

UTAH LAKE STUDY COMMITTEE MEETING

October 28, 2004

7:30 a.m. to 8:50 a.m.

County Commission Conference Room, Room 2300
100 East Center Street, Provo, UT

ATTENDEES:

Members

Mayor Lewis Billings, Provo
Mayor Rulon Gammon, Vineyard
Mayor Fritz Boyer, Springville
Clyde Naylor, Utah County
Mayor Bernell Evans, Payson
Mayor Dean Allan, Mapleton
Steve White, County Commission
Mayor Jerry Washburn, Orem

Other Interested Parties

Dan Nelson, MAG
Chris Finlinson, CUWCD
Chris Keleher, June Sucker Recovery Program
Robert West, Provo City
Bruce Chesnut, Technical Committee Chair
Jarret Whicker, Envision Utah
Marianne Crawford, US Fish & Wildlife Service
Karl Kappe, Div. of Forestry, Fire & State Lands
Dave Gardner, citizen and developer

Mayor Billings invited the mayor of each City to participate on the Utah Lake Study Committee and appoint an alternate when unable to attend.

The minutes of Utah Lake Study Committee meeting of September 23, 2004, were reviewed and approved.

New Information Sharing

Clyde Naylor distributed a handout on Lake Management prepared by Homer Chandler in 1989 (on file at the Provo City Recorder's Office). There was strong feeling that "before Utah Lake can realize its full potential, it is imperative that all improvement efforts be coordinated by a Utah Lake authority empowered to manage all aspects of lake development and maintenance" as stated in the document.

Issues of concerns for a lake authority would include boundaries, a master plan, management systems, environmental safeguards, engineering studies and economic analysis, grants and bond issuance. Other duties would include management of authority affairs through a local board of directors, obtaining services of other agencies, negotiating with DSLF, coordinating with Utah County cities, preserving historical sites, land reclamation, providing property transportation facilities, dredging and diking the lake, providing parkways, parks, and other recreational facilities, and negotiating for flood control, water conservation, lake level stabilization, etc.

Mr. Naylor said in 1990 the legislature attempted to establish a Utah Lake Authority (ULA). The draft bill provided for a 13-member Board of Directors, eight of whom were outside Utah County. The bill did not pass because the County did not want outside control. Options for the organization and structure of a lake authority include autonomous independent districts, county service areas or local government management. Each option is outlined in the handout. The recommendation of this study is that "the Utah County Commission...serve as the manager of a lake development plan and its implementation." Mr. Chandler felt the best way to accomplish this would be by interlocal agreement.

Discussion included the following points:

- Nothing new has really happened since the proposed legislation in 1990.
- Some property ownership has been resolved; others still need to be resolved. A map is available and will be presented at the next meeting.
- Agricultural uses of the property.
- Feasibility of an east lake highway, causeway, dike, bridge, etc. for transportation.
- Utah Lake water levels and necessity of reserves from Jordanelle.
- Lake bed management plan.
- The committee was created as the result of a citizen's group and can build momentum, but has no real authority to make changes. That citizen's group has asked to make a presentation at the November meeting.
- Legal review of organization options.
- Need for an overall supervisory control organization to coordinate development around the entire lake.
- Add the organization of such an entity to the *Issues and Information Sought* list.

Technical Committee Report

Each city has been asked to appoint a member to this committee which is chaired by Bruce Chesnut, Orem City. The committee has been charged to review and gather information on important concepts and principles.

Dr. LaVere Merritt, BYU, attended the last Technical Committee Meeting and presented information on water quality at Utah Lake. A copy of the minutes will be provided to the Study Committee when completed. Dr. Merritt could be invited to meet with the Study Committee to give more detail and additional input once the Technical Committee minutes have been completed, presented and reviewed.

Comments on Dr. Merritt's presentation follow.

