

**Utah Lake Study Committee Meeting  
February 23, 2006  
Utah County Commission Conference Room  
100 East Center, Provo, Utah**

ATTENDEES:

Members

Mayor Lewis Billings, Provo  
Mayor Randy Farnworth, Vineyard  
Michael A. Vail, Town of Genola  
Mayor Howard H. Johnson, Lehi  
Larry Ellertson, Utah County Commissioner  
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs  
Mayor Jeff Acerson, Lindon City  
Mayor Heber Thompson, American Fork

Other Interested Parties

Bruce Chesnut, Orem City and Technical Committee Chair  
Dan Nelson, Mountainland Assoc. of Gov.  
Robyn Pearson, Utah Dept. of Natural Resources (DNR)  
Reed Harris, DNR  
Chris Keleher, DNR  
Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire and State Lands (FFSL)  
David Grierson, FFSL  
Robert West, Provo City  
Raylene Ireland, Provo City  
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City  
Kris Buelow, CUWCD  
Ty Hunter, Utah Lake State Park  
Steve Densley, Provo/Orem Chamber of Commerce  
Tim Watkins, Envision Utah  
Paul Hawker, Utah County

1. **Welcome and call to order** given by Mayor Billings.
2. **Review and approve minutes** of January 26, 2006. The minutes were approved as written.
3. **Utah Lake Study Committee Historical Overview:**
  - i) **Events that led to formation of Committee.** Numerous proposals were submitted to COG in 2004. Groups with opposing viewpoints were encountered. Mayors felt they needed a better understanding of issues and so they formed the Utah Lake Study Committee which has been going for about two years.
  - ii) **Key Objectives and Purposes.** Two documents--*Guiding Statements Outlining Committee Purpose and Mission* and *Issues and Information Sought*--were distributed and read point by point.

Bruce Chesnut reviewed the work done by the Technical Committee. Currently, the main focus of the committee is water quality (including the Total Maximum Daily Load [TMDL] study) and issues relating to Carp. He said there has been interest expressed in the last 10 days by two cities and consulting engineers who want to be involved in the meetings. The Technical Committee has been given the task of addressing the issues listed on the *Issues and Information Sought* document. The committee realized that water quality and Carp issues need to be addressed before recreational issues can be pursued. The committee is still awaiting the results of the TMDL study from the State that will regulate effluent allowed in the lake. Representatives from all jurisdictions are encouraged on the Technical Committee. The next meeting is Monday, March 20, at 8:30 a.m. at 955 North 900 West in Orem.

Several agencies have stepped forward to provide trucks to haul Carp away from the Lake in conjunction with the Carp removal pilot program. (More trucks and staff are needed. Contact Bruce Chesnut.) The pilot program consists of a 10-day effort to remove 45,000 pounds of Carp each day from the Lake. The Carp will be hauled to the transfer station to be used in compost during the test period. Dates have not yet been set and will depend on the weather. If the pilot program appears to work, the process is planned to continue on an ongoing basis. Funding for the pilot study is through the JSRP; an extended effort would require additional funds. The option of poisoning the Lake to kill the Carp was raised and discussed. Harvesting the Carp is more feasible, more cost effective and more environmentally safe. The role of Utah Lake in the water supply along the Wasatch Front is a significant issue.

- iii) **Utah Lake Bus Tour.** To get a broader understanding of issues surrounding the Lake, the committee participated in a bus drive around the Lake. Representatives from each community discussed concerns and issues for their respective communities. One major issue raised was the need to discuss development, vegetation, use and access to the Lake shore. The boundary of the Lake will be identified as law suits are settled. A lake shore trail will also help define the boundary. The DVD prepared by the JSRP has been very helpful in educating the public on issues concerning the Lake. Observations from the bus tour included the need to do something now before there is too much development around the Lake. The window of influence is fairly narrow and the opportunity may be lost if action is delayed too long.
- iv) **Bear Lake Commission Visit.** Allen Harrison, Executive Director of the Bear Lake Commission, made a presentation to the Study Committee. The main thrust was the need for someone to work daily and to focus specifically on the issues at the Lake. Clyde Naylor previously presented a historical overview of past attempts at legislation/creation of an administrative body for the Lake. This information is on file in the Utah Lake file of information maintained by Provo City. A number of Study Committee members visited the Bear Lake Commission. This Commission involves two states, several counties and numerous local governments. They will be a resource if a similar administrative format is selected for Utah Lake.

The Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is another organization that was visited by Mayor Washburn. A structure of this nature has the ability to impose tax and set and enforce regulations.

