



## Governing Board

Thursday, February 23, 2012, 7:30 A.M.  
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Ballroom, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

### ATTENDEES:

Commissioner Larry Ellertson, Utah County  
Gene Shawcroft, Central Utah Water  
Conservancy District (CUP)  
Mayor James Hadfield, American Fork City  
Mayor Bert Wilson, Lehi City, Commission Vice-Chair  
Mayor Jim Dain, Lindon City, Commission Chair  
Mayor John Curtis, Provo City  
Mayor James Evans, Orem City  
Councilman James Linford, Santaquin City  
Councilman Rebecca Call, Saratoga Springs City  
Councilman Dean F. Olsen, Springville City  
Mayor Randy Farnworth, Vineyard Town  
Robyn Pearson, Dept. of Natural Resources (DNR)  
Leah Ann Lamb, Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)  
Dick Buehler, Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, and  
State Lands (FFSL)

### INTERESTED PARTIES / VISITORS

Chris Keleher, Technical Committee Chairman, DNR  
Reed Harris, JSRIP  
Andrew Jackson, MAG  
Taylor Oldroyd, Utah County Realtors  
Mike Mills, JSRIP  
Michael Guymon, URS  
Mark Holden, Utah Reclamation, Mitigation and  
Conservation Commission  
Bill Pope, HDR  
Doug Witney, Utah County Commissioner  
Bob Trombly, Provo City Attorney  
Matt Pottenger, Citizen  
James O'Neal, Citizen  
Carol Walters, Utah Valley Earth Forum

**ABSENT:** Mapleton City, Woodland Hills Town, and Utah State Legislature.

1 **1. Welcome and call to order.**

2 Mayor and Chairman Jim Dain called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m. He welcomed the members of the  
3 Governing Board, municipal leaders, and public visitors. He acknowledged new member, Councilwoman  
4 Rebecca Call from Saratoga Springs.  
5

6 **2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from meeting of January 26, 2012.**

7 Mayor Dain asked for discussion, comments, or corrections for the minutes of the meeting held January 26,  
8 2012. Commissioner Larry Ellertson corrected the second motion for nominations by Mayor John Curtis to state  
9 he seconded Mayor Jim Dain as Chair and Mayor Bert Wilson as Vice Chair. It was motioned by Commissioner  
10 Larry Ellertson to approve the minutes of January 26, 2012 as corrected; it was seconded by Mayor Bert Wilson.  
11 The motion carried and it was unanimously approved.  
12

13 **3. Review and approve the monthly financial report of the Commission for January 2012.**

14 Mr. Price reported on the monthly financial report for January:

1        **January:** The financial report dated January 31, 2012, shows 41.7 percent of the fiscal year remaining. The  
2 Zions checking account balance was \$1,226.00; the money market account balance was \$46,608.20; and the  
3 Utah Public Treasurers Investment Fund balance was \$246,598.55. From Zion’s account, \$200,000.00 was  
4 transferred to PTIF because of the higher rate of return. The money market account balance received a rate of  
5 return at 0.57 percent, and the PTIF received a return of 0.75 percent. There were two transfers to checking for  
6 \$8,500.00 on January 10, and \$8,000.00 on January 25, 2012. Interest earned in January was \$175.89 bringing  
7 year-to-date interest earned to \$1,188.72. The expenses for the month are listed in the middle totaling  
8 \$16,755.26. The General Fund Budget Report is listed at the bottom, showing year-to-date transactions totaling  
9 \$127,342.26 with a balance of \$128,907.74 with 50 percent of the budget remaining. He informed the  
10 Governing Board, that PEHP had been overcharging all members of the Local Governments Risk Pool. There will  
11 be no PEHP health insurance premium because of the overcharge of \$10,000 over four years. No health  
12 insurance benefits premium will be charged until May from the return the Commission will be receiving. After  
13 the \$10,000 amount is reduced, the premiums will continue. Commissioner Ellertson stated Public Outreach is  
14 listed in the expenses and wanted to know what account item number it was. Mr. Price said it was 6540.