- Information he presented has significant impact on the operation of waste water treatment and sewage treatment plants that discharge into the lake and the TMDL studies.
- Dr. Merritt is working with the engineering firm on the TMDL study and phosphorus impact in the lake. There is a TMD Followup Meeting on November 18, from 2:00-4:00 p.m. at the Provo Library Bullock Room.
- The sedimentation of Utah Lake could be as deep as 10,000 feet which will have a huge impact on any roads built across the lake. Dr. Merritt said a road would have to be wide for stability and, if built narrower, annual maintenance would be necessary.
- The impact of ice sheets historically has destroyed any structure that is not protected.
- A summary of the information will be provided once the minutes are completed.

June Sucker update and presentation--Chris Finlinson and Chris Keleher

Ms. Finlinson invited Chris Keleher, biologist for the June Sucker Recovery Program, to give an update of activities.

Mr. Keleher introduced a book, Ecology of Shallow Lakes by Martin Sheffer, which presents research done in Europe on ecological boundaries and possibilities of shallow lakes, including how to restore shallow lakes to a pre-urbanization condition.

- Their challenging goal is to recover the June sucker as well as allow continued water development and use for human needs.

- The June sucker suffers from a “recruitment bottleneck” in early life stages. Larger, hatchery- raised fish stocked in the lake do survive. Therefore, efforts are made to improve conditions for early life stages in the tributaries of Provo Bay.
- Non-native fish control will increase the chance of June sucker survival. Predators include the white bass, walleye, sun fish, carp, and other non-native fish.
- The primary predator focus of the Recovery Program is the carp.

The document, Concept Analysis of Habitat in the Lower Provo River, was written by a consulting firm and addresses ways to improve the habitat for the young June sucker. Dale Despain has expressed some interest in helping to provide a better habitat on his property. Efforts include additional spawning areas in Utah Lake and Hobble Creek. Negotiations are in process to acquire property in Hobble Creek.

A consulting firm has reviewed the feasibility of controlling non-native fish. Some of their findings follow.

- The common carp is the primary threat to the June sucker.
- Carp was introduced as a food source in the 1880s and has the ability to overrun the system and modify the habitat to its benefit.
- Carp constitutes 90% of fish weight in Utah Lake.
- Studies predict that reducing the carp population by 75% will create an ecological response in the lake.
- A study was conducted which tagged carp and then re-sampled the population in an attempt to calculate a population estimate. A final report will be available in a few months. Copies of the preliminary study are available to the Technical Committee and other interested parties.
- Uses for carp after removal from the lake are being considered.
- Poisoning the lake would kill all the fish and the same non-native fish would be re-introduced into the lake from the tributaries. Also, dealing with the dead fish would be huge job. What is needed is a mechanism for long-term carp control.

A documentary video patterned after the Utah Lake Legacy book is being prepared on Utah Lake. The video to raise public awareness about Utah Lake will be narrated by Robert Carter and should be completed after the first of the year.

Historic Utah Lake artifacts will be displayed at the Utah Lake State Park Visitors Center. The display should be completed in 6-8 weeks.

Copies of the studies and books discussed by Mr. Keleher were requested for the Utah Lake information library located at the Provo City Recorder’s Office.

Items for discussion at future meetings

Jarret Whicker said the Wasatch Choice Program is sponsored by MAG and the Wasatch Front Council. Workshops in February will address land use and transportation issues in the four urban counties along the Wasatch front. Each community will be visited before February and input for the next transportation model will be solicited. Ideas from the session will be presented to this Study Committee when ready.

Other

Karl Kappe, Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands, is working with Barbara Gardner and Dick Beuhler on a comprehensive management plan for Utah Lake. He presented a handout with subject headings for Utah Lake “Statement of Current Conditions and Trends,” and a memo to Utah County Commissioner White outlining the process for producing the management plan (handout on file at the Provo City Recorder’s

Office). A summary document will be prepared to stimulate public thinking and then a public meeting will be held. Mr. Kappe was invited to attend both the Study Committee and the Technical Committee meetings.

Set date, place and time for next meeting

The next meeting will be held December 9, 2004, at 7:30 a.m. and will serve as both the November and December meetings. The meetings will return to the 4th Thursday schedule in January.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 a.m.