



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, November 18, 2013, 8:30 A.M.

Historic County Courthouse, Suite 211

51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah 84601

ATTENDEES:

- Chris Keleher, Chairman, Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Laura Ault, Division of Forestry, Fire & State Lands
- Matt Howard, Division of Wildlife Resources
- Kimber Gabryszak, Saratoga Springs City
- Kim Struthers, Lehi City
- Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
- Neal Winterton, Orem City
- Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
- Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP)
- Jason Allen, Division of State Parks
- Hilary Arens, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
- Trent Bristol, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL)
- Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

VISITORS:

- Stan Nau, Homeowner, Saratoga Springs
- Janice Nau, Homeowner, Saratoga Springs
- Matt Pottenger, Homeowner, Saratoga Springs
- Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs Owners Association
- LaVere Merritt, Citizen

ABSENT:

American Fork City, Lindon City, Mapleton City, Vineyard Town, Santaquin City, Springville City, Woodland Hills Town, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Division of Wildlife, Utah Lake Water Users, Division of Water Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

1. Welcome.

Chairman Chris Keleher called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. He welcomed the members and visitors to the meeting. He asked each person to introduce him/herself to the group.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Commission (ULC) Technical Committee (TC) minutes from Sept. 23, 2013.

Mr. Keleher asked if there were any questions, comments, or corrections on the minutes from April 22, 2013. It was motioned by Mr. Greg Beckstrom to approve the minutes, unless there were any comments or corrections. Mr. Keleher recommended that on page three, under item J, subheadings be added to the different issues that were discussed at that point in the meeting. With that change, a second to the motion was offered and was unanimously approved.

3. Brief updates on Utah Lake issues, projects, and priorities.

Mr. Reed Price reported on the recent projects, issues, and priorities facing Utah Lake Commission.

1 **a. Executive Office Assistant** – Carin Green, the Commission’s Executive Office Assistant got a new job. Her job
2 responsibilities will be separated into two part-time positions. One will take care of office responsibilities, the other
3 will be to help with public outreach, project planning, grant application and tracking, etc. The job posted the week
4 previous and closes right before Thanksgiving. The positions will be approximately 20 hours per week.

5 **b. Legislative Event** – An event to inform Utah County legislators was held on October 22. Of 21 members, 15
6 members showed up to learn what we were doing. They left with a better understanding of what the Commission and
7 its partners are trying to accomplish at Utah Lake, particularly the need for continued carp removal.

8 **c. Lake Level** – The lake is the same as it was in September. The elevation is 4,485.5 feet, which is 3.5 feet below
9 the compromise elevation. The level will begin to go up throughout the winter.

10 **d. Utah Lake Symposium** – The Utah Lake Symposium was successful. It was held the second week of October
11 and was attended by many and lots of good information was shared about the lake. Topics ranged from recreation
12 opportunities, current project reports, and research reports.

13 **e. Nature Center/Research Facility** – The National Parks Service (NPS), who acted as consultants, is preparing a
14 document. A draft has been completed and is being reviewed. Once done, it will be forwarded to the nature center
15 and research facility subcommittees for review.

16 **f. Phragmites** – The project is moving forward. The Land Tamers have had a few difficult issues, including
17 broken axles. It is difficult to get work done when the main piece of machinery needed is down. The Land Tamers are
18 used to get into areas that the helicopter cannot treat due to proximity to desired plants or other reasons. They are
19 also used to smash down the phragmites. Burn requirements for air quality are becoming more stringent making
20 burning phragmites nearly impossible.

21 **g. Permitting private docks** – Laura Ault was at the meeting to discuss this issue, so no detail was given at this
22 point of the meeting.

23 **h. Point source discharge permit limits for POTWs** – ULC is assisting DEQ with educating officials on point source
24 discharge permit limits on nutrients for Publicly Operated Treatment Works (POTWs). The Commission sponsored a
25 meeting in early November with POTW managers, elected officials, and city management to make them aware of the
26 issue. The meeting suggested that the municipalities work together to conduct needed research to better understand
27 the phosphorus and nitrogen interactions with Utah Lake to ensure that any decisions made by the state were
28 scientifically based and appropriate. The Commission will lead an effort to work with the municipalities to address this
29 important issue.