- v) **Alternative Forms and Structure.** Robyn Pearson, State Department of Natural Resources, said they have a vested interest in the Lake since they own the Lake floor. They are excited about what is occurring through the Utah Lake Committees and are anxious to help the process move along. He noted the need for funding in order to get anything accomplished and said there are federal partners, Senator Bennett and Congressman Cannon, who are supportive of moving forward on this issue. Senator Bennett's office believes federal funding could be directed toward this project. However, in order to receive Federal funds, a recipient organization with continuity, stability and manpower is needed. The State does not want to dictate or mandate the organization and wants the cities to have control and majority representation on any board. He emphasized the need for local involvement and local consensus.

Robert West distributed a handout titled "*Utah Lake Management Options.*" The document reviews various models including a "Business as Usual" (no action) option, an association, a committee, commission, authority and planning agency. Since each option meets different goals, the structure best suited for Utah Lake may be determined once the desired goals are established. An association implies a loose group getting together to address issues, a committee is centered around a particular approach, a commission is much broader, and an authority is associated with an additional level of government. Compliance with existing State and Federal laws will be required when dealing with

Utah Lake issues. Two things have happened that started “new thinking” about Utah Lake: 1) the development on the Geneva Steel property, and 2) the resolution of boundary disputes.

Mr. Pearson said he believes the time is right for legislation at Federal and State levels to organize something to meet the needs of Utah Lake today and in the future. DNR is ready to move forward in this effort. There are good partners in place with the JSRP and CUP, which could also be conduits for money flow until the organization is set up. He proposed an initial attempt to raise funds, realizing that Federal dollars will likely require a match which could come from the State, but may also require local participation.

Concern was expressed about the likelihood of city councils delegating the responsibility for review and zoning around the Lake to an outside authority. However, a commission with parameters and a general plan would likely receive city council support. A mandate from the legislature is not needed; local officials can do the work.

Caution should be exercised in “moving forward” to insure the best organization and to determine the most pertinent issues for the greatest good.

Each entity representative was asked to voice opinions regarding organizational structure. Comments included the following:

Support commission format through Interlocal Agreement.

Some legislative buy-in may be needed.

Membership based on local representation.

Include all Utah County jurisdictions, not just those fronting on the Lake .

Keep county-wide resources as broad as possible.

In commission form, elected bodies would still control development.

A commission is a starting point. As confidence grows, an authority may be considered.

Roles of the organization should be planning and direction.

The State gave unanimous support from all divisions.

Perhaps a commission would not have enough “teeth.” An authority would be better to make decisions and seek funding.

Get started by hiring a director.

An authority would take another year for legislative approval.

Local control is needed by communities, not an authority.

Working together is critical and each individual body is responsible for what happens adjacent to the Lake.

A key message from Senator Bennett’s office is that if there is no cohesive organization and no complete buy-in of the partners, there will be no Federal funding. There must be a recipient organization to receive the funding.

A commission can be organized to do anything an authority can do. The difference is the buy-in by every community.

A commission cannot levy taxes, but can assess fees.

The opportunity may be missed if action is not taken to move forward.

Mayor Billings said perhaps other areas needed an authority because there was not an involved group of elected officials like this one currently involved with Utah Lake. He proposed that, before the next meeting, dialogue with the State begin to get a draft document of the form of administration considered for Utah Lake. Clyde Naylor has prepared a draft that could be the beginning point of the dialogue. He recommended Mr. Naylor be involved in the meeting and that all others on the committee be invited to attend. He will set up a meeting with the State and notify

the rest of the committee. No commitments will be made and no vote will be taken. The intent is to formulate a draft for further discussion. There was no objection to this action.

4. **Other Reports: Support for Federal funding for Carp Management and Planning.** If a proposal is submitted to Senator Bennett's office by the end of March, a request for funding could be included in the Federal budget. A projection of funds needed is \$1 million to \$1.5 million per year for 7-10 years. It is important that all government entities and partnering organizations utilize any Washington, D.C. contacts to voice support for this effort.

A motion was made and passed to pursue funding for the Carp Management and Planning program. (One mayor abstained from the vote in order to get the feeling of the council on this issue.) This budget could facilitate administrative support, not just for Carp removal, but also for this group to begin the planning process for staff, etc.

Staff was requested to provide information for mayors to forward to respective councils.

5. **Public Comment.** There was no public comment.
6. **Set date place and time for next meeting.** The next meeting will be held March 23, 2006, at the Utah Lake State Park.

A boat tour and the ribbon cutting for the new Utah Lake State Park bridge were briefly discussed.

7. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned 9:05 a.m.