



**Utah Lake Commission Governing Board**

Thursday, April 28, 2011, 7:30 A.M.  
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Ballroom  
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

**ATTENDEES:**

Mayor James Hadfield, American Fork City  
Chris Finlinson, Central Utah Water  
Conservancy District  
Mayor Bert Wilson, Lehi City  
Mayor Jim Dain, Lindon City  
Mayor Jerry Washburn, Orem City  
Mayor John Curtis, Provo City  
Councilman Cecil Tuley, Saratoga Springs City  
Dean Olsen, Springville City  
Mayor Randy Farnworth, Vineyard Town  
Michael Styler, Utah Dept. of Natural Resources  
Dave Wham, Utah Dept. of Environmental  
Quality  
Jerry Johnson, Woodland Hills  
Reed Price, Executive Director, Utah Lake  
Commission

**INTERESTED PARTIES / VISITORS:**

Greg Beckstrom, Technical Committee Chair  
Rick Cox, URS  
Todd Frye, Bonneville School of Sailing  
Bob Trombly, Provo City  
Michael Mills, JSRIP  
Dan Bolke, FCE  
Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs HOA  
Gary Aitken, Strawberry Water Users Association  
Jim Price, MAG  
Steve Densley, Utah Valley Chamber  
Greg Ford, Citizen

1 **ABSENT:**

2 Eagle Mountain, Genola Town, Highland City, Mapleton City, Pleasant Grove City, Santaquin City, Utah Division  
3 of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL), Utah County, and Utah State Legislature.  
4

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

6 Vice-Chairman and Orem Mayor Jerry Washburn called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m. He excused the  
7 Chairman and Commissioner, Larry Ellertson, as he was out of town. He welcomed the members of the  
8 Governing Board, state and city leaders, and public visitors.  
9

10 **2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Governing Board minutes from the meeting of February 24, 2011.**

11 Mayor Washburn asked for discussion, additions, comments, or corrections of the minutes for the  
12 meeting held February 24, 2011. It was motioned by Mayor James Hadfield to approve the minutes of  
13 February 24, 2011 and seconded by Mayor Bert Wilson. The motion carried and it was unanimously  
14 approved.  
15

1 **3. Review and approve the monthly financial report of the Commission.**

2 Mr. Reed Price, Executive Director, reported on the January monthly financial report:

3 **February:** The financial report dated February 28, 2011, shows 33 percent of the fiscal year remaining. The  
4 Zions checking account balance was \$1,551.03; the money market account balance was \$220,176.68; and the  
5 Public Treasurers Investment Fund balance was \$41,932.05. The money market account balance received a  
6 rate of return at 0.83 percent, and the PTIF received a return of 0.49 percent. There were two transfers to  
7 checking for \$7,500 and \$8,000. Interest earned was \$157.79. The expenses for the month are listed in the  
8 middle. The General Fund Budget Report is listed at the bottom, showing a balance of \$120,716.75 with 46  
9 percent of the budget remaining.

10 **March:** The financial report dated March 30, 2011, shows 25 percent of the fiscal year remaining. The Zions  
11 checking account balance was \$1,794.10; the money market account balance was \$210,324.14; and the Public  
12 Treasurers Investment Fund balance was \$29,447.96. The money market account balance received a rate of  
13 return at .80 percent, and the PTIF received a return of 0.52 percent. There were three transfers to checking  
14 for \$7,500 on March 9, \$10,000 on March 21, and \$5,000 on March 31, 2011. Interest earned in was \$163.37,  
15 bringing year-to-date interest earned to \$1,768.65. The expenses for are listed in the middle totaling  
16 \$22,256.93. The items out of the ordinary were purchases of herbicide for the phragmites removal project on  
17 March 21 in the amount of \$3,637.25. This replaced some chemical the county used in their project when  
18 they treated later last year. The public outreach and web re-design project with expenses totaling \$1,258 out  
19 of the website re-design budget and public outreach project in the amount of \$3,125. An overall General Fund  
20 balance shows \$98,459.32, showing 38 percent of the budget remaining.

21 Mayor Hadfield motioned the financial reports for February and March 2011 be approved as presented  
22 and it was seconded by Mayor Randy Farnworth. The motion carried and voting was unanimous.

23  
24 **4. Report from the Technical Committee.**

25 Technical Committee Chairman Greg Beckstrom gave the report of the Technical Committee:

26 Earlier in April, several members of the Technical Committee attended the Annual June Sucker Assessment  
27 Report hosted by the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP). The meeting provided updates  
28 on the research, studies, and ongoing activities associated with the program as they affect Utah Lake.

