



Governing Board

Thursday, September 26, 2013, 7:30 A.M.
Historic County Courthouse Ballroom – 3rd floor
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES

Mayor Bert Wilson, Lehi City, Commission Vice-Chair
Mayor John Curtis, Provo City
Councilwoman Rebecca Call, Saratoga Springs City
Councilman Jim Linford, Santaquin City
Councilman Dean Olsen, Springville City
Mayor Randy Farnworth, Vineyard Town
Councilman Ray Walker, Woodland Hills Town
Ms. Chris Finlinson, Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD)
Mr. Robyn Pearson, Utah Department of Natural Resources (DNR), representing Mr. Mike Styler
Commissioner Larry Ellertson, Utah County
Representative Mike McKell, Utah State Legislature
Senator Deidre Henderson, Utah State Legislature

ATTENDEES

Ms. Hilary Arens, Utah Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) representing Mr. Walt Baker

INTERESTED PARTIES / VISITORS

Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources
Henry Maddux, June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP)
Gene Shawcroft, CUWCD
Mike Mills, JSRIP
Brianna Binnebose,
Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs HOA
Bob Trombly, Provo City
Carol Walters, Utah Valley Earth Forum
Kimber Gabryszak, Saratoga Springs Planning Dir.
Larry Ballard, Citizen

ABSENT:

Lindon City, American Fork City, Orem City, Mapleton City, and Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL).

1 **1. Welcome and call to order.**

2 Vice-Chairman Mayor Bert Wilson called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m., noting a quorum was present. He
3 welcomed the members of the Governing Board and the visiting public. He excused Chairman Mayor Jim Dain,
4 Mayor James Hadfield, Mr. Mike Styler, Mr. Dick Buehler, and Mr. Walt Baker.

5
6 **2. Approve consent agenda.**

7 **a. Governing Board minutes from of August 22, 2013; b. August 2013 financial report.**

8 Mayor Wilson asked if there were questions on the agenda consent items. Mayor Wilson called for a motion
9 on the consent agenda.

10 Mayor John Curtis moved the consent agenda items including the minutes of August 22, 2013, and the August
11 financial report is approved; and it was seconded by Councilman Dean Olsen. The motion carried and the minutes
12 and the financial report were unanimously approved. With a quorum present, all in favor were Mayor Wilson,
13 Mayor Curtis, Councilwoman Call, Councilman Linford, Councilman Olsen, Mayor Farnworth, Councilman Walker,
14 Ms. Finlinson, Mr. Pearson, Commissioner Ellertson, Representative McKell, and Ms. Arens. Senator Henderson
15 entered the meeting after this vote.

16

1 **3. Report from the Technical Committee (TC).**

2 Mr. Chris Keleher gave the Technical Committee report. A presentation on the public survey results was
3 presented and TC provided feedback. A lot of discussion ensued on the survey because it was only sent to
4 homeowners and renters were not included. The respondents probably are partly skewed to the older age class, so
5 it doesn't represent the age distribution of the valley. There might be a need to try and capture the younger group
6 of the community in a follow-up survey.

7 In October, FFSL will present the private dock issue, the process, and their proposal. Also, TC will have a
8 presentation from the Army Corps of Engineers of what their role is in the development review process as there
9 have been some questions of when they intervene on things and when they don't.

10 Mr. Keleher reported taking a trip to the lake on Monday and with the shallow lake, it is unique as all the birds
11 are arriving. If people get an opportunity to spend time at the lake; fall is a good time to go.

12
13 **4. Report from the Executive Director.**

14 Mr. Reed Price, Executive Director, updated the Governing Board on the ongoing activities of the Utah Lake
15 Commission (ULC).

