

**Utah Lake Study Committee Meeting**  
**August 3, 2006**  
**Utah Lake State Park Visitor's Center Conference Room**  
**4400 West Center, Provo, Utah**

ATTENDEES:

Members

Mayor Lewis Billings, Provo  
Mayor Jerry Washburn, Orem  
Mayor Gene Mangum, Springville  
Mayor Howard Johnson, Lehi  
Mayor Heber Thompson, American Fork  
Mayor Burtis Bills, Payson  
Mayor Jeff Acerson, Lindon  
Mayor Randy Farnworth, Vineyard  
Clyde Naylor, Utah County

Other Interested Parties

Robert West, Provo  
Greg Beckstrom, Provo  
Bruce Chesnut, Orem  
Kris Buelow, CUWCD (JSRIP)  
Chris Keleher, Dept. Of Natural Resources (JSRIP)  
Ty Hunter, Utah Lake State Park  
Dan Nelson, MAG  
Stephen Schwendiman, Attorney General's Office  
Robyn Pearson, DNR  
Bob Fisher, Woodland Hills  
David Grierson, Forestry, Fire & State Lands  
Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire & State Lands  
Reed Harris, DNR, (JSRIP)  
Mike Styler, Utah DNR  
Steve Kroes, Utah Foundation  
Chris Finlinson, CUWCD  
Steve Densley, Chamber of Commerce

1. **Welcome and call to order** by Mayor Billings.
2. **Review and approve minutes of June 5, 2006** Boat Harbor Tour. Motion to approve the minutes as written was seconded and passed unanimously. **Minutes of the June 22, 2006 Meeting.** Motion to approve the minutes as written was seconded and passed unanimously.
3. **Reports:**

---

**Status of Carp Management Project:** Kris Buelow reported that they did not get in as many fishing days as they had hoped but did take about 84,000 pounds of carp out of the Lake. About seven percent of the catch was other fish, mostly cat fish, the game fish were returned to the lake. Taking the fish out during the summer is harder than in the colder months when the fish tend to swarm together. Also during the summer they pay about 15 cents a pound where in the winter they can pay only 10 cents a pound which is a considerable savings. Kris thought that it was definitely better to pay by the pound and not by the day because the fishermen have more incentive to make that one last load.

The question was asked about what they did with the fish and Kris indicated that they were incorporated into the compost at Elberta. He also said that BYU was still doing research on different ways to market the carp and other ways they can be used. He said they had received a number of calls regarding their use. One call was from a group in Idaho who are very interested in using them in their compost as there is a high demand for organic compost.

---

**Status of Request for Federal Funding:** It was reported that Senator Bennett's office is assisting with finding some federal funding for the project. To date there has been no commitment of any kind.

4. **Review and Discussion on Proposed Interlocal Cooperation Agreement:** Clyde Naylor lead the discussion and thanked the group that had worked so hard on the most recent draft of the Agreement.

It was felt that many of the definitions throughout the Agreement were very important and still needed lots of work and discussion. Some of the definitions still needing refinement are "Board," "Governing Board," and "Master Plan." "Parties to this Agreement" is another term that will need lots of refining as it is decided what will constitute a board member and an ex officio member of the board. One of the key differences here will be that the board members will pay a sustaining membership and have a financial commitment and the ex officio member will not.

Many of the other areas of the Agreement were pretty standard while some sections such as Article 8 were pretty specific to our Commission and their development was very important and would need to stay with the Board. Other items such as the bylaws will need to be reviewed after the Board is established. The items relating to funding, budget, etc. in Article 13 are all still under discussion.

It was stressed again how important it is to have a plan for the use of Utah Lake and that there should be a body to coordinate and govern the use and planning around the Lake .

The question was asked how this group would be involved in the case of a city such as American Fork, as an example, who wants to put a resort along the lake. It was explained that the city would first need to comply with their own master plan and then if it fell within the jurisdiction of the Commission they would also need to comply with the Commission master plan. Clyde indicated that this would bring some much needed uniformity to development along the lake.