15        Mayor James Hadfield moved the financial report for January 31, 2012 be approved as presented by the  
16 Executive Director; it was seconded by Mr. Gene Shawcroft. The motion carried and voting was unanimous.  
17

18        **4. Report from the Technical Committee.**

19        Technical Committee Chairman Chris Keleher reported to the Governing Board stating the Technical  
20 Committee monthly meeting was cancelled because there was not a lot to discuss. The Technical Committee is  
21 looking forward to March because the Division of Water Quality will present a draft TMDL for the Jordan River.  
22 After discussion it will be determined if comments are warranted from the Utah Lake Commission especially  
23 how it relates to TMDL at Utah Lake. Commissioner Ellertson asked who was presenting, and Mr. Keleher said  
24 Ms. Hilary Arens.  
25

26        **5. Report from the Executive Director.**

27        Mr. Price reported on the activities of the Utah Lake Commission. In his Executive Director capacity, he  
28 spoke to American Fork and Lindon City Councils about the purpose and objectives of the Utah Lake  
29 Commission. He will schedule a 15-20 minute address March/April at other city councils. The presentation will  
30 educate the new councils about the Commission’s goals and accomplishments to support our efforts.

31        Lindon adopted a model ordinance for the shoreline protection overlay zone at their recent city council  
32 meeting. Other cities are continuing to work on the model ordinance with planning commissions, and he hopes  
33 the other municipalities will complete and adopt the process for their overlay zone.

34        Phragmites Removal Team’s (PRT) efforts to smash down the invasive weed along the shoreline of Utah Lake  
35 have continued. Because of the instability, smashing over the ice was bypassed. Manual removal work along  
36 the shoreline was done in the Saratoga Bay area. A weed control conference will be held in Logan where  
37 phragmites removal will play a significant role. Mr. Price will attend and participate in the discussion about Utah  
38 Lake, and explain how the phragmites problems are being attacked. PRT is getting attention and people are  
39 interested in how Utah Lake Commission is eradicating the problem.

40        FFSL is reviewing the process of proposed private types of docks on Utah Lake as there had not been one  
41 previously. FFSL is reaching out to the public to determine if docks are desired and/or should be permitted. A  
42 public open house was held last week in Saratoga Springs with about 50 people in attendance. FFSL has been  
43 receiving comments and most in attendance at the meeting were in support of private docks and felt it would be  
44 beneficial to the community and the lake. A meeting is scheduled this evening (February 23) at the Health and  
45 Justice Building at 7:00 p.m. The format is open house where people come, view FFSL posters, ask questions to  
46 receive information, and then make their comments. Everyone is invited to attend. FFSL is in the scoping  
47 process for public input to help determine how to move forward. Concerns of docks for Utah Lake are the  
48 physical characteristics of the docks. Other issues are the water levels going up and down, weather with  
49 freezing, ice, wind, and others. The public needs to know FFSL understands the desire of the public, but

1 obstacles may stand in the way. If dock permits are allowed in the future, requirements will necessitate the  
2 home owners to insure their private docks are safe, identified, and anchored. Other requirements may be any  
3 dock over 75 feet from the shore has to be lit up.

4 Mr. Dick Buehler said Bear Lake has a number of private docks that have caused issues. Docks have broken  
5 away from the shore and floated away, creating navigation hazards for boats. FFSL wants to be proactive and  
6 not reactive to what is occurring. Saratoga Springs area, where people have property, they don't own to the  
7 edge of the lake as a strip belongs to the HOA with no adjoining land owners. The docks will have to be taken  
8 out during the winter and stored, and FFSL wonders where the docks will be stored. There are a lot of issues to  
9 deal with and in order to make the right choice they need public input to make an informed decision. Mr. Price  
10 said the Utah Lake Commission would continue assisting in scheduling meetings and participating in helping the  
11 public understand what the issues are.

