

**Utah Lake Water Quality Study (ULWQS)
Steering Committee
March 17, 12:30 PM to 3:00 PM
Virtual Meeting
Meeting Summary - FINAL**

ATTENDANCE:

Steering Committee Members and Alternates: David Barlow, Scott Bird, Sam Braegger, Gary Calder, Eric Ellis, Erica Gaddis, Rich Mickelsen, Jay Olsen, Mike Rau, Dennis Shiozawa, Jesse Stewart, Ben Stireman, and Gerard Yates

Science Panel Members: Mitch Hogsett

Members of the Public: Renn Lambert, LaVere Merritt, David Richards, Soren Simonsen, and Terry Warner

Utah Division of Water Quality (DWQ) staff: Scott Daly, Jodi Gardberg, John Mackey, and Jeff Ostermiller

Technical Consultants: Kateri Salk and Jordan Smith

Facilitation Team: Heather Bergman and Samuel Wallace

ACTION ITEMS

Who	Action Item	Due Date	Date Completed
Scott Daly	Follow up with the watershed modeling team to identify how land-use changes will be incorporated into the watershed model, particularly as it relates to wildfires.	April 15	
Scott Daly and Erica Gaddis	Reach out to the EPA to learn more about applying a water quality trading program to Utah Lake and report their findings to the ULWQS Steering Committee.	Next Steering Committee Mtg	
Scott Daly and Rich Mickelsen	Continue to reach out to the POTW community to gather their feedback on the Implementation Planning Framework, particularly on the point source scenarios, permit implementation approach, planning horizons, and load allocation approach.	April 15	

DECISIONS AND APPROVALS

No decisions or approvals were made at this meeting.

UTAH LAKE RECREATION SURVEYS INTRODUCTION

Jeff Ostermiller, DWQ, introduced the Utah Lake recreation user perception survey. His comments are summarized below.

- User perception surveys are becoming increasingly common across states.
- The visible effects of excess nutrients can potentially affect people's recreational use decisions. The recreation survey will ask people the degree to which they consider different varieties of water quality conditions as desirable or undesirable. The goal of the recreation survey is for the ULWQS Steering Committee to use the survey data to develop endpoints to protect recreational uses.
- The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) developed a guidance document to create recreation user surveys.
- There have been previous surveys conducted on Utah Lake before. There is a general perception that the lake is too dirty. This general perception affects people's recreational use decisions, negatively impacting the economy.
- In recreation user perception surveys conducted on other water bodies in Utah, surveyors asked people to indicate whether certain conditions in a photograph were desirable. When they took the pictures, they also collected water samples to measure chlorophyll concentrations. When they fill out the survey, the survey respondents do not know the chlorophyll concentrations. The survey study team then takes the results from the survey to interpret what chlorophyll concentrations are desirable for recreationists.
- The survey team will link the survey results to water quality goals on Utah Lake. The ultimate goal is to increase lake visitation and satisfaction, improve recreational user experiences related to water quality, and support the 2A recreation beneficial use standards: narrative water quality standards.
- The survey will ultimately identify how people respond to different water clarity levels and at what level they consider the conditions to be better for their respective recreational uses.

Steering Committee Questions

Steering Committee members asked questions about the Utah Lake recreation user perception survey. Their questions are indicated in italics below, with the corresponding answer in plain text.

The slide deck said that previous Utah Lake surveys revealed that about 2/3 of people stated that they did not visit the lake because it was "too dirty." Shouldn't the survey team send out the surveys before making that assertion?

This result is from a previous survey. The Utah Lake recreation user perception survey is not the first survey conducted on Utah Lake recreation.

Steering Committee Discussion

Steering Committee members discussed the Utah Lake recreation user perception survey. Their comments are summarized below.

- The survey should not use negative terms, like "degradation," when describing Utah Lake. This language may bias responses, and it assumes that decreases in water clarity alter recreational use decisions.
- Utah State University has plans to work with Steering Committee members and the general public before sending out the survey to make sure that they phrase the questions in a clear and understandable way.

UTAH LAKE RECREATION USER SURVEY PRESENTATION

Dr. Jordan Smith, Utah State University, presented the objectives, process, and next steps for the Utah Lake recreation user perception survey. His presentation is summarized below.

