



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, October 22, 2012, 8:30 A.M.
Historic County Courthouse, Suite 211
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah 84601

ATTENDEES:

Chairman, Chris Keleher, Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Vice-Chairman, Richard Nielson, Utah County
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City
Neal Winterton, Orem City
Adam Cowie, Lindon City
Lee Hansen, Saratoga Springs City
Mike Mills, June Sucker Recovery
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission

ATTENDEES:

Doug Sakaguchi, Division of Wildlife Resources
Laura Ault, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL)
Dave Wham, Utah State Division of Water Resources

VISITORS:

Dee Chamberlain, Saratoga Springs Home Owners Association
Hugh Van Wagenen, Lindon City
Karen Nichols, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Krissy Wilson, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

ABSENT:

American Fork City, Lehi City, Mapleton City, Santaquin City, Springville City, Vineyard Town, Woodland Hills Town, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Recreation, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Utah Lake Water Users, and Utah State Division of Water Resources.

- 1 **1. Welcome.**
2 Chairman Chris Keleher called the meeting to order at 8:38 a.m. He welcomed the members and visitors
3 to the meeting.
4
5 **2. Review and approve minutes from the August 20, 2012 meeting.**
6 Mr. Keleher asked for discussion, comments, or corrections of the minutes for the meeting held on
7 August 20, 2012. Mr. Lee Hansen stated on page 4, line 28 the word “vast” should be changed to “large.” It
8 was motioned by Mr. Greg Beckstrom to approve the minutes as amended; and it was seconded by Mr.
9 Richard Nielsen. The motion carried and the minutes were unanimously approved as amended.
10
11 **3. Reports and discussion on various Utah Lake issues.**
12 **a. Invasive Species:**
13 *i. Carp* -- Mr. Mike Mills said fishing has picked up in September/October reporting over nine
14 million pounds had been removed. From funding received from the Bureau of Reclamation, a new contract
15 with the same terms was awarded to Loy Fisheries for \$500,000 to continue the project through 2012/2013.
16 Mr. Dee Chamberlain asked if the poundage was the total amount. Mr. Mills said yes, since February 2010.
17 Mr. Greg Beckstrom asked the status of fish population count in Utah Lake to evaluate the impact of the
18 nine million pound removal. Mr. Mills said the field work was completed, data gathered, and the Utah State
19 University researchers were in the process of updating the statistical analysis. Mr. Keleher said they were

1 evaluating the research aspect of the Utah Lake ecosystem, key parameters, and monitoring. The research
2 would involve the regularity and numbers to get a statistical outcome demonstrating change in the system,
3 with fish communities being one aspect of the research monitoring the effectiveness of the carp removal.
4 There were no further questions.

5 **ii. Phragmites** -- Mr. Reed Price reported on the phragmites removal team's (PRT) efforts. The county
6 crews have knocked down phragmites along the two project areas to accelerate bio-decomposition. Freezing
7 and ice flow will knock more down. Funding had been received for 750 acres at the north end of Utah Lake
8 between Jordan River and Lindon Boat Harbor and in between the Utah Lake State Park and into Provo Bay.
9 The 1500 acres were treated with Glyphosate, a product called AquaNeat. The projects opened up shoreline.
10 The county crews are creating fuel breaks, anticipating burning with FFSL at the north end sometime in the
11 winter. PRT is creating fuel breaks along the south area into Provo Bay, but because of the airport proximity,
12 safety is an issue.

13 Grant requests are beginning for next year's projects. The project has been successful, and with recurring
14 grants, PRT is confident they will receive another grant. The Watershed Restoration Initiative Grant was
15 earmarked for the area between Provo Boat Harbor and Provo Bay, and the second one was through the
16 Department of Agriculture Invasive Species Mitigation for \$150,000 for the north end. Mr. Doug Sakaguchi
17 asked if treatment areas would be extended next year. Mr. Price said it depended upon funding, but the
18 intention was to continue from Provo Bay into Springville.

19 Mr. Keleher asked if the total was 1500 acres for both projects. Mr. Price said yes. Mr. Keleher asked
20 when burning was anticipated. Mr. Price said usually winter/early spring, when plans and appropriate
21 weather conditions are in place. Ms. Laura Ault of FFSL said crews were evaluating the north shore property
22 for possible burn areas. Mr. Price was concerned about the pump house in Lehi. If floating dead reeds
23 clogged their screen area, it would be labor intensive to keep them clean. PRT/FFSL hopes to burn a
24 significant portion to lessen the possibility of the screens being clogged. Ms. Ault said doing it before winter
25 is helpful because of better air quality standards. Mr. Price said the Utah Lake Commission, FFSL, Utah
26 County, and DWR work together so everyone needs to be aware of the requirements. Mr. Keleher
27 complimented the coordinated joint efforts of the projects.

