



UTAH LAKE COMMISSION GOVERNING BOARD

June 24, 2010, Thursday – 7:30 a.m.
Historic Utah County Courthouse Ballroom – 3rd floor
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Walter L. Baker, Utah Dept. of Environmental
Quality
Don Blohm, Highland City
Randy Kaufman, Utah Division of Forestry, Fire,
and State Lands
Councilman Mike Cobia, Mapleton City
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Commissioner Larry Ellertson, Utah County
Chris Finlinson, Central Utah Water
Conservancy District
Mayor James Hadfield, American Fork City
Mayor Heather Jackson, Eagle Mountain City
Councilman James Linford, Santaquin City
Representative Mike Morley, Utah State
Legislature

ATTENDEES:

Councilman Dean F. Olsen, Springville City
Michael Styler, Utah Dept. of Natural Resources
Mayor Jerry Washburn, Orem City
Mayor Bert Wilson, Lehi City

INTERESTED PARTIES / VISITORS

Reed Harris, JSRIP
Jackie Watson, JSRIP Biologist
Bob Trombly, Provo City
Dee Chamberlain, SSHA
Dell Smith, Congressman Jason Chaffetz
Wade Garrett, Congressman Jason Chaffetz
Gary Aitken, Strawberry Water Users
Gene Shawcroft, CUWCD
James O'Neal, Provo citizen

ABSENT:

Genola Town, Lindon City, Vineyard Town, Pleasant Grove City, Saratoga Springs City, Woodland Hills
Town.

1. Welcome and call to order.

Vice Chair Mayor Jerry Washburn noted there was a quorum, and called the meeting to order at
7:32 a.m. He noted Commissioner Larry Ellertson would be arriving later.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Commission minutes from May 27, 2010.

Mayor Washburn asked for discussion, comments, or corrections for the meeting minutes of May
27, 2010. There was none. Mayor James Hadfield motioned to approve and adopt the minutes as
presented, seconded by Gene Shawcroft, and motion carried.

3. Review and approve the monthly financial report of the Commission for May 2010.

Mr. Price reviewed the financial report ending May 31, 2010. The Zions Checking Account balance was \$1,133.10. The Zion's Money Market Account balance is \$182,655.67 with an annual rate of return of 0.85 percent. The Utah Public Treasurer's Investment Fund balance was \$30,129.62 showing an annual rate of return at 0.58 percent. There were two transfers to checking, one for \$7,000 on May 3 and one for \$8,000 on May 17. Interest earned in May was \$149.96 with the earned year-to-date interest of \$2,184.65. The expenses for May totaled \$14,979.65. A purchase of a new laptop was made for the meeting presentations, etc. Funds were available and Chairman Ellertson approved the purchase. The general fund budget showed remaining balances. A balance of \$45,484.45 (or 21 percent of the budget) remains. Only 8.3 percent of the fiscal year remains with significant expected expenses from the Utah Lake Festival and the model ordinance consultants to be paid in June.

Mayor Hadfield motioned to approve the financial report as presented, seconded by Mr. Shawcroft, and motion carried.

4. Report from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Greg Beckstrom reported on the Technical Committee activities. He stated members of the committee had met together with the Land Use Subcommittee, local community planners, and Logan Simpson Design Team working on a model ordinance. The ordinance will address issues such as open spaces, buffering, and shoreline protection around Utah Lake. Progress is being made in this endeavor.

The Committee met on Monday focusing on evaluating the potential of a generic bridge crossing of Utah Lake and the impacts it would have on promoting or hindering the fulfillment of the goals and objectives of the Utah Lake Master Plan. Preliminary efforts were completed on the evaluation. Mr. Price, Mr. Chris Keleher, and Mr. Beckstrom will prepare a written summary report to be reviewed and voted on by the Technical Committee. The report will not require any Governing Board action. But, it will be utilized as a resource document for evaluating specific future crossing proposals across Utah Lake. The goal for completion of the report is by August/September.

After the public hearing in July for the "no-action" proposal across Utah Lake, the Technical Committee will report their feedback to the Governing Board.

5. Report from the Executive Director.

Mr. Reed Price updated the board with details on the projects the Utah Lake Commission has been involved in over the past month.

Utah Lake Festival: The Utah Lake Festival was successful. He acknowledged the Governing Board members and their families who attended the boat tour. He publicly thanked Jim Cross of Cross Marine Projects who provided the boats for both the private and public tours during the Festival. The event attendance has increased to an estimated 4,000, which up from 2500 in 2009. The park was at capacity within the first two hours. The first summer vacation and good weather weekend, a free family event, increased the numbers. The public had an education in the projects, state agencies, and stakeholders who participated and experienced Utah Lake. He thanked those who provided food and kids booths including American Fork, Santaquin, Springville, Orem, and Provo.

