



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, March 14, 2018, 10:00 AM

Utah County Historic Courthouse

51 S. University Ave., 3rd Floor Ballroom, Provo, Utah 84601

ATTENDEES:

Eric Ellis, Utah Lake Commission
Rebecca Andrus, Provo
Kari Malkovich, Woodland Hills
Brandon Snyder, Lindon
Sullivan Love, Vineyard
Ben Stireman, FFSL
Juan Garrido, Springville

VISITORS:

Randy Zollinger, CH2M
David Stroud, Saratoga Springs City
D. Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs HOA
Randy Lutz, REI

ABSENT: Alpine, American Fork, Highland, Mapleton, Payson, Salem, Spanish Fork, Vineyard, DNR, FFSL, Utah County,

1 **1. Welcome and introductions**

2 Eric Ellis called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. Everyone introduced themselves.

3
4 **2. Discussion of Vice Chair Position**

- 5 A. Eric reviewed that from last meeting, Scott Daly and Ben Stireman were nominated. FFSL suggested instead that
6 Ben be assigned the responsibility to represent FFSL in the year-long process of reviewing the ULC Master Plan.
7 Erica Gaddis, DWQ Director supported Scott as taking the Vice Chair. There was discussion in the group on the
8 topic. Voting will wait until next meeting, as a quorum was not present.

9 **3. Review and approve minutes from the January 17, 2018 meeting**

- 10 A. Approval of the minutes was delayed until the next meeting, lacking the sufficient quorum necessary to vote.

11
12 **4. 2018 Meeting Schedule**

- 13 A. The schedule is May 16, July 18, September 19, October 17, and December 19. Everyone agreed on the
14 schedule.

15
16 **5. Brief updates on Utah Lake issues, projects, and priorities**

- 17 A. Eric Ellis:

- 1 i. Permanent Stations for Wind Sensors on Utah Lake – American Fork: UDOT agreed to construct a
2 weather station on the southwestern side of the lake. The Commission recently purchased all the
3 materials for the weather station that will go into American Fork Boat Harbor. DWQ has agreed to
4 partner with the Commission to cover the ongoing costs of data and maintenance. We will be scheduling
5 a time with Mesowest, a U of U program that is helping us with the process. There was a brief discussion
6 about the station, the data that will be provided online to the public, and the timetable on the project.
- 7 ii. Utah Lake State Park – Non-motorized Access Point at the end of Provo River Trail just outside Park: Eric
8 summarized what the project is. Grubbing has been completed. Jason Allen, former ULSP manager still
9 has lead on the project. Waiting on the county for next step in work. The Commission is contributing
10 \$15,000 to the project. He summarized some of the benefits of the project to the public.
- 11 iii. Dredging in ULSP: The park received additional funding, approx. \$500k to dredge 2 feet more out of a
12 priority area in the channel. Additional material is being sited in one of the larger asphalt parking lots.
13 Work is progressing well, estimated reopening is Memorial Day.
- 14 iv. Restoration Proposals / Water Quality Improvement Update:
 - 15 i. Lake Restoration Solutions Inc. – HB 272 passed in the legislative session, providing additional
16 language to FFSL for the exchange of land for service and established criteria of what that
17 exchange would look like and creates another oversight mechanism for reviewing restoration
18 proposals on Utah Lake. The proposal by Lake Restoration Solutions Inc. is close to being
19 accepted by FFSL, which doesn't approve the project but simply accepts their proposal with a list
20 of conditions, among which will be a federal EIS and all of the regulatory agencies (UDOT, US
21 Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers) will need to be a part of the EIS and issue
22 permits. The acceptance of the proposal will simply move them into the phase of fleshing out
23 their proposal into more finite detail and completing the multiple-year long EIS process.
 - 24 ii. Renewable Energy Innovations: Update – Randy Lutz – REI received tentative approval to go
25 forward with an aeration project, placing aeration in all the marinas on Utah Lake. Almost all
26 marina operators have confirmed, so next they will work with FFSL. There were a few questions
27 from the Technical Committee members, Randy provided answers to those questions. He also
28 reported on the demonstration of pre-treatment of green waste at BYU. A number of
29 wastewater treatment plants in Davis, Salt Lake and Utah County that want to use the pre-
30 treatment process. Lastly, he reported that REI is in escrow on the property that sits right next
31 to TSSD to begin their first plant and green waste operation. He explained the biological process
32 that BYU has developed to aid in green waste digestion and creation of consumables such as
33 carbon dioxide or natural gas.
- 34 v. Research Funding Discussion (Legislative Appropriation): Wasatch Front Water Quality Council (WFWQC)
35 made a legislative request to supplement the funding going to the DWQ Utah Lake Water Quality Study
36 and asked that those funds be directed through the Utah Lake Commission. That's \$500,000 to go
37 towards research, to supplement the \$1 million from DWQ and the approx. \$600k from WFWQC. The
38 Technical Committee will evaluate, in conjunction with the Steering Committee and Science Panel from
39 the Utah Lake Water Quality Study. It will become available on July 1st, and have the following year to
40 assign those funds.