12 The Utah Valley Convention & Visitors Bureau were approached by FLW Outdoors, a highly-respected  
13 outdoors fishing organization, who is interested in holding a regional collegiate bass fishing tournament at Utah  
14 Lake. There is a series of qualifying events leading up to the tournament. The format is to hold it near a college  
15 campus in conjunction with a football game. They would like a crowd/tailgating party prior to the game where  
16 they have a chance to teach fishing and the values of fishing. The final weigh-in of the fishing tournament is also  
17 held at that time. From the videos and research information, Mr. Price determined it is a respectable  
18 organization. Crews are sent out to film the event, and it is televised after the fact. It is then broadcast on the  
19 NBC sports cable channel, formerly known as VERSUS, and has the potential of reaching out to many people in  
20 this country and the world. An educational component is included where professionals, who facilitate the  
21 tournament, go to the schools and teach about fish. It has the potential of bringing great exposure to Utah Lake.  
22 A financial requirement of \$20,000 is to help defray local costs, which include leasing the space for the BYU  
23 tailgating party. The proposal shows an economic impact of over \$600,000 when they bring their boats,  
24 television cameras, and crews.

25 Mayor Dain asked if the money was to lease land for an afternoon televised game. Mr. Price said it would  
26 be for three-days of use. Mr. Dain asked if they kept a base camp, and how big it was. Mr. Price said yes and it  
27 was about 20,000 square feet. No commitment has been made because other obstacles need to be overcome  
28 pertaining to the fishing regulations on Utah Lake. The first one is transporting fish live from the lake, which is  
29 against the law. Size limits on Utah Lake limit fishermen to take only one fish over 12 inches long. He and John  
30 Fairchild, DWR, are checking to see if tournament exemptions are possible. The fishermen catch healthy fish,  
31 bringing it to the shore, and transport it in an aerated live aquarium tank to weigh the fish.

32 Mr. Dain asked if the state has made exemptions for tournaments. Mr. Buehler said there is a possibility.  
33 Mr. Price said it was new ground for DWR. A tentative spot is set for September 2, with a game against  
34 Washington State, but he believed there was not enough time to prepare. If the Wildlife Board is willing to  
35 grant exemptions, a tournament could be held next year. Some partners helping in the funding are the Utah  
36 Sports Commission, the Utah Valley Visitor's Convention Bureau, and tentatively Provo City.

37 People's reactions included asking if there were enough bass to catch and they did not want embarrass us.  
38 Wildlife personnel and fishermen say the fishermen know what they are doing and can go to the right places to  
39 fish. Mr. Dain asked if more lead time was needed for things to fall in place to have the tournament. Mr. Price  
40 said they wanted a firm commitment several weeks ago and he had to tell them no. A conference call was held  
41 and they are still interested. The Wildlife Board meets in May and it would have to be a public process, which is  
42 a long-shot. Mayor Dain said if enough hurdles were out of the way this year, then they could come next year  
43 and the Commission would be ready. Mr. Price said yes, and after they came once to Utah Lake then every few  
44 years they could come back and hold another tournament.

45 Field trips for the 4<sup>th</sup> grade students are scheduled for April 18, 25, and May 2 with DWR. Applications from  
46 the teachers are beginning to come in.

47 In January, it was requested to know if PAG members are registered with the state. In their recent meeting,  
48 the members said they are registered. Some are listed as nonprofit 501C-3 and others are listed as recognized

1 clubs in the state. He asked if the Board needed further information such as paperwork and he would comply.  
2 He felt the groups are valid organizations and all actively contribute to the goals of PAG.

3 Mayor Curtis asked if a position on the docks situation was formulated by the Commission, and if it would be  
4 helpful in the process. Mr. Price said it was being planned, but he would like to see public comments first. The  
5 Technical Committee will help to make sure all the different issues have been identified. A recommendation will  
6 then be given to the Division and/or Commission.