28 **b. Fishing Tournament:** Mr. Price reported FLW Outdoors National Guard Western Region Collegiate
29 Championship Fishing Tournament was held at Utah Lake with 20 teams participating. A patriotic launch sent
30 them off each morning, fishing until 3 p.m. with some catching the limit and others nothing. The largest fish
31 caught was 5.5 pounds by a student in the high school division. On average, the fish caught were between 2-
32 3 pounds. UVU's team finished in eighth place. The Long Beach, California team took the title with the
33 winning bag of 23 pounds over three days. Film crews edited video into broadcast quality presentation to be
34 aired on NBC Sports on November 4 at 11:00 a.m. (MST). Ms. Krissy Wilson asked the type of fish and Mr.
35 Price said large and small mouth bass.

36 Mr. Price is excited to see how Utah Lake is promoted as the organizers were pleased with the proximity
37 of the lake to Provo city, when tournament locations are 30-45 minutes from the host lake. Mr. Sakaguchi
38 asked about Utah Lake winds. Mr. Price said storms came, but it was always safe. Fishing was successful the
39 first few hours, and afterwards few fish were caught. Provo Bay was the winning team's location navigating
40 one-foot of water the entire day. Mr. Keleher asked if TV crews interviewed others besides the fishermen.
41 Mr. Price didn't think so as they focused mainly on the fishing aspect. Mr. Keleher said it was pleasing to see
42 the Lake get positive attention. Mr. Price hoped as improvements continue more events will occur. FLW was
43 interested in returning and so Utah Lake stakeholders and FLW will stay in touch. Mr. Keleher asked for
44 further questions and there were none.

45 **c. NPS Grant Report:** Mr. Price applied for a National Park Service grant for professional facilitation
46 services. A goal of the Master Plan is focused on a nature center/research facility on the shorelines. The
47 grant helps with discussion of what a nature center would entail, the potential locations, and related issues.
48 If awarded, something tangible will be in place to present to stakeholders and to seek funding for
49 construction. It would be a central connection point to the Lake Trail system and access the lake shore trails
50 with interconnecting points in various communities so visitors can get on the Lakeshore Trail and visit the
51 Nature Center. A meeting was held to shore up expectations. The National Parks staff left with an

1 understanding of what needs to be accomplished. Mr. Keleher asked if “something tangible” was a
2 conceptual report or design. Mr. Price said yes. During the application process, he requested letters of
3 support from various federal, state, and local agencies. As the process continues, more support will be
4 forthcoming in the planning process and/or for funding.

5 **d. Water Quality:** Mr. David Wham said DEQ conducted regular sampling on Utah Lake stations for
6 water chemistry and algae samples in an ongoing basis as part of the Utah Lake Drainage Basin/Provo River.
7 The two-year intensive monitoring cycle is finished with data collection. DEQ partnered with BYU, Dr. Wood
8 Miller, and Central Utah Water Conservancy District to collect information of water chemistry on a lot of the
9 inflow streams to help update existing models. There is better data on the lake than the inflows, and it was
10 updated with about 19 inflows monitored. DEQ had made aggressive assumptions on the inflows on limited
11 data sets.

12 A lake bed sediment study with additional testing sites was required. A graduate student set the
13 chambers to test for sediment oxygen demand to help with modeling. Ph and dissolved oxygen vary and
14 testing will evaluate what types of nutrient fluctuations come off in different parts of the lake. During the
15 summer, six more stations were added to the study. When the report is received, Mr. Wham wants the
16 findings presented to the Utah Lake Commission. DEQ has also done multi-parameter points where long-
17 term probes were left in Provo Bay area, the productive part of the lake. It consistently has higher nutrient
18 values and algal concentrations. As wastewater treatment plants flow into Provo Bay and the Lake, and
19 permits are renewed, DEQ has been trying to get a better data set for future reference.