Model Ordinance: The Model Ordinance group met at the beginning of June as a land-use subcommittee to offer information to the consultants who are preparing a draft for the model ordinance as set up in the Master Plan to coordinate efforts and so the communities around the lake will have similar guidelines. The consultant received information regarding trails, flood-based development restrictions, and other issues. The draft of the ordinance will be reviewed by the subcommittee on August 2. A report should be presented to the Governing Board on the ordinance progress. The consultant is easy to work with and the cities have responded with all the requested information.

Public Outreach: The outreach efforts for Utah Lake will begin with funds approved from the FY2011 budget. These projects include creating curriculum for fourth grade students in the three school

districts, which border Utah Lake. A public outreach editorial plan may be utilized creating information via announcements to be communicated through internet, social media, websites, pamphlets, etc.

Sovereign Land Lease Process: Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL) are the lead entity in the sovereign land lease process. FFSL has asked the Commission to help in receiving public comments in a public hearing.

Phragmites: The removal efforts are moving forward on the west side of Utah Lake. There is no necessary treatment during the summertime. Phragmites is better treated in the fall season when it is fully grown. The group is waiting for possible funding from the Department of Natural Resources on the Watershed Restoration Initiative Grant Program to continue the project. If funds remaining from last year's budget cannot be found, then the removal project will look to other funding sources and/or go into a holding pattern.

Land Purchase: A high priority project is carp removal. Mr. Loy continues to fish, but it is hard during the summertime because of water temperature. However, the catch will improve when the volumes of congregating carp increase in the fall after the water temperature decreases.

The June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) has been considering purchasing a piece of property on the south end of Utah Lake near Lincoln Point, near a former resort area. Mr. Dick Buehler of the Division of Wildlife Resources and Mr. Reed Harris with JSRIP contacted Mr. Price about continuing with the purchase. They asked if the Commission would support the purchase by providing a letter of support. The past Commission (2009) had been in favor of the possible purchase; however, with new Governing Board members, Mr. Price invited Mr. Harris to present the plan for land purchases. Mr. Price stated the Technical Committee recognized purchasing the property would help move the Commission forward in accomplishing several goals of the Master Plan.

Mr. Reed Harris stated that before the Division of Utah Wildlife Resources acquires land in the county, it is required to get approval from the County Commission. He wanted to explain why JSRIP would like to acquire the property, how much acreage is involved, and the reasons the land is needed.

JSRIP is proposing to purchase 19.6 acres of an area near Lincoln Point by Provo to be used for carp removal, fisherman access, constructing a building to conduct management of the lake, and/or as a future research facility. Limited development of the land will include roads, parking lots, toilets, enhancing the marina, and a facility to help process carp. Carp removal is a top issue for the June sucker program and JSRIP prefers to utilize the carp for any monetary benefit to turn back into the program.

On a long-term basis, the land purchase will also be beneficial to fishermen. Part of the purchasing funds will be provided by anglers for boating access. Other funding will come from state sources, but angler funds will be utilized as matching funds to the Federal funding. JSRIP asked the Commission to evaluate and provide a letter of support, which will be worthwhile towards approval of the land purchase. Mr. Price said, as Executive Director, he could write the letter, but felt an official letter from the Governing Board would be of greater benefit and have more impact. With the Technical Committee's recommendation, the Board might consider supporting JSRIP's land purchase.

Councilman Jim Linford inquired how many land owners were involved in the purchase. Mr. Harris replied two are holding title to 42 acres. The partners agreed to sell 19.6 acres nearest the water to JSRIP. Mr. Linford asked how other surrounding land owners' felt. Mr. Harris said the other areas are fruit orchards and Utah County. He said JSRIP does not want to build a facility that causes odors for the land owners, neighbors, or personnel working at the location. Mr. Linford asked if the neighbors on the bordering lands had concerns. Mr. Harris stated indirectly those neighbors wanted to help with development and share in the water and electricity, so they were supportive.

Mr. Price said in order to obtain land a significant public process will be followed by the Division of Wildlife Resources before any land is purchased. The JSRIP is in the initial stages of a public outreach effort of getting public support. In the future, the Utah County Commission will hold a hearing to receive public comments.

Mayor Washburn asked what JSRIP envisioned for the outcome with the land and development including accessibility, how improvements would be made for anglers, and if other facilities would be added. Mr. Harris replied primarily it would be open space with a building to allow for some processing of the carp. The building is not presently designed, because the future use of the carp has not been decided, (choices are to freeze the fish, turn into fish meal, or make into liquid fertilizer). Once the land is acquired, an RFP will go out because many people have expressed an interest in taking the fish. However, planning and developing a facility will require more work from the private sector. Mr. Harris noted a number of people who fish the area come from the marina side of Lincoln Beach and work their way around. Although it is not accessible at present, some of the best fishing on Utah Lake is located on this property and he would like to facilitate it so more people are getting out and using the area.