7 Mr. Buehler said the Commission was engaged early and a moratorium was signed for any kind of leasing for  
8 boat docks until the process was completed and DWR has the capability to be proactive again. There are several  
9 perceptions of what a boat dock is and/or should be, and where the locations should be to launch the boats on  
10 the water. One gentleman wanted to purchase two boat lifts to pull up his boats, there are floating docks,  
11 anchored docks, etc. DNR looks to the Technical Committee and the Commission to give advice. Mr. Price said  
12 commenting will be for 30 days. Mr. Buehler said scoping meetings are held with 30-day comment periods, and  
13 after a draft is made public, there will be another one, so plenty of opportunities are available for public input.  
14 Mayor Dain complimented Mr. Price on his efforts and said he represented the Commission well.  
15

16 **6. Presentation from the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program on their program and plans for the**  
17 **future.**

18 Mr. Reed Harris, Species Recovery Program Director, gave a presentation on the history, goals, and plans of  
19 the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP). The press recently printed stories the endangered  
20 June sucker and Provo River plans. A newspaper insert was given to those in attendance explaining the Provo  
21 River Delta Restoration Plan, its purposes, and goals. JSRIP hopes the public understands the logic in moving  
22 forward with programs to save June suckers, dealing with federal government, and the Endangered Species Act.

23 JSRIP partners include U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Utah Department of Natural Resources, Utah  
24 Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Bureau of  
25 Reclamation, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Provo River Water Users Association, Provo Reservoir  
26 Water Users Company, and Outdoor and Environmental Interests. The partners are members of the water  
27 development community, environmental groups, agencies that build dams, and/or use water. Ten years ago the  
28 partners came together to form a recovery program, and fulfill two goals. One of the goals is to save the June  
29 sucker. The other goal was to ensure the suckers continue to get their water through the Central Utah Project  
30 (CUP), as there needs to be continued water development in Utah. The goals require JSRIP to continue to make  
31 progress on June sucker recovery in order to continue to have water development. He showed the contributing  
32 partners' support monies, the largest being the Department of the Interior, and the JSRIP operating budget.  
33 They oversee the development of CUP. Almost 60 percent of the money spent on the June sucker recovery  
34 program is for water that is leased, purchased, or comes through operations. The largest part of the water  
35 budget is to provide supplemental water for June suckers late in the season when there is normally no water  
36 available. Commissioner Ellertson asked for the time-span shown for the budget period. Mr. Harris said the  
37 budget was set up ten years ago when they were working directly with agencies. The amount of \$60,454,038.00  
38 represented the expenditures of the last 15-20 years to the present. The water not only helps June sucker, it  
39 also fulfills goals to keep water in the stream, to help with recreational purposes, and to maintain water in the  
40 Provo River at times when there would be no other water.

41 Besides trying to hold the fish and raise them, JSRIP is trying to find a way to get June sucker back into the  
42 lake, which is another big cost to the project. In 1991, the June sucker was going extinct and in 1998, the  
43 estimate was between 300-500 adult fish. Since then numbers have increased based on incidental catches by  
44 Mr. Bill Loy, commercial fisherman, with 1800 in 2010 and 2335 in 2011. Commissioner Ellertson asked if the  
45 suckers were returned and Mr. Harris said yes. Through their seining process, they catch all kinds of fish  
46 including carp, walleye, white bass, June suckers, and others, and Mr. Loy tallies the other fish. The desirable  
47 incidental fish are returned to the lake.

48 Under the Endangered Species Act, one of the main goals is to delist the species. The first step is to down-  
49 list the suckers from endangered to threatened, and then eventually take them off the list. After a period, they

1 are no longer covered under the endangered species act, which is the goal to get June sucker off of the list. To  
2 down list, the suckers have to be self-sustaining. The suckers are not extinct as they are spawning in virtually all  
3 Utah Lake tributaries. A second spawning run is at Hobbles Creek. Larval and year-old young fish have been  
4 caught in Hobbles Creek. JSRIP is demonstrating actual recruitment back into the lake. When a recovery plan is  
5 in place, the goals are to restore the fish and get a large number into the lake. In Utah Lake, the state fish  
6 hatcheries stocked some 70,000 June sucker in 2011 and likely up to 100,000 in 2012. JSRIP wants to assure if  
7 something catastrophic happened to the Provo River, it would not diminish all the suckers, so fish are put in  
8 other areas such as the Red Butte Reservoir and the fisheries experimentation station in Logan.