29 At the most recent monthly meeting the Technical Committee received an update from Ms. Laura Ault,  
30 FFSL, regarding their review process on the bridge proposal across Utah Lake, particularly the impacts with  
31 recent legislative action to involve UDOT in the process. With the legislation, it would result in a more  
32 thorough and complete review process regarding UDOT-related issues associated with the proposal. The final  
33 decision will be better when it is made. The Technical Committee also discussed the Resolution and the  
34 accompanying documents (the Governing Board would discuss in their meeting).

35 Mr. Rob Baskin, of US Geological Survey, gave an interesting presentation concerning hydro-geology, the  
36 lake chemistry, and other things that affect Utah Lake. The Technical Committee found it interesting and  
37 informative. The presentation provided background, knowledge, and perspective regarding issues and details  
38 as they affect the character of Utah Lake. It will help when these subjects have to be considered for any  
39 particular programs or activities, which have an impact on the lake.

40 Mayor Washburn expressed his appreciation for the time the Technical Committee spends on the issues.  
41 He said the Technical Committee is a great resource to the Governing Board, and is a protecting influence  
42 when they look at different aspects of the lake and screen the information for the Board.

43  
44 **5. Report from Executive Director.**

45 Executive Director, Reed Price, gave the report of the Utah Lake Commission activities:

46 Mr. Price stated the Utah Lake Commission was formulated four years ago and April is the anniversary  
47 month.

1 **a. CUP Project:** In 2010, the federal government proposed to remove funding from CUP for their ongoing  
2 projects. The Governing Board requested a letter be written to the state’s federal delegation requesting the  
3 funding be reinstated. Orrin Hatch responded to the Governing Board, thanking the Commission for the letter  
4 and saying he went to battle for CUP. The Commission’s letter was added to many others.

5 Ms. Chris Finlinson, CUP representative, felt the public support received from the Commission and others  
6 was much appreciated. The federal government re-instated most of the money for the FY12 budget. CUP had  
7 been receiving about \$42 million per year, which would have allowed CUP to move forward with the  
8 construction projects. But, the funding recommended by the administration was cut to \$31 million. Then  
9 another \$10 million was cut from the current budget, which was not expected. They had received some  
10 stimulus money in prior years and bids are coming in under projected costs, and CUP can plug through the  
11 budget cuts. CUP appreciated the support received from the Commission and all the others throughout the  
12 state, which had been helpful and satisfying support throughout the entire state.

13 Mayor Curtis asked if the total cut between the two budgets was \$20 million. Ms. Finlinson confirmed the  
14 statement. They had been recently opened bids for Provo Reach Phase II and it came in \$13 million under the  
15 estimate. Mayor Curtis complimented CUP stating Provo had a good experience with the first phase and CUP  
16 had worked hard to make it a good experience. Ms. Finlinson commented that Provo was great to work with  
17 and appreciated their support. The public relations firm holding the contract with Reach (Phase) I did an  
18 outstanding job in communicating with the residents of the city. She explained the layout of the project and  
19 said it would take about 1.5 years to complete.

20 **b. Legislative Session:**

21 *(1) Phosphorus in Dishwashing Detergent:* Some legislation was discussed to allow phosphorus to be re-  
22 introduced into dishwashing detergents. The Commission wasn’t excited about the proposal. The Master  
23 Plan stated the Commission would do what they could to keep the chemicals out of Utah Lake. Removing the  
24 phosphorus from dishwashing detergent was an easy way to reduce phosphorus in wastewater. He and the  
25 Technical Committee agreed the industry responded and efforts to improve the products were made. The  
26 detergent may not yet be as effective, but it is a necessary sacrifice to decrease the amounts of phosphorus  
27 going into Utah Lake. If these simple types of efforts were not met, it would give DEQ more reason to  
28 implement stricter regulations on those nutrients.

29 *(2) House Bill 137:* At the last Governing Board Meeting, HB137 was discussed. It was still a boxcar bill  
30 and had not been released to the public. Representative Ken Sumsion, the bill’s sponsor, wanted to include  
31 UDOT in the review process of any proposed crossing of sovereign lake bed lands. With that understanding,  
32 the Board supported the bill. The bill was released just a couple of weeks prior to the end of the session and  
33 was approved in the last few days. The Commission felt it was a beneficial bill. Transportation experts are  
34 now officially involved in the review process and the weight of the extensive review processes does not fall  
35 totally on the Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands. FFSL does not have the transportation engineers,  
36 construction engineers, design engineers or other public policy experts needed. HB137 will be beneficial with  
37 UDOT utilizing their experts in the determining the feasibility of the proposal.