30 **h. Adopt the Shoreline Program** – FFSL is moving forward with a program patterned after “Adopt a Highway”
31 Program was developed by a BYU student. His ideas were presented to FFSL who has management responsibilities for
32 the lake. They were excited with his plan and are moving forward. Agreements are being drafted. ULC will be ready
33 to engage groups when they come forward and show them areas needing focus. As shoreline is opened up, help from
34 the public is needed to keep the lakeshore clean.

35 Mr. Price called for additional questions on the summary. No questions were asked.

36 Mr. Keleher asked if there were any updates from the group.

37 Hilary Arens, DWQ, stated that they will be helping to fund some monitoring research on the lake with Kevin
38 Landom (USU) and Dr. Sam Rushforth for the next two years.

39 Laura Ault, FFSL, reported on a new air boat that they purchased recently. They have used it to find a number of
40 trespasses on the lake. They are working with the US Army Corps of Engineers to address several of them. They found
41 someone dredging and filling on the shoreline near Sandy Beach. You can only see it if you come in from the water
42 side. They plan on patrolling more often.

43 There were no other updates.

44 45 **4. Presentation and discussion from FFSL on proposal to permit docks on Utah Lake.**

46 Ms. Laura Ault, with FFSL presented and led the discussion in this portion of the meeting. She started by stating
47 that FFSL received an application in 2011 from an adjacent upland landowner to put a private non-commercial boat
48 ramp on Utah Lake. It was the first one received since the adoption of the Utah Lake Master Plan. FFSL consulted the
49 master plan for guidance concerning the request. The plan lacked any information about the issue. FFSL determined

1 that they needed to do a plan amendment to determine whether or how boat docks would be allowed on the lake.
2 FFSL rules allow for plan amendments of management plans.

3 At this point, most interest in boat docks is in the Saratoga Springs area. An understanding of what an adjacent
4 upland landowner is important because the rules allow only those with property adjacent to sovereign lands to apply
5 for permits. Most of the landowners in the Saratoga Springs area are not adjacent upland landowners as there is a
6 strip of land owned by the Saratoga Springs Owners Association between their property and sovereign land. This rule
7 does not allow most of the residents to apply.

8 Mr. Beckstrom asked whether the lakeside boundary has been settled in the Saratoga Springs area. Ms. Ault said
9 that they had, and that agreements had been put in place to ensure construction of a trail that would be deeded to
10 FFSL, and then deeded to Saratoga Springs City or Utah County. Many residents with lots next to the lake do not
11 realize that there is another property owner between them and the public lands.

12 Mr. Dee Chamberlain said that there are some landowners who say that their property goes into the trail. Ms.
13 Ault said that should not be the case, unless the trail was put in the wrong place. There was some mixup on some
14 property acquisitions with the developer and a development on Amanda Lane in Saratoga Springs that requires some
15 further discussion. Ms. Ault said that there are a few places where there is no strip of land between the property
16 owner and sovereign land. The majority are not upland adjacent landowners. The HOA is the main property owner.

17 There are currently no authorized docks on Utah Lake associated with an upland adjacent landowner. There has
18 been little interest until now. There were many factors considered in the development of the analysis and ultimate
19 selection of a permitting strategy. First and foremost is the Public Trust Doctrine, under which sovereign lands are
20 governed. Another important consideration was public sentiment towards private boat docks on Utah Lake.

21 As FFSL moved forward, they worked with members of the Utah Lake Commission and other government agencies
22 with regulatory authority at the lake as the alternatives analysis was developed. They also looked at what other states
23 do, and also used their own experience in regulating boat docks on other sovereign land units, including Bear Lake.

