 North in Orem/Vineyard. The competitive bid is from combined special interest groups of Utah Lake asking for "no action" or preservation. The first proposal held a public hearing in October 2009 to receive public comment and feedback, specifically regarding the bridge. Mr. Dick Buehler approached Mr. Price to hold a similar public hearing for the special interest group proposal of no-action/preservation. The Executive Committee is supportive of the hearing to help FFSL work through the process. It is proposed a public hearing be held for the preservation/no-action proposal. As a Technical Committee, members may be asked to discuss the pros and cons for the proposal of no-action, such as how does the no-action option allow or inhibit the Commission to accomplish the Master Plan goals. The public hearing for the preservation proposal to be held by the Governing Board is tentatively scheduled for July 29, 2010, at 7:00 p.m. in room 2500 of the County Health and Justice Building.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if the requested additional information had been received from the two proponents and the deadline date for the information. He understood the Harward group had already responded and asked if the Special Interest Group had submitted their information. Mr. Bloodworth said he had not received word as of last Wednesday and the deadline was within the next 12 days. The additional submitted information would affect what the Technical Committee may be evaluating. After consultation with the FFSL attorneys, the lawyers wondered if there is a purpose for a public hearing for the do-nothing. The additional information is needed to see if conservation needs and other issues are addressed. He said there was just a "no bridge be built," and the attorneys were wondering if it was a legitimate proposal. Mr. Beckstrom asked if there was an official group name for those associated with the proposal. Mr. Bloodworth said no, just a body of special interest groups. Mr. Price said Marc Heileson, regional representative for the Sierra Club, submitted the proposal on behalf of the group. Mr. Beckstrom asked to be notified if the meeting were cancelled. Mr. Bloodworth said they are moving ahead with the public hearing.

Mr. Beckstrom said it would be helpful for the public to have the information associated with the no-action proposal. When the Harward proposal was originally submitted, it was put on the FFSL website for solicitation of feedback and comment. He asked if something comparable for the no-action proposal would be available. Mr. Bloodworth said they were waiting on more information. He believed the "no build" proposal has some sort of argument as to why doing nothing is the best thing to do at that location. Mr. Beckstrom said the language of the

proposal put out in a public forum would be helpful, especially at the time of the public hearing. The no-action proposal may be the focal point of the Technical Committee meeting in July and would stimulate discussion. Mr. Price said Mr. Heilesen had forwarded him the special group's proposal information and he asked protocol to forward the information. Mr. Bloodworth said if Mr. Heilesen had given it to Mr. Price, it must be all right to distribute it to the Technical Committee. Mr. Keleher said consistent criteria and treatment for both proposals needed to be assured so they will both have been treated consistently. Mr. Beckstrom said he agreed as the first proposal went through some extensive comments, and that is the reason he asked if something similar would be done with the second proposal by putting it on the website. Mr. Price asked if they knew when the attorneys would make a determination of whether or not the proposal is legitimate. Mr. Bloodworth said they are functioning under the assumption the proposal is going to happen, hoping a little more information would come, and so they are treating the proposal as a valid one and to proceed with the public hearing.

Mr. Beckstrom continued the discussion of goal evaluation stating six goals needed to be discussed in the potential a lake crossing would have on the goals of the Utah Lake Master Plan. He explained the criteria on the continued evaluation of a generic bridge crossing across Utah Lake and if the crossing may help fulfill or inhibit fulfilling the goals and objectives of the Utah Lake Master Plan. He stated eight goals were completed with detailed comments indicating reasons positive or negative in fulfillment of the goals and objectives. The final six would be evaluated today. He asked for detailed documented reasons to include in a document to be prepared for the Governing Board to review.

The Committee started the evaluation. Mr. Price would read the goal, supportive objectives, and then the committee would make comments.

1. Land Use Goal 1 – Coordinated Land Use Planning – Received 2 positive and 2 negative votes.

Mr. Price read, "Coordination and communication for land-use planning proposals affecting Utah Lake are established through the use of model ordinances, which provide consistency and compatibility among jurisdictions." The objectives associated with that include, "The Commission will facilitate communication among jurisdictions; the objective to develop a model ordinance; and the objective to have sovereign lands and local land-use coordination."

Mr. Adam Cowie said on the supportive side the land use planning, the crossing has spurred a lot of transportation discussion between different municipalities, which may continue. One general impact, as far as transportation modes is more input between Vineyard and Saratoga Springs, management of corridor, snow removal, police activities, are discussed. Coordination between the various aspects is a positive. MAG has a crossing on the long-range plan, whether now or for the future, but the discussion may continue based on a regional standpoint. He saw it as a positive between the municipalities, as far as the land-use planning aspect.

