APPENDIX E

PROPOSED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES NEEDING FURTHER REVIEW



June 26, 2009

of the Utah Lake Commission



1.0 PROPOSED GOALS NEEDING FURTHER REVIEW

The following issues were proposed as specific vision statements and were not pursued in the Master Plan based on the explanation given.

Incentives: Incentives will be available to encourage volunteer participation in protection of the environment of Utah Lake and for land developers to protect the Utah Lake ecosystem.

Explanation: This proposed vision statement was deemed a tool for accomplishing goals or objectives and therefore not considered an appropriate goal.

Re-engineering of Utah Lake: Utah Lake will be re-engineered to improve its depth by dredging and creation of island(s) or other shoreline developments.

Explanation: It was decided that this vision statement was addressed by approved Vision Statement 16, Proactive Enhancements. Also, re-engineering Utah Lake should only be accomplished for a specific highly beneficial purpose.

Planning for the Future: Model ordinances are established to guide land use and other natural resource management decisions.

Explanation: It was decided that a model ordinance is an objective to meet a goal and not a goal.

2.0 PROPOSED OBJECTIVES NEEDING FURTHER REVIEW

The following issues were considered as opportunities and not pursued in the Master Plan based on the explanation given.

Establish a Cross-lake Transportation Corridor

Explanation: Identifying a transportation corridor conflicts with Specific Vision Statement 27, Transportation Planning.

The Commission does not want to take a position on any proposal prior to completion of appropriate and needed studies. The Commission wants to have a significant role throughout any planning process, and will provide input representing the goals and objectives of the Master Plan. The following constraints should also be considered for a proposal that crosses Utah Lake:

- NEPA compliance
- Sovereign lands issues/permitting
- Corp of Engineers approval
- Costs
- Funding requirements
- Requires operations and maintenance funding
- Few initial users
- Visual impacts to Utah Lake



- Challenging geotechnical issues very weak foundation
- Impacts to June sucker habitat
- Impacts to recreation
- Impacts to water circulation
- Limited access to Cedar Valley (Lake Mountain obstruction)
- Cedar Valley N-S transportation corridor may reduce need
- On-going E-W transportation plans may reduce need

Provo Bay Transportation Corridor or Dike

Explanation: The issues are similar for this suggested opportunity as for the Cross-lake Transportation Corridor. Constraints unique to this alternative that should be considered during planning include:

- Potential to diminish water quality in remainder of lake by cutting off fresh water inflows
- Respect for Utah Lake water rights (storage)
- Inflows may be dominated by treated wastewater effluents, increasing nutrient concentrations in Provo Bay
- Limits fish migration in lake
- Requires new marina to provide boater access to a favorite skiing area
- Improves water level at a detriment to the level in the rest of Utah Lake
- Limited fish migration is potentially detrimental to recovery of June sucker

Although not an objective of the Commission, the Commission should initiate and sustain continued participation in the Nebo Transportation Study to ensure that the goals, objectives and concerns about this concept are addressed in any studies.

Ferry Service

Explanation: This concept does not meet the Commission's identified goals as articulated in the Master Plan. If a proposal for ferry service is proposed, the Commission will consider it within the context of the Master Plan and the following constraints:

- Shallow lake limits types of available ferries
- Energy intensive and associated air quality issues
- Few initial users
- Sovereign land issues/ permitting
- Requires consideration of icing and significant ice lifts resulting from wind
- Requires consideration of large wave action



- Is not a high volume transportation solution
- Lake level fluctuation at low levels may prevent service without dredging

Dredge Provo Bay to provide better power boating and water skiing

Explanation: Because of the unique and important natural resources associated with

Provo Bay and its associated wetlands habitat, this concept was rejected as an objective. Furthermore, federal Public Law 207-575, Sec. 306(d), Central Utah Project Completion Act, prohibits any federal permits on the southern shore, including dredging.