24 The criteria they used to conduct their analysis to ensure they followed the public trust doctrine included
25 navigation and public safety, shoreline habitat and vegetation, water quality, public access, wildlife and
26 endangered/threatened species, threat of aquatic invasive species, cultural resources, administrative and financial
27 burden, capacity to address future demand, and adjacent landowner costs and ease of accessibility.

28 The state considered four different alternatives. The first was private boat docks. The next was community boat
29 docks, followed by managed mooring fields, and finally state and local government marinas.

30 Under the private boat docks option, FFSL would permit private boat dock structures on Utah Lake for each
31 residential property owner successfully completing an application and providing sufficient evidence of ownership of
32 adjacent, upland property. FFSL would allow the installation of portable/floating or fixed boat dock structures on
33 sovereign lands at Utah Lake, provided that the landowner meet basic spacing requirements from adjacent property
34 lines, place the dock at a right angle to the shoreline and satisfy State Parks requirements for marking and lighting (if
35 applicable). There would be no restrictions on size, design, appearance, or material type of dock structure nor would
36 it cap the number of docks allowed in a given area.

37 A community boat dock is a temporary, non-commercial structure that provides moorage facilities for more than
38 two residential landowners or for a homeowners association with adjacent, upland property. Under this alternative, a
39 group consisting of three or more upland residential landowners could form a "dock association" and submit an
40 application for a community dock to FFSL. Members of a community dock association would not need to be
41 immediate neighbors to one another. However, each member of the association would need to verify ownership of
42 adjacent upland property. In addition, a homeowners association could also submit an application for a community
43 dock provided the association demonstrates ownership of adjacent upland property. Docks would have an operable
44 window of April 30th through October 1st of each year. They would need to be removed from sovereign land each
45 year. A cap on the total number of docks allowed in a given area would be required and stipulations regarding design,
46 size, and material type of each dock structure would be enforced. FFSL is concerned about docks that are purchased
47 from another water body that might contain invasive species such as quagga mussels.

48 The third alternative considered was a managed mooring fields (MMF). FFSL would not allow private boat docks
49 or other similar structures on Utah Lake under this alternative. Instead, FFSL would work with an interested local
50 government or private entity willing to develop an MMF. An MMF is a mooring field that is enhanced by the addition

1 of facilities to accommodate waste disposal from bilge pumps and other trash and is regulated by a designated harbor
2 master. No fueling stations would be allowed on any MMF on Utah Lake. The placement of the mooring field would
3 be subject to land use classifications identified in the master plan and a minimum number of landowners would need
4 to participate in order for the mooring field to receive authorization from FFSL.

5 The last alternative was for a state/local government marina. FFSL would not allow private boat docks or similar
6 structures on Utah Lake under this alternative. Instead, FFSL would partner with local government entities through
7 existing FFSL leasing mechanisms to construct and operate additional public marinas on Utah Lake. Marinas would be
8 located where FFSL, local governments and other stakeholders have identified a need for additional access based on
9 public feedback, field observations/data, and Commission input. FFSL would coordinate with the local government
10 entity and the Commission to find funding sources for the construction of the marina. This alternative assumes that
11 FFSL would provide some level of financial support subject to legislative approval for the construction of the marina
12 but not for ongoing operation and maintenance. The operation and maintenance of the marina would be the
13 responsibility of the local government entity with logistical support from FFSL and other state agencies.

14 Using a matrix, FFSL conducted their analysis using the criteria stated previously. Private boat docks scored 17,
15 community boat docks scored 31, MMFs scored 26, and public marinas scored 23.