- Dr. Jordan Smith and Dr. Anna Miller are from the Utah State University Institute of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism. They are the primary investigators for the Utah Lake recreation

user perception survey. The Institute of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism is a state organization created in 1988 by the Utah State Legislature. It is part of the Utah State Extension System. The Institute was founded to provide information to the legislature and state agencies to inform decision processes related to outdoor recreation and tourism. The Institute also assists community officials as they attempt to balance economic, social, and environmental tradeoffs in tourism development. They train undergraduate and graduate students and conduct research on recreation-related issues.

- The objective of the Utah Lake recreation user perception survey is to identify how users respond to different levels of water aesthetics and how they perceive water quality in Utah Lake.
- The vision for the project is to use well-established methods from the field of survey research and recreation economics to develop an empirically grounded and scientifically defensible understanding of the various preferences for water clarity and quality amongst those who currently do or potentially could recreate on Utah Lake. The perceptions of those who regularly recreate on Utah Lake may differ from those who have not recreated on the lake recently. The survey will help identify how those different user groups perceive water quality on the lake.
- The EPA's direction on developing user perception surveys to protect water quality from nutrient pollution guides the development of the survey.
- There are designated authorized uses on Utah Lake under the Clean Water Act. Utah Lake is designated for 2A primary contact recreation uses (e.g., swimming, paddle boarding, water skiing, fishing, etc.). It is important to understand the aesthetic expectation of the users engaging in these types of recreational activities as it relates to water clarity, color, odor, and algal biomass. The two primary questions of the recreation user perception survey are 1) how green is too green, and 2) how brown is too brown?
- The user perception surveys will identify the aesthetic expectations of recreationists. The survey team can align the aesthetic expectations identified from the user perception survey with different targets and assessment endpoints (e.g., nutrient parameters).
- The survey team will use photographs and water quality sample data to determine how green is too green and how brown is too brown. The survey team will collect images (e.g., landscape images, beach images, images with water only, images with water and prop, images of water in jars). As they collect those images, they will also collect water quality samples to measure the chlorophyll-a concentrations and water clarity associated with those images. The proposed method is to categorize the images of water clarity and quality into bins, ranging from very low to very high. The survey will present these images to different recreation user groups as prompts to identify how acceptable each image is. The images can then be tied to water quality data.
- There are remaining questions about who determines aesthetic expectations and how the survey team controls for factors that might bias survey respondents' opinions. The survey team wants to work with the Steering Committee members in small group discussions to help answer these questions and develop a survey that controls for biases.
- The survey team is proposing to distribute the survey in two ways. The first way is to sample residents near the lake through mail and online surveys. This sample includes residents in Salt Lake County and Utah County. There may be an opportunity to survey within closer proximity of Utah Lake, depending on the input from the Steering Committee. The second approach uses on-site intercept surveys at select access points to sample the recreationists using the lake. The Steering Committee will provide input to determine the access points.

- Several factors might bias someone's opinion of Utah Lake. Potential identified factors include outdoor recreation participation, geographic proximity to Utah Lake, length of residence proximate to Utah Lake, prior experience with warnings about and/or closures to Utah Lake, education, gender, income, race, and religion. The survey will ask some of these questions to control for bias, and in other cases, the survey distribution method will help control some of these factors, such as geographic proximity to Utah Lake.
- The survey team will use the survey results to plot the acceptability of user perceptions against the chlorophyll-a or water clarity measurements. This graph will identify the difference between current conditions and acceptable conditions.
- The next step for the development of the survey is to meet with Steering Committee members in small groups to discuss the salient questions that should be in the survey and where the survey team should distribute the survey. The survey team will take the input from Steering Committee members to develop the survey questions for review and feedback from the Steering Committee. They plan to collect data in April and May, analyze the data from May to June, and present it to the Steering Committee in July and August.

Steering Committee Questions

Steering Committee members asked questions about the Utah Lake recreation user perception survey. Their questions are indicated in italics below, with the corresponding answer in plain text.

The turbidity of the lake is in part due to the shallowness of the lake and the wind impact. By asking survey respondents questions about their desired turbidity conditions, is the survey setting expectations on certain Utah Lake conditions that are not achievable given the physical characteristics of the lake?

As the survey team develops the survey, they will be thinking about how to phrase the questions to better understand user perceptions. They want to avoid setting false expectations among survey respondents about what is achievable regarding water quality conditions in Utah Lake.

