



September 27, 2007, 7:30 A.M.
Historic County Courthouse Ballroom – 3rd floor
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Members

Commissioner Larry Ellertson
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission
Bruce Chesnut, Orem & Technical Committee Chair
Nathan Riley, Vineyard
Dave Grierson, Forestry, Fire & State Land
Robert West, Provo City Attorney
Mayor Tim Parker, Saratoga Springs
Steve Clark, House of Representatives
Michael Styler, Department of Natural Resources
Chris Finlinson, Central UT Water Conservancy District
Bob Fisher, Woodland Hills
Mayor Howard Johnson, Lehi
Jim Linford, Santaquin
Mayor Gene R. Mangum, Springville
Lee G. Hansen, Pleasant Grove
Mayor Heber Thompson, American Fork
Dave Wham, Utah Dept. of Environmental Quality
Mike Morley, House of Representatives

Other Interested Parties

Steve Schwendiman, Attorney General's Office
Greg Beckstrom, Provo & Tech. Committee Vice Chair
Robyn Pearson, Department of Natural Resources
Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire & State Lands
Clyde Naylor, Utah County
Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire & State Lands
Reed Harris, June Sucker Recovery Program
Sarah Sutherland, Central UT Water Conservancy Dist.
Gene Shawcroft, Central UT Water Conservancy Dist.
Tom Twedt, Bio-West, Inc.
Rick Cox, URS
Kris Buelow, Central UT Water Conservancy Dist.
Ralph G. Swanson, Department of the Interior
Joe Donaldson, Logan-Simpson Design
Skip McWherter, Consultant
Kyle Bateman
LaVere Merritt, Private Consultant
Robert Sheftell, Salt Lake Tribune
John Holden, Heartland Processing
Steve Holden, Heartland Processing
Walt Donaldson, UDWR-Fisheries
Krissy Wilson, UDWR-Native Aquatics
Michael Mills, UDWR-Central Region
Ron Kidd, Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District

ABSENT: Genola, Highland, Lindon, and Mapleton. (Chairman Billings, Walt Baker, Mayor Dain and Mayor Washburn asked to be excused.)

1. Welcome and call to order.

Vice Chairman Commissioner Ellertson, acting on behalf of Chairman Billings, called the meeting to order at 7:35 a.m.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Commission minutes from August 16, 2007.

A motion was made to approve the minutes from the August 16, 2007 meeting. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

3. Review and approve the monthly financial report of the Commission for August, 2007.

Reed Price reviewed the financial report for the month ending August 31, 2007. He assessed the Expenses for August and the Budget Report including the account balances. One item that needs to be addressed is because the budget was approved before the Commission was even an organization there were naturally some oversights of what would be needed in each account. Therefore, there are some funds that need to be transferred. As a transfer request, Mr. Price stated that \$2,029.00 be transferred from the Restricted Account into the Liability Insurance Account. Originally there had been \$1000.00 budgeted; however, the bid from Olympus Insurance Agency, which was approved by Chairman Billings, came in at \$3,029.00. Also, there was not an account established for a cell phone for the Director. A new account (2810) for titled Cell Phone needs to be created with a Balance of \$1,100.00. Another account that needs to be created is (2500) Food and Meals. This account is needed to host the Selection Committee during the selection process and anything else that might come up. The proposed budget for that account is \$500.00. With these transfers the balance of the Restricted Account will be reduced by \$3,629.00 and the new balance will be \$29,441.55. Commissioner Ellertson commented that in meeting with Mr. Price earlier in the week he had been informed that there had been two bids received for the liability insurance and the other bid had come in at an additional \$500.00. Mr. Price clarified that according to Resolution 5 he was required to seek out liability insurance. He worked with the Risk Manager at Provo City and they approved this plan from Olympus. Commissioner Ellertson clarified that this transfer amount for liability insurance would be the annual expense and that was affirmed. Mr. Price reviewed the details of the budget in regard to the percentages left in each account and it appears the balances are on track for the budgeted year. There were no questions. A motion was made to accept the financial report including the transfers. It was seconded and the financial report was unanimously approved as presented.