38 **c. Model Ordinance:** Mr. Price has received feedback from several cities, which are going through the  
39 review process. American Fork adopted a shoreline protection ordinance and he wanted to recognize  
40 American Fork for their efforts in moving forward. He reminded the remaining members the Commission is a  
41 resource to the individual cities, can address issues that are difficult to address, and the Technical Committee  
42 can help as well as the consultant who is under contract.

43 **d. Phragmites and Land Tamer:** The Land Tamer, co-purchased with the June Sucker Recovery Program to  
44 assist with the removal of phragmites of Utah Lake, was brought for the Commission members to see. Mr.  
45 Aaron Eagar of Utah County will update the Board on the progress of the removal process.

1 **e. Fourth Grade Field Trips:** A field trip to Utah Lake State Park, sponsored by the Commission, was held on  
2 Wednesday, April 27 for fourth grade students who were rewarded for learning about Utah Lake and utilizing  
3 the curriculum created last year. It was a great field trip. One response, received from a teacher, states, “I  
4 just wanted to thank you for the AMAZING field trip! Our 4<sup>th</sup> graders had the time of their lives! As a teacher,  
5 this has to be the one of the best field trips I have been on in my 9 years of teaching. The kids were engaged  
6 and having so much fun, they didn’t even realize they were learning. This was such a great opportunity and I  
7 just wanted to say thanks to everyone involved in making this such a fantastic experience.”

8 Carin Green did the primary coordination for the Commission and did an excellent job. She worked with  
9 the State’s Division of Wildlife Resources, primarily Scott Root. Their experts and others throughout Utah  
10 County were involved. They learned of phragmites, invasive species, wetlands, birds of the lake, a nature  
11 walk, experienced a sailboat, learned to cast a fishing pole and a June sucker booth where they were able to  
12 see and hold carp and June sucker. Another field trip is scheduled for Wednesday, May 5. Over 530 students  
13 will experience the lake firsthand. This was possible because of the support of the Governing Board in  
14 creating the curriculum and providing transportation to the lake for the event.

15 **f. Utah Lake Festival:** Mr. Price reminded the Governing Board of the Utah Lake Festival on Saturday, June 4  
16 from 10-2 p.m. It will follow a similar format as in the past. He noted significant involvement from Provo,  
17 Orem, American Fork, Santaquin, and Springville in helping to provide fun activities at the lake.

18 **g. Jordan River Commission:** He announced the Jordan River Commission was formed patterned after the  
19 Utah Lake Commission. The Jordan River Commission had hired an executive director named Laura Hansen.  
20 He had been working with their new executive director helping to make the transition as easy as possible.

21 Mayor Washburn said the report was exciting, especially the field trips the Commission is involved in. He  
22 asked if all the school districts were contacted and if they were interested and supported the field trips. Mr.  
23 Price replied in the affirmative with representatives from all three districts. He is now working with the junior  
24 high curriculum directors to create a curriculum for junior high school students.

25  
26 **6. Discuss and consider the draft resolution and supporting documents stating the position of the**  
27 **Commission in the Utah Lake bridge proposal review process.**

28 Mr. Price said at the last meeting there was a 14-page document that summarized the history of the  
29 bridge review process from the Commission’s standpoint. Over the past 1.5 years, Mr. Price had attended  
30 numerous meetings including the Technical Committee, Executive Committee, MAG meetings, Public Advisory  
31 Group, and also interaction with the public. He created a document to describe the history and discussion of  
32 the issue. He was asked to condense that document at the last meeting into something highlighting the  
33 important questions needing to be asked and to come up with a position statement of the Commission. The  
34 Board was provided three documents: the draft resolution and supporting documents. After meeting with  
35 the Technical Committee and Executive Committee, a few corrections and additions were made. A summary  
36 of those corrections were provided to the Board. The resolution summarizes what the discussion has been at  
37 Governing Board. The proposed position of the board as written in the resolution was:

38 NOW, THEREFORE, upon motion and second, be it resolved by a majority vote of the Governing Board of  
39 the Utah Lake Commission as follows:

- 40 1. The Utah Lake Commission supports the review process being conducted by FFSL on the current  
41 proposal to build a bridge across Utah Lake; and
- 42 2. The Utah Lake Commission maintains a neutral position on the current proposal, and will not take a  
43 position until both identified questions and public policy issues (see attached) have been addressed  
44 and adequate and sufficient information needed to make an informed recommendation has been  
45 received and reviewed; and
- 46 3. The Utah Lake Commission is committed to being heavily involved in the review process so that future  
47 generations will benefit from the final decision; and

1 4. The Utah Lake Commission calls upon other municipal governments and planning organizations to  
2 become engaged in the review process.