Mayor Bert Wilson asked if this location would be the main processing plant for the carp. Mr. Harris said it depended on how the carp were handled. Being the deepest part of the lake, this part of the lake has enough depth to continue the carp removal process. Mayor Wilson asked where the carp were going. Mr. Harris said some carp went to mink farms for food and others were taken to landfills.

Mr. Randy Kaufman asked what type of changes are anticipated at the boat dock as far as the public being able to have access to the dock, or if access would be limited. Mr. Harris said removing the carp at Utah Lake State Park with the public present during the summer can be intimidating, and they want to avoid the same situation at the new marina. Part of the land would not be used by the public because of the carp. The marina is there for the public to go in and out. JSRIP plans to work with local fishermen to see how much they can use the ramp already located there. The long-term goal is to have a facility where the public can come in later, because the commercial fishery will be present only for a six to seven year period.

Mr. Styler asked if there was a use for the small pond located in the area. Mr. Harris said the pond could be renovated and turned into a holding pond for the carp until they can be processed, which could help for a short period. A dike around the pond would need to be renovated to accommodate holding the fish to insure getting the fish in and out and not cause problems. The geology at the proposed location is different from most areas on the lake because of the existing pond, marina, and springs located nearby.

Mr. Walt Baker asked for clarification on public access development. Mr. Harris said the owners' original plan was to have the lower part as an open area for possible putting greens, etc., but did not have plans in terms of installing physical facilities. Most of the owners' developments would go above the road secondary to the beautiful view of the lake.

Mr. Styler explained the background and important reasons for purchasing the land. He said Wildlife Resources is hesitant to purchase property and the legislature does not approve land purchases because legislators say the state owns enough public property. The state has significant procedures before they will even consider land purchases. Receiving permission from County Commissioners and local legislators requires a compelling motive is needed for new purchases and a vote of approval.

Mr. Baker asked to whom the letter of support should be addressed. Mr. Styler said the Governor would sign a letter giving permission. Mr. Baker suggested the letter of recommendation be addressed to the county commissioners and the governor. Mr. Linford agreed with Mr. Styler that there are a lot of state-owned lands, but believed the purposes for this purchase would be a good idea. He said if the Commission was serious about getting the carp out the lake, a facility around the lake should be in place, and this location was a prime spot.

Commissioner Ellertson wondered how much land the owners wanted the state to buy. Mr. Harris said initially they were going to sell four acres, but the acreage expanded to 19.6 when they recognized it could be a place for their people to access the lake. He believed the owners accepted the land purchase as a way to recoup some of the money they originally spent on the large parcel of land. Mr. Harris said JSRIP would meet with the Commissioners. He knows one of the requirements is to hold a public meeting for the land purchase. The fishermen and other groups are supportive of buying this

particular piece of property. When JSRIP looked at possibly acquiring the land and the funding from Habitat Council, their number one issue was access to Utah Lake.

Mr. Baker motioned the Commission provide support in the form of a letter addressed to the Commissioners and the Governor for the purchase of the 19.6 acres, which is supportive of the Utah Lake goals, and noted it is a very worthy cause; seconded by Mayor B. Wilson; and the motion carried.

6. Presentation from Jackie Watson, June Sucker Biologist, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.

Mr. Price attended a June Sucker Recovery Program Annual Assessment Meeting where Jackie Watson, a June Sucker biologist with the Division of Wildlife Resources, gave a presentation concerning the entire fishery of Utah Lake, how JSRIP details the progress of the June sucker program, and tracks the entire fishery of Utah Lake. He invited her to give the informative presentation before the Board.

Ms. Watson included the background of the fisheries of Utah Lake and the progress of re-establishing the June sucker. Historically, Utah Lake had 13 native species. Of the original 13 native fish (June sucker, Utah Sucker, Utah Lake Sculpin, Bonneville Cutthroat Trout, Least Chub, Bonneville Redside Shiner, Mottled Sculpin, Leatherside Chub, Utah Chub, Speckled Dace, Long-nosed Dace, Mountain Whitefish, and Mountain Sucker), currently only two, June and Utah suckers, are found in any abundance in Utah Lake. The Bonneville cutthroat trout was historically the only predatory species.