16 **a. Legislative Event:** The legislative event will be held on Tuesday, October 22 at 6 p.m. Working with
17 Senator Deidre Henderson and Representative Mike McKell they will discuss the important issues the lake faces
18 and seek support for solutions. Senator Henderson sent a save-the-date email and then invitations were sent out
19 to the legislators. RSVPs should be in soon, and he is hoping for good attendance. Councilwoman Rebecca Call has
20 been vital in scheduling the venue and other efforts. He hopes members of the Board can arrange their schedule to
21 show broad support for the efforts being made with the Commission. They are beginning to draft the message of
22 what issues need to be highlighted, and those found during the survey report. In discussing the event with the
23 Executive Committee, it was suggested contact be made to Governor Gary Herbert. Commissioner Ellertson has
24 been working with the Governor's office to find a date when a key group of Board members can go to seek his
25 support.

26 **b. Utah Lake Nature Center:** The National Park Service (NPS) report was recently received. It is being
27 prepared to send out to nature center/research facility subcommittees for input. ULC hopes to finalize the
28 document in the near future to present to the public and get their ideas and comments. After the document is
29 complete, it will allow ULC to pursue partnerships to insure future construction as well as its maintenance.

30 **c. "Adopt A Shoreline" program:** This program was put together by a BYU intern. FFSL was pleased with the
31 presentation and are moving forward. FFSL will identify areas that will benefit the most from the program. With
32 about 80 miles of shoreline, only certain areas will be targeted initially testing the program out to assure it is
33 successful and can be expanded over time. FFSL is drafting sample agreements for different groups that may want
34 to participate. The goal is to have it in place by springtime.

35 **d. Water Quality:** In February, Mr. Walt Baker and Mr. Leland Myers, who runs the Central Davis Sewer
36 Improvement District presented information to the Board. They explained issues the Division of Water Quality is
37 being faced with looking at permitting different nutrients including phosphorus and nitrogen. In order to educate
38 and help municipal leaders, elected officials, city administrators, and POTW managers understand the issues they
39 face, ULC and DWQ will jointly co-host a nutrient loading educational event on November 7. They want the group
40 to know about the looming issues and be certain they understand the economic impacts the decisions might have,
41 assure they know the process, and respond to any permitting requirements DEQ will suggest.

42 **e. Outreach** – The Utah Lake Symposium is scheduled for Tuesday, October 15 9 a.m. at UVU at the Library
43 Auditorium. Numerous speakers are lined up to explain the facets of Utah Lake. These include the survey results,
44 someone to speak on economics of ecosystem services, Utah Lake nature center, Ms. Laura Hansen with the Jordan
45 River Commission will talk about the Jordan River Commission efforts, an update from JSRIP, Mr. Aaron Eagar with
46 Utah County will give an update about phragmites, Mr. Ron Madson the new lease holder at the Lindon Marina will
47 speak about his future plans for developing the Lindon Marina, and Mr. Todd Frye, will speak about sailing on Utah
48 Lake. It is a good place to learn what is going on at Utah Lake.

49 ULC has reached out to all the 4th grade teachers in the valley and encouraged them to use the lesson plans.
50 Using the curriculum will help qualify their classes for the spring time field trips.

1 **f. Dock review process:** A core group of ULC and FFSL members heard the proposal for dock reviews. As Mr.
2 Buehler suggested in the past they are recommending community docks. Some areas still need to have input and
3 so they will be approaching TC to evaluate appropriate restrictions in regards to dimensions, spacing between
4 community docks, characteristics of the docks to insure the lake remains a publicly accessible lake, safety hazards
5 or other items. When the TC offers its input, there are plans to present to the public. These changes will initiate a
6 UL Master Plan Amendment process and ULC is an integral part as the ULMP is the comprehensive management
7 plan for both FFSL and ULC.

8 **g. Bear Lake Commission:** Has set up a 501c-3, and may be a model for ULC. The Commission has not
9 pursued this assignment due to other projects, but it should be completed in the near future.

10 **h. Representative Jim Matheson:** Mr. Matheson went out on the lake, observed carp removal, and evaluated
11 the phragmites removal project. It was good to show him all the efforts being made. ULC will keep in touch with
12 his office to see if there are ways to partner or to find funding to continue the important projects ULC is working
13 on.