3 Mr. Price said the resolution is what will be considered and be approved. The second, single-page  
4 document entitled Utah Lake Bridge Proposal Questions and Issues summarizes a list of questions the  
5 Commission feels should be adequately answered by the current project proponent and by any other  
6 proposals that might come forward in the future, even publicly-funded projects. These questions should be  
7 effectively addressed before the Commission supported the proposal. The only change recommended by the  
8 Technical Committee was to insert a phrase in the middle of the summary paragraph (italicized) at the top  
9 starting with the word these. It would state, “these questions and issues *as well as potential follow-up*  
10 *questions or points of clarification that may arise*, need to be adequately addressed in order for the  
11 Commission to support any crossing of Utah Lake. The Technical Committee felt any project proponent  
12 needed to understand answered questions may spark other questions to be answered.

13 The third, two-page document is entitled “Utah Lake Bridge Proposal Policy Questions and Issues.” This  
14 document is a summary of policy-related questions to be considered by lake and transportation stakeholders.  
15 These questions wouldn’t necessarily be asked of the project proponent but are more policy questions and  
16 appropriate for decision-making bodies. There was only one change recommended by the Technical  
17 Committee and it was the fourth bullet point under planning where it says, “What is the best alignment? Will  
18 investors be gone *if after* an extensive review process identifies ~~that~~ the proposed alignment as the most  
19 beneficial?”

20 These three documents represented Mr. Price’s summary of the 14-page document reviewed last month.

21 Mayor Washburn called for questions and discussion on the Resolution and supporting documents. Mr.  
22 Mike Styler asked why investors would be gone if the proposed alignment is the most beneficial because if it is  
23 the most beneficial alignment, they would stay. Mr. Price said the point is if the alignment is an issue for us,  
24 and it is decided to go through an alignment study, and the study takes time and ultimately determines the  
25 original alignment was the preferred location, would the investors stay or be gone due to the time involved.

26 Mayor Washburn asked if clarifying language could be added. Mr. Styler said yes. Mr. Price said he would  
27 clarify that the investors are gone because of the time it takes to do a proposed study, if it happens. Mr. Price  
28 said he would put a comma at the end of the sentence and state because of the additional time it takes.  
29 Mayor Washburn said it would only take a few words such as, “if after extensive review they are discouraged  
30 because of the length of time and process. “ Mayor Washburn said on the second page number four where it  
31 states, “The Utah Lake Commission calls upon other municipal governments,” who was it directed to. Mr.  
32 Price said he would like to hear from other cities who feel passionate about this issue knowing it would affect  
33 the region. It was a call on MAG, which is involved, but this statement makes it official we want other  
34 organizations who feel they should be involved and would want an informed, educated decision to be made.

35 Mayor Washburn asked for additional questions or discussion, stating the five pages is a more condensed  
36 draft resolution. Mayor Washburn called for consideration of approval of the document with the changes  
37 that have been identified. Mayor Jim Dain motioned to move forward with the document as revised and it  
38 seconded by Ms. Finlinson. The motion unanimously passed, with none opposing and none abstaining.  
39

#### 40 **7. Discuss and consider approving a preliminary budget for FY2012.**

41 As required by law, the Commission is required to pass a preliminary budget prior to approval of the final  
42 budget. Budget documents were provided prior to the meeting and were available for the public to review.  
43 The first page of the budget documents summarized Mr. Price’s recommendation for the General Fund, the  
44 second page is for the Utah Lake Capital Projects Fund, and the final one is what each member’s contribution  
45 will be if this budget were approved.

46 He reviewed the general fund; he suggested membership contributions totaling \$235,222, which is a 12.8  
47 decrease from last year. An interest income is expected to be \$2,500, which is the same as last year. Then

1 the use of fund balance of \$32,200, which is 222 percent increase. Because the Commission will have unspent  
2 funds totaling approximately \$32,200 this year, and that the Commission already has a maximum allowable  
3 fund balance, the unused funds need to be sued or transferred to the Capital Projects fund.