The Utah Lake fish assemblage was predominantly dominated by Bonneville cutthroat trout and the sucker species. This prompted David S. Jordan in 1889 to call it “the greatest sucker pond in the Universe.” Another comment about the lake during this period was “you can walk across the lake on the back of suckers during the spawning season.” The suckers and the Bonneville cutthroat trout were a primary food source for the indigenous people in the area, and became the primary food source for Anglos who settled the area in 1847. Commercial fishing began on Utah Lake shortly after settling the area, and quickly the trout and sucker populations became depleted.

Introductions of non-native species began to supplement the depleted food source. As early as 1895, nearly 50 years after settlement of the area, commercial anglers reported 100 percent of their catch was composed non-native species. Throughout time, this combined with urbanization, industrialization of the area, and a drought in the 1930s all led to the decline of June sucker.

Species of black bullhead, common carp, channel catfish, green sunfish, bluegill, largemouth bass, black crappie, yellow perch, brown trout, walleye, white bass, and fathead minnow are dominant now. The purposes for fish introduction was for human consumption, aquarium releases, forage fish, and sport fish. Two of the earliest introductions still found in the lake today, are black bullhead and common carp. Channel catfish, green sunfish, bluegill, bass, black crappie and yellow perch were all introduced species and still abundant in the Utah Lake fishery today. Initially it was thought to stock Utah Lake with American eel for human consumption, but it did not work out.

Several attempts were made at establishing a fishery of trout and cold water species. The lake was and is too warm to support cold water species. The brown trout listed is not common in the main lake itself, but is common in the tributaries around the lake. The walleye, white bass, and fat-head minnow, which established itself in Utah Lake and were stocked for forage purposes, are quite a different fish assemblage from the original 13. The introductions of non-native species began as early as 1871 to replace depleted food storage. Shortly, nonnative fishes were introduced for recreational purposes. There have been over 24 nonnative introductions, 12 of which are established.

The June sucker is of the genus *Chasmistes Liorus*, which means “one who yawns.” Utah suckers are bottom feeding fish that suck their food off of things like rocks or gravel, like most members of the sucker family. The June sucker differs because they feed in open water. The structure of their mouth is different from the rest of the sucker family. There are four species of Genus *Chasmistes*. One is the June sucker found in our basin, there is the short-nose sucker found in the Klamath River basin, the Cui- ui in the Lahontan Basin, and Snake River sucker now extinct. Of the four species, the three that still exist are all listed as endangered. There is a great lack of biological and life history information of the

June sucker, which is true of many endangered species. Little is known about them before they became endangered making study hard when not too many exist. What is known is the June sucker is long-lived, having aged at over 40 years for mature adults. They reach reproductive maturity as early as age five, but at least by age 10. They are *potamodromous*, which are fish that migrate within fresh water only. Other spawning migrations are *anadromous*, fish that ascends rivers from the sea for spawning or *catadromous*, fish that live in fresh water and go to the sea to spawn. Potamodromous means spawning occurs completely within fresh water. They live their adult life in the open water of the lake and move into the tributaries for spawning purposes. Another thing known about the June sucker is they use all of Utah Lake tributaries for spawning purposes; any restoration at any of the tributaries around the lake benefits the June Sucker.

Chairman Ellertson asked if the late reproductive age was common among other fish. Ms. Watson said most fish average two to five years for an entire life span, so it is extremely unique and rare to have such a long-lived species. This plays a part in why there is a decline in June sucker because the population is not turning over every couple of years as it does with most fish.

Mr. Harris explained a lot of desert fishes have the long-life strategy, such as the Colorado River fishes. The problem is the species live a long time and do not reproduce every year. For the short-lived fish, they need to get a lot of reproduction every year to get the next year's class. Some species might go two to three years without spawning, so they have to live 40 years. A lot of native desert fish live a long time and it definitely gives a leg up to the nonnative species that can reproduce every one to two years.

Ms. Watson said the overall decline of June sucker is attributed to over fishing, irrigation, severe drought in the 1930s, urbanization, industry, and development around the lake. This led to listing the June sucker as endangered in 1986 with the critical spawning habitat designated on the lower 4.9 miles of the Provo River. At the time of endangered listing, it was estimated there were less than 1000 individuals and ten years later in 1997, a population gave a low end number of 388 individuals. Today, due to the stocking program, there are more than 388 out in the lake.

The JSRIP has six recovery elements. These elements and the Utah Lake Master Plan goals are similar.

The first element is nonnative and sport fish management. This is accomplished in several ways with key examples of fishing regulations, such as increasing the walleye limit and removing the limit on white bass. The other is removal of the non-native common carp.

The second recovery element is habitat development and maintenance. This is done in projects such as Hobble Creek restoration, plans for the restoration of the lower Provo River, and other restoration areas near the lake.