4. Report from the Master Plan Consultant Selection Committee.

Mr. Price reviewed with the Board that before the selection process begins the Request for Proposal (RFP) document needs to be addressed. It has been modified since it was presented in July to the Board. At the last meeting it was recommended that a Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) be accepted from interested firms instead of an RFP which will limit the amount of detail required for the Master Plan application process. It was decided that between two to four firms would be selected from the SOQs to prepare RFPs and then those firms would proceed with oral presentations. The RFP was created to be the document that will guide the selected firms in understanding exactly what is to be addressed in the desired Master Plan document. The main change in the RFP is that the price proposal will be disclosed to the Selection Committee throughout the entire process rather than have it hidden until after the firm has been selected. After having worked through

this with Mr. Chesnut, Mr. Beckstrom and Mr. Naylor, the Committee feels it will be more advantageous for them to see the different pricing elements of the Master Plan as they review each firm's proposals. Mr. Price acknowledged that the Board had not had the opportunity to review the RFP document and therefore, proposed that they and their staff have the weekend to review it to see if it meets with their expectations. Comments should be sent to Mr. Price by Monday so that the documents can be sent to the firms on Tuesday. Commissioner Ellertson commented that there is an urgency to get the documents to the firms and if there are no comments, approval will be assumed. Mr. Price will accept comments via phone or email. The RFP deadline is October 29 and if the deadline is to be met it is necessary to limit comments by closing day on Monday or the deadline will have to be pushed back. In the new RFP document the price will be included. Commissioner Ellertson congratulated the Selection Committee on their good work and said the public and many interest groups are ready for this project to go forward.

Mr. Price then introduced those who are serving on the Selection Committee and thanked them. He reported that the SOQ process was very productive and produced much discussion about the different firms. As background, the SOQs were sent to twelve different firms and there were advertisements placed in the Deseret Morning News, Salt Lake Tribune and Daily Herald produced about six national telephone inquiries. In the end there were six firms that responded with completed SOQs and those firms included Logan, Las Vegas and Salt Lake City. There were three firms selected to proceed with the RFP process. All of these firms have excellent qualifications and lots of experience in environmental issues and planning issues. If their firm is not able to address certain issues they have teamed up with other firms who can help them address those issues. Mr. Price announced the three firms that were chosen by the Selection Committee for the Board's approval are Landmark Design from Salt Lake City, Bio-West from Logan and URS from Salt Lake City. Discussion was invited. There was no discussion.

5. Vote to approve the consulting firms recommended by the Master Plan Consultant Selection Committee.

It was moved to accept the recommendation of the three firms selected by the Master Plan Consultant Selection Committee. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

6. Report from the Technical Committee.

Bruce Chesnut reported that the Technical Committee met on Monday, September 24. They had a presentation by Mr. Kunsman, Noah's Ark Resort, regarding a proposal that he is looking at regarding the Lake. They will take it under consideration as the Master Plan is developed. Time was also spent time looking at committee assignments and they are trying to get the subcommittees organized. For reference, the Board members were provided with a list of subcommittee assignments at this point. The Technical Committee members were all encouraged to take a specific look to see what subcommittee they would like to work on. It is felt very strongly that these committees need to be organized by mid October so that they will be ready to go with the Master Plan effort.

a. Review Membership and Subcommittees

Mr. Price commented that the current list as handed today is a little different than the list that was mailed out. He has been asked how large should each committee be? His response is, "large enough". There is not a set number for each subcommittee and his request is that each organization has representation on a committee where necessary or desired. Members should attend or assign

someone in their municipality to attend the subcommittees where they want representation. These subcommittees will be the main tools that the firm will be consulting.

b. Other Business .

There was no other discussion.

7. Presentation from Kris Buelow, Program Coordinator with the June Sucker Recovery Program about carp removal efforts.

Kris Buelow passed out brochures for the Utah Lake Symposium that will be held at Utah Valley State College on Friday, October 5. He also passed out copies of his power point presentation. He thanked everyone for inviting the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) to come and present their Carp Management Program. The common carp is also known as the European carp where it is native to both Eastern Europe and Western Asia Minor. It has interesting components. It can live in a wide range of habitat. It was introduced into Utah Lake in the late 1800s and it did very well because the lake was large, shallow and had a lot of aquatic plant life. Once the common carp made their way into Utah Lake the aquatic vegetation started to disappear and now the Lake doesn't have very much. Why is JSRIP interested in removing the common carp from Utah Lake? The main reason is that the carp took away one of the life history components that the June Sucker needs. Since 2001 JSRIP has been conducting many feasibility studies to investigate control methods, population and removal possibilities. During those studies they were able to estimate that there are 7.5 million carp in the lake that are age 2 or over totaling 43 million lbs. of carp. To change the ecosystem it has been determined that 75%-90% minimum of the carp must be removed. To determine the specifics of how to accomplish this they have used a stock-recruitment relationship graph and they have also graphed what effort is required to achieve the catch quotas. For example, it would require a catch per day of 46,000 lbs. of carp to complete the project in seven years. To shorten that process to three years the catch required per day would be 500,000 lbs. The purpose of some of the pilot studies that have been conducted was to determine how many fish one seining crew can catch. Also it was a method to build institutional knowledge of how difficult it is to remove fish. In the pilot study they conducted both a spring and a winter effort. In the spring/summer effort they were able to catch about 90,000 lbs. with a single crew. In the summer the best catch was about 15,000 lbs. making the mean daily catch of 9,322 lbs. In the winter they were able to increase the catch to about 180,000 lbs. which produced a mean daily catch of about 14,000 lbs which is a mean daily catch of 14,180 lb. The hours worked in the winter were significantly higher because much of the time was spent breaking ice.