4 In the expenditures for employee wages, Mr. Price recommended an increase of what would amount to  
5 three (3) percent increase as well as a three (3) percent increase to benefits. When discussed in the Executive  
6 Committee, Mr. Price was requested to contact various cities to see what they were doing for their  
7 employees. Seven cities responded and it was mixed. Some had not made the details public yet, some were  
8 open saying they were not giving anything and some were getting between 2-3 percent COLA or merit  
9 increases. Some say they will be receiving a raise of some sort and the remainder is either saying no raise or  
10 we can't tell you yet because it has not been made public yet. Mr. Price's recommendation was to keep it in  
11 the preliminary budget and remove it, if the Board desired, during the final budget approval next month after  
12 there is a better understanding of what is happening with member agencies. The Commission understands  
13 with the participants while some receive wage increases and others are not it will be difficult for an appointed  
14 official to support wage increases when they can't support them in their own organization.

15 Mr. Price was also asked to compare employee benefits including health insurance with the Commission  
16 members. After doing so, he recommended an expense the Commission employees will take upon  
17 themselves to help offset the costs of health insurance. The employees will be absorbing approximately \$80  
18 of health insurance benefit per month.

19 There was no significant change recommended to the 2000 accounts except for the increase in gas  
20 mileage reimbursement, which is an additional \$500 for the account.

21 Mayor Washburn asked for discussion on the salaries and benefits of the employees. Mayor Hadfield said  
22 he was one of the cities Mr. Price had inquired about. It was American Fork City's plan to look into a change.  
23 The city has not had a change in wages in five years, and so Mayor Hadfield was hoping for a two percent  
24 increase for the employees. It needs to pass council and until they approve the budget, he can't tell what is  
25 going to happen. The same is here, what has been the past record of Utah Lake Commission, what has the  
26 salary package been historically, and when was it bumped last and for what percentage was it bumped. Mr.  
27 Price said the Commission employees received a COLA in 2009 of 3 percent and so it will be three years for  
28 FY12. Mayor Hadfield asked about the health insurance benefits provided by the Commission. Mr. Price said  
29 when the Commission started, the office was one person, and PEHP was the only one who offered a one-  
30 person group package. We have been contractually obligated to stay with them. Mr. Hadfield said those who  
31 had employees were covered with the state retirement that the contribution to that plan increases this year  
32 as well. A two-person package is somewhat easier to approve than a larger city, which is difficult to justify.

33 Mr. Price pointed out that health insurance premiums are larger with a small group, whereas, most  
34 members have more employees in their pool, so premiums are lower. When the Commission was created,  
35 the Board made the decision to become its own entity and not merge in with a participating member.

36 Mayor Dain said in Lindon they have not had a COLA for three years. They had not drafted the budget yet,  
37 but they would like to do 2.5 percent based on the sales tax revenue and other things, and may be able to do  
38 that. It has been three years since the last one.

39 Ms. Finlinson said that speaking for the water districts, all the budget numbers are preliminary, but they  
40 are feel most of the water districts are looking at a 2 to 2.5 percent increase. At Central Utah, it has been  
41 three years since any increase and it is probably the same for other water districts.

42 Mayor Wilson of Lehi said his city is three years out on the COLA and they are trying to budget in two  
43 percent for an increase.

44 Mr. Styler said the state has not had one for three years and this will be the fourth year without a COLA.  
45 They are going to cover the cost of the retirement increase this year, but to make up for that, they are  
46 increasing the employee's share of health insurance. It is about a wash for the employees.

1 Mayor Washburn said Orem has not had any increase for about three years and so they were looking at no  
2 COLA this year. They have some seasonal employees that they are going to bring up to what they should have  
3 been.

4 Mr. Jerry Johnson said Woodland Hills has been two years without a COLA and they wouldn't have an  
5 increase this year. The town has elected likely for a three-year wait.

6 Mr. Tuley said Saratoga Springs was three years without it. Last year they did a one-time only one (1)  
7 percent increase that does not carry over into this year and so the employees are back to the same. There  
8 has not been any discussion of what would happen this year. They are unable to provide any significant  
9 information yet. The proposed budget will be presented next week and see what they have planned.