9 Since JSRIP was started, there is a broader desire for the protection of Utah Lake. After the Utah Lake  
10 Commission was organized, the Lake became an opportunity for biological restoration and economic  
11 opportunities. Included in JSRIP's June sucker recovery plan is dealing with nonnative fish, how to develop  
12 habitat and maintain it, how to acquire water, how to make sure the fish get in to the lake, and ensuring genetic  
13 integrity. JSRIP also does management, research, and monitoring, including gaining information and education.  
14 If a clean lake is obtained, June sucker and other sport fish/species will grow.

15 In dealing with the nonnative fish, JSRIP is working on having carp removed. To date over seven million  
16 pounds of carp have been removed. Mr. Loy has been the contractor and it costs 20 cents a pound to remove  
17 carp. Ways are being sought to help subsidize the cost. When the carp are caught, the present disposition of  
18 them includes hauling them to the landfill, using them for compost, feeding mink, liquefying them and turning  
19 into fertilizer, other plans might include turning them into pet food, bio-fuel, fish meal (animal protein), and  
20 human consumption.

21 JSRIP made a trip to Seattle, Washington and evaluated the processing of carp into fish meal, comparable to  
22 anchovy meal worth about \$1500-\$1600 per ton. If a fish meal plant is built and there is a way to sell the fish, it  
23 would subsidize the removal cost by 70 percent. It would be a new source of high quality protein and helps  
24 match the harvest with the disposal. One of the problems experienced is where to put harvested carp. If a fish  
25 meal plant were built, it would open up a future for continual harvest. Mayor Wilson asked what would be done  
26 with the fish meal. Mr. Harris said fish meal was used for animal feed. It could be made into pellets, and fed  
27 back to trout and DWR spends money on fish pellets. Mr. Pearson said it would help subsidize the removal cost  
28 as dumping the carp on the ground is a huge waste of protein, when it can be utilized in a productive way.

29 The cost of catching and disposing of five million pounds a year is about \$1.15 million with an ongoing  
30 financial need. Catching carp needs to continue in order not to lose the ground already gained. Currently, JSRIP  
31 has applied for a \$400,000 grant from the Natural Resources Conservation Service, through a Conservation  
32 Innovation Grant. The money would actually be used to help pay for part of the costs. Funding is already in the  
33 program to match the grant. Through the program of capital funds, JSRIP can get enough to help pay the costs  
34 of putting in a fish meal plant. Mayor Dain asked where the fishmeal plant would be located, if the real estate  
35 were in place, or if it would be purchased. Mr. Harris said Mr. Buehler might have state land for construction.

36 Mayor Dain asked if a fish meal plant were built if fishermen at large could bring 20-50 carp in a bucket and  
37 get about 25 cents a pound. Mr. Harris said the logistics would be overwhelming for the plant and so JSRIP has  
38 avoided it. The fish need to be processed immediately after being caught. The fish meal is good and has  
39 actually been tested for viability.

40 Mr. Harris said it was also the Commission's responsibility for carp removal. After looking at the Master Plan  
41 for Utah Lake with Mr. Price, it listed objectives and goals, including supporting the June sucker recovery  
42 program and providing public member education on the program benefits. The Commission will coordinate with  
43 the DWR to facilitate balancing out and getting the recreational fishery. The public doesn't realize how  
44 economically important Utah Lake is with its full potential until changes are made. Improvements would be  
45 advantageous for fishermen and the citizens of Utah.

46 Two high priority goals for the Master Plan are to help get rid of carp, phragmites, and to keep quagga and  
47 zebra mussels out of the lake, which is important. The invasive species can cause all kinds of detrimental havoc  
48 to the lake. That is the reason JSRIP asks for support, because they cannot do it alone. JSRIP looks for and tries  
49 to find money to get the job done while other programs suffer because of the carp removal. Through DWR and

1 JSRIP, a goal is to recover the June sucker, remove the carp, and establish a compatible sports fishery, another  
2 one of the goals of the Master Plan. The list of goals is longer, but these are two of the most important.

3 JSRIP developed a habitat on a 20-acre farm created over in a two-month period at Hobble Creek. This gave  
4 the suckers a new entrance into the lake and by the next spring, over 100 June sucker were running up stream.  
5 With restoration a lot of different vegetation grew, uses are different and the public has access to it. With  
6 Hobble Creek, it is hopeful natural recruitment will occur into the lake. Hobble Creek was a pilot project to see if  
7 restoration could be done. The same restoration principles will be applied to the large 500 acres of Provo River  
8 delta system.