16 Based on this, FFSL selected community boat docks as their preferred permitting strategy. Reasons included that
17 it scored well in almost every category except for administrative burden, adjacent landowner costs, and threat for
18 aquatic invasive species introduction. The costs for adjacent landowners was considered high because of the potential
19 expenses required to construct and install the community boat dock. However, these costs are shared among
20 landowners resulting in lower costs than if the landowner constructed their own dock. There is risk with introduction
21 of invasive species, but these risks are inherent in boating and recreational uses and can be minimized through public
22 education campaigns. This option has a high capacity for meeting future demand for private access. It also affords an
23 above average level of accessibility for adjacent landowners, and has relatively minor impacts to cultural and natural
24 resources when compared to the other alternatives. The HOA is able to apply on behalf of the group for a permit
25 under this option. The community boat strategy is viewed by FFSL as a balance between affording adjacent private
26 landowners direct access to the water and minimizing adverse impacts to the shoreline habitat as well as natural and
27 cultural resources. FFSL believes that this permitting strategy is consistent with rule, statute, the Utah Lake Master
28 plan and the mandate to manage sovereign lands under the multiple-use, sustained-yield principles.

29 The definition of a community boat dock is a private, temporary, non-commercial structure that provides moorage
30 facilities for pleasure/recreational watercraft for more than two adjacent, riparian/littoral property owners, or for a
31 homeowners association that is an adjacent, riparian/littoral property owner. The imposition of a fee for the
32 maintenance or use of a community boat dock by owner-members or members of a homeowners association served
33 by a community boat dock will not result in the boat dock being characterized as a "commercial" entity.

34 Only adjacent, upland property owners, a local government, or a homeowners association with adjacent, upland
35 property to Utah Lake may apply to FFSL for a permit.

36 Proposed locations for community boat docks will be a primary factor when considering applications. Community
37 boat docks will be considered when there is a demonstrated need for moorage in an approved area, adequate access
38 is available and an appropriate site exists, as determined by FFSL, to support a community dock.

39 Applicants must demonstrate compliance with all other applicable state and federal rules and regulations (e.g.,
40 Army Corps of Engineers and Utah State Parks). FFSL would like to have one permit for all state agencies with
41 jurisdiction to review.

42 Only temporary structures will be allowed. They may be placed in the water beginning April 30 and must be
43 removed by October 1 of each year. It must also be made only with approved construction materials and have signage
44 clearly indicating the owner. There was a question asked about the significance of the dates. It was answered that
45 those dates allow for winter conditions to no-longer be a concern. The dates are the beginning and end of the usual
46 usable season. Mr. Allen asked if they would be required to adjust their own docks as the water level went up or
47 down. It was answered that they would be responsible.

48 Ms. Ault concluded by stating that this is the direction that FFSL is headed in allowing boat docks on Utah Lake.
49 She asked for any questions. Mr. Beckstrom asked if the other three alternatives have been rejected. He wondered if
50 community boat docks would be preferable in many locations, but that there may be some locations around the lake

1 where one of the other alternative might be preferable. Ms. Ault said they will not pursue permitting private boat
2 docks because it just does not make sense, primarily because of the upland adjacent landowner scenario. However, if
3 someone owned a significant amount of land adjacent to the shoreline and a community boat dock did not make
4 sense, they would consider it. They would consider requests for MMFs and for additional marinas as well.

5 Mr. Hansen asked if there would be a provision that guarantees that the trail or access to the lake and lake shore
6 would not be blocked. Ms. Ault replied that they would not be allowed to do so, and need to rely on the community
7 to report if that does happen.

8 Mr. Howard asked for more detail on the invasive species control. Ms. Ault responded that if a boat dock was
9 purchased from another water body, FFSL would require that they know where it came from, make sure that it sits
10 high and dry for the required amount of time, have it pressure washed, and determine that the structure is free from
11 invasive species.

12 Mr. Merritt stated that one of the big problems for this issue is the low gradient of the lake making access difficult.
13 During high water years, there is great demand for a boat dock. In low water years, one has to hike a quarter mile to
14 get to the water. Those requesting a permit need to be made aware of this characteristic. Ms. Ault said that FFSL tries
15 to explain these conditions to those who express a desire to have a boat dock. She added that some people want to
16 simply dredge the area, but she said that is not something that FFSL nor the Army Corps of Engineers would allow.