Recreation uses around Utah Lake change. For example, the southwest part of the lake is more rural and agriculture-oriented, and the north end is more urbanized. How will the survey sort the data based on geographic differences?

The survey team cannot control geographic differences except in deciding who receives hard copies of the survey. There are other questions the survey team can ask to indirectly gather this information, such as whether a survey respondent is employed in the agricultural sector.

Is it possible to preface the survey with an educational statement about how Utah Lake is a shallow, turbid lake before launching into questions?

There may be an opportunity to recognize the biophysical characteristics of Utah Lake to set expectations about what management options are possible in Utah Lake.

Will there be any questions related to smell?

The survey team will consider adding a question related to smell.

Steering Committee Discussion

Steering Committee members discussed the Utah Lake recreation user perception survey. Their comments are summarized below.

- The survey team should avoid setting false expectations about what is achievable regarding water quality conditions in Utah Lake. The purpose of the survey is not to set expectations about water quality conditions in Utah Lake. The goal of the survey is to understand people's perceptions of the water quality thresholds that they are comfortable with when

deciding whether to recreate in Utah Lake. Managers and policymakers can then use that information to determine what water quality conditions are achievable in Utah Lake.

- There are messaging campaigns creating unrealistic expectations about what water quality conditions in Utah Lake can be. The survey team should consider how to measure the media exposure of survey respondents to understand what expectations they may already have related to potential water quality conditions on Utah Lake.
- The survey team should consider adding a question about whether people think water quality is better today or twenty years ago in Utah Lake. If they think it is worse today, that may indicate some type of media exposure. Whether someone thinks water quality in Utah Lake is better today or twenty years ago may depend on how someone is measuring water quality in Utah Lake.
- Survey respondents will likely respond poorly to any picture of water that is muddy or murky, even if it is not dangerous to their health. Some of the water quality contaminants that are the biggest risk are not visible, such as E. coli and parasites. The survey team is planning on pilot testing the images to see if there are systematic biases in the images themselves.
- The survey team should consider asking where people get their information from, how frequently, and how much they trust it. This type of information may be useful to Steering Committee members when it comes to educating people about the lake and the realistic management solutions that can be employed on the lake.
- The survey team should consider asking questions about people's perceptions of the toxicity of the lake to see if they hold any biases. There could also be a question on whether people recreated in Utah Lake when they were young and whether they choose to do so now. There could be an opportunity to ask respondents about their perception of the safety of Utah Lake to look at the relationship between public acceptability and safety.
- One goal of the survey is to connect management goals related to recreation to nutrient criteria. The EPA has set thresholds for toxins. There are no established thresholds for nuisance and aesthetic concerns related to algal growth. One goal of the survey is to help identify these thresholds for nuisance and aesthetic concerns.
- The survey team should consider asking respondents whether they recently moved to Utah from out of state. Someone from a different state may have a different perception of Utah Lake than someone who grew up near it.
- Survey respondents will most likely respond to floating algal mats on the surface of Utah Lake. There are algae mixed in the lake's water column, but most respondents will likely not be aware of the algae mixed into the water column. The survey team did collect data on species composition in the water samples. They also collected images from the open water of Utah Lake and near the shoreline. There were more examples of floating mats near the shoreline, so there may be an opportunity to use those images to see how perceptions of algae in the water differ between the shoreline and open water.
- Light winds on Utah Lake can result in large changes in turbidity. These changes in turbidity can occur quickly but are easily measured.
- The survey team should consider asking respondents not only about the acceptability of the magnitude of algal blooms but also the frequency and extent. The management goals consider the magnitude, frequency, and extent of harmful algal blooms as indicators for recreation.

Public Comments

Members of the public provided comments on the Utah Lake recreation user perception survey. Their comments are summarized below.

- The survey team should consider asking a question related to how far a person would travel based on the water quality conditions of the lake.
- The quality of a water sample can look very different in the lake versus in a jar. The survey team should consider that when selecting images for the survey.

Recreation User Survey Next Steps

Samuel Wallace sent out a Doodle to Steering Committee members to schedule small group discussions on the recreation user survey. The small groups will begin meeting next week to provide input on survey questions and distribution methods.

