

**Utah Lake Study Committee Meeting**  
**October 26, 2006**  
**Utah Lake State Park Visitor Center**  
**7:30 a.m.**

ATTENDEES:

Members

Mayor Lewis K. Billings, Provo  
Mayor Jerry Washburn, Orem  
Mayor Heber Thompson, A.F.  
Mayor Burtis Bills, Payson  
Mayor Howard Johnson, Lehi  
Michael Vail, Genola  
Commissioner Larry Ellertson, Utah County  
Clyde Naylor, Utah County

Other Interested Parties

Stephen Schwendiman, Attorney General's Office  
Greg Beckstrom, Provo  
Robert West, Provo  
Bruce Chesnut, Orem and Technical Committee Chair  
Mike Styler, Division of Natural Resources (DNR)  
Reed Harris, DNR  
Chris Keleher, DNR  
Kris Beulow, CUWCD  
Chris Finlinson, CUWCD  
Barry Tripp, Forestry, Fire and State Lands  
Ty Hunter, Utah Lake State Park  
Steve Densley, Provo Orem Chamber of Commerce  
Steve Kroes, Utah Foundation  
Keith Morgan, Water Ski School  
Rick Cox, Citizen/Consultant  
Amy Choate-Nielson, Deseret News

1. Welcome and call to order – Mayor Billings.

A schedule of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Utah Lake Symposium to be held on October 27, 2006, at UVSC, was distributed.

2. Review and approve minutes of August 24, 2006 meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved. Minutes of previous Utah Lake Study Meeting are on the website at [www.utahlakecommission.org](http://www.utahlakecommission.org).

3. Reports on three public hearings held during the month of October regarding proposed creation of Utah Lake Commission:

- i) **Provo Hearing – Steve Densley (and others who attended).** About 55 people attended and comments were intelligent and positive. Presenters were Clyde Naylor, Mike Styler and Ty Hunter. Three different parties presented their own Utah Lake Plans. Two included building a causeway using private funding. Mr. West said people were interested in knowing how the Commission would impact their personal interests, i.e., farms and water rights, and how to become a member of the Commission. He explained that the organization must consist of public entities under the law, but other parties could participate as ex officio members. Comments varied from support of a commission over an authority to skipping the commission and going directly to an authority. Attitudes were supportive toward the end of the meeting after the Commission had been explained. Representation of the Salt Lake Water Users by the CUWCD was discussed.

- ii) **Lehi Hearing – Mayor Howard Johnson (and others who attended).** About 30 people attended. Presenters were Commission Ellertson, Raylene Ireland, Jim Hewiston, and Robin Pearson. Comments were positive and included a discussion on how landowners can become involved through the local entity where their property is located. It was explained that the Commission will be a help and a resource to individual property owners in their decision of what to do with their property. The main question was how they would participate with the Commission if not on the governing board. Multiple groups of people are working on this together with government and opportunities for those who want to be involved could come through the Technical Committee, etc. The formation of a Commission will not change rights of ownership.
  
- iii) **Payson Hearing – Mayor Burtis Bills (and others who attended).** There were about 30 attendees. Comments included maintaining, preserving and enhancing the wildlife and fisheries, enhancing the current Sandy Beach and developing another Sandy Beach in American Fork or Pleasant Grove area. The South County Mayor’s group would like to have one person from their organization serve on the Commission to represent them all rather than all of them be ex officio members. Private property and water rights were a concern. Even though the State will be their representative, many still want their own representative to protect their private interest. Mr. Naylor said everyone needs to understand that the Commission will not have much influence on either land or water. Land issues will be settled by the ownership resolution and water issues are controlled by the State Engineer. Mr. Styler said the Commission will also not have authority over how much water comes in or goes out of the Lake as that is completely controlled by water rights. A misunderstanding was that the Commission would back individual projects and interests, i.e., Noah’s Ark. People need to understand that the Commission will be an information board to assist people in accomplishing their objectives and a recommending board to those agencies with authority. The power will be in how the Commission helps others through good information, discovery and science. Effective communication is needed with all stakeholders.

4. Report on written comments received during comment period – LaNice Groesbeck

Comments received after the first mailing were distributed. All documents are available to anyone who has not already received them.