There are factors affecting beach seining effectiveness in Utah Lake. The emergent vegetation, phragmites and tamarisk, inhibit where fishing can be done. Also water depth and the wind are limiting factors. There are opportunities that can be taken advantage of that would make it easier to catch carp. When the water level is lower, fishing can double. Removing the phragmites along the shoreline would be very helpful. As they develop this program the JSRIP want to have adaptive management meaning keeping aware of anything that is working elsewhere and being able to change plans as things go along. They are currently working on a different trap net. In Australia and Clearwater, Idaho they are using permanent traps that catch carp whenever they are moving. At the University of Minnesota (Dr. Sorenson) they are putting together chemicals that will attract female carp and they will come into the traps on their own. Right now the program is focusing on what they will need to do to get the carp to the docks and then onto their destination. One idea

that seems to work well is to use the carp as compost. They would like to work with an existing facility but also would like to enhance the development of another facility to process the carp. When outside parties come and make proposals the JSRIP want to listen to them as long as they don't cause more burdens to the program. They don't want to allow outside projects to interfere with the main objection of removal of the carp.

The JSRIP has been discussing with the division of Wildlife that if funding becomes available there could be a special project developed similar to the Great Salt Lake and Bear Lake. The funding will need to come from federal, state and local funds and will require about 1.34-1.68 million a year for seven years. Furthermore, there will need to be facility development, personnel, development of access points along the lake and, if needed, the development of a processing facility. It will be important to continue and maintain partnerships both fiscally and politically. They have identified funding to enter into the NEPA process in 2008. Research and development will continue the entire time and facility development will have to take place once the major funding has been identified. Carp removal and monitoring will take place throughout the entire time and there will need to be post-project maintenance also. Responding to the question of what NEPA stands for, Mr. Buelow remarked it is National Environmental Policy Act. There was discussion on the Clearwater, Iowa long standing carp removal project. Mr. Buelow pointed out that they had a marsh and instituted a yearlong removal program and used chemicals in their program. Utah Lake is on a much larger scale. It was questioned how the JSRIP were able to obtain measurements of carp and Mr. Buelow explained how they break up the lake into different areas to determine the population. They section off an area of the lake and use nets that are purse strainers and are able to remove the carp from the strainers to measure population. They did the studies when the water was low so they didn't have to deal with the tamarisk problem. It was questioned if there is a possibility of pushing the carp into the Goshen Bay or Provo Bay. Mr. Buelow said you could do that because carp are very sensitive to noise and they actually do that sometimes. But the carp don't cooperate for long distances; they eventually start fanning out. They are also very adaptable. However, it is a technique that could be added to other processes. It was also asked how sustainable mechanical removal is and how much money will be needed annually for maintenance. JSRIP projects that it will take seven years to remove five million lbs. of carp and then after that about 46,000 – 150,000 lbs. of carp would need to be removed annually. So the maintenance fee per year would cost about \$40,000. Mr. Price added that it is the Commission's hope that after the seven years there will be other biological maintenances in the Lake. He emphasized that this has to be done continuously every year. Once the program is instated it has to be kept up in order to be successful. Mr. Buelow stated that up to 1 million lbs. of carp removal is easily maintained. Responding to the question if there was a natural predator Mr. Buelow answered there is, but it also would affect the June Sucker and carp are adaptable to predators. Commissioner Ellertson thanked Mr. Buelow for his report and invited him to continue to update the Board with development.