LEGISLATIVE FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

Erica Gaddis and Eric Ellis, ULWQS Co-Chairs, provided updates on funding and legislative initiatives related to Utah Lake. Their updates are summarized below.

- Utah House Bill 240 amended the previous Utah Lake Restoration Act. The Utah Lake Restoration Act enabled the Utah Lake Restoration Solutions project. House Bill 240 added additional process to any approval of the dispossession of land under that original act. The process now includes that the Utah Legislature and Governor would both have to approve any project recommended by the Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands. The Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands will continue to review the Utah Lake Restoration Solutions project and develop criteria to evaluate it before making a recommendation.
- Utah House Bill 232 creates the Utah Lake Authority. The bill passed, and the initiation of the Utah Lake Authority will be on July 1. Before the Utah Lake Authority launch, a governing board will be seated for the entity. The Utah Lake Commission will be dissolved and transitioned into the Utah Lake Authority by June 1, 2023. The Utah Lake Authority will receive an annual allocation of \$1.5 million from the state's general fund.
- In addition to the \$25 million allocated to DWQ from the Utah Legislature, DWQ has also received \$30 million for the Utah Lake Water Quality Preservation Fund. The \$30 million comes from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) and can fund projects that are also eligible for the state's revolving loan funds program. DWQ developed different categories of projects eligible for funding under the Utah Lake Water Quality Preservation Fund and presented the categories and associated criteria to the legislature. The categories and criteria are not final, but DWQ wants to honor the information they provided to legislators. The four categories of projects eligible for funding are:
 - Category 1 is called the Utah Lake Water Quality Infrastructure Competitive Grant Program and includes wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvement projects. This program would prioritize projects that reduce nutrient inputs into Utah Lake. The application grant criteria include:
 - A minimum 80% cost-share and, if applicable, disclosure of the amount of local ARPA funding committed to the project
 - Prioritization based on the return on investment for projects that exceed the current regulations (funding will not be allocated to projects that help a facility meet current regulations)
 - Prioritization of projects that regionalize wastewater systems
 - Requirement and implementation of an asset management plan
 - Category 2 includes projects that improve in-lake water quality. These projects could include harmful algal bloom treatments, nutrient inactivation projects, dredging of high-nutrient sediments, and research to evaluate the outcomes of these projects.
 - Category 3 includes outreach and education activities. These projects have to be related to water quality, such as educating people on reducing pollutant loads to

stormwater systems. There is movement towards developing a Utah Lake Research and Education Center. Some components of that Center could be funded by ARPA funding.

- A total of \$25 million is allocated to projects in the first three categories, with the intent that most of the \$25 million go to projects in category 1. The additional \$5 million is earmarked for nonpoint source projects and potentially an agricultural voluntary incentives program. There may be an opportunity to allocate funding to a water quality trading program, depending on the outcomes of watershed planning and cost analysis.
- The ARPA funding has to be obligated by 2024 and spent by 2026.

Steering Committee Questions

Steering Committee members asked questions about the Utah Lake legislative and funding update. Their questions are indicated in italics below, with the corresponding answer in plain text.

If the Utah Lake Restoration Solutions project digs sediment from the Utah Lake bed, should that action be considered mining? If it is considered mining, should they not have to put aside funding for reclamation if the project fails?

The Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands is considering this approach. Any reclamation bond would likely be sizable if that is the approach the State chooses to take.

Does the \$1.5 million allocated to the Utah Lake Authority become available this year or next year? Could that funding be used to fund the Utah Lake research being conducted by DWQ and Wasatch Front Water Quality Council?

The funds become available this year, but they are only earmarked for planning until the new Utah Lake Authority Board adopts a comprehensive management plan by April of next year. On April 1, 2023, the remainder of the funds will become available for implementation.

Steering Committee Discussion

Steering Committee members discussed the Utah Lake legislative and funding updates, including feedback on any potential additions or revisions to the Utah Lake Water Quality Preservation Fund program. Their comments are summarized below.

- The DWQ should consider funding research to plan and manage increased discharges into Utah Lake due to population growth. The funding cannot be used for direct development, but it could potentially be used to plan for growth. It would be particularly beneficial to plan for growth in the southern part of Utah County, where growth is expected to occur because there is no current plan to manage wastewater in that area.
- The DWQ will continue to revise the Utah Lake Water Quality Preservation Fund program and bring it back to the Steering Committee once there is a final version.