17 There was a question about installing the boat docks. Ms. Ault said that installation would need to be done from
18 the water, unless they were constructed to be moved easily by hand, for example a wheeled pier. Heavy equipment
19 would not be allowed on the shoreline for this purpose.

20 Mr. Price asked Mr. Pottenger, a property owner with a permit to FFSL if the gradient issue concerned him. He
21 responded that current conditions are not ideal for a lake. There is a lot of mud before you reach the water. At
22 current lake levels, there would be little if any interest to have a boat dock out on the lake. When the level is at
23 compromise, a dock would work great. Ms. Ault added that mooring buoys have been looked at as well, which allows
24 boat owners to moor their boat temporarily a distance from the shore.

25 Mr. Bristol added that he had been told that a permit might be able to allow a boardwalk-type structure to allow
26 access across a muddy area to a mooring buoy, which could be part of the same permit. Ms. Ault did not think that
27 would be allowed.

28 Mr. Pottenger asked when this would be considered for approval. Ms. Ault said she felt they were getting close.

29 Mr. Nau said that they have several large rocks in the lake on a sand bar near their home that are navigational
30 hazards. When the wind blows east, the sand bar is exposed where you can see many other rocks. He requested that
31 the state put a navigational hazard buoy up in the area, but they would not do it. Ms. Ault replied that Utah Lake is
32 use at your own risk.

33 Mr. Price asked what the next step was in the approval process. She replied that there are some additional details
34 that they would like to finalize before going on to the next step. Mr. Price said that he's willing to engage his Executive
35 Committee and Governing Board as required by the amendment process. Whenever FFSL is ready, he'll be ready to
36 involve them in an official capacity. Once a final draft is ready, there will be an additional public meeting as well.
37

38 **5. Discussion on long-term carp removal options.**

39 Mr. Price started the discussion by reviewing the history of carp removal on Utah Lake. Several years ago, the
40 June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP) identified carp as the main reason that the species was unable
41 to sufficiently recover. Efforts began soon after to remove carp from Utah Lake. Carp removal is identified in the Utah
42 Lake Master Plan as a high priority project.

43 The JSRIP completed research with Dr. Richard Kellems to identify potential beneficial products that could be
44 produced. Options included pet food, fertilizer, carp jerkey, canned carp, and fish meal. The most promising one was
45 fish meal. The legislature was approached last year to fund a facility to produce fish meal out of carp. Funding was
46 not granted that year. Over the summer, the Commission and JSRIP have been working with Environ Corp. to answer
47 two questions. The first was, what are the economic benefits to our area for carp removal, and the second was is
48 there a best option for using the carp. Should we continue just removing and disposing them, or is there a more
49 economic use.

1 To answer the first question, Environ analyzed the improvements to ecosystem services that the lake provides.
2 Ecosystem services are the services an ecosystem provides to a community. Most ecosystem services are public goods
3 which are not traded in markets and consequently lack market indications of value. Many ecosystem services are
4 underappreciated when weighed against those services that have traditional market values, so methods have been
5 created to estimate the monetary value of ecosystem services.

6 Using the Millenium Assessment report which was created in 2005 with input from thousands of the world's
7 leading biological scientists provides a summary and guidelines to decision makers about benefits ecosystems bring to
8 humanity. The study looked at expected improvements to direct benefits received from carp removal. These include
9 improved recreation, such as boating, water skiing, trails, hunting, fishing, bird watching, etc. It also looked at
10 expected improvements to passive use benefits, including freshwater storage, habitat for wildlife, aesthetic and
11 cultural values.