14 He called for questions. Councilwoman Call asked Mayor Curtis to repeat his recommendation during the dock
15 proposal meeting. He said he appreciated the efforts being made to be more accommodating for the docks, but
16 they are balancing difficult issues by making the lake more accessible and at the same time maintaining
17 stewardship. He recommended FFSL be willing to review the dock issue as needed in the future.

18 Councilwoman Call asked when the symposium meeting would start. Mr. Price said the different speakers
19 were being finalized, and they assumed it would start around 9 a.m. and end around 3 p.m. She encouraged Mr.
20 Price to work with FFSL to make sure with the "Adopt a Shoreline" program is very successful "out the gate."
21

22 **5. Approve accounting firm to conduct the Commission's annual "Agreed-Upon Procedures" financial report for**
23 **FY2013.**

24 Mr. Price presented the options for the firms to be considered to conduct the annual financial report for
25 FY2013. According to the purchasing policy, every five years a new accounting firm should be approved to conduct
26 the year-end report. The Utah State Auditors' Office changed the required reporting requirements. Previously,
27 ULC had to do a financial review for government entities with budgets between \$100,000 and \$500,000. It is now
28 required to do an "Agreed upon Procedures Financial Report," which is reporting the financial health and insuring
29 the Utah Lake Commission is following good accounting procedures. A request was issued for proposals and he
30 received four responses from Squire, Gilbert & Stewart, Greg Ogden, and Litz Company. As the proposals were
31 reviewed, a matrix was created. Based upon technical factors and the cost of conducting the report, he
32 recommended to the Board that ULC enter into an agreement with Squire who scored the highest of the group.
33 Reasons he cited were their proposal indicated they understood what the new "Agreed upon Procedures Financial
34 Report" was, they were able to define they knew what would be required, they had a good estimate of time
35 required, and their staff is qualified. They are a recognized firm. The main factor was the cost of the report over
36 the course of five years would save ULC \$1,200 from the next lowest bid. He was confident they could get good
37 results as they conducted the financial review for the past several years and are familiar with the accounting
38 system.

39 Commissioner Larry Ellertson motioned to approve Squire, Inc. to conduct the financial report for FY2013; it
40 was seconded by Councilwoman Call. It unanimously passed. All in favor were Mayor Wilson, Mayor Curtis,
41 Councilwoman Call, Councilman Linford, Councilman Olsen, Mayor Farnworth, Councilman Walker, Ms. Finlinson,
42 Mr. Pearson, Commissioner Ellertson, Representative McKell, Senator Henderson, and Ms. Arens.

43 **6. Report and discussion on the Utah Lake survey results.**

44 Mr. Price said they had been working on a survey to gage the public interest in and support for improving Utah
45 Lake. He introduced Ms. Brianna Binnabose, who is a recent graduate of the University of Utah with a Master's in
46 Public Policy. She interned with FFSL and agreed to help ULC and Mr. Price on a volunteer basis to keep her skills
47 current. The survey is completed and she presented the findings of what the public felt. Mr. Price wanted to have
48 the Board review the results and ask questions for clarification on what the recommendations are. He welcomed
49 questions or comments throughout the presentation.

1 He stated when the Utah Lake Master Plan was created there were numerous goals and objectives identified as
2 either high or medium priority goals. Those goals were to help to achieve the vision for Utah Lake. As the
3 Commission has moved forward, there has been a lot of progress in accomplishing many of the goals of Master
4 Plan, but ULC felt it needed to have public input to determine where they should focus efforts and receive support
5 from other groups. To create the survey, input was received from the TC, Public Advisory Group (PAG) and other
6 stakeholders to determine what questions to ask and what information should be sought from the public. After
7 getting feedback, the survey totaled six pages with 27 questions. It was designed to determine which amenities
8 were most important to the public and which amenities should be improved. The most important result was to
9 gage the public's attitude towards funding the improvements.