2. Land Use Goal 3 – Land Use Buffers – Received 7 negative votes.

Mr. Price read, "Land uses are located and designed to support lake management objectives; including a buffer between the lakeshore and adjacent development to provide for safety, flood protection, public access, recreation, open space, and resource protection." The objectives associated with the goal are to create a buffer, flooding-based development restrictions; and to obtain elevation data for the shoreline."

Dr. Hansen said he had two reasons. First, was putting roads on the lakeshore, is going to inhibit because the Master Plan of the lake shore is mainly for recreational purposes. Second, a lot of traffic on the lake shore presents an entirely different use than originally envisioned in the Master Plan.

Mr. Steve Mumford said the only negative thing was with the road on either side of the lake, the pressure to develop and build right around the road adjacent to the lake would be increased. This is potentially negative. Dr. Hansen said it depended on the kind of development. In Saratoga Springs, presently the only allowed development is commercial development where the bridge comes to the shore.

Mr. Beckstrom asked Dr. Hansen if the Saratoga Springs Master Plan identified the area as commercial irrespective of what happens or if it is identified as commercial anticipating a potential corridor. Dr. Hansen did not know the answer, but he was verbally told it was zoned commercial.

Mr. Dennis Carlisle said the development point could be positive if it allowed for growth or development around the bridge. Mr. Mumford asked if one of the reasons for the buffer zone was for recreational purposes for public access. Mr. Price said it is a Master Plan goal but not particularly this one.

3. Land Use Goal 4 – Land Acquisition and Management - Received 2 positive and 4 negative votes.

Mr. Price read, “Shoreline, open space, critical lands, and wetland areas are acquired, expanded, and/or protected for public use, preservation of natural resources, and potential mitigation purposes.” The objectives associated with this goal include sensitive lands management meaning coordinated effort to manage the sensitive lands and acquisition of sensitive lands as they became available and funding was available. Other objectives were to manage the non-sensitive land management; and acquisition of non-sensitive lands as available and determined as necessary; to manage appropriately all land around the lake, both sensitive and non-sensitive.

Mr. Beckstrom said the goal could be enhanced by the bridge but there were tradeoffs. Clearly, a bridge corridor crossing would impact the lands on both shorelines. If the proposal is successful, money will be generated. With mitigation, a tradeoff could possibly be acquiring, preserving, and protecting greater number of shoreline sensitive areas, which may exceed the impact associated with the areas immediately surrounding. Mr. Sakaguchi asked who the Commission envisioned enforcing the mitigation. Mr. Beckstrom said he envisions it to be groups that support the preservation of those areas. This is advocated by the Utah Lake Commission, Technical Committee, or Governing Board, or can be pursued by state agencies, such as DWR and potentially others. Mr. Keleher said it should be a requirement and condition of the permit from FFSL. It needs to be clearly understood with any bridge building, there will be required mitigation to offset the impacts to the different goals in the Master Plan, such as open space, land use buffers, and shoreline character.

Mr. Price stated looking at the specific bridge on a broader scale, Leon’s proposal purposefully chooses the least impacted wetlands areas, particularly on the east side of the lake with the west side having fewer issues. Looking at future proposals, depending on termination points, a crossing could potentially conflict with the goal to manage sensitive lands. Requirements to mitigate for any impacts need to be identified for any potential proposal that could impact a particular goal, such as acquiring the land and managing it appropriately, unless mitigated.

Dr. Hansen said mitigation works under two assumptions. The first assumption is if there is money build the bridge, there is possibly money to do other things; and the second assumption is whoever builds the bridge has to be willing to transfer the money. Dr. Hansen questioned if the proposed bridge is financially viable for any bridge across the lake.

Mr. Beckstrom agreed saying financial non-viability kills the project. The review is focused on the premise the proposal is financially viable and if not the evaluation discussion is moot. Mr. Keleher said sufficient money should be in place to mitigate for it. Mr. Beckstrom said specific mitigation efforts and costs needs to be factored into the financial viability evaluation. Mr. Mumford asked if the discussion was for a possible upfront requirement or donation of money to the group to purchase land for the bridge or as the project progresses for mitigation in phases. Mr. Beckstrom said an idea is assuming FFSL is going to evaluate a financial spinoff from the ongoing state revenues, which is used for potential purposes that would benefit Utah Lake. Mr. Bloodworth wanted the permits based on what the Corps said, doing it for money up front and then ongoing maintenance money as a probable bonus.