Several suggestions were made about additional possible Board members. It was suggested that there be a legislator on the board, also someone representing the rights of the water owners around the lake, someone from the DEQ, as well as a representative from MAG..

There was discussion about how some of the larger cities in Utah County who do not

have lake frontage could be involved in the Commission. It was stated that it would just depend upon their interest and commitment and their willingness to be a paying member. If they were not willing to be financially involved then they could be ex officio members and be involved but could not vote. If they do not sign up they cannot become a member. Most of the cities in Utah County will ultimately receive secondary benefit from the clean up and development of Utah Lake through tourism and other recreational benefits. The statement was made that it was not necessarily a bad thing to be an ex officio member. The MAG representative felt like anyone who is a part of their organization should be able to be a part of this Commission. Robert West reminded everyone that it was important to remember that this document was very good but that there were still many issues to still be resolved, membership, funding, etc. There needs to be some input from the board. Mayor Billings and Mayor Washburn both stated that it was very important that those cities that come on as Board members be regular attenders and fully committed to the Commission.

A long discussion was held regarding the suggestion that a legislator be added to the Board. It initially was thought that this would be a very good move. So much of what happens involves the legislature and that is where some possible funding could come from that it was felt like this could be very beneficial. The concern was expressed that this appointment be someone who is interested and supportive of the needs and concerns regarding the Lake. It was felt that the legislature would appoint a Utah County representative that the Board could work with. As the discussion progressed other problems surfaced such as could they be a Board member if they were not paying in as the other Board members and would it be good to have someone new each year in this capacity. Even with many questions still needing resolution the following proposal was made.

**A proposal** was made to adjust the language defining the make up of the Board to include a Legislator jointly appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House to fill a position on the Board. It would be a legislator from Utah County that would be agreeable to the Board and would need to be confirmed by the Board. The voting passed.

Another long discussion was also held regarding having a representative of the water owners around Utah Lake be a member of the Board. Again here after some discussion about who this should be, the same problems surfaced as with the discussion regarding the legislator, as they talked about it revolving between Utah County and Salt Lake and other water owners with the lack of continuity and commitment. It was felt that as the CUP was by far the largest water owner on the lake and also being an organization that is totally dedicated to the betterment of the Lake, that it would be good to have them as a permanent member. Again here Mayor Washburn brought up the importance of keeping the Board consistent and having the same person be appointed on a returning basis. The idea of possible ex officio membership was also suggested here for smaller water owners so they could still be involved. After this discussion the following proposal was made.

**A proposal** was made to have the CUP be a Board member and have any other water user

groups or owners apply to be ex officio members. The voting passed.

After some discussion regarding the DEQ being a Board member with lot of the same questions being asked as to money, commitment and continuity of representation, the following proposal was made.

**A proposal** was made to discuss with the DEQ at what level they wanted to be involved. The voting passed.

The question was asked if the Commission could be run like a Special Improvement District. It was felt that this would take away from the voluntary nature of the Commission. A Special Improvement District could be used for special projects and money assessed for that particular project but that the running of the Commission should be set up as an agency and the money paid in by the Board member cities would be used to run the program. It was felt that this would be a relatively small sum of money for each city.

**A proposal** was made to modify the membership to include any city in Utah County. The voting passed.

After much discussion Clyde Naylor and his technical group were asked to please come up with a boundary definition that would be a little clearer. The group discussed how difficult this is because of the varying levels of the lake and other definitions that move and shift with the water level. They were asked to please come up with boundary recommendations that use the 4495 level as a standard and then to do a one-quarter mile plan and a one-half mile plan for the proposed area of jurisdiction for the Commission.

5. **Public Comment:** There was no public comment.
6. **Set date, place, and time for next meeting:** The next meeting was set for August 24, 2006 at 7:30 am at the Utah Lake State Park Visitor's Center Conference Room, 4400 West Center, Provo, Utah.
7. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:40 am.