20 DEQ still wants to move forward with the long-term USGS integrated data stations on the lake scheduled
21 for next summer. They will be approaching the South Utah Valley Municipal Water Users Association to
22 request the funds for the station. Mr. Price said Utah Lake Commission had \$10,000 earmarked in the
23 budget. Mr. Keleher asked if DEQ had been communicating with USGS on the monitoring station. Mr. Wham
24 said he had not. Mr. Keleher said there is a meeting in November and asked him to communicate with USGS
25 so they can plan it in their budget. Mr. Wham said enough monies were left to continue with the algal
26 sampling and dropping samples off to Dr. Sam Rushforth. DEQ does not have budget for extended testing.
27 Budget is appropriated for the primary site on the lake, but since Utah Lake is diverse, they wanted to get
28 algal samples from different stations and collect the data. Not enough is budgeted and DEQ will be asking for
29 those funds.

30 Mr. Wham said everyone they take out to the Lake is amazed how pretty the lake is. There is a
31 misconception of the lake until they go out on it and then they are amazed. He asked who maintained the
32 Dry Creek Canal as it appeared to have been dredged, cut, and maintained. Mr. Richard Nielsen said it was
33 the Springville Drainage and headed up by Mr. Calvin Crandall. Mr. Wham said it definitely looked like it had
34 work done. Mr. Nielsen said it had been dredged about ten years prior, but something more may have been
35 done recently.

36 Mr. Hansen asked if anyone knew if the USGS report given by Mr. Rob Baskin one year prior was
37 published. Mr. Price said he did not know. Mr. Keleher stated DEQ was very busy on the lake this summer.

38 **e. FFSL Issues:**

39 **i. Docks:** Ms. Ault met with Saratoga Springs City Manager, their engineering department, and
40 public works. FFSL was held up getting comments back because of the natural occurrences at Saratoga
41 Springs. FFSL is going to move forward with community boat docks. Rather than every landowner having
42 their own boat dock, groups of four to six homeowners will group up on a single dock. Ms. Ault will present a
43 proposal for the Technical Committee to comment and help shape the rules. Mr. Ryan Nesbitt had done a lot
44 of work on the request. The rules state if there is a boat dock, the person requesting has to be the upland
45 adjacent landowner. Most of the owners aren't the upland adjacent landowner, but the HOA in Saratoga
46 Springs, so they would create a community boat dock. This helps FFSL from managing potentially many
47 docks. A formal proposal will be presented in a few months; FFSL is leaning towards the group dock proposal.
48 No decisions are made, but Ms. Ault believes it would work to prevent a boat dock every 50-100 feet.

49 Mr. Cowie asked if FFSL had looked at actual formal construction standards. Ms. Ault said yes. People
50 don't realize Utah Lake is different with lots of mud and sediment. What people propose may not work as
51 boat docks and would need to come out after summer season. Mr. Cowie asked about a 200-foot dock. Ms.

1 Ault said it would be a problem because of the lake shallowness, it would require permanent lighting, would
2 become a navigational hazard, etc. She noted illegal boat docks on the lake have been high and dry most of
3 the summer and they can't get them out. FFSL will create standards and work with them to figure out how to
4 make it work. Many people attended the public meeting pushing for docks and boat ramps and/or sea walls
5 to protect their boat.

6 **ii. Bridge:** FFSL had sent Utah Crossing, Inc. a request for supplemental information over a year ago
7 and they have not addressed the request. Mr. Price asked the last time Mr. Leon Harward contacted FFSL.
8 She said one week prior. Presently, Utah Crossing has not put in the required application with the Utah
9 Department of Transportation Commission, in order to move ahead in the process. Mr. Greg Beckstrom said
10 if there was not progress in activating the application, it may be removed. He asked if it is still under
11 consideration or not feasible. Ms. Ault said FFSL is working in that direction. It has been a year since
12 communication and FFSL is discussing their options. It is a problem with the rules in they do not
13 administratively have a way to withdraw an application. They are working with the AG's office. The
14 information has to get through the Transportation Commission before FFSL can technically consider it.

15 Ms. Ault said she has met with two other groups considering similar proposals across Utah Lake but no
16 one is in a position to do anything. Mr. Cowie asked if they proposed the general same location. Ms. Ault
17 said yes, but aligning more with the general transportation plan. Mr. Hansen said Mr. Harward had collected
18 from various investors for the bridge and asked if the financial structure of the company was being evaluated.
19 Ms. Ault said financial supervision would be headed by UDOT's Transportation Commission. When the bill
20 was passed about a year ago, they gave the financial aspects, including bonding review, to them. They will
21 scrutinize the information as UDOT is over construction and Ms. Ault believed they would do a thorough
22 investigation.