PHASE 3 - IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING OVERVIEW

Scott Daly, DWQ, provided an overview of the current status of Phase 3 of the ULWQS. His comments are summarized below.

- Over the past few meetings, the Steering Committee has discussed and approved an Implementation Planning Framework. Today's discussion will focus on a couple of key decision points for the Steering Committee to consider to formulate a scope of work for implementation planning.
- At the last Steering Committee meeting, Scott Daly was assigned the action item of developing an executive summary for the framework. He wrote the executive summary and provided it to a subgroup of Steering Committee members for their review. They provided

feedback, and he will be incorporating the feedback into the framework over the next few weeks.

- At the last Steering Committee meeting, Scott Daly and Rich Mickelsen were assigned the action item of sending the Implementation Planning Framework to the publicly owned treatment works (POTW) for their review and feedback. They are currently working on communicating with the POTWs to receive feedback on the framework.
- The next step for the Implementation Planning Framework is to identify the technical and financial resources needed to implement the framework.
- The Steering Committee may be able to accomplish some of the tasks outlined in the Implementation Planning Framework. Still, a technical consultant may be required for tasks that the Steering Committee cannot implement. Scott Daly identified which tasks could fall under the current scope of the technical consultants working on the ULWQS and which ones will require a new technical consultant if the Steering Committee decides to outsource the work to a consultant.
- There were unanswered items on several decision points in the Implementation Planning Framework following the last Steering Committee. Some of the key decision points are related to tasks on building partnerships, characterizing the watershed, developing management strategies, and developing an approach to implement permits.
- Less urgent tasks that require decisions from the Steering Committee include the cost/feasibility analysis and assembling the final plan tasks. The cost/feasibility analysis and assembly of the final plan are not within the scope of any of the current technical contractors, but it will be easy to frame up these tasks for a technical consultant once the Steering Committee reaches that point in the planning process.
- The task of building partnerships was included in the document to ensure that the Steering Committee had the right people and interests at the table for implementation planning. This task also involves updating and implementing an outreach plan. The Steering Committee previously worked on an outreach plan, so Steering Committee members will need to discuss their preferred approach for updating the plan (i.e., whether they would prefer to do that work in-house or with contractor support). Steering Committee members can also decide to wait on updating the outreach plan until they have more information to share with the public.
- Characterizing the watershed task involves identifying the sources in the watershed, quantifying their relative role in the overall nutrient budget of the lake, and prioritizing the sources based on their nutrient contribution to the lake. Key decision points for the Steering Committee related to this task include:
 - Identifying the planning horizons to determine how population growth will be incorporated into the implementation planning process.
 - Identifying what future population data could be used to evaluate the impacts of population growth on nutrient inputs.
 - Determining what climate-related scenarios to incorporate into the implementation planning process (e.g., dry weather, wet weather, wildfire impacts, etc.).
- The developing management strategies task will involve developing scenarios to evaluate source-specific management scenarios. The scenarios for the point sources are fairly well defined, and the POTW community will continue to discuss the point source thresholds for those scenarios. The Steering Committee will need to consider the approach for developing scenarios for stormwater, nonpoint source, atmospheric deposition, and in-lake/ecological sources. Once the watershed modeling team has made more progress on the watershed model, the Steering Committee will be able to have a more in-depth conversation on how to develop scenarios for the four other sources other than point sources. Dr. Mike Brett on the

ULWQS Science Panel is also developing a tool to help assess the impact of reducing nutrient inputs from specific sources at a high level. This tool will be helpful for planning.

- Developing an approach to implement permits will involve the Steering Committee discussing whether permits are based on loads or concentrations and the averaging periods for permits. The POTW community will also discuss these topics. The big idea for the Steering Committee to explore related to this task is the idea of watershed-based permitting and water quality trading. Scott Daly and Erica Gaddis will reach out to the EPA to learn more about applying a water quality trading program to Utah Lake and report their findings to the ULWQS Steering Committee.
- The Steering Committee should consider if there are any charge questions on implementation planning to send to the Science Panel for them to consider.

Steering Committee Discussion

The Steering Committee discussed the key considerations outlined in the Implementation Planning Framework. The feedback from Steering Committee members is categorized and summarized below.