9 Mr. Harris explained the lake and river area the delta would involve. It is still in the planning stages by  
10 evaluating the size, the amount of acres, where it would be located, and what to do with the Provo River, what  
11 to do with the recreation area, and if land needs to be purchased. The most contentious issue of the project is  
12 what to do with the existing Provo River. Commissioner Ellertson said a question he receives is if any water will  
13 remain in the river, and the size in terms of impact upon the land. When the proposal was originally presented  
14 to the Governing Board, they were told it would involve land presently covered by a Conservation Easement, not  
15 additional private lands. He questioned the proposed area and if water would remain in the river.

16 Mr. Harris said \$40 million is spent to keep water in the river for June sucker. A part of the problem being  
17 addressed is leaving 35 cfs in the Provo River. If water were left, there would not be enough water for a delta  
18 during the prime times it is needed. The delta area chosen has 400 acres under the conservation easement. The  
19 other 100 acres (totaling the proposed 500) belong to two or three major land owners. Commissioner Ellertson  
20 asked if there was a way to size up to 500 acres in increments. Mr. Harris said he did not know. There are  
21 people who have lands that probably are willing to sell but more interaction is needed with the local people.  
22 Another thing complicating the issue is a proposed road through the area. Between the proposed road, the  
23 NEPA process, funding, and other issues, it will take two to three more years. Mr. Mark Holden from Utah  
24 Reclamation Mitigation Commission, CUP district, and the Department of Interior, are joint sponsors on the  
25 project. Mr. Holden is the project leader trying to find a way for June suckers to spawn, and eventually go out  
26 and recruit. At present, the fish spawn, go down the Provo River, and are eaten or they die for of lack of food.

27 Mayor Dain asked how far up the Provo River channel the water flows or if it has to be blocked off. Mr.  
28 Harris said without the dike, the water would move higher, and the area would be inundated. The delta is an  
29 opportunity to take the existing Provo River and make it better. Commissioner Ellertson asked for the location  
30 of the ropes course. Mr. Harris said the area is more lake area than river area as it backs up. He explained the  
31 history of the Provo River. In 2002, it was hard to keep a fishery alive which is a reason why JSRIP acquired the  
32 supplemental water was to enhance the water at certain demand times. Through working with water users,  
33 issues have been avoided.

34 JSRIP would like to create year-round fisheries and have them available. At the first of the year, meetings  
35 are held in February/March to discuss snowpack and water in reservoirs to determine the amount of water  
36 allocated to CUP/JSRIP. When the Utah Lake System is completed, there are the options of putting water at  
37 Hobble Creek, putting it in the Provo River, or running it through the reservoir operation itself at an average of  
38 16,000 acre feet of water to get back to Utah Lake. In years where there is not much water, all the shareholders  
39 take a shortage; but in years where water is plentiful, there is more flexibility. JSRIP has a water supply that is  
40 secure, but are looking for more water. A lot of municipalities are on pipe lines trying to save water. Mayor  
41 Dain asked if some of the safe water came from the Murdock Canal piping. Mr. Harris said yes, approximately  
42 8000 acre feet of safe water came from there.

43 The JSRIP has a goal to get fish back into the lake. Working through the Department of Interior, they built a  
44 hatchery that takes root stock and raises the young fish up to 8 inches. These young fish are surviving out in  
45 Utah Lake. Thousands of June suckers went into the Lake in 1994. Mr. Mills said the suckers stocked in the lake  
46 from 1994 to 2003, probably didn't survive. No one had raised June suckers and there was a learning curve to  
47 develop the correct conditions. Just having numbers of June sucker in the lake alone is not enough, as the  
48 suckers have to recruit naturally. Spawning of June suckers has been documented in the Provo River. In 2011,  
49 no recorded data was taken from Provo River or Hobble Creek because of the amount of water. For 2012, it is

1 anticipated the waters will be low enough to measure the June sucker. JSRIP isn't successful if there is not a  
2 place for the fish to go once they are let out.