23 Mr. Hansen said on a drive around the lake, public access places were marked on a map. However, signs
24 have been posted "No trespassing." "No Fishing." "No Hunting." It was listed as private property, but there
25 is no indication who posted the sign. Ms. Ault said a law enforcement officer would go to check on the areas.
26 Mr. Hansen said a specific location was mile marker 19. An FFSL sign was posted, but next to it was another
27 stating "Private Property." She said it is a common occurrence.

28 29 **4. Discuss the Utah Lake Restoration White Paper.**

30 Mr. Price said Utah Lake Commission was approached by DNR about presenting before the legislature.
31 Several members of the business community including Utah Valley Chamber of Commerce, the Economic
32 Development Corporation of Utah, American Fork Chamber of Commerce, and other business leaders were
33 invited to talk about revitalization of Utah Lake and focus on carp removal. Over the years, carp has
34 decimated the ecosystem of Utah Lake and made it less inviting. Driving the effort, the June sucker recovery
35 (JSRIP) sought and obtained funding to remove carp from Utah Lake and to help the ecosystem improve. The
36 funding in the form of grants is becoming less available. Research has been done to find a market to defray
37 the cost of carp removal. The most promising product is creating fishmeal. DNR suggested the Commission
38 take the lead on and approach the legislature asking for appropriation to construct a facility to enable carp
39 meal production, and decrease the cost of removal to approximately \$500,000 a year; covering a significant
40 portion but not completely.

41 The game plan was to create a white paper clearly and succinctly explaining the issues legislators could
42 read through, understand the problems, and be supportive. It is an attempt to help someone who was
43 uninformed about the issue to understand what the issues are, to see the needs and the solutions to the
44 problem. Before approaching the legislature, he wanted to run the paper by the Technical Committee and
45 Governing Board, for their input, consider questions, and include additional information, and delete
46 unnecessary information as they approach the legislature to seek funding.

47 Mr. Keleher summarized the DNR and June sucker program history. Research on the carp population was
48 done over ten years ago. It was looking at what the non-native fish issues were for June sucker recovery. At
49 the time, the thinking was predatory native fish were the big issue. An independent consultant evaluated the
50 fish population and found carp were the problem because of their dominance and the destruction they cause
51 to which disrupts predator/prey interactions by reducing the cover available for small fish. The JSRIP funded

1 a consulting firm to look at the practicality of controlling the carp population. A mechanical control project
2 was proposed using commercial fishermen. The research showed it was feasible. Removing five million
3 pounds of carp per year for 6-7 years would result in a 75 percent reduction in population, the point where
4 the scientific literature suggests vegetation would come back into the system. Grants were used initially.
5 JSRIP/DNR believes now they should have waited until they were able to fund the entire seven year project.
6 A million dollar grant and matching funds from the state started the funding, but since that time, their efforts
7 have not been as successful in getting grants. The Bureau of Reclamation (BLM) has provided funding for a
8 few years. The Endangered Species Mitigation Fund was used to continue the carp removal effort, but this
9 funding is used for sensitive species conservation statewide to prevent additional federal listings. If
10 harvesting carp stops, the fish would rebound and the Lake would be back to ground zero. The effort needs
11 to continue so progress is not lost. Carp removal was draining the fund and a lot of attention to other
12 sensitive species was lacking. DNR's deputy director then approached Mr. Price to start the discussions with
13 other entities. Mr. Price said the proposal was discussed with the business community, and they caught the
14 vision. If Utah Lake Commission can help get Utah Lake over the negative perceptions, great things are in line
15 for economic vitality of the region. The negative perception in large part is caused by carp. Mr. Price asked
16 for input from the Committee on the paper.

17 Mr. Neal Winterton asked what the negative perceptions were. He wondered if the goal was to get more
18 people to the Lake. Mr. Price confirmed his understanding. Additional access points are also desired. With
19 the negative perception of the lake, the idea of investing in improvements is not as palatable. Mr. Hansen
20 said one of the problems is there are limited and access points to the lake. Mr. Keleher said this involved
21 discussion of the Master Plan funding. The Utah Lake Commission put the Master Plan together with the
22 FFSL plans, but there is no mechanism to fund anything in the plan. Carp removal is a high priority of the
23 plan, but so is access, trail system around the lake, etc. Carp removal is on the front burner because it is
24 already started. A plan is in place but it does not get it accomplished unless there is funding available. Mr.
25 Price listed the Master Plan projects (see Agenda Item 5).