12 The Millenium Assessment report assigns monetary values to specific improvements to Utah Lake that would be
13 improved with successful carp removal. Environ looked at the expected improvements over twenty years and
14 determined the value of the improvement. Improved and increased fishing was determined to add an almost \$30
15 million of benefit to the lake over 20 years. Non-fishing recreation was examined at a one-unit water quality
16 improvement and added a benefit of \$4 million benefit to the lake over 20 years. A one-unit water quality
17 improvement equates to a 10% improvement to water quality, which they felt was a very conservative estimate.
18 Passive recreation was also examined. They estimated that over 20 years, almost \$30 million of benefit is expected
19 with successful carp removal.

20 Other improvements expected included increased property values of homes and property around the lake,
21 increasing property tax revenues. Improvements to wildlife habitat would be expected as well as improved water
22 quality to the Jordan River and Great Salt Lake. The fishery would also improve as more desirable species would grow.
23 The report concluded that carp removal should continue. Investment in carp removal would have great returns in the
24 future.

25 The next area Environ looked at was how the carp should be disposed. They looked at numerous alternatives,
26 including the present method of composting and taking to the landfill. This was termed LC1 in the report. They also
27 considered two different types of fish meal processing plants under numerous different operating scenarios. The
28 methods considered included the Montlake process (ML1) and the Falcon Protein Process (FP4). With the Montlake
29 process, the state would purchase the equipment, construct a building, and operate the facility. They would also
30 retain all profits. The Falcon Protein process would require the state to construct a facility and provide all
31 improvements, but a private company would come in and operate the plant and share profits with the state. A
32 handout was provided to technical committee members summarizing the results of the study.

33 After much analyzing, it was determined that the best option is not to construct a fish meal processing plant. This
34 is different from years past.

35 LC1 option had an estimated cost of \$5.3 million, which covered carp removal and transportation. The ML1 option
36 had an estimated initial investment of \$1.5 million to construct a facility, \$7.9 million in operating costs (including carp
37 removal) and with expected revenues of \$5 million, brings the total estimated investment of just over \$4.4 million.
38 The FP4 option had an initial investment of \$1.4 million to construct a facility, operating costs (including carp removal)
39 of \$5.4 million, and expected profit sharing revenues of \$2.5 million brings the total estimated investment of just
40 under \$4.4 million. The difference over 20 years was \$1.0 million between the current method and other alternatives.
41 As the analysis was done, it did not seem worth the effort and potential unexpected roadblocks and risks that might
42 stop all progress. Thus it was decided to continue with the current method.

43 Key costs identified in the report for the LC1 method are the current costs, paying for the fishing and
44 transportation to and occasionally disposal of the carp at various disposal facilities. The costs associated with the ML1
45 option were building site development, building site design and engineering, utility extensions, purchase of equipment
46 and licenses, and fish quality testing. The operating costs include paying the fisherman, labor to run and maintain the
47 plant, trucks to transport the final produce, utilities cost. In the FP4 option, there would be similar costs in
48 constructing the building and extend utilities to the site. The operating costs would be incurred by the fish meal
49 company, so the only cost associated with this option would be the cost to remove carp.

1 There were costs that were not considered in the study that added to the decision to continue current operations
2 rather than pursue a fish meal processing plant. These costs were due to an expected need for dredging as well as the
3 opportunity cost for the land that could be used for a more-beneficial use. These costs were considered high. Other
4 costs included marketing, stabilizing chemicals, and transportation to out of state buyers. These costs were
5 considered relatively low.

6 There were also assumptions that were made that could thwart the efforts of the removal effort. It was assumed
7 that all fish meal would be sold at market prices. This was likely to occur. It was assumed that the market price would
8 remain above \$0.80 per pound. This is risky, but likely to occur. If it dropped below this price, the revenues would
9 drop dramatically. It was assumed that the expected volumes of carp would be removed annually. This is likely to
10 occur. It also assumed that the product yield for each process would remain constant, 20-24% for the ML1 and 28-
11 30% for FP4 processes. It was assumed that the private industry would agree to a 1/3 share of profits. Those
12 reviewing the options felt that this would be difficult to do and did not feel it was likely to occur. Mr. Mills stated that
13 in previous conversations with the company proposing the FP4 process, this had never been discussed before causing
14 him to doubt that they would agree to it. If it did not occur, and it would need to occur before any approvals for
15 funding from the legislature would be approved, it could derail the removal effort.