Commission involvement in creating another Sandy Beach could be in bringing the shareholders together for discussion, insuring a good process is followed and technical questions are answered. A master plan would be a helpful resource. A recreation subcommittee could be formed to address such issues.

The question of how to represent the environmental community, which is interested in being involved, was raised.

5. General discussion, questions and comment:

- i) **Interlocal Cooperation Agreement approval process.** State law mandates that only public agencies can be party to an Interlocal Agreement and voting members of the Commission. Those who can’t vote can be ex officio members and receive notice and participate in

meetings. A draft resolution to be presented to city councils entering into the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement establishing the Utah Lake Commission was distributed. Each jurisdiction would follow its own legislative process to approve a resolution authorizing and executing the agreement.

Mr. Schwendiman explained that, since this is a new Commission requesting State resources and has not had previous legislative review, the resolution would need to be presented to the legislature for approval. The general session in January would be the time to present the resolution. The authorization of the legislature is necessary for the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Environmental Quality to contribute to the Commission budget and to participate on the Commission. The Utah County legislative delegation should be supportive and there should be no problem obtaining the support of the Governor's office.

Since review of the comments received through the comment period may impact language of the proposed interlocal agreement, those who drafted that agreement will meet again to consider them. Additional comments on the agreement should be submitted to Mr. Naylor as soon as possible.

- ii) Possible funding models for the proposed Commission.** A handout with a proposed budget for the Commission and numerous options for funding was distributed. There were no comments on the budget proposal. (A copy is attached to the official minutes.)

Formulas to determine funding from each local government entity listed as voting members on Appendix 1 included population, shoreline miles, land area, a combination of any two factors, and a combination of all three. The recommended option was #7 including all three factors. Cost contributions were based on \$150,000 from local government, \$75,000 from State government, \$50,000 from the Central Utah Water Conservancy District and \$25,000 or more from grants. (A copy of the options handout is attached to the official minutes.) The cost would be calculated annually based on the approved budget. If one agency decided not to participate, the others would make up the difference. Other entities could become members and would then pay their share of the budget.

Comments included the following:

- Provide flexibility to allow the Board to add new members without going through the whole process each time an entity wanted to join.
  - Consider if and how to have one representative from the South County Mayors Association.
  - Address a continuity guarantee for participation and commitment so communities won't drop out. There are already provisions for that in the interlocal agreement. A community must remain responsible for any financial commitment it may be a part of, i.e., bonding, etc.
- iii) Technical Committee Recommendations.** Comments received regarding the boundary of the study area will be discussed by the Technical Committee. Any additional comments to this committee need to be submitted immediately. Kris Beulow gave a brief report on a meeting he

attended that addressed carp nationally. A winter carp harvest is being planned. Information on the spring carp reduction program will be distributed with the next agenda packet. A dumpster for carp at Lincoln Beach was discussed.

6. Discuss next steps. Any final comments regarding the Interlocal Agreement or proposed budget should be provided to Mr. Naylor by November 15. Final comments regarding the map should be provided to Mr. Chesnut and final comments regarding the resolution should be provided to Mr. West, both by November 15.
7. Public comment. Comments received will be provided to the press.
8. Set date, place and time for next meeting. The next meeting will be Friday, December 1, 2006, 7:30 a.m., at the State Park Visitor Center and will be the meeting for November and December. All should come ready to make a final vote on documents to be sent to local city councils, the County Commission and the State Legislature. Major proposal changes to any documents should be given to the subcommittee by November 15 so final documents can be prepared for action.

Envision Utah has invited the Utah Lake Study Committee to make a presentation at their Steering Committee Meeting on November 16, 12:00 noon. Those interested in attending should contact Mayor Billings.

Mayor Billings and Chris Keleher will work together to respond to written comments received as well as those comments that were made verbally at each of the forums.

Each attendee was given the opportunity to comment. All were supportive and willing to participate in moving the Commission forward. Additional comments included the following:

- State budgets have already been approved; therefore, a request for \$75,000 will need to be made and approved.
  - The request for funding from CUWCD will also be addressed with the trustees.
  - Once the legalities and funding are formalized, the next big step will be the Master Plan and getting everyone to understand the significance of the boundary area. All entities were encouraged to have their representative at the Technical Committee meeting to address the boundaries of the study area.
9. Adjourn