26 Mr. Hansen said it would make the white paper more palatable if those projects were included. The
27 community would have long-term benefits. It may make the white paper more marketable. According to Mr.
28 Hansen, the paper reads like a JSRIP paper. If the Legislature believes removing carp benefits the June
29 sucker, it won't sell. If we are removing carp to make the lake a profitable thing for the cities, it sells. Mr.
30 Mills said Mr. Price had tried to write it speaking about the overall health of the lake. Maybe more tweaking
31 should be done so the message comes across. He agreed it should not be sold as JSRIP, but benefits the lake
32 as a whole. The benefits of June sucker go far beyond and it needs to be made clearer. Mr. Price said he
33 tried to tune the June sucker focus down. Mr. Hansen said carp removal should be stated as the first stage in
34 the whole program of revitalization.

35 Mr. Cowie asked what agency would run the carp processing facility. Mr. Keleher said it would be on
36 government land. Over a ten-year period, there has been discussion between Mr. Mills, Mr. Reed Harris, and
37 Mr. Keleher about the private enterprise people who would like to take advantage of all the carp but don't
38 have the start-up funds to do it or a long-term gain for them to invest in the cost of start-up. If the facility
39 was constructed, the possibility of getting private enterprise involved working with the fishermen and
40 keeping the government out of it is feasible. The government would own the building and be leased to the
41 plant manufacturers. Those details are not worked out at this point. Mr. Cowie said with the legislature, he
42 would have a hard time saying yes to million-dollar funding without details. If contracts were in place stating
43 the actual amount of the fish and a company is willing to give it to you in writing, those kinds of things give
44 more leverage. Mr. Keleher acknowledged it was a good perspective. He wanted to know what could be
45 offered to private enterprise to help get them started.

46 Mr. Cowie asked where the closest location would be to ship the carp for processing. Mr. Mills said the
47 Pacific Northwest, but shipping costs are prohibitive. Ms. Krissy Wilson asked if the carp would have to be
48 shipped frozen. Mr. Mills said in order to make the fish meal they would need to be frozen. Margins are
49 already thin and shipping would be too much. Mr. Cowie said it concerned him when private enterprise says
50 they can't make it and then the group tries to do it. Mr. Keleher said private enterprise is not interested in
51 the ecology of Utah Lake; a number of things to improve the lake won't make money; this one DNR is trying

1 to offset the cost. Information was analyzed, and it will not make money in and of itself. In meeting with the
2 business community, they capture the bigger vision of the lake being cleaned up with a lot of dividends. It is
3 a challenge looking at something in isolation when the upfront condition is it needs to make money. Mr.
4 Cowie said this is a specific proposal to generate money; a point it will offset the costs. It needs to have a
5 business plan. Mr. Neal Winterton said if someone was concerned about running out, a carp farm
6 component could be added to this, by building a holding pond. Mr. Price said the facility could be converted
7 into something to produce fillets from more desirable fish. DNR's research said fillets were an option or they
8 continue to harvest carp and have fishmeal. Mr. Mills said there was also the possibility the facility could
9 take fish from other bodies of water. Having a facility located inland could take undesirable fish from other
10 locations, so there is potential there, but no one is ready to commit without a facility.

11 Mr. Hansen asked if there were more local markets for the fishmeal. Mr. Mills said if the fishmeal could
12 be produced, it would not make it out of the state of Utah as poultry industry, and fish hatcheries would
13 purchase it. With the amount of fishmeal consumption in the state, pellets of Utah Lake carp would sell
14 locally. Presently, they are purchasing marine fishmeal out of Central America/South America. Samples of
15 Utah Lake fishmeal have been tested and it is a good product.