3 It was asked how JSRIP determined if their goals were successful and if they were accomplished. Mr.  
4 Buehler asked if June sucker was using the tributaries. Mr. Harris said yes. They spawn in the tributaries, but  
5 the larval fish won't come out. The fish sampled in the Lake are found all around the lake with a concentration  
6 at the mouths of Provo River, Spanish Fork, and Hobble Creek. Mr. Loy's June sucker incidental catches are  
7 mostly down around the mouth of the Spanish Fork. He caught over 400 June suckers between the areas.  
8 JSRIP's success may not be by numbers, but making of a self-sustaining population, and natural recruitment.

9 Mayor Wilson said funding issues were indicated for future carp removal. Mr. Harris confirmed his  
10 understanding. Mayor Wilson asked if Mr. Harris had optimism with the carp removal. Mr. Harris said grants  
11 are always being sought after. A half million dollar grant will possibly be awarded but the grant money needs to  
12 also go to sage grouse, spotted frog, least chub, or other species that need to be kept off of the list. Carp  
13 removal is a high cost to JSRIP. He asked the Board if they felt carp removal was the Commission's  
14 responsibility, and if so, they should try and find funding to help take over. When JSRIP is successful, they will be  
15 dissolved. He stated the most important thing for JSRIP is to recover the June sucker and leave management of  
16 the Lake to the Commission, FFSL, and others who have jurisdictional responsibilities. A major issue for sucker  
17 recovery is continual funding, and DNR can't keep up the million dollars a year funding. Cost will take over \$1.15  
18 million a year for the next four to five years. Mayor Wilson asked if Mr. Harris felt it would be a challenge to  
19 keep the funding coming in. Mr. Harris confirmed his understanding and said he did not think JSRIP could go  
20 past 2012. Mayor Wilson asked if JSRIP stopped, would everything accomplished thus far be lost or would they  
21 still be ahead with the goal. Mr. Harris said that with their research it could be a loss because Utah Lake will  
22 never be cleaned up until the carp are gone or they are down to 20-25 percent. If the Commission wants the  
23 lake cleaned up, the carp has to be dealt with in some way.

24 Mayor Dain asked if the fishmeal goal became reality, would it be self-sustaining. Mr. Harris said not  
25 completely but it would be manageable. The fish meal plant can be supplemented with the use of other fishes;  
26 especially if the biomass were converted into 70 percent of useable fish, which would be worth it. Mr. Pearson  
27 said that at some point the whole strategy needed to get outside of regional government and into a private  
28 sector enterprise supported by government. Although government doesn't make fish meal, but DNR would be  
29 an agency willing to purchase fish meal. The thousands of dollars spent sustaining hatcheries with the trout  
30 program would buy fish pellets. The plant is a private sector activity and as they get involved, the opportunity  
31 for return of investment is greater. There will always be a large amount of biomass of fish in the Lake. It is an  
32 opportunity for a fish plant to continue with carp removal and can be fruitful. Mayor Dain said if a fish meal  
33 plant were at Utah Lake, if Mr. Pearson could take biomass from other bodies of water in the state and bring  
34 them to the plant for processing. Mr. Pearson said absolutely. Carp removal could be out of many lakes in order  
35 to sustain the plant.

36 Ms. Lamb asked if they were partnering with the governor's office or professionals who bring new  
37 businesses into Utah with packages of tax incentives, etc. Mr. Harris said the DNR was preparing a business plan  
38 inside the finance office, working on the plan with BYU. The only way it can be self-sustaining is to get private  
39 business interested enough to build the fishmeal plant and remove the carp. JSRIP partners are saying the plan  
40 is a big risk and gamble and are asking if it will work. He said making fishmeal is simple as the fish are ground up,  
41 dried, and ground up again. Mr. Pearson said questions were asked if it would be good fishmeal, if there were  
42 contaminants, and if the protein was adequate to support other fish and meet the administration standards.  
43 DNR spent a lot of money to answer the questions and resolve the issues, and they are confident the fishmeal  
44 will compete excellently in the market. DNR wants to get over the risk hurdles so an entrepreneur can take over  
45 the plant.