10 ULC had three different survey types -- a hard copy that was mailed out, another was an emailed survey, and
11 the third was a survey put on the website. All surveys were identical in wording. The difference between the two
12 on-line surveys was responses were limited. If a certain number were allowed, the computer limited their answers
13 to the number asked, whereas with the hard copy, the respondents gave many choices, which made it a difficult to
14 assess.

15 About 75 email surveys were sent to the PAG, TC, and they were then asked to send it on to their groups so it
16 was difficult to tell how many emails were actually sent. The hard copy was six pages and was mailed to 1482
17 residents in Utah County. Almost 60 came back as undeliverable with bad addresses. There were 339 responses,
18 which is 24 percent. Between the hard copy and emailed survey, there were 490 total responses. ULC was
19 prepared to do a phone survey by choosing random numbers out of the phone book. The survey was tried and it
20 averaged one response per hour. In order to get a good statistical random, it would take the staff too long, so, ULC
21 relied heavily on the hard copy.

22 Ms. Binnebose said the intent was to get a random sample throughout Utah County. The goal was somewhat
23 achieved. ULC obtained addresses from the Utah County treasurer. As the surveys started returning, it was
24 discovered the addresses were homeowners, so the random survey was limited to property tax payers. It was
25 recognized the rental population was underutilized, which included students. Three of the paper respondents
26 indicated they were renters. As the surveys came in, ULC was unsure if it was an error with data input or renters
27 had been included in the total random sample, or the other 700-800 people who didn't reply could have been
28 renters. The same thing applied to the age, as the older population tends to respond to surveys and vote more,
29 whether it has more time or passion. It is the trend from national studies as well. The third possibility was the
30 younger people were included in the survey, if they were living at home with their parents and their parents were
31 the ones who filled out the survey, which could have caused a shift in the reported age group. About 66
32 respondents reported they had at least two people living in their household who were the ages of 18-25, and the
33 parents filled out the survey rather than the younger demographic. Overall, 339 people felt it was worth their time
34 to fill out a lengthy survey, and many left open-ended, in-depth comments with specific concerns and issues. A
35 response rate of 24 percent is a high number. This survey is a strong base for the future surveys. Potentially just
36 the property owners' demographic was represented, but it can be expanded. As projects are completed or
37 initiated, a survey could be sent to a sample of a much more diverse population such as students or people who are
38 undocumented. ULC was alerted that a large group of people is shoreline fishermen; are non-English-speaking and
39 would be left out of the sample. Similarly, PO boxes would not have the survey sent to them. If ways can be found
40 to expand the survey to everyone, this study would be a starting comparison point.

41 Several questions had multiple answers, such as choosing the top five most-used launching areas. For those
42 questions, individual responses were given its own variable with a zero if the respondent did not choose a location
43 and a one if they did. For questions where there was only one possible choice, such as how would you rate the
44 overall condition in Utah Lake, they were given numerical value. Those who responded overall were kept track of.
45 A group of indices was created to gage the overall feel for those particular questions where they had multi-part
46 answers. No sophisticated analysis was used mainly because of the difficulty to pick just one cause of what may be
47 contributing the most and it made it difficult to separate. Mr. Price passed around a copy of the survey and a
48 returned-envelope to show what the survey looked like when it went out. Board members were told an executive
49 summary of the report was provided. Ms. Binnebose gave the data results in order of the survey questions.