8. Presentation from John Holden MD, CEO of Heartland Processing about carp processing.

Commissioner Ellertson introduced John Holden MD and Steve Holden from Heartland Processing to present a proposal they have about processing carp. Steve Holden gave a brief background of himself and his family and his previous association with living in Utah County. In a desire to return to live in Utah County they were looking for a project that would allow them to do so and learned about the carp issue with Utah Lake. They began to study carp and researched what their company, Heartland Processing, could do to alleviate the problem. In their research they discovered that carp can be used to produce fish meal and there is a shortage of fish meal production. Most fish that is consumed in the United States comes from fish farms. China and Peru produce the largest amount of fish meal. There is increased demand for fish meal but there is a decrease

in supply. All indicators show that demand will continue to rise and amount of fish meal available will decrease. Another productive way to use carp is the oil in carp. Fish oil is used as enrichment because it is an essential nutrient. Body requires omega three oils. Omega 6 comes in other products we eat. Omega 3 is beneficial to the body including helping with clotting. Mr. Holden and his brother started researching and found a company on the East Coast who has developed processing fish and they met with them. Heartland has developed a contract with them to use their technology. They extracted 1500 lbs. of carp from Utah Lake and sent it back to their labs. The lab report came back very clean. The heavy metals in the carp were very low and the measured protein content in the fish meal came out 60% which is a good level. There is a way to utilize this carp. There is a demand in the world market and a process to provide an American source of fish meal. An example of the need for that came out this year in regard to dog food. There was a dog food produced in China that was marketed in the United States. The dogs eating this dog food were dying from kidney disease. Apparently, the manufacturers were masking the protein in the dog food with melamine. There was a massive recall of this product. There has since been public call for government regulation in the United States. Fish meal has been a major ingredient in pet foods and now, since this outcry, the inclusion of fish meal will be more closely monitored. This is one example of a where a need for fish meal is going to increase in the next few years.

The process is not cheap. The machine to produce fish meal from carp would be \$2.5 million. In order to pay for staffing, rent, utilities, etc. Heartland Processing has estimated \$2 million and another \$1 million in escrow fees. The person who holds the patent on this machinery expects royalties which all totaled would equal about \$6 million for startup charges. At the estimated figure of processing two million carp per year they project a profit of \$1 million per year. At the end of three years Heartland projects the investment could be balanced. They are still in negotiations with this company but they wanted to reinforce to the Board that there is use for carp and it can be a good thing. Commissioner Ellertson thanked the Holdens. Mayor Parker asked what form the meal comes in. Mr. Holden explained it is pellet sized and looks like rabbit food. John Holden addressed the Board and said that although their proposal is ambitious, it is do-able. It is feasible to begin extracting the carp within a one year time frame. The faster the carp are extracted the sooner it will allow the Commission to concentrate on the real purpose of this Commission which is to improve other facets on the Lake. Commissioner Ellertson thanked the Holdens for their presentations.

9. Report from the Executive Director.

Mr. Price gave his monthly report. He referred to his Top Ten List that he presented last month that he wanted to accomplish. In reference to that the office is up and running smoothly. The library is organized so the consultant can rely on the knowledge he has in the office. There's been a big step in fine tuning the subcommittees and making them functional. The Master Plan is moving forward and the SOQ process has been gone through and the RFP process has been narrowed to three firms. He is looking forward to working with them. Some of the top concerns that the Commission has presently are the carp removal and working with the JSRIP and understanding their efforts and goals and what can be done. The Commission is listening to the many ideas out there of what to do with the carp, once caught, and how to remove them which is a daunting task. Other issues are the goals of creating and maintaining access to the Lake and the concern about the phragmites that grow prevalently around the lake. He had the opportunity to take a weed tour with the Commissioner to see exactly what the problem is concerning phragmites and it's as bad as he imagined. It will also be a task to get rid of them as well. The Commission will be working closely with the Division of Natural Resources, Forestry, Fire & State Lands, who has the responsibility to get rid of the phragmites to create better

access to target areas of the lake. Someone said to him recently that they could walk from Saratoga Springs to American Fork on sandy beach years ago. He said he is working on being visible. Mr. Price met with Orem Chamber of Conference and will be speaking up at Sundance at a summit conference today. He hopes that will get some exposure for the Commission. He feels the Commission has made great progress and will continue to make progress. It's been exciting. Commissioner Ellertson said that the word from the community is complimentary and there is excitement. People are enthused and want to get started on their own projects. The challenge will be to run fast while being patient enough to do it right. It's important to keep the excitement going during the process. He reminded all the Board members that there are individually important and asked them to encourage people in their organizations assigned to committees to be an active participants. A lot of information will come forth yet.

10. Other Business.

Mr. Price reminded the Executive Committee that they would meet in the Utah Lake Commission office on October 17 at 7:30 a.m. Those members include Mayor Thompson, Howard Johnson, Mayor Washburn, Bruce Chesnut, Mayor Billings, Mayor Parker, Commissioner Ellertson, Clyde Naylor, Mr. Styler and Mr. Price.

11. Confirm that the next meeting will be held at the Historic County Courthouse Ballroom on Thursday, October 25, 2007 at 7:30 AM.

12. Adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 a.m.