4. Natural Resources Goal 1 – Natural Areas – Received 6 negatives votes.

Mr. Price read, “Portions of the lakefront and wetland areas are kept in a natural state; wildlife corridors are protected, and feature passive uses (e.g., trail use, hiking, bird watching, photography) focusing on ecological attributes and experiences.” Objectives associated with the goal are investigation of expansion of preservation area at the south end of the lake, Provo Bay, the north shore, and to preserve Powell Slough wildlife area.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for comments. Dr. Merritt said he had not studied the area for specific data, but his observation showed as people became aware of a particular resource and the unique features, it generated additional support for preservation and proper use of the resource. He suggested people who use the bridge may become proponents for future preservation and better use of Utah Lake recognizing the unique features, recognizing it is not going to take care of itself without help. Mr. Cowie said the concept of increasing awareness is probably reflected better in the other evaluated goals, such as public outreach.

Mr. Price said an obvious impact in building a bridge is not keeping the lake in its natural state, but the goal does not state every foot of Utah Lake is to be kept in its natural state. Dr. Hansen said the existing proposal does not impact any of the special areas listed in the Master Plan and Mr. Price concurred. Mr. Price noted there were no positive votes, meaning a bridge would not help create a natural area.

5. Natural Resources Goal 4 – Invasive Species - Received 7 negative votes.

Mr. Price read, “Existing invasive species (e.g., carp, phragmites) are controlled and effectively managed to minimize their negative effects on Utah Lake natural resources. Programs are implemented to prevent additional invasions.” The objectives associated with this goal are to promote an understanding of impacts of invasive species; phragmites control; control of carp and other undesirable fish species, and prevent infestation of aquatic nuisance species.

Mr. Sakaguchi said this is a negative effect on the goal with the risk of bringing in aquatic nuisance species on the equipment used to build the facility, and the measures to be taken to disinfect. However, it may not apply to all the equipment that is used in the lake.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if the issue was adequately addressed, if there would still be a concern of the exposure to nuisance species of merely having a bridge with traffic or would it be small enough to be inconsequential. Mr. Sakaguchi said after the bridge was built there would be little risk of introducing aquatic nuisance species, but the equipment brought in and used during construction on other bodies of water outside the state may bring in the aquatic nuisance species.

It was asked, if a bridge in any way would help or hurt the carp removal. Mr. Keleher said because the bridge would be a permanent structure in the water, it may accommodate some of the fish and species in terms of habitat, but it could be problematic. Mr. Beckstrom asked if a bridge structure with piers in the water makes it more favorable for invasive species as opposed to be desirable for native species. Mr. Keleher said there were predatory fish species that would associate with the structure. Mr. Price agreed stating desirable non-native species and undesirable non-native species would be utilizing the structure.

Dr. Hansen said a crossing appears to apply to everything on the list of goals. He noted invasive species takes money and if a bridge would bring in money to address the invasive species, then the crossing has a potential positive aspect. He noted a bridge crossing would cause problems, but also brings in money to address the problems.

Mr. Sakaguchi said quagga mussels might attach to something hard in the lake. Presently, there are very few hard structures out in the middle of the lake for the mussels to attach. However, with the number of piers going in across the lake, these would be a lot of new hard places to monitor for the quagga to attach.

Dr. Merritt asked if the mussels could attach and establish at the low velocity found in those areas. Mr. Sakaguchi said it was probable. Dr. Merritt believed the mussels needed to have fair current movement around them in order to have a favorable habitat. Mr. Price said the wave action caused by the structure was good enough to send them everywhere.

6. Recreation Goal 1 – Public Access – Received 7 negative votes.

Mr. Price read, “Adequate public access points are provided to the lake shore, to pocket parks and other day use destinations around Utah Lake, along with appropriate and legal private property crossings, and other amenities.” The objectives associated with this goal include secure legal public access; improve access points, referring to existing ones; to have common standards and themes; and create additional access.

Dr. Hansen said an argument for the bridge was to mitigate their access to the other side of the lake. He believed the current project did not warrant the 12 miles saved in travel and it would be inhibited by the toll charge.