1 The demographic results showed 57 respondents were male, which was a surprise as females usually are the
2 main ones who respond. About 45 percent of the respondents were age 55 and above. Broken into the household
3 age-groups, there was an even distribution in how many people had two or more residents for the various ages.
4 The 18-25 age-groups had two or more living in the house at the same time which was 21 percent of the
5 respondents. In this particular area, a lot of people are still living at home with their families for various reasons.
6 Education level showed they were well educated as 64 percent had a bachelor's degree or higher. With
7 employment, 49 percent were employed full time, 27 percent retired. The majority of the people were
8 homeowners with three renters in the paper survey. The rest of the renters were compiled between email and
9 people who access the website. The household income levels were fairly high with 38 percent having an income of
10 \$75,000 or above, followed by 38 percent with those under the \$25-75,000 income bracket. The three most
11 popular areas that had the highest responses were Provo, Orem, and Saratoga Springs followed by American Fork.
12 The demographic questions were put at the end where respondents were given an option to answer personal
13 information rather than skip the questions entirely.

14 The majority of the people who responded had attended Utah Lake. The majority respondents had visited
15 annually and with only about 24 percent more than three times a year; overall, most people typically visit one to
16 three times. Increase in the number of years going to the lake is to be expected from the older person response
17 group with 43 percent visiting over 20 years, and 16 percent were new people.

18 The most popular activities were motor boating, water skiing, wakeboarding, followed by fishing, walking,
19 picnicking, and swimming. In the TC presentation it was stated the fishermen and Spanish population could be
20 respondents could be increased. The possibility was discussed of a sample population with a survey being
21 produced in Spanish so it could potentially increase the response rate.

22 The five access points most widely used were Utah Lake State Park, American Fork, Lindon Marina, Lincoln
23 Beach, and Saratoga Springs. Mr. Price said the purpose of this question was to help know what the most popular
24 access points were, knowing the marinas would be the most used. Noting other access points frequently used
25 would help ULC when focusing on using access points, ULC can go to the next ones most frequently used.

26 Ms. Binnebose said the majority of people cited Utah Lake was dirty as the main reason they do not use it more
27 often. Themes of cleanliness of the lake appear throughout the survey especially on the open-ended comments.

28 The next question asked residents to rank existing amenities at the lake. Sand beaches was another topic that
29 reappeared by respondents saying they didn't have a beach to go to, and 54 percent said their beach needs were
30 not met followed closely by picnic areas, playgrounds, and trails. Many people thought their needs were met for
31 boat launches. At times there were issues at the marinas with people having to wait to load or unload their boats.
32 Considering the future population growth, with other activities used to encourage people to visit the lake, the
33 launches will see more congestion.

34 The most important five amenities are restrooms, sand beaches, parking, picnic areas, trails, and boat docks.
35 Some of the amenities, especially sand beaches, crop up and in the final version. Mrs. Green organized the
36 comments to see a little more of what people specifically had to say. This question was geared towards what
37 changes could be made to amenities. Amenities were organized in categories of more, better, lesser/fewer.
38 Respondents' main desire was for more sand beaches. There was nothing people thought they could do without.

39 Mr. Price said restrooms were the key area with picnic areas, sand beaches, and parking. More people wished
40 to have more sand beaches. The results will be used to base recommendations on to see what the public
41 determines they need more of, better, or improved amenities.

42 Ms. Binnebose said respondents who use the lake felt the amenities were at least good and fair, and it is
43 encouraging. One of the open-ended replies was, "I don't know enough to get give this accurate marks" or "I don't
44 go there enough."

45 Respondents' level of support showed several questions targeted towards various activities and actions that
46 the community is considering implementing now or in the future. Ones that garnered the most support were carp
47 removal, shoreline restoration, developing new trails and beaches, recreation areas, as well as acquiring property
48 for access for active/passive activities, and "Adopt a Shoreline" program. Mr. Price said these choices would be
49 used to gage which areas received the greatest support. Ms. Binnebose said on the opposite end of the scale the
50 actions that did not get much support were dog parks, resorts, nature centers, or a research facility. The reason

1 might be because respondents associated them with a higher cost. The least supported might be getting funding
2 for them as well for the particular activities. Mr. Price was concerned as efforts are currently moving forward with
3 the nature center process. It made him question if the public would not support it. He realized the nature center
4 was something that should be promoted, and it can be very effective. Several years ago a survey poll done about
5 the value of carp removal, people would have said "don't bother, it is not worth it." Because of educating the
6 public, there is now broad support for that program. Although it was a bit disconcerting to see there was not broad
7 support for the nature center, it makes ULC think differently about educating the public on the center. There was a
8 lot of support for the phragmites removal program with 246 of the responses.