10 Mayor Hadfield said with only two employees in the Commission and looking at the responsibility and  
11 quality of employees, he did not have a hardship. He felt that it is really Mr. Price's call to make. It is his  
12 responsibility as director to champion that cause and if in good conscience he puts it in the budget then he  
13 could support the proposal. Mayor Washburn said it was a philosophical issue. The quality of employees of  
14 the Commission is undisputed just as the quality of employees in Orem is. He felt this was a relatively small  
15 request and if it is Mr. Price's recommendation, then grant it.

16 Mr. Price continued there is a decrease in the liability insurance. We have a pretty good understanding of  
17 what it is going to cost and it went down 11 percent.

18 With the projects, there are goals and objectives in the Master Plan the Utah Lake Commission has taken  
19 the lead on and the Commission would like to continue to fund, primarily the public education and outreach  
20 efforts. He stated the same amount of money was budgeted for the Utah Lake Festival and for continuing the  
21 school curriculum. It is anticipated the seventh grade curriculum will be created this summer and make it  
22 available to the seventh grade students in the three districts. Also, the Commission is launching the  
23 UtahLake.gov website and funding is needed to maintain the site if any issues arise. He would like to retain  
24 the consultant helping with the editorial plan, as he creates some fun energetic and informative editorials  
25 about the lake. The funds have gone up 100 percent because he will be used throughout the year rather than  
26 part of the year. This is essentially maintaining funding but just having him on for longer.

27 The model ordinance, the money that was unspent, Mr. Price proposes to roll it over to next year to be  
28 able to use and keep Logan Simpson Design on contract. The amount has gone down but it is money that  
29 could have been spent this year, but was not.

30 Finally, there is \$10,000 appropriated for phragmites removal. The Commission has submitted an  
31 application for a \$30,000 grant to continue shoreline restoration/phragmites removal, which was received the  
32 past few years. If the grant is not received, the requested \$10,000 will allow the Commission to treat the area  
33 anticipated this next year on the west side of Utah Lake.

34 There is also a contribution to the capital projects fund of \$18,672 to bring the budget into balance. When  
35 discussing this with Commissioner Ellertson, prior to discussion to at Executive Committee, it was decided that  
36 it was important to suggest that Commission members pay at least what they paid last year, instead of getting  
37 used to decreasing contributions from year to year. We have had three members give notice that they no  
38 longer have the financial means to participate in the Commission including Eagle Mountain City, Genola, and  
39 Highland City. Also, with the census that came out, some populations went down and in the larger cities  
40 primarily, and some cities that don't have shoreline have annexed some land and that has increased their  
41 contribution. If we maintained our formula this year, it caused an increase for some, and a decrease for  
42 others. The Executive Committee felt probably the best way to approach this issue this year was to maintain  
43 the contribution level and to pay what was paid last year. Recognizing some municipalities have dropped out,  
44 the proposed budget will allow the Commission to maintain a good revenue stream and not be too taxing on  
45 some of the smaller members, particularly non-shoreline communities needing to be kept energized and  
46 excited. Membership contribution amounts listed on the last page reflected the amount paid last year. This  
47 concluded Mr. Price's presentation of the preliminary budget.

1 Mayor Washburn said the Commission needed to do three things: Discuss the budget and any necessary  
2 items; second, to approve or disapprove the recommended preliminary budget; and, third, set a day and time  
3 for public hearing. He asked if there were any specific items on the proposed preliminary budget they would  
4 like to discuss.

5 Mayor Hadfield said he was satisfied with the preliminary budget. He had a few questions on the  
6 membership contributions of three municipalities dropping out. He questioned whether withdrawing was  
7 something any member could choose to do at any time. Mr. Price said they did not want that to happen, but  
8 the requirement is there has to be a year's notice. As soon as a year's notice is given, then it allows the  
9 Commission to make adjustments to its upcoming budget. Genola, Highland, and Eagle Mountain provided  
10 notification last year. Mayor Hadfield said he was one of the municipalities whose 2010 census says there is a  
11 10 percent smaller population than they thought they had. He expressed he was comfortable about what has  
12 been presented by Mr. Price.

