

Utah Lake Water Quality Study: Stakeholder Process
Steering Committee Meeting #1
Meeting Summary
January 4, 2018

This document includes a list of future meetings, action items, and a brief summary of the discussions. Please review the action item list for tasks assigned to you and/or the Steering Committee in general (NOTE: the action items highlighted in yellow apply to all ULWQS Steering Committee members). A list of attendees can be found at the end of the document.

Upcoming Meeting/Call	When & Where	Suggested Agenda Items
ULWQS Steering Committee Meeting	<i>Tuesday, Jan. 23</i> 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Goals/objectives cont. ○ Stakeholder Process document ○ Standing up Science Panel (SP)
ULWQS Steering Committee Meeting	<i>Tuesday, Feb. 27</i> 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Standing up SP cont. ○ Information needed to proceed ○ Assessment report
ULWQS Steering Committee Meeting	<i>Monday, Mar. 12</i> 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SP decision or interaction (TBD) ○ Goals/questions to share with SP
ULWQS Steering Committee Meeting	<i>Thursday, Apr. 12</i> 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TBD; might be a joint SC/SP meeting depending on progress/schedule

I. Action Items

Action Item	Who	To be Completed by
1. Share draft action items memo/summary for Steering Committee member review	Facilitation Team	COMPLETED
2. Schedule remaining stakeholder interviews	Facilitation Team	COMPLETED
3. Review and share any comments on draft action items memo/summary	Steering Committee members	COMPLETED
4. Share reminder and draft agenda for January 23 Steering Committee meeting	Facilitation Team	COMPLETED
5. Share draft set of operating procedures	Facilitation Team	Friday, Jan. 19
6. Share list of all stakeholders involved in Phase 1	UDWQ	Friday, Jan. 19

7. Read through the Stakeholder Process document in preparation for discussion at meeting #2	Steering Committee members	Tuesday, Jan. 23
8. Reach out to your stakeholders and discuss ULWQS goals in preparation for discussion of opportunities and concerns at meeting #2	Steering Committee members	Tuesday, Jan. 23
9. Share draft Assessment Report	Facilitation Team	Friday, Feb. 16
10. Share draft public engagement white paper	Facilitation Team	Friday, March 23

II. Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting will be available on the DWQ website in the near future.

III. Key Points of Discussion

Participants were welcomed to the first meeting of the Utah Lake Water Quality Study Steering Committee by one of the Co-Chairs, Eric Ellis, Director of the Utah Lake Commission. In addition, Alan Matheson, Director of the Utah Department of Environmental Quality offered some opening comments on behalf of Erica Gaddis, the Director of the Utah Department of Water Quality and the other Co-Chair, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Meeting facilitator Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE, provided the group with an overview of the meeting objectives: provide an opportunity for Steering Committee members to introduce themselves and their interests to each other; begin to build a common platform of understanding for the overall effort and its objectives; initiate identification of Steering Committee members' goals, issues, and information needs; and describe the proposed plan for activities over the next three to four months.

Perspectives on Goals

Steering Committee members shared their ideas regarding the Steering Committee goals. The responses were diverse (see Attachment A: Flipchart Notes); however, common themes included:

- Increase understanding of the Utah Lake ecosystem
- Increase understanding of the sources of nutrient inputs
- Develop a solution that will improve the condition of Utah Lake
- Develop a solution that all stakeholders agree on
- Ensure the public is engaged in the efforts and understands the decisions

Overview of Why We're Here:

As part of the effort to develop a common platform of understanding for the overall effort and its objectives, Scott Daly, Utah Division of Water Quality, provided a presentation on the Clean Water Act and the EPA mandate to the Utah Division of Water Quality to manage water quality in the state. After a break, Mr. Daly provided a separate presentation on the history of water quality management in Utah Lake and the background of the Utah Lake Water Quality Study. Slides were subsequently distributed.

During the presentations, the following questions were addressed:

- In response to a question about how the recreation criteria for turbidity gets implemented on Utah Lake when increases in turbidity are due to wind events, Mr. Daly indicated he was not sure how it is applied to recreational use on lakes, but in general for streams the increase in turbidity above background is regulated (i.e., a 10 Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU) increase above background in streams results in a violation)
- In response to a question regarding the DWQ considering a change of Designated Beneficial Use (DBU) from 2B to 2A for recreation and the rationale for such a change, Mr. Daly offered that DWQ believes a mistake was made in the initial designation and as such this would not be a change as much as a reclassification to address the actual use of the lake. He indicated this would most likely be significant with respect to *E. coli*, given that the 2A standard is lower and concentrations in the lake are often very high in portions of the lake and tributaries.
 - Based on related follow-up questions, in particular related to how Utah Lake would ever be removed from the 303(D) list for *E. Coli*, it was apparent some additional discussion of the topic to explain potential implications for the effort would be useful.
- A question was raised regarding the interplay between efforts to meet standards for the different beneficial uses in Utah Lake and in particular. As with the recreation DBU-related issue, it was suggested that additional clarification of the different standards and how they relate would be useful in the future.
 - Another question was raised related to how more stringent standards could be set for water bodies downstream of water bodies with less stringent standards. In responding, it was clarified that the example used, Deer Creek Reservoir, has a DBU of 2A for recreation which is more stringent than the current 2B designation for Utah Lake (recognizing that even with DWQs intention to shift Utah Lake to a 2A designation it would be the same level).
- In response to a question about the Use Attainability Analysis (UAA) option for Phase 3 and whether it is a stand-alone option or is it just a step along the path to a TMDL or another alternative, Mr. Daly suggested a UAA is generally considered a potential endpoint following a complete analysis of impairments and actions required to restore beneficial uses (as such it is not an alternative to TMDL).
- Regarding a question about who is doing the literature search and whether they are aware of studies done in the 1980s, Mr. Daly noted it is Rushforth Phycology.

Additional Information Moving Forward:

Building on the “Why We’re Here” presentations, the Steering Committee members were asked what additional information (from DWQ or others) they would find useful in building the common platform of understanding and moving forward with efforts to achieve the overall objectives. The Steering Committee generated a list of presentation topics that might be beneficial:

- Shallow lake ecology – how they function, the role of nutrients
- Management of lake levels – and water rights and how they dictate water levels
- Lake vs. reservoir – differences and the implications
- Other efforts to solve Harmful Algal Bloom (HAB) problems

- Interaction between carp removal and HABs
- The role of the public in the process and the stakeholders already involved
- Approach to engaging the public during and after public health concerns arise
- Public health issues related to the lake, should be some discussion on how the lake is not meeting standards for human health
- A summary of what is currently known about the lake
- Information and research on public perceptions of Utah Lake and what that means
- A discussion of terms and language to make sure we are communicating successfully and speaking the same language
 - Need parameters from the science panel so that we can put some boundaries on the discussion

The group also identified some information needs and ideas on questions to address regarding sharing of information in the future:

- A list of the greater group of stakeholders [Information need]
- Identification of existing literature (and a bibliography) [Information sharing mechanism]
- A mechanism for submitting documents that help understand the issues – this will require a vetting process so that only legitimate studies are considered

In response to a question about the approach to communicating with the public when lake closures are over, Jason Garrett of Utah County Health Department, indicated the Department does issue public statements when warnings/closures are made and when they are rescinded however what is picked up by the press is out of their control.

It was noted that neither the Health Department nor DEQ has had much in the way of a formal budget to deal with HABs and their implications, but they have still found a way to work on the issue given its importance. Last year there was a little bit of funding and this year the state budget may provide some funding.

A few members noted the educational aspects of this effort should be tied to the public engagement process as well to assist in building an informed constituency. Another member suggested a goal of the public engagement process should be to have a unified message.

Mr. Daly reiterated that a lot of additional information, some of which was raised in the discussion such as a sense of what is currently known about the Lake, will be provided in the Phase I report which is expected to be shared this Spring.

IV. Public Comments

At the end of the meeting, a short public comment period was available for members of the public to share brief perspectives with the Steering Committee. Four individuals provided comments.

Dan Potts (Salt Lake Fish and Game Foundation) introduced himself as an avid hunter and fisherman on Utah Lake for over 40 years. He indicated fishing has been overlooked as an interest group and there is a glaring hole on the Steering Committee by not including an angler.

Jeff Salt (Utah Anglers Coalition) suggested there is a huge hole on the Steering Committee and they are upset that anglers are not represented despite being the largest user on Utah Lake and given that they contribute the largest amount to the local economy. He indicated he represented more than 14 organizations (and several thousand individuals) and they feel the recreation representatives on the Steering Committee do not sufficiently capture fishing interests.

Dr. Richards (Oreo Helix consulting) offered his support for the effort and noted he is doing contract work with the WFWQC.

Michael Mills (June Sucker Recovery Program) noted he has been doing work on Utah Lake since 1999 to recover the June Sucker. He added that if progress towards recovery is not made, there could be restrictions to how water from Utah Lake can be used. He added that he has done tributary restoration, primarily providing water to the Provo River and Hobble Creek.