16 Mr. Beckstrom said over the years, it has seemed like a good idea. A legislator who has less exposure or
17 commitment to Utah Lake ecological issues, may not be enthusiastic or interested in promoting Utah Lake
18 commercially or environmentally and will look at it from a financial standpoint. One of the key questions is
19 the value this facility will have after the seven-year period. He asked if the annual maintenance removal
20 required after the seven years would generate enough fish to make it a commercially-viable operation. If
21 not, it comes down where they are looking at a six or seven year project to cost \$8-9 million. What is being
22 discussed is spending two million dollars up front to reduce the \$8-9 million investment down to \$4.5 million.
23 We are investing \$2 million and there are issues as to how hard of a number it is to save \$2 million over a 7-
24 year period. There were lots of questions: Is Utah Lake better off trying getting funding for the \$8-9 million
25 over the seven-year period and just get rid of the carp. Given the uncertainties and the risks, is it really the
26 way to go? If there is some long-term value or the numbers are sharpened a little, it might make sense. It is
27 risky with the numbers, and legislators relating to public investment in a quasi-private operation, it would be
28 a steep uphill battle. It is worth pursuing, but questions need to be answered to make a sale with the state
29 legislature. Mr. Price reiterated Mr. Beckstrom's suggestion asking if seeking funding from the legislature
30 simply for the removal is better. Mr. Cowie asked if Mr. Beckstrom was saying to resolve making it
31 sustainable long-term. Mr. Beckstrom said yes. He felt it would be hard to justify a seven-year long
32 proposition just to save \$2 million.

33 Mr. Hansen asked if there was an option to actually putting in a permanent facility. Mr. Price asked if he
34 meant a temporary structure. Mr. Hansen did not know the fishmeal process, but asked if there was a
35 transportable plant,
36 with no permanent facility. Then when the use is maxed out, it could be sold, and most of the capital could
37 be recovered, and it would change the accounting. Mr. Price said he didn't know either. Mr. Mills said it is
38 something feasible with the majority of the costs being equipment, processing the fish, and turning it into
39 fishmeal. The shell for the building itself is looking at \$5-\$600,000 savings if there is not a building, and
40 shipping contained where the equipment was. The fish could be sold and \$2 million would be saved. He is
41 not sure of the underlying assumption when the seven-year program is over, there needs to be a required
42 ongoing carp control effort. As this unfolds, it can be said it will have zero long-term maintenance level costs
43 because this facility will cover the costs. The \$2 million could be leveraged into another funding source,
44 federal, private level, etc. Depending on how it is presented, more money could be saved over the seven-
45 year period. Mr. Hansen asked if there were any other higher value products not listed. It seemed one of
46 the problems was large-volume, low-value product and the only thing for the carp are fillets with human
47 consumption, but the distance from the locations who consume carp is daunting. They have closer facilities
48 and closer resources to get those fish, and they are not interested in Utah Lake carp. The entire removal goal
49 exceeds the consumption of carp, and many of these facilities have not had the demand.

50 Mr. Beckstrom asked if they were looking for an action from the Technical Committee and Governing
51 Board. Mr. Price said he was not looking for a motion unless they wanted to make one. Feedback from the

1 Technical Committee would be taken to the Governing Board to tell them the concerns they voiced. He said
 2 the Board might have further questions. Mr. Cowie brought up the exact things he wondered about, stating
 3 \$2 million is requested and they will want more details. Mr. Beckstrom asked in “The Need” section, “we are
 4 seeking” who is the “we?” Mr. Price said DNR can’t go to the legislature, and asked if the Commission would
 5 do so. He didn’t feel he was the expert and he was relying on everyone for input because whatever they
 6 ended up doing, he has to be the expert ready to answer the questions. Mr. Beckstrom felt it would be
 7 entirely appropriate if the Utah Lake Commission were the lead agency on the proposal to the state
 8 legislature. Mr. Mills said they met with the business community and talked over the issues of the white
 9 paper. They saw the value of Utah Lake and thought removing carp was positive in cleaning it up. They were
 10 intrigued by the idea of obtaining a permanent, ongoing funding source to help the Commission implement
 11 the Master Plan.

12 Mr. Cowie said when looking at it from a different perspective, he asked what the original plan was when
 13 the implementation was to remove five million pounds. Mr. Beckstrom said it was to find the source of \$1.5
 14 million a year. Mr. Mills said the amount would ideally have been \$10 million. Mr. Keleher said the program
 15 did a lot of research on potential usage, and was always looking for a way to offset the costs of removal. It
 16 was an opportunity because of a federal grant they received. Mr. Beckstrom said if they could demonstrate
 17 the practical ability of removing quantities of fish in a short time, it would theoretically trigger other funding
 18 opportunities. Mr. Mills said when business entities saw the proven removal of fish, they wanted a building
 19 and help in establishing the business.