Mr. Mumford said a positive argument could be used for development around the crossing on both sides, as there will be increased access whether private or public. As the individual cities reviewed the proposal, they may require trail access, access to the lake, additional street accesses, or road accesses to other areas of the lake. Dr. Hansen said it depended where the bridge was, and whether it was commercial or residential. Mr. Mumford said with the commercial proposal, the commercial development could possibly provide a trail head location or preserving it for views or with residential have more access. It would depend upon the city’s review of the proposals.

Mr. Keleher said although the land use goals did not identify open spaces out on the lake itself, but a bridge certainly impacts the open space of the lake.

The final aspect of the evaluations would entail a preparing a document. Mr. Beckstrom, Mr. Keleher, and Mr. Price will put together a draft or summary of how a generic bridge proposal may help promote or fulfill the goals and objectives of the general plan, as well as listing the concerns. The draft document would be reviewed by the Technical Committee as a whole before being forwarded to the Governing Board. A goal is to present it to the Governing Board in by their August or September meeting.

Mr. Beckstrom summarized the discussion and future plans for the proposals, support for access point brochure, etc. He asked for the documents for the Technical Committee to review at the July 19 technical committee meeting which would be the primary focus for discussion. The Committee will be reviewing and addressing the proposal and making some comments to the Governing Board at their meeting and public hearing later that month.

Mr. Mumford asked when preparing the document with the Technical Committee's comments, the negative aspects of the goals that would be negatively impacted and list specific conditions or recommendations for conditions on how to mitigate the impact. Mr. Beckstrom said it would be an interpretive process with many opportunities to review and make comment, anticipating numerous drafts before the final copy is endorsed by the Technical Committee. Mr. Price reviewed the Technical Committee's approach was to look at from a broad perspective. The document developed will be used for the current proposal and for discussion of other crossings elsewhere. The groundwork discussion will also be necessary in the future. If another crossing proposal were presented, either private or public, for another area of the lake, the document created will help move forward in a more coordinated fashion.

6. Other items.

Mr. Beckstrom asked for comments, other items, or information. Dr. Hansen stated a Supreme Court decision was made which could have an impact on Utah Lake shores. The decision said a boundary between private property and state property remains the same even if the state fills in the lake below that property. He cited the example of, if a private land owner refused to allow trail across the land, the state could fill in the lake, and put a trail below the boundary.

Mr. Dee Chamberlain updated the committee on the Saratoga Springs Home Owner's Association dredging of the marina. He said the project might take as long as two years as funds are saved to complete the project. The SSHOA has identified two dredge companies in Utah, made contact with one and are trying to estimate how much dredge material should be taken out before a proposal can reflect all the costs. The dredging plan was to dredge the entrance, the harbor and possibly take out a sand bar near the entrance outside of the marina. They may put in some fishing enhancement structures around the outside of the lake for mitigation. There is a little island at the base of the entrance to the marina and there will be plenty of room to dispose of the dredge spoil and put the residue. Mr. Beckstrom asked if the configuration of the harbor would be changed or just be cleaned out. Mr. Chamberlain said just cleaned up, and they were making measurements and getting an estimate.

Mr. Beckstrom asked if it was an entirely home owner's association project or if Saratoga Springs City was involved. Mr. Chamberlain said it was SSHOA since it was a privately owned land and marina. Mr. Beckstrom asked if the permit processes were started. Mr. Chamberlain said the Corps of Engineers were contacted and SSHOA needs a permit before they can proceed. The SSHOA had contacted one company and have an estimate to continue the process of obtaining the permit. That is the progress so far. Mr. Bloodworth asked if SSHOA had contacted FFSL. Mr. Chamberlain said no. Mr. Beckstrom asked if the marina was sovereign land and Mr. Bloodworth replied yes. Mr. Price said it was a permitted facility and the marina is on sovereign land as opposed to private property. Mr. Price suggested SSHOA contact FFSL and although they are aware of what SSHOA is doing, they should proceed in a formal fashion. Mr. Bloodworth said Mr. Chamberlain should contact Randy Kaufman.

7. Confirm that the next meeting will be held at the Historic County Courthouse Suite 212 on Monday, July 19, 2010, at 8:30 AM.

Mr. Beckstrom reminded everyone the next meeting would be in four weeks on Monday, July 19, 2010 at 8:30 a.m. He also reminded everyone pending approval on Thursday by the Governing Board, the July meeting originally scheduled for the morning July 22 had been moved to the evening of July 29 to accommodate the potential public hearing on the no-build option for the corridor across Utah Lake.

8. Adjourn.

Mr. Beckstrom adjourned the meeting at 10:52 a.m.