13 **a. Set date for a public hearing and final approval of the FY2012 budget.**

14 Mayor Hadfield motioned to approve the proposed contribution of membership fees, to approve the  
15 preliminary budget, and to set a date and time for the public hearing for May 26, 2011 at the next Governing  
16 Board meeting at 7:30 a.m.. Mr. Price said the business of the group will take place at 7:30 a.m. and the  
17 public hearing should be scheduled for 8:30 a.m. The motion was amended to reflect that. The motion was  
18 seconded by Mayor Randy Farnworth; and it was passed unanimously.  
19

20 **8. Report on Phragmites removal and shoreline restoration progress.**

21 Mr. Price explained there was a presentation by Mr. Aaron Eagar, the Utah County Weed Supervisor. He  
22 and his crew are the primary work horses on the phragmites project. The Governing Board participated in the  
23 purchase of the Land Tamer on display on the road by the courthouse. He wanted to report and remind the  
24 Board of the project and the success.

25 Mr. Eagar explained the project goals, pilot location, time appropriated, and future locations. The project  
26 was started in the spring 2009 by creating fuel breaks and a staging area. Later that year, there was an  
27 aquatic herbicide application by an airplane over the phragmites. In 2010, the first stage of restoration was  
28 begun with hard stem bulrush, and some alkaline bulrush being transplanted to the treatment area. In the fall  
29 of 2010, there was ground application where the airplane couldn't hit. They did this with some of the ground  
30 equipment. In fall 2010, the second stage was begun in the restoration component, which was removal of salt  
31 cedar and Russian olive. There was also a seeding project in 2010. This year, 2011, the final component of  
32 the restoration was completed and continued down the shoreline south by removing the tamarisk and the  
33 Russian olive.

34 The initial equipment was a Ranger, which was too light and would not go through the phragmites, and a  
35 Bobcat, which was too heavy. It could stay high on the shoreline and it could be used when the lake was  
36 frozen. There was an evaluation conducted to investigate how different equipment would help the removal  
37 effort. A decision was made to purchase the Land Tamer in June 2010. The Land Tamer is an amphibious 8 x  
38 8 and has a turbo diesel motor 80 horsepower and other beneficial attributes. It will go through water, land,  
39 mud, snow, and work on the ice. It has ice spikes on the tracks. A video of using the Land Tamer was shown  
40 as well as before and after pictures of the projects over the past 2.5 years.

41 Mayor Wilson asked when the Land Tamer drives over the phragmites if the main idea is to drive over it  
42 and break it off and lay the weed down. Mr. Eagar concurred. Initially it was chemically treated. The two  
43 options were to treat it and then either burn it, which is the best option. Burning is hard as there are a lot of  
44 criteria the Phragmites Removal Team would have to meet in order to burn. If it can be burned, they will do  
45 that. If they cannot burn it, once it is dead, they want to knock it all down. When knocked down, it allows  
46 easier retreatment of any regrowth. The ice and wave action breaks it up over the winter, but allows the  
47 group in the spring to see what percent was killed. Approximately ten percent regrows. The crew retreats the

1 smaller areas of regrowth and also checks for other invasive species moving in and where. The group quickly  
2 jumps on it. The Land Tamer is mostly to knock the weed down.

3 Mr. Eagar said the restoration was accomplished on the pilot area. FFSL wanted restoration along the  
4 shoreline. They planted bulrush and willows for erosion control. The Tamarisk and Russian olive removal was  
5 begun where it was cut, chipped, and removed offsite, a chemical treatment was done, and a follow-up  
6 treatment to make sure it would not return. They worked with DWR on a section where they seeded an area  
7 to see if a wetland grass species could thrive on the shoreline and curb invasion of other invasive plant  
8 species. They will monitor the area this spring to see if the revegetation efforts were successful.

9 Mayor Washburn asked what the probability was of the phragmites starting back up again. He asked if it  
10 had to be maintained over the years. Mr. Eagar said that there will be some re-growth and each year it will  
11 need to be maintained if there is significant re-growth. Mr. Tuley asked if when the grass is knocked down, if  
12 the seeds made impotent by the spray or if the seed heads just lay down. Mr. Eagar confirmed the seed  
13 heads laid down. Phragmites seeds are numerous but vitality of the seeds is not very high. He said they were  
14 in consultation with FFSL on the maintenance and continued project once it is cleared.