The third is water management and protection to benefit the June sucker. This is conducted primarily through the Central Utah Water Conservancy District and Department of Interior, which is responsible for acquisition of water rights and controlling the flow into Utah Lake. Several flow recommendations for tributaries around Utah Lake from the environmental consulting firm BIO-WEST in Logan have been made.

The fourth element is information and education. The Utah Lake Festival is the number one method of reaching the public to let them know about June sucker recovery, the benefits of Utah Lake, and the work being done. Another educational format is the Utah Lake Legacy book and curriculum, which is part of the recovery element.

The fifth element is genetic integrity and augmentation. This began as streamside spawns or artificial propagation of wild June sucker in the Provo River. The fertilized eggs were taken to a hatchery up in Logan called the Fisheries Experiment station where they are raised. In June 2010, the Fishery Experiment Station has brood stock for June sucker where the June sucker will be stocked into Utah Lake. The stocking hatchery began raising June suckers about 1994, and presently continues. Most of the June suckers stocked are eight inches in length. There are two grow-out facilities, the first is in Box

Elder County called Rosebud Pond, and the second is at the Springville Hatchery. There is one refuge population at Red Butte Reservoir, which was developed in 1992 as a June sucker refuge.

The final element is the research, monitoring, and data management. There are three major data sets including the June Sucker data set, the carp removal, and the entire fish community. Three major tools are used for June sucker monitoring. These are trammel netting, stationary PIT tag readers, and spotlighting.

The PIT tags used give the fish an individual ID, which is the same technology used to microchip dogs and cats. When suckers are recaptured in the lake, they each receive a PIT tag, get a unique ID, and some data is gathered from that fish.

Mr. Ellertson asked how the tags are placed. Ms. Watson replied they are injected into the lower fins. Prior to 2007, every June sucker out of the hatchery and stocked into the lake came with a PIT tag. Due to the recent large-scale stocking of Utah Lake, getting each fish an individual PIT tag number was too expensive, so they are batched marked and tags are given when they are recaptured.

The first method of monitoring June sucker is trammel netting. Trammel is similar to gill netting. A hanging curtain of net is placed in a water column and the fish swim into it and become entangled. The benefit of trammel netting versus gill netting is lower mortality. Instead of getting gilled, the fish are caught in a bag or pocket in the net. The trammel netting is mainly around the mouths of the major tributaries. The Division of Wildlife is specifically tasked with monitoring Spanish Fork River, Provo River, and Hobble Creek, but nets are set in other areas and tributaries. Areas out on the lake such as in Goshen Bay and the mouth of Provo Bay are areas where high activity is noted. This trammel netting goes during the summer prior to the spawning season, working heavily during spawning to capture suckers as they move into the tributaries. The nets are set about an hour at a time, fishing at a depth of 1.5 meters. When the nets are pulled in, the fish are collected, identified, and measured. If the fish is a June sucker or Utah sucker, then it is tagged. An overview of the trammel netting results show fishes in Utah Lake today are very different from those that initially there.

In all the netting data, common carp and white bass are some of the most predominant species in the lake. Using trammel netting, the June sucker and Utah sucker have higher relative abundance because they are targeted at the mouth of the rivers. With the trammel netting, some of the river species such as Bonneville cutthroat trout, mountain white fish, and the Utah chub are identified

Mr. Ellertson asked if there was a significant change in carp and the white bass. Ms. Watson said that because the data gathered is categorized in relative abundances, it is related to what is caught in the net. The data is a small snapshot of what is occurring overall in the lake and the data is evaluated. Even though it appears the relative abundance has potentially decreased over three years, it is hard to say there is a significant decrease from 43 percent in 2007 to 30 percent in 2009 in the overall population. Relative abundance is relative to what is caught in the net. Mr. Ellertson asked if the purpose of netting was to determine the populations. Ms. Watson said partly to get population, but mainly it is to get an idea of June sucker activity around the lake.

In trammel netting results, if the June suckers have tags, they are identified to determine where they came from. In the DNR trammel netting, the majority of suckers come from the FES Logan hatchery, followed closely by the refuge population from Red Butte. With this tracking information is gathered on how much weight the suckers have gained and how much they have grown since the time they were stocked. Mr. Ellertson asked if the June suckers could be monitored in the lake or after they are caught. Ms. Watson replied they are monitored in the lake.