9 The next question was ranking value of Utah Lake in the categories of recreational, environmental, and
10 commercial. Overall, the majority of respondents felt recreationally and environmentally, Utah Lake was very
11 valuable, but not as much commercially. The open-ended comments said they had been coming to the lake since
12 they were children and are now bringing their grandchildren to the lake. They want to preserve the resources for
13 their posterity. It is good to see data matching up with the open-ended information.

14 The next questions addressed funding and financial aspects for the lake. The questions in this area began with
15 what were the three activities people would be willing to allocate funding to. There were multiple choices, but carp
16 removal, improving wildlife habitat, and shoreline restoration were the three most popular and the nature
17 center/research facility being the least supportive.

18 The most popular method of funding was user fees and it was addressed in the open-ended comments. Quite
19 a few commented they were supportive of improvements at Utah Lake, but they felt a lot of funding should come
20 only from people who most utilized the lake. This was followed by legislative appropriation, increased sales taxes,
21 increased wastewater use, and increased property taxes. There were ten percent who just did not support the
22 improvements for whatever reason. Overall people did not feel supportive of tax increases or fee increases in
23 general. The open-ended question garnered a lot of responses with people's attitudes on taxation. The
24 recommendations are based on the open comments with transparency where the funding is going to alleviate the
25 concerns.

26 Question 15 had a more specific plan as how to raise revenue to fund the improvements. It was encouraging to
27 see 37 percent felt they would vote in favor, while 21 percent said they would vote against it. There were some
28 who said they might or they would vote in favor if the improvements were made to areas they used or they might
29 vote in favor. Councilwoman Call asked about how it could be collected. Mr. Price said the county could spearhead
30 an effort to increase sales tax for that purpose if they wanted. Mayor Curtis said it would conflict with Orem as
31 they had the tax. Mr. Price asked if it could be added on top of it. Mayor Curtis did not think it could.
32 Councilwoman Call said she would research to make sure. Mr. Price said he interpreted the response to mean
33 there was good support if it would cost a penny and the improvements would be made. The public seemed to
34 understand it was not an immense cost, but it could do a lot of good. Ms. Binnebose said if it was a high support
35 for a penny, a half of a penny would encourage more support but it would be less. The primary reason cited for
36 voting against the tax increase was more information was needed or a group of people did not believe in increasing
37 taxes for Utah Lake improvements. These showed up in the comments that they just don't support tax increases in
38 general. They may be a hard group to win over and ULC would need to focus on the people who are undecided.
39 The next group cited they did not use the lake enough to warrant supporting improvements, and others would
40 support additional funding if the economy improves.

41 The next question asked the people the maximum amount they would be willing to pay to fund additional
42 improvements at Utah Lake, and there were 25 percent who were willing to pay an additional \$1-9 a year, 19
43 percent would pay \$10-24; 11 percent would pay between \$12-49, and 8 percent would pay \$50-99 a year; and a
44 small fraction of people would be willing to spend over \$150. There was a very large portion of people who were
45 unwilling to pay any additional increased taxes or fees.

46 In outreach education, 40 percent of respondents said they found out about Utah Lake from their friends,
47 family, and neighborhoods. Word of mouth was very big followed by the newspaper, then television. Whatever
48 can be done to increase contacts in communities to help spread the word would be very effective especially moving
49 forward with new projects. Areas could be improved with outreach such as through schools, website that can be
50 used to promote other areas including brochures, or the Utah Lake Festival.

1 Mr. Price said media was asked to observe the treatment of phragmites removal, and ULC got air time and
2 newspaper coverage. It is the same thing with carp removal. There is positive press with the family, friends, and
3 neighbors hearing about the projects. Newspaper and television are great resources and ULC needs to discover
4 how to tap into it as they promote the recommendations of the survey and move forward with the efforts.