15 Mayor Dain asked what kind of shade trees were to be installed. Mr. Eagar said FFSL submitted a list that  
16 would work. Mr. Eagar and Mr. Price met with a BYU professor, Dr. Phil Allen, and he gave recommendations  
17 of what would be established. Mr. Price stated that they would primarily be cottonwoods and other native  
18 tree species. Mr. Farnworth asked if planting trees for restoration should wait because it would be hard to  
19 treat phragmites between the trees. Treatment would have to be by hand because a plane couldn't be used.  
20 Mr. Eagar said they wanted to re-establish along the beach and there was a good above 90 percent kill, and  
21 this new spring, nothing new is coming up. He was sure that a little may grow, but it could be hand-treated.  
22 Mr. Price said that it is after the second year of treatment the restoration begins to put trees in. He stated  
23 after they treat Saratoga Bay, they will have 80 percent kill. However, trees will not be planted until they are  
24 sure the trees won't be choked out. After the second year of treatment, tree replanting would be considered.  
25 Mr. Eagar concurred saying restoration occurred during the second and third year of treatment. Mr. Price  
26 said this particular area is done. Anything that grows up will be small and can be hand-treated.

27 Mr. Price stated if anyone walked in the pilot area, and didn't see the before pictures they would not  
28 realize the changes made. There is dead, dry phragmites sitting on the beach, which is not too inviting to  
29 come and play on the beach, but it will eventually go away, open up, and will be a more inviting place. Mr.  
30 Eagar said there is funding where they are planning treatment next year at Saratoga Bay. Firebreaks are  
31 already in place.

32 It was stated there was some discussion about someone potentially making fuel pellets out of the residual  
33 on the dead phragmites. Mr. Eagar said Mr. Dick Buehler was working with a place in Lindon that wanted to  
34 do it. They were looking at a piece of equipment to harvest the phragmites, but no one knew of any further  
35 plans or preparations.

36 Mr. Washburn complimented the PRT and said it was remarkable what was accomplished. It was  
37 outstanding. Mr. Beckstrom said with the lake inspection at the highest elevation it has been in 25 years, how  
38 is it impacting the efforts regarding the phragmites. Mr. Eagar said on his level it was not making a difference,  
39 but as the water moves up and down through the year, it opens up a different environment. They are still in  
40 the learning curve and have only had the machine for three months. Mr. Price said the bulk of the work will  
41 be done with the air treatment and so lake level does not impact the efforts. Mayor Washburn said it was  
42 exciting to be a part of this and see the progress made.

43  
44 **9. Announce the creation of a new website, UtahLake.gov, which will be devoted to promoting the Lake.**

45 Mr. Price spoke about the website, UtahLake.gov. Part of the public outreach effort was to update the  
46 website. The new website will have frequent and regular updates of fun stories, released on a weekly basis.  
47 Over a dozen are waiting in queue to be released. The Commission was able to secure the URL UtahLake.gov

1 thanks to Mr. Styler’s support. It is a difficult process to get a .gov URL, but the state’s effort allowed the  
2 Commission to obtain the URL and keep the focus on the lake with UtahLake.gov. We want this to be a portal  
3 for all things Utah Lake. Mr. Price encouraged the Board to take a look at the new site and offer some  
4 feedback, with links to Facebook and Twitter. It is hoped the new site will drive public interest in Utah Lake.  
5

6 **10. Other business/Public Comments.**

7 Mr. Todd Frye said he was from the Bonneville School of Sailing and Seamanship in Springville and  
8 operated out of the Provo Marina, and he desired to address the board. He noted interest in the lake had  
9 increased as his business has increased 52 percent. He was interested in the improvements in the lake but  
10 was heartened by the way, the Commission is able to move the work forward with noticeable improvements  
11 in the lake. In particular, he wanted to comment on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade classes coming to the Lake for field trips.  
12 Their faces were evidence of the success. He was involved with the Utah Arts Council and in the public school  
13 system. He presented ancillary ideas to small classes of about 30 kids. He said people can tell when they are  
14 losing the children’s attention, but none of that occurred during the field trips. It was a quality educational  
15 offering using our resource people. Kids being this close to the lake have a great resource and opportunity.  
16 One teacher who has been teaching for nine years said she had not seen anything like it. It was a quality  
17 program and he endorsed it and would like to see it grow. Mayor Washburn thanked him and said it has to  
18 be one of the brightest endeavors of the Commission right now.

19 Mr. Price announced Mr. Eagar would be down on the road by the Land Tamer to show the members of  
20 the Governing Board.  
21

22 **11. Confirm the next meeting of the Governing Board to be held on May 26, 2011.**

23 Mayor Washburn announced the next Governing Board Meeting would be held on Thursday, May 26,  
24 2011 at 7:30 a.m. at the Historic Utah County Courthouse in Provo, Utah, unless otherwise notified.  
25

26 **12. Adjourn.**

27 Mayor Washburn officially adjourned the meeting at 8:55 a.m.