41 **5. Direction from Executive Committee for Technical Committee**

- 42 A. Eric reported on the input from the Executive Committee. They are very supportive of the Technical Committee
43 reviewing the Utah Lake Master Plan in preparation for the 2019 revision process, and ask that the Committee
44 works with FFSL. If FFSL wants help reviewing any portions of the proposal from Lake Restoration Solutions Inc.,
45 do so.
- 46 B. There was a question about whether the proposal from Lake Restoration Solutions Inc. matches up with the
47 Utah Lake Master Plan, and if the Commission will be providing the public input on the Master Plan as it relates
48 to that proposal. Eric responded that the review of the master plan that the Committee will be doing will be a
49

1 public setting, the public are welcome to participate in the Committee meetings. The Technical Committee, and
2 the Commission in general is more of an advisory group, so we will find feedback and next year it will switch into
3 the official guided Utah Lake Management Plan with a consultant. Ben Stireman added that there are a lot of
4 public involvement/stakeholder meetings that are essentially invitations to anyone who owns land around the
5 lake, municipalities, etc. On the point of development of the lake, FFSL usually doesn't identify that specific in
6 the master plan, but they do identify things like: classifying the lake, etc. The final plan will also go out for
7 several review periods to other state agencies, the public, etc.

8
9 **6. Review and provide updates to section #1 of Utah Lake Master Plan – Ben Stireman (FFSL)**

- 10 A. Ben Stireman started off explaining that the first section of the master plan (Front cover – pg. 10) was more
11 general information, i.e. the table of contents, etc. so not many changes might be needed for the revision in
12 2019. Eric asked what is needed to make it more of a management plan instead of a master plan. Ben responded
13 that the master plan doesn't provide FFSL with any obligation to use it is a management plan, versus a
14 management plan is created to help guide FFSL decisions. He explained with the example of the Jordan River
15 management plan. Discussion on the Utah Lake Master Plan and changing language, etc. to make it into a
16 management plan. I.e. instead of using language like "encourages" use words like "can, can't, won't", etc.
- 17 B. Another attendee asked that if the Lake Restoration Solutions proposal goes through, will Utah Lake be turned
18 over to that company? Ben replied that that topic will be a part of the internal review process for FFSL. In the
19 process of revising the Utah Lake Master Plan and creating a management plan for the lake instead, they will be
20 identifying how policies in the plan identify with the proposal. There will be oversight over the proposal.
21 Currently, the company only would receive the land exchange if everything was approved. FFSL will still have
22 permitting and oversight over the plan as it would be implemented. Eric explained that it will be a long,
23 methodical process, all involved government agencies considering all elements, before it ever gets to the land
24 exchange.
- 25 C. Discussion on what Technical Committee will be reviewing. Ben explained that the review of the master plan is
26 to provide additional input on what should be included or adjusted, or removed from the plan. Basically, what
27 the Commission and FFSL support happening at the lake and what they don't support at the lake. Eric added it is
28 the Commission's opportunity to direct and provide feedback on what the management plan that is enforced by
29 FFSL will look like. Afterwards, their management plan could be adopted by the Commission as our master plan.
30 Rebecca suggested that maybe there should be a master plan for Utah Lake Commission, and a management
31 plan based on that document; have two separate documents. Discussion on that topic. Eric envisioned a more
32 succinct vision document that becomes the ULC master plan that doesn't have as many specific elements as it
33 currently exists, that would then guide the management plan of the lake for FFSL.
- 34 D. Agreement by the Committee members present to review the sections of the master plan previous to each of
35 the Committee's meetings and send comments via email to Ben Stireman with FFSL for compilation and
36 distribution to everyone else. Commission staff can send reminders to Committee members to review each
37 section. Commission staff to send out the Jordan River management plan to Committee. Some discussion on
38 other documents, model ordinances adopted by some cities about development around the lake, the
39 compromise agreement for water management, etc. Juan Garrido requested consideration of including details
40 of what agency needs to be contacted for what issues in the new management plan for the lake. Further
41 discussion on details that could be included in either the revised master plan or management plan. Idea for a
42 regulatory flowchart describing regulatory authorities for projects at the lake, what process to go through, etc.
- 43 E. Discussion on Table 2.2 of the master plan, needs updating for current voting and ex-officio members.
- 44 F. Ben referenced the map on pg. 10 of the master plan, explained that the maps and charts in the ULC master
45 plan are a broader focus then what the FFSL would include in their management plan. They only manage the
46 state land, meaning the lake bed right up to the edge of development. Discussion and clarification on this topic.

47
48 **7. Water Quality Study; Steering Committee Structure – Eric Ellis - Updates**

- 1 A. Eric reported that the Science Panel should be seated by the next meeting. The Steering Committee is
2 considering 3 different structures that the Science Panel could be, attempting to balance scientists who don't
3 have conflicts of interest, are/are not planning to bid on projects in the water quality study, etc.
4

5 **8. Carp Removal & June Sucker Research Update – Eric Ellis**

- 6 A. No appropriation from the state Legislature this year for carp. The last appropriation that was intended to
7 happen was last year, somewhere around \$400k. Those funds, along with the federal funds JSRIP has will last
8 until 2019 summer. In April 2018, USU is completing their carp density study and will bring back
9 recommendations on what level of maintenance needs to take place with carp removal going forward. JSRIP will
10 then use that data and recommendations to determine which tools to use to perform the maintenance fishing.
11

12 **9. Round Table updates from committee members**

- 13 A. There were no comments made.
14

15 **10. General comments from the committee members and the public**

- 16 A. Someone asked if the lake is coming up. Eric responded that last we saw it was at 3-4 feet below full. Snow pack
17 isn't great. We will probably start the summer 2-3 feet below full and probably not go higher.
18 B. Juan Garrido asked if the new FEMA maps affect anything the Commission is doing. Eric responded that no, it is
19 more about flood insurance for the various areas of the valley. Rebecca explained more of what FEMA is doing in
20 their map revision. Discussion on the topic.
21 C. Discussion of former Mayor Hadfield's (American Fork City) death and a gift from the Commission, thanking him
22 for service that can be delivered to his wife.

23 **11. Confirm next meeting time**

24 The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday May 16, 2018 at 9:30 AM.
25

26 **12. Adjourn.**

27 The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 AM.