

Utah Lake Study Committee Meeting  
January 25, 2007  
Utah Lake State Park Visitor Center  
7:30 a.m.

ATTENDEES:

Members

Mayor Lewis K. Billings, Provo  
Mayor Jerry Washburn, Orem  
Mayor Gene Mangum, Springville  
Mayor Howard Johnson, Lehi  
Mayor Heber Thompson, American Fork  
Mayor Jeff Acerson, Lindon  
Mayor Tim Parker, Saratoga Springs  
Bob Fisher, Woodland Hills  
Representative from Genola  
Steve Hanson, Payson Councilmember  
Commissioner Larry Ellertson, Utah County  
Commissioner Gary Anderson, Utah County  
Clyde Naylor, Utah Couth

Other Interested Parties

Stephen Schwendiman, Attorney Generals' Office  
Dan Nelson, MAG  
Robert West, Provo  
Greg Beckstrom, Provo  
Bruce Chesnut, Orem and Technical Committee  
Reed Price, Orem and Technical Committee  
Barry Tripp, Fire, Forest and State Lands  
Ty Hunter, Utah Lake State Park  
Richard Kellens, Brigham Young University  
Kris Buelow, JSRIP  
Reed Harris, JSRIP, UDNR  
Chris Finlinson, CUWCD  
Sarah Sutherland, CUWCD  
Ron Kidd, Jordan Valley Water Conservation Dist.  
Steve Densley, Provo/Orem Chamber of Commerce  
Steve Kroes, Utah Foundation  
Joe Donaldson, Logan Simpson Design  
Rick Cox, Citizen  
Amy Choate-Nielson, Deseret News

1. Welcome and call to order – Mayor Billings.
2. Review and approve minutes of December 1, 2006. The minutes were approved as written.
3. General Reports:
  - a. **Review information distributed from last meeting.** The documents sent to each entity were itemized: 1) the cover letter, 2) a draft of 12-1-06 minutes, 3) the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement, 4) a proposed budget, 5) the cost sharing models, and 6) a proposed resolution for a city to use to proceed and participate in the Commission. Mr. Naylor made a motion, which was seconded and approved, that all adopted resolutions be sent to him. He asked that two additional original signature pages be signed and also sent to him at: Utah County Engineer, 2855 South State Street, Provo, UT 84606. Each entity will want to keep an original in their file as well. A letter will be sent to each entity inviting them to send the approved originals to Mr. Naylor. One entity passed a resolution subject to approval of other entities, which is reasonable since the Commission is not officially formed and won't be until all participating entities have approved authorizing documents.
  - b. **Status of Legislative Approval of Interlocal Agreement.** Mr. Schwendiman distributed a copy of the concurrent resolution which was introduced to the legislature to create the Utah Lake Commission. The Chief Sponsor is Stephen D. Clark. The Senate, the House and Governor all will sign a concurrent resolution. There seems to be support for the resolution. A meeting was held with Governor Huntsman who

quickly understood the importance and value of creating this entity. Comments have been heard regarding the need for the resolution authorizing State department heads to sign the interlocal agreement and the absence of a funding proposal for the Commission. Advice from the General Counsel Office was that any interlocal agreement that required State funding needed to be authorized by the Legislature. Funding for the Commission, if approved, has been arranged.

c. **Status of various Municipal Approvals of Interlocal Agreement.** Woodland Hills will probably not participate. The Lindon attorney had a question of increased cost to those who go forward with the Commission if all entities don't go forward. Payson hopes to join through SUMWA with other entities that have no shore line. Once the Commission is created, the board can consider other membership options. Lehi will send the resolution to Mr. Naylor if it has been approved. Springville, American Fork, Orem and Genola have already adopted the resolution. Utah County, Provo and Saratoga Springs anticipate adoption of the resolution. The Provo/ Orem Chamber will provide a letter of endorsement. MAG is willing to review and incorporate the Utah Lake Master Plan and Land Use Plan into the long range plan. The CUWP board of trustees reviewed the agreement and agreed to participate. There was a concern expressed by the County that all communities attend and participate.

d. **Status of other needed approvals.** None other than those discussed.

4. **Technical Committee Report.** A TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) update was given by Reed Price. Dave Wham, State DEQ, wants to meet again with the Technical Committee. The TMDL study will determine the proper amount of loading of certain chemicals, particularly total dissolved solids and total phosphorus, that should be put into the Lake. The report was finished by the consultant and is now under the review of the State. Initially, the report couldn't pinpoint the source of the phosphorous and total dissolved solids and so didn't put loading limits on municipal treatment plants. The Technical Committee will brief the Study Committee as soon as they know more.