The second tool is stationary PIT tag readers. This allows monitoring when June suckers move into the tributaries. The one used in Hobble Creek currently has a row of antennas that span the entire creek. Fish with a PIT tag, get a date and time stamp when they swim across the antennas so it documents which individual swam up and when. This is a good tool for estimating June sucker population changes, such as survival, growth, or decline in the population as well as monitoring individual June suckers, life history behaviors, habitat use at different life stages, and spawning

behaviors. Historically it was known they used all the tributaries of the lake, but now there is physical evidence documented the suckers use all the lake tributaries. This documentation shows suckers going from American Fork down to Hobble Creek, up to the Provo River, and then to Spanish Fork within a few days. They are traveling all that distance during the spawning run and all within a few days. Spawning suckers are tracked and there is no need to collect the fish physically. Before the use of antennas there was zero data during high flows, or flows over 300 cfs. Now that remote technologies are used, data is gathered during high flows when it is not possible to get in the river and collect data.

Last year antennas covered a full river spanning the Provo River just at the warehouse, one in the Spanish Fork below Huff diversion, and the flat plates in Hobble Creek. Flat plates are a little bit different from the full river antenna as it covers a smaller area. All of these were up and running prior to the spawn and ran throughout the summer. Over 346 different fish were recorded using the Provo River in 2009, 114 individuals using the Spanish Fork River, and 27 different individuals using the Hobble Creek new restoration area. A lot of different things play into the efficiency of these antennas. The number one thing is the majority of suckers that are in Utah Lake do not have a PIT tag that is readable by the antennas. The technology has switched and attempts are being made to get new tags out into the lake. A small percentage of suckers can now be detected by the antennas. Although 27 suckers in Hobble Creek may not seem exciting, it validates a small portion of the fish utilized the creek last year.

The final method of specifically monitoring June sucker is spotlighting. Anything over 300 cfs is unsafe for crews to get out into the Provo River. In 2009, the crew could only go out one night, and it was quite near the end of the spawning season, capturing only four individuals. For spotlighting, a good water year allows DNR to gather length and weight information, and growth data for individuals, which is not collected by the antennas. This provides another picture of what the fish look like during the spawning period and gives additional opportunities to get new PIT tags out that are compatible with the antennas, meaning less effort with other netting methods. There are two major methods for monitoring the entire fish community, which are annual trap netting and trawling.

The first method for monitoring is trap netting. Trap nets begin with two big squares with hoops and a 47-foot leader. In Utah Lake, two leaders are tied together to make a net complex. In the past, these are set once each summer and it takes about one week to cover the whole lake. In 2009, it was decided to set trap netting four times a summer in June, July, August, and September. These nets are intended to fish for 24 hours. In 2009, the trap netting averaged 22 hours fishing at an average depth of 1.4 meters. All suckers were identified, measured, and PIT tagged.

DNR monitors 22 sites, 16 have been monitored since 1982, and six additional sites were added in 2002. The overview results from the catch last year showed the most abundant species in the annual trap netting to be white bass, black crappie, common carp, and bluegill, which is heavily weighted on the non-native species.

Ms. Watson began work with the division in 2006. Prior to 2006, biologists said June suckers are rarely caught out on the lake. The only time the June sucker was seen was during the spawning season in the tributaries. However, through the intensive stocking of fish there has been success with the in-lake netting. In 2006, there was five caught but it has increased to 82 suckers in the lake in 2009. Biologists prior to 2006 are extremely excited about this. This success is because of the stocking program and the fish stocked are surviving and healthy when caught.

The second method of overall fish community monitoring is trawling. Trawling is a large net dragged behind the boat along the bottom of the lake where fish are collected. This is primarily supported and/or collected by the sport fish program. Two hauls are done at the 16 monitoring sites, one off-shore, and one onshore. Trawling is done in the fall and all fish are identified, weighed, and measured. This monitoring is intended for smaller bodied or juvenile fish. The key difference from the other netting results is monitoring the fathead minnow, which is a little fish that was stocked for forage. Overall, trawling has resulted in lower catches but the assemblage of the fish community is about the same where white bass and common carp are the most common species in the nets.

The final data set is carp removal monitoring. Last year, there were 65 commercial fishing days between September and February. Division of Wildlife was present for ten of those days. Of the 1.3 million pounds of carp removed, DNR observed 200,000 pounds being removed. When monitoring the carp removal on the commercial fishing days, the goal of the Division of Wildlife is also to monitor what is coming out with the carp or the by-catch. White bass made up the second most abundant species in the catch, which the commercial fisherman is also permitted to take. Overall, only a small percentage of fish netted during commercial removal is not carp. The non-targeted species are returned alive back into the lake. White bass, common carp, and black bullhead are what the commercial fishermen are permitted to take. The other fish are released. The impact on the other fish is very small and they make up only a small percentage of the catch. As June suckers are caught, they are monitored where they came from, where they were stocked, and measured for growth. Mr. Bill Loy is a good resource for catching June suckers and getting tags out.