Building Partnership Task Feedback

- The Steering Committee should wait on updating the outreach plan until there is more concrete data from the science.
- One interest missing from the current Steering Committee as they move into implementation planning is the homebuilders. The homebuilders may be interested in the assumptions made around growth and financing stormwater and wastewater projects.
- There are several items in the Implementation Planning Framework that the general public could provide feedback on. Engaging with the public on the Implementation Planning Framework can help bring more attention to and increase awareness of the ULWQS. Another opportunity to engage in outreach is once the ULWQS Steering Committee has developed a numeric nutrient criteria value and finalized the implementation plan.
- The building partnership task is a relatively low priority for the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will revisit the outreach plan once they have more information on the results of the ongoing scientific studies. The Steering Committee should have a conversation in their next few meetings focused on identifying and recruiting interests missing from the table.

Watershed Characterization Task Feedback

- The planning horizon is important as the Steering Committee thinks about load allocations. Some loads will be reserved for future growth, so the Steering Committee needs to consider how far into the future to reserve loads for future growth.
- DWQ does not have to reserve future loads in the present. DWQ typically reserves future loads in a total maximum daily load (TMDL) because otherwise, they have to go through the TMDL process again to revise the TMDL values.
- The way future loads have been reserved in the past is that a POTW facility will receive both a current load allocation and future load allocation for anticipated growth. There is another approach to reserve future loads that would involve not allocating them to a specific source/facility and dividing the loads up as new areas become annexed and new stormwater and wastewater facilities potentially come online.
- The Steering Committee could consider setting a shorter planning horizon and revisiting the questions on load allocation in ten to fifteen years. There is a tradeoff with setting a longer planning horizon: more certainty for a longer time makes it easier and cheaper to invest in

infrastructure improvements, but at some point, it is no longer feasible to project population growth and future impacts.

- The planning horizon for 2040 and 2060 came from the POTW community. The plan is for the POTWs to meet to talk about planning horizons and growth scenarios. Once the POTWs have a chance to meet, they will have a response on their preferred approach to planning horizons and load allocations.
- Past wildfires have contributed a lot of sediment and nutrients to Utah Lake. The watershed model should capture the nutrient contributions from wildfires. The ULWQS watershed model will assume a certain land-use type, but it is not clear how the watershed model will incorporate land-use changes, particularly as it relates to wildfire. Scott Daly will follow up with the watershed modeling team to identify how land-use changes will be incorporated into the watershed model, particularly as it relates to wildfires.
- A Brigham Young University (BYU) study being conducted by Dr. Ben Abbott is assessing the nutrient loading of the most recent fire from Spanish Fork Canyon. The data from that fire would be a good worst-case scenario to incorporate into the model and/or empirical analysis. DWQ collects regular data on the tributaries, so there may be an opportunity to identify the average nutrient loading occurring without a major fire and create a separate scenario for the nutrient loading during a major wildfire.
- The Central Utah Water Conservancy District has water quality data on the amount of sediment they collected in the Orem Treatment Plant during a wildfire downstream from Jordanelle Reservoir. Fires that occur upstream of reservoirs, like Jordanelle Reservoir, will not deposit much sediment into Utah Lake.
- The Central Utah Water Conservancy District is putting together a drought contingency plan. They can share information from that drought contingency plan on how much water they expect to go to Utah Lake under drought conditions. The plan is about two months out.
- Utah is in a 22-year drought. A recent paper assessed that it is the worst drought in 1,200 years and that 20% of the drought is due to climate change. Given the length of the drought, the Steering Committee should consider setting the planning horizon at 2060 rather than 2040 to help prepare for future conditions.
- The Utah Division of Water Resources recently released a water supply plan. That water supply plan would be a good reference to align with the ULWQS implementation planning scenarios.

Next Steps for Implementation Planning

- Steering Committee members have several months to develop the scenarios for future population and climate-related impacts that feed into the watershed model.
- Scott Daly and Rich Mickelsen will continue to reach out to the POTW community to gather their feedback on the Implementation Planning Framework, particularly on the point source scenarios, the approach for permit implementation, and the approach for planning horizons and load allocations.

NEXT STEPS

The next Steering Committee will be in April and May. DWQ staff will gather information on the Utah Lake Implementation Planning Framework and frame up a conversation for Steering Committee members to continue weighing in and developing specific scenarios for the implementation planning effort.