46 Mayor Wilson asked what precautions were taken to prevent the smells at the plant. Mr. Harris said it  
47 would smell like fresh fish. At the University of Washington, the people who ground up the fishmeal, were in  
48 downtown Seattle, and had been making fishmeal for a while. The fish are processed and converted into  
49 fishmeal the same day, and there is no smell, just the odor of fresh fish. He believed the plant would be prudent

1 to make sure there were no smells are detected. There were no more questions and Mayor Dain thanked Mr.  
2 Harris for his presentation.

3  
4 **7. Other Business or Public Comments.**

5 Mayor Dain asked if members of the Governing Board and/or the public had further business or input.

6 Mr. Price said Mr. Pearson gave the members a document describing an issue presently at the state  
7 legislature regarding the state engineer's office, and Mr. Pearson wanted to make everyone aware of it.

8 Mr. Andrew Jackson, Executive Director of Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) informed the  
9 Governing Board that the Clean Water Act 208 written in 1977 has had amendments, but has not been  
10 rewritten. It was originally set up and funded by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which focused on  
11 watershed management pertaining to water quality, not quantity. Because there have been many changes, it  
12 was believed environmentalists could use the old law as leverage for their causes. He stated the municipalities  
13 needed to address the water quality act written in 1977.

14 Ms. Lamb said it was a difficult issue for Utah Department of Water Quality (DWQ). Under the Clean Water  
15 Act, the EPA fully funded the water programs to get them started. But EPA no longer funds them and is not  
16 involved anymore. DWQ has evaluated and has decided the communities have to be committed to the water  
17 program as DWQ does not have any baseline funding and there are a lot of demands on the limited funds they  
18 do have. Ms. Lamb suggested the Utah County Commissioners look at the program, and speak to the Salt Lake  
19 County Commissioners for a lead. Salt Lake County has structure in place for storm water, so they have a  
20 revenue force they could dedicate to the program. They are doing a comprehensive plan to bring it into the  
21 current era. DWQ does not have a revenue source, and recommended Salt Lake and Utah Counties discuss their  
22 plans. Mr. Jackson said it might be of enough importance to put the item on the next Governing Board agenda  
23 to discuss and take action. Ms. Lamb said the communities would benefit from it and should find the revenue to  
24 do it. Mayor Dain said it would be good item for the next agenda.

25 Mr. James O'Neal private citizen of Provo said he didn't think the carp of Utah Lake could be removed, but if  
26 they were caught, then processing them into fishmeal would be good. He felt spraying phragmites with an  
27 herbicide would cause health problems in the carp and transferred into the fishmeal. He reversed his standing  
28 on the Provo Delta reconstruction, and now supports it.

29 Mr. Linford updated the Board on the Santaquin City water reclamation facility with the bonds passing after  
30 Utah County and the court recounted the votes. He said they would be breaking ground for the facility very  
31 soon. He thanked the Commission, Technical Committee and other agencies for their advice and support  
32 concerning disposing wastewater into Utah Lake. Mayor Dain asked for confirmation that the recount was over.  
33 Mr. Linford said yes and the lawsuits were thrown out or dropped.

34 Ms. Call said Saratoga Springs wanted to let the Commission know that they are committed to allowing lake  
35 property owners to have private docks. She understood there might be mitigation in allowing them. Saratoga  
36 Springs has a long stretch of shoreline property, and people are clamoring for the use of their own property.  
37 The other item concerned the website budget. As a professional, she could help with the development if  
38 needed. Mr. Price said someone has been working on it and it was completed last summer. He didn't know if  
39 additional maintenance would be required, but to date none of the money was used.

40  
41 **8. Confirm the next meeting of the Governing Board to be held on Thursday, March 22, 2012 at 7:30 AM.**

42 Mayor Dain confirmed the next meeting would be held at the Historic Utah County Courthouse Ballroom on  
43 Thursday, March 22, 2012 at 7:30 a.m.

44  
45 **9. Adjourn.**

46 It was motioned by Mayor Wilson, it was seconded by Commissioner Ellertson, and the motion carried and it  
47 unanimously passed to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 9:07 a.m.