The fishery in Utah Lake is very different from the historical fishery. Ms. Watson encouraged everyone to get a fishing license and to get out on Utah Lake to fish because of the unique sport fishery including great walleye and channel catfish. Utah Lake has a lot of highly sought after sport fish species with a lot of big fish. She noted the largest walleye collected was 28 inches and ten pounds and the largest channel catfish was 30 inches and 11 pounds, with many of these species coming close to those same measurements. Utah Lake is under utilized by the anglers. Utah Lake is closer, more accessible and is our Utah Lake. As the Commission continues to restore Utah Lake, there is the potential to bring a lot of angling dollars into the communities around Utah Lake. She stated the carp removal program is improving the ecosystem and creating a more balanced fishery and fish community. Finally, the excellent stocking program and returns of the June sucker is helping increase their survivability.

7. 8:30 AM: Conduct Public Hearing on the Utah Lake Commission final budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010.

Commissioner stated a public hearing for the 2011 fiscal year budget had been scheduled for 8:30 a.m. Mayor Hadfield motioned to go into a public hearing, seconded by Mayor B. Wilson, and motion carried.

Mr. Price reviewed the preliminary budget approved by the Governing Board in May's meeting. Following the hearing to receive public comment on the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, and pending approval, the budget was ready for finalization. The total budget of \$282,250 is funded from the Utah Lake Commission membership contributions, earned interest income, fund balances from the monies not used in 2010 projects that will be carried over to 2011. He explained there was a net decrease of 1.8 percent of the expected expenditures from last year. The account divisions are numerically listed with 1000 for employee wages and benefits; 2000 for office operations and day-to-day activities; 3000 for accounting services and financial review; 5000 for insurance and rent; and 6000 for funding projects. The funding projects are identified in the master plan as high priority projects (primarily outreach and education efforts, creation of the model ordinance, and assistance with invasive species control or phragmites removal).

Mr. James O'Neal citizen from Provo, Utah, explained his background and his verbal support of the Commission. Concerning the budget, he noted his dissatisfaction with the proposed employee wages and money for the outreach program. His main disagreement of the budget was for the proposed treatment method of phragmites. He was opposed to the herbicide treatment involving the water.

He stated there are other ways to treat the phragmites. He and a friend had been working on a natural way, rather than killing the weed with an herbicide. He did not approve of the herbicide potentially going into the aquifers and the downstream effects of the herbicide. The chemical being used is said to be completely safe, but the tests done on the chemicals are for acute, short-term exposure, but not long-term exposure. Because of the massive scale, he said the treatment method should be stopped until more detail is available and there is a scientific review. Mr. Ellertson asked if he

was referring his comments on the herbicide used for the phragmites. Mr. O’Neal replied yes, he had done research and there were other ways to treat rather than with a simplistic application of an herbicide. He said the Commission had some frivolous projects, such as Hobbles Creek that did not accomplish what was proposed, but it was still an asset to the community. He said when it comes to something with the public health involved, he was not going to sit back, smile, and say all is well.

Mr. Randy Kaufman asked Mr. O’Neal to tell him what ideas he had on treating phragmites as he was gathering up information pertaining to the phragmites. Mr. O’Neal agreed.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Jackson moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Mayor B. Wilson, and the motion carried.

Commissioner Ellertson asked for Governing Board comments on the budget.

Mr. Baker asked about the school curriculum and editorial campaign. Mr. Price explained part of the identified Master Plan goals was public outreach to teach the public concerning the value of Utah Lake. One way was to create a school curriculum to provide materials to instructors, which can be incorporated into the fourth grade Utah History study requirements. He has been working with the curriculum directors in the three districts, Provo, Alpine, and Nebo. The curriculum committee might utilize the resources and ground work already completed by the JSRIP in their video and book, “Utah Lake: Legacy.” These can be used to create other materials for teachers to utilize when instructing students about Utah Lake. He compared this outreach education program to children educating their parents on using seatbelts and the same may occur concerning the importance of Utah Lake.

The editorial campaign would entail hiring an experienced person to help gather ideas and interesting facts from the Technical Committee, Governing Board, Public Advisory Group, and others. These Utah Lake highlights would be effectively communicated to the public utilizing the internet, the website, or other social networking sites. Another avenue would be outreaching through cities by creating information for pamphlets or city newsletters. This will be a consistent, regular outreach plan so the public is constantly receiving interesting, new, and updated information about of Utah Lake.