V. Participation

Meeting Participants (Name, Organization – Stakeholder Interest):

- Jon Adams, Timpanogos Special Service District – POTW
- Gary Calder, City of Provo – Municipal
- Eric Ellis, Utah Lake Commission – Co-Chair
- Todd Frye, Bonneville Sailing Club – Recreation (Alternate)
- Jason Garrett, Utah County Health Department – Public Health
- Heidi Hoven, Audubon Society – Conservation and Environment
- Chris Keleher, Utah Department of Natural Resources – Recreation, Fishing and Sovereign Lands
- Jay Montgomery, Utah County Stormwater Association – Stormwater
- Jay Olsen, Utah Department of Agriculture and Food – Agriculture
- Dennis Shiozawa, Brigham Young University – Academia
- Brad Stapley, Springville City – Municipal
- Jesse Stewart, Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities – Agriculture/Water Rights/Water Users
- George Weekley, US Fish and Wildlife Service – Fish and Wildlife
- Neal Winterton, City of Orem – Municipal
- Gerard Yates, Central Utah Water Conservancy District – Water Management of Utah Lake

Alternate Steering Committee Members Present:

- Laura Ault, Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands - Recreation, Fishing and Sovereign Lands
- David Barlow, Timpanogos Special Service District - POTW
- Craig Bostock, Utah County Health Department - Public Health
- Sam Braegger, Utah Lake Commission – Utah Lake Commission
- Juan Garrido, Springville City - Municipal
- Chris Cline, US Fish and Wildlife Service - Fish and Wildlife
- Dave Norman, Lehi City – Municipal
- Mike Rau, Central Utah Water Conservancy District – Water Management of Utah Lake

- Ella Sorenson, Audubon Society - Conservation and Environment
- Travis Taylor, Utah County Storm Water Association - Stormwater

Observers Present:

- Zach Anderud, Brigham Young University
- Greg Carling, Brigham Young University
- Dylan Dastrup, Brigham Young University
- Jon Hilbert, Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District
- Sarah Hanners, University of Utah
- Mitch Hogsett, Forsgren Associates
- Mike Mills, June Sucker Restoration Implementation Program
- Dan Potts, Salt Lake Fish and Game Foundation
- David Richards, Oreo Helix Consulting
- Jeff Salt, Utah Anglers Coalition/Salt Lake Fish and Game Foundation
- Sarah Sutherland, Central Utah Water Conservancy District

State of Utah Staff Present:

- Carl Adams, Division of Water Quality
- Scott Daly, Division of Water Quality
- Alan Matheson, Department of Environmental Quality

Facilitation Team:

- Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE
- Dave Epstein, SWCA

Attachment A**Utah Lake Water Quality Study Steering Committee
Flipchart Notes
January 4, 2018****Perspectives: Goals**

- Avoid long-term algal blooms
 - Ask questions and find answers to the causes and solution on how to minimize them
- Ensure Utah Lake potential is achieved
 - And ensure stakeholders engaged
- Identify key questions to be answered
 - In particular questions the community wants answered
- Determine best ways to answer the questions and then use that information
- Understand science – sources of pollution; ways to address problems
- Understand what is “below the surface”
- Bring all interests to the table to develop recommendations for the decision makers
- Understand what it takes to maintain ecosystem health (and improve to increase desirability for wildlife and people)
- Define problem; what’s attainable; role of storm water – cost effective approach
- Understand implications of Utah Lake water quality on other parts of basin
- Understand science of algal blooms in Utah Lake and the process of managing HABs
- Note the incredible resource we have – recommendations to get to a more pristine condition
- Accurately pinpoint what is impacting Utah Lake and quantify the magnitude ... and how best to achieve goals (cleaner lake)
- Open minds ...
- Understand what Utahans expect the Lake to be and are they willing to support the necessary associated costs
- Help achieve good, sound science to inform decisions ... best water quality in lake and below possible
- Ensure we are getting the most accurate information possible
- Health decisions/actions have to proceed despite uncertainty
- What are the expectations of people of Utah – costs commensurate with impacts?
- Find solutions that benefit species and people in/around the lake
- Ecosystem health – functioning system
- Collaboration – mutual understanding , find solutions for all
- Recommendation we can understand but also that the public can understand
- Want public/ratepayers knowledge to increase and ensure they support for costs/expenditures
- Common understanding of what’s possible/what needs to be done (and what has already occurred)
- Recognize realities of future and impact of those on the lake when identifying goals and developing solutions
- Understand the system – lake in context

- Good relationship with the Science Panel
- Understand system vis a vis sources of pollution/inputs and develop solutions based on scientific knowledge
- Look holistically at the Lake and figure out what we can do to preserve and enhance (but recognize cost implications)
- Help ratepayers see linkages between the benefits and costs

Additional Topics

- Algal bloom efforts outside Utah
- Shallow Lake ecology
- Carp removal program and interactions
- Lake management and lake levels
- Communication process
- What is known with regards to issues (e.g., nutrient loading)
- Annotated bibliography idea
- Public perceptions
- Educational aspect of the public involvement process
- Common language (e.g., “Toxic Algae”)
- Management of lakes versus reservoirs
- Unified messages
 - Goal is win/win
 - Science, cause, what needs to be done
- What type of scientific material can be value-added?
 - Mechanism for sharing documents