16 Other concerns that were voiced included the fact that if funding were granted, it would take a year to construct
17 the facility, leaving only two years of high volume, higher profit fishing levels. There just is not enough time left to
18 make the numbers work to our benefit.

19 Our message is that carp removal must continue. Public support is high as evidenced by the survey and media
20 coverage over the past year. Neither option will make money. All options are investments. There are great benefits
21 to the ecosystem services provided by the lake. Pursuing the fish processing plant is too risky. It would have been a
22 good idea if it had been in place at the beginning of the process. With a low lake level, fishing is much easier. We
23 expect this to continue. We will be asking the state legislature to support lake improvements. We will need
24 approximately \$5.2 million over the next three years to ensure the process continues.

25 Mr. Price asked if there were any questions from the group. Ms. Gabryszak asked if there were any incentives
26 available to offer interested companies. Mr. Mills said the only incentive would be by selling the fish for a very low
27 rate. Unfortunately, the high volumes removed make it difficult for private industry to purchase the fish.

28 Mr. Keleher asked Mr. Mills about the research Utah State had recently completed. Mr. Mills responded that they
29 were repeating the population estimate done at the beginning of the effort. They have found that the population has
30 been reduced with the removal effort.

31 Mr. Winterton asked if the JSRIP had funding to add to the effort. Mr. Mills stated that the JSRIP has run the
32 program to date. Unfortunately, they do not have any guarantee for ongoing funding. He pointed out that the
33 benefits to carp removal are much more than the benefits to June sucker recovery. The Commission has been great at
34 helping keep the focus on those other far-reaching benefits. Mr. Price noted that the survey showed that many
35 responses in the survey conducted over the summer showed that the project was supported by the public.

36 **6. Consider making a recommendation to the Governing Board on the best option for ongoing carp removal**

37 Mr. Beckstrom moved that the Technical Committee endorse the report prepared by the Executive Director and
38 recommend that the Governing Board endorse a solicitation of \$5.2 million over three years from the legislature to
39 improve the lake's ecosystem through carp removal. It was seconded by Lee Hansen. Voting was unanimous.
40

41 **7. General comments from committee members and the public**

42 Mr. Price noted that every two years, there is a leadership change at the Technical Committee. Those interested in
43 serving as the vice-chair, please let him know.

44 Mr. Price also thanked the public for being in attendance and engaged in lake issues.

45 Dee Chamberlain said that dredging of the Saratoga Springs Owners Association Marina is near completion. They
46 are seeking help to revegetate some of the area. Mr. Price asked Mr. Howard to see what resources UDWR could
47 offer.
48

49 Dr. Merritt mentioned the nutrient removal seminar that was held earlier in the month. He supported efforts to
50 get a group of state and local officials together to discuss the best approach to addressing the nutrient removal issue.

1 He felt Utah Lake is a different water body and should be considered based on its own characteristics. Dr. Hansen said
2 that two pieces of information that should be answered. The first is what is the bioavailability of phosphate that is
3 already in the lake. The other question is if we reduce nitrogen in the lake, will it favor blue-green algae. These
4 questions should be able to be answered rather quickly and probably would not be too costly. Answering these and
5 other questions can help assure the public that good decisions were made. A meeting was being scheduled with
6 treatment plant managers to discuss how to move forward and fund a research effort to answer these and other
7 questions.

8
9 **8. Consider canceling the next Technical Committee meeting that is scheduled for Monday, December 16. The**
10 **following meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 13, 2014.**

11 The meeting was canceled in December. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 13, 2014.

12
13 **9. Adjourn.**

14 Mr. Greg Beckstrom motioned for the meeting to adjourn; it was seconded and the motion carried unanimously in
15 favor. Mr. Keleher adjourned the meeting at 10:15 a.m.