## 5. **Management and Project Planning updates**

a. **Carp Management Study.** Dr. Richard Kellens, BYU, has been exploring potential markets for carp that will be removed from the Lake to improve the ecology, help restore the Lake and make it a better resource. He considers the carp a resource and not a problem. 15,000 to 18,000 tons of carp need to be removed in a 6-7 year period, which is 2,500 to 3,000 tons per year or 20 to 25 tons a day for 120 fishing days per year. That is not considered a very large fishery. Uses need to be found for the protein, fat and minerals composing the carp. The number of carp that needs to be removed from the Lake would yield 2,200 to 2,750 tons of protein, 4,000 to 5,000 tons of fish meal, and 750 to 950 tons of fish oil. A simple solution would be for everyone to eat about 2 pounds of carp a year, but that is not practical.

Potential markets include human consumption, aquiculture food, pet food, fish bait, and fertilizer. PCBs were discovered when carp were tested for human consumption at levels that slightly exceed the EPA requirements but are acceptable for the FDA requirement. The difference between the two is about "ten fold." Carp could be minced, deboned for fish sticks or cakes, consumed as a whole fish, a soup base or as canned carp. Safety of the food source is always the greatest concern and research on the PCBs was not included in the RFP to which Dr. Kellens responded, but he is still looking into that aspect. There is a simple method to liquefy carp and produce a product that can be stored without refrigeration.

Aquiculture feed would use the carp as a food resource for recreational fish in the State, i.e., trout. 4,000 to 5,000 tons of fish meal could produce 5.3 million one-pound trout; this would be a good use of that product. An initial attempt to produce fish food was successful. If the PCBs can be managed, this could be an ideal fit and could be applied for other animal feed, such as cats and dogs. PCBs came from electrical transformer boxes, which were banned in 70s, therefore, additional PCBs are not introduced into the Lake. However, they do persist and do not break down.

Carp oil is a good source of omega-3 fatty acids, but PCBs are associated with the fat and need to be isolated and removed. Concentrating the PCBs in the fat could make the protein safer for use. Then the PCBs could perhaps be broken away from the fat.

Another potential use would be for bio-diesel fuel. About 187,500 to 237,000 gallons of bio diesel fuel could be produced from the carp oil, and, while this seems like a lot, it is not significant when compared to fuel that is actually used. Viewed as a resource, putting carp in the land fill is wasting a valuable resource. Most of the problem with human consumption is the negative public perception. Because PCBs are not water soluble, carp could be used as compost with little risk of the plants picking up the contaminant. The PCB level in Utah Lake is lower than in the Midwest and other industrial areas. No other contaminants showed up in the testing of the carp. Other lake fish are being tested to determine how widespread the problem is and perhaps the possibility of some areas of the lake having more PCB problems than other areas. Additional studies are being conducted on carp and other fish.

The June Sucker Recovery Program (JSRP) ran a pilot for carp catch efficiencies this summer. A winter catch is now under way. A document summarizing both pilot catches was distributed. (On file in the Provo City Recorder's office.) Essentially, the winter catch was more successful than the summer catch. However, the cold weather and ice on the Lake have made it difficult to fish on a consistent basis. The ice is thick enough now to be able to ice fish. Winter catch rates are higher because the fish "pool up," are more lethargic and can't out swim the nets. Also, a larger area can be fished and trucks can be driven out on the ice to load the fish. The fish are sorted to remove the sport fish and return them to the lake. Fish were taken to the landfill last year to be used as compost. The compost was popular and was not smelly as a product or at the compost site. A video or slide show of the catch process was requested.

A study determined the reduction in carp population needed and the sustainable level, which has quite a broad range. If a good market could be found for carp products, the desired level could be easily sustained. Other alternatives for carp reduction will be considered in the Management Plan

**6. Other business.** Before an executive director can be hired, all participating entities must approve the interlocal cooperation agreement and the Legislature must approve the creation of the commission. Assuming that occurs, a job description needs to be drafted for the search to begin. Technically, funding will not be available until July 1; however, there may be some partners that could provide funding earlier than that and the recruiting could begin in the spring. We don't want to wait until July 1 to begin that process. The process, job description, selection committee, etc. could be discussed at the next meeting. Allan Harrison, Bear Lake Commission Executive Director, has offered to help in defining the job description and scope of work.

**7. Public comment and questions.** When the resolution will come up in the Legislature is still unknown. However, the resolution has a fairly low number and could come up relatively soon.

**8. Next Meeting:** 7:30 a.m., February 22, 2007, Utah Lake State Park, Provo,

**9. Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 8:55 a.m.