5 Ms. Binnebose said the final question consisted of what sort of activity they use, that had family specific
6 interest. Fifty percent of respondents did not participate in an organized activity group. With the results and input
7 from TC, ULC has made recommendations of how to move forward. A lot of the information will be shared at the
8 legislative event. With the responses received, sand beaches are one area highly desired by the general public. The
9 recommendation is to maintain existing areas and find other areas that can be created into beaches for public use.
10 It was also recommended the shoreline restoration efforts be maintained to remove invasive plant species,
11 including phragmites and to insure the project is maintained in the future.

12 In regard to access points, it is recommended they enhance existing access points and create new access points
13 so the public can experience the lake. With this goal, adequate parking should be provided along with restrooms.
14 Another access issue is to enhance and develop new trails. Commissioner Ellertson said the county has done some
15 significant efforts putting in trail segments. In the immediate future, ULC wants to get the segments connected
16 from Provo River Parkway Trail to the Jordan River Parkway Trail and in the long-term future complete the trail
17 around the lake. Other desires associated with the trail system include overnight camping facilities, playground
18 and picnic areas with signage.

19 In regards to water quality, ULC feels it is important to insure the success of the carp removal program and
20 make sure it receives the funding so progress achieved is not lost. There is evidence the program is succeeding and
21 the water clarity is improving. Along with water quality is public education. The public needs to know it is cloudy,
22 not dirty. The Utah Lake water quality is good and should not be feared, and is a good place to recreate. Dredging
23 was mentioned frequently so in public outreach efforts, the public should know about the cost of large-scale
24 dredging and other impacts dredging would entail.

25 ULC needs to increase communications with the community as some indicated they didn't know where to find
26 information about the lake. As the lake is promoted through various media resources, it would help to increase
27 public support for it. ULC needs to make sure they are transparent when they discuss taxes or fee increases to
28 make improvements. PAG wants to encourage participation from the different users that frequent the lake as they
29 can be a catalyst to help increase public support for the different improvements.

30 The Commission also feels it is important to continue the survey efforts on a regular basis, whether annual or
31 biannual. The real benefit of surveys is when public opinion is tracked over time it can be seen what they are really
32 feeling. When ULC gets better at surveys, they can be fine-tuned to get more accurate and better information and
33 reach out to a broader population allowing ULC to be more confident in the results.

34 ULC needs to seek long-term funding for their needs. The Commission needs an operations budget to make
35 greater strides in accomplishing the vision of ULMP. It should lead the effort to help encourage regional support
36 for finding the necessary funding to make the improvements.

37 Mr. Price asked for any questions or comments. Representative McKell asked if ULC received any portion of
38 the fees received at the Provo Utah Lake State Park. Mr. Price said no. The fees currently collected at the lake and
39 other marinas are a revenue source for the cities. It is unclear how ULC can utilize this resource or the fees
40 attached to different stamps for hunting and fishing licenses. Nothing is earmarked for Utah Lake improvements
41 through these sources. Representative McKell said ULC needs to look towards a model of a restricted funds
42 budget. He is vice-chair on the resource appropriation committee. Mr. Buehler, Mr. Styler, and other agencies
43 dealing with natural resources have been able to control their budgets by utilizing restricted funds gathered
44 through fees rather than using general funds. The restricted budget mode can be helpful for Utah Lake. He stated
45 he supported user-fees rather than a tax across the board. It is problematic ULC does not get any share of fees and
46 it is something that needs to be addressed.

47 Councilwoman Call commented funding carp and phragmites removal could increase the fee to be \$25 per
48 entry. The goal is not to discourage people from coming to the lake by increasing the annual pass by \$40, to fund
49 phragmites, etc. ULC needs kick-off money because the projects can't be completed without some influx of cash.