Mr. Linford asked if the Commission was getting significant use from the present website and questioned why the website needed to be rewritten. Mr. Price noted the present website was archaic and not interactive. Mr. Linford asked how many hits were on the website and what the tracking was before money is spent to upgrade the website. Mr. Price believed the money should be spent and the hits tracked to make sure the website is effective. He said the website is not as effective as it could be but redesigning and making it more attractive would increase traffic, which could then be tracked. Mr. Linford asked for the purpose of the editorial plan for Utah Lake. Mr. Price said the editorial plan would be to update a section of the website on a regular basis with fresh, new information regarding Utah Lake. The website and editorial plan are two methods to reach out to the public and educate them. He said by formulating fascinating information and disseminating it to the public would generate more attention and create a new interest. Noting it may be a step in the dark, he felt this would prove to be beneficial and fruitful.

Commissioner Ellertson asked if the schools would have access to the website and other outreach programs. Mr. Price confirmed the statement. He said there were a number of issues relevant to the outreach effort but the Board did not understand how they all worked together. Mr. Price said he could use Google analytics for tracking the requested information. As money goes towards the editorial plan and communicating through the social media and website, it would be traceable also. The money on the editorial campaign would be for a consultant, and it will be a requirement to track the use. If there is no increase and the method is not working, then the focus will change to something else.

8. Discuss and consider approval of Resolution 2010-1 of the Utah Lake Commission adopting a final budget for the Utah Lake Commission for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2011.

Mayor Hadfield motioned to adopt the Resolution 2010, which was to accept and approve the budget of Utah Lake Commission adopting a final budget for Utah Lake Commission for fiscal year 2011 beginning July 1, 2010, and ending June 30, 2011, seconded by Mayor Jackson. Chairman Ellertson asked for further discussion.

Mr. Linford asked if \$7500 was enough to redo the website. Mr. Price said yes, according to estimates he had received. Mr. Linford said Santaquin's website is very similar to Utah Lake Commission's and it was costing more to revamp Santaquin's site. He took a straw poll of the Board asking how many had been to the Utah Lake Commission website and who was happy with it. Mr. Price said the website at present was utilitarian that got the job done. However, people have not and do not return to a website if it is not interactive, interesting, and kept current. He hoped with a proverbial fresh coat of paint and consistent update of new information people will benefit and use the website more. Mr. Linford supported the new website, stating he has been actively involved in his over the last few years and it needed to be changed.

Mayor Jackson said she totally agreed with the concept of upgrading the website. She cited in Eagle Mountain's experience the creation of a better website has driven more individuals to use their website, and there are more hits, which it is very beneficial. She did state the amount of money appropriated for the editorial plan was high in comparison to the website. She said juggling monies a little bit in the long-run might be needed.

Mr. Styler proposed a substitute motion accepting the proposed budget, but switching the amounts appropriated of \$10,000 for the editorial campaign and the \$7500 for the website design, seconded by Mayor Wilson.

Commissioner Ellertson requested fine-tuning would be forthcoming with more information as the year progresses. Mayor Hadfield said with a fiscal year budget, the director does his best in planning and putting the budget together, and barring extenuating circumstances, he may not hit it right on the head. The original motion was on the table and Mayor Hadfield called for a vote on the motion.

Chairman Ellertson called for a 2/3 vote to end the discussion. It was unanimously voted to close the discussion.

Mr. Baker said he felt the budget for the outreach program was premature, like a "ready, fire, and aim" approach not knowing what the specific needs were. He said the Technical Committee should see what the Commission's needs are concerning the outreach and return to the Governing Board with more specific proposals. He said he felt like he was throwing money at something and not knowing what it is.

Commissioner Ellertson said he had a substitute motion and a motion to adopt the overall budget as planned and switch the two items. The vote was 12 positive, three negative, and no abstaining. Those opposed were Mayor Jackson, Mayor Hadfield, and Mr. Blohm. The motion carried with the understanding Mr. Price would return to the Governing Board with more specific plans as the program unfolded.

9. Other business and public comment.

There was no further business or public comment.

10. Consider changing the date of the July 22, 2010, meeting to Thursday, July 29 at 6:30 PM to conduct a Public Hearing on the no-action proposal, as requested by Utah Division of Forestry, Fire & State Land.

Pertaining to the proposed bridge, Mr. Styler announced that other entities were now involved, and the bridge proposal may require an environmental impact statement. The Fish and Wildlife Service believe with the pilings going into the lake, it would have an effect on the June sucker and they may become involved. NEPA may also be part of it where it was not involved prior. He stated the "Rules may have changed."

Mayor Hadfield motioned to change the date and time of the next Governing Board Meeting to July 29, 2010, at 6:30 p.m. to facilitate the public hearing; Mayor Jackson seconded the motion, and motion carried.

11 Adjourn.

Mayor Hadfield motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mayor Jackson, and motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:23 a.m.