1 Ms. Arens asked what it would take to make the public aware of the importance of the June sucker and its
2 endemic qualifications. Mr. Price said it was not included in this survey but could be included in the future.

3 Councilwoman Call said as the result of the survey, she would be in favor of educating the public about the
4 nature center/research facility, and then resurvey before the funds are allocated. ULC may think it is a great idea
5 but the community may wonder how it will be paid for. She suggested tackling the nature center after higher
6 priorities of phragmites and carp removal are finished. Mayor Wilson said he didn't think people knew of the
7 educational system of the Commission. If ULC got the fourth grade teachers who have attended the field trips to
8 share their experiences, support would increase 400 percent plus. He felt it was a matter of educating the public.
9 Mayor Curtis said the chances of his family going to the lake just to attend the nature center are low. But, going to
10 a beach and then to a nature center while there would be extremely high. He suggested looking at as an
11 all/nothing, bundle-type situation. He suggested creating activities at the lake that draws families and the public
12 together. Mr. Price said the nature center is planned to be a hub and part of the regional trails system. With trails,
13 a beach close by, and the nature center would be positive reasons for the center. Councilwoman Call suggested
14 possibly having ULC and the Jordan River Commission partner together to have a regional nature center. Mr. Price
15 said it was a good suggestion.

16 Councilman Ray Walker said he would like to see increased attendance at the Utah Lake Festival. It would be a
17 good place for community education. He felt the attendance numbers were low at this year's festival. Mr. Price
18 said the event is difficult to expand because of the space limitations. At the present time, the number of people
19 who can attend has maxed out. Ways should be considered to expand the Festival because it is a great way to get
20 the message out.

21 Mr. Price appreciated the feedback and input and will fine tune the final report. A similar presentation will be
22 presented to the public at the Utah Lake Symposium. Many of the needs will be communicated to the legislature
23 and legislative event on October 22. Ms. Arens said it was a good presentation, but suggested shortening the
24 presentation. Mr. Price said the legislators would receive only the recommendation portion in the limited time as
25 ULC wants it to be jam-packed with information. The Commission is working with a consultant.

26 Mayor Wilson thanked Mr. Price and Ms. Binnebose for their presentation.
27

28 **7. General Comments from Board members and the public.**

29 Mayor Wilson asked for comments from the Board. There was none. He asked if there were public comments.
30 Mr. Larry Ballard, Utah County citizen, has studied local governments. Ultimately, the Utah Lake Commission's
31 survey was to generate a consensus that stating the survey results were the will of the public in Utah County. He
32 said the survey represents only 0.0007 percent of the people. It is only an opinion poll, and felt it was statistically
33 insignificant as far as something like a referendum or getting the true consensus of the people.
34

35 **8. Consider replacing the October meeting that was scheduled for 7:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 24, 2013 with 36 the legislative event that has been scheduled for Tuesday, October 22, 2013 at Talons Cove Golf Course.**

37 Mayor Curtis motioned to cancel the regularly scheduled meeting in lieu of the legislative event held on
38 October 22. It was seconded by Councilman Jim Linford. Voting in favor were Mayor Wilson, Mayor Curtis,
39 Councilwoman Call, Councilman Linford, Councilman Olsen, Mayor Farnworth, Councilman Walker, Ms. Finlinson,
40 Mr. Pearson, Representative McKell, Senator Henderson, and Ms. Arens (Commissioner Ellertson had left the
41 meeting early).
42

43 **9. Adjourn.**

44 Councilwoman Call moved the meeting be adjourned; it was seconded by Councilman Linford. The motion
45 carried and voting was unanimous. Those voting in favor were Mayor Wilson, Mayor Curtis, Councilwoman Call,
46 Councilman Linford, Councilman Olsen, Mayor Farnworth, Councilman Walker, Ms. Finlinson, Mr. Pearson,
47 Representative McKell, Senator Henderson, and Ms. Arens. Mayor Wilson adjourned the meeting at 8:52 a.m.