20 Mr. Hansen asked if a motion from the Technical Committee showing support were needed, he would be
 21 happy to make the motion. Mr. Keleher said before a motion was made, they needed to discuss agenda item
 22 five. Discussion of putting it into the context of the bigger picture would be beneficial. If things need to be
 23 done on Utah Lake, the Master Plan cannot be piecemealed.

24 25 **5. Discuss long-term funding options for Master Plan Implementation.**

26 Mr. Price identified the Master Plan currently does not have a funding mechanism for the following
 27 goals: Acquisition and management of sensitive lands, expansion of existing preservation areas, elevation
 28 data for shoreline, improved access, more access points, Powell Slough Wildlife Management area
 29 improvements, lake level studies, better outreach, research facility, promoting the lake, phragmites control,
 30 improving existing beaches, create new beaches, mosquito abatement, and others. He wanted to inform the
 31 Committee there are lots of issues. The removal of carp has gained momentum and is moving the focus on
 32 the lake forward. If the legislature would give some help, it would allow funding sources for other goals.

33 Mr. Keleher said when meeting with business leaders, the large projects occurring at Utah Lake were carp
 34 and phragmites removal. Strides with these obvious physical things are being accomplished. The projects
 35 come with obstacles and difficult things to overcome, but the Commission is moving forward. When
 36 discussing this topic with the business community, they were told there are other things the Commission
 37 wanted to see happen, but grants were being sought to carry them out. It was asked if there were long-term
 38 funding solutions to enable the Commission to assure efforts for all the goals (listed above), that currently
 39 don't have a funding mechanism, would get completed. He wanted a discussion with the Governing Board
 40 about long-term funding options to implement the projects. Utah Lake Commission and the state’s
 41 management for the Lake is the Utah Lake Master Plan. The Commission wants goals of Utah Lake
 42 accomplished, but funding needs to be found. Several ideas were revealed after brainstorming. First, was to
 43 create a special improvement district with property tax allotment or appropriation similar to the Central Utah
 44 Water Conservancy District. Everyone pays a small portion to the district each year but it has obstacles.
 45 Second, is to have a nexus where everyone in the county with wastewater discharge into Utah Lake could
 46 levy a fee increase whether from a connection fee or based on use. Rough calculations show if fees were
 47 increased at five cents per 1,000 gallons on just Utah Lake Commission members, it would generate about
 48 \$650,000 a year; if it were levied on everyone in the county, it can generate approximately one million a year.
 49 Mr. Beckstrom asked what the typical residential consumption was a month. Mr. Price said it was 100 gallons
 50 per person per day. The calculations are based on residential only and if commercial were added, funds
 51 would increase. The wastewater fees would be the easiest route. A third option is to have the county levy

1 per household charge of approximately \$5 per month. This would have to go through a truth in taxation
2 process. If champions of the government got behind this, it could generate a local contribution to try to
3 accomplish these goals. Then the state could be approached to request state match. The bottom line is the
4 lake is owned and managed by the state of Utah for the citizens of Utah. If the local governments choose to
5 participate, the state should also.

6 He asked for Technical Committee ideas. He said it is a preliminary idea of what the funds would be
7 used for and who would determine where the funds would be used. Someone asked what the target amount
8 was. Mr. Price said he would like to receive a million a year. Mr. Beckstrom said wastewater fees are the
9 easiest and makes sense due to water quality issues. Mr. Price said the problem with wastewater is some
10 cities are not members, and how would septic tanks be levied.

11 The special improvement district (SID) or special services district (SSD) may be problematic and difficult
12 from a product standpoint. A simple alternative is to convert the Commission to an authority. It may not
13 have popular support, but is the simple one if the political hurdles were overcome. As an authority, it could
14 have tax levying and general revenue-generating abilities, by levying taxes on member agencies. It was
15 discussed and considered eight years ago. They consciously made a decision to create a Commission rather
16 than an authority. Now having established a track record, members may be more receptive to converting the
17 Commission to an authority to address funding issues. Mr. Keleher asked if utilizing an authority as the
18 mechanism would be any different from the three outlined funding options. Mr. Beckstrom said he would
19 have to look at the state code. At a minimum, it would have property tax levying authority the Commission
20 does not currently have.

21 Mr. Keleher said rather than the County Commissioners being the heavy, it would be the Commission
22 Board. Mr. Beckstrom said it would be tradeoffs. The advantage of the County Commission doing it is they
23 are elected county-wide. The advantage of the Board doing it is it represents the locally-elected officials from
24 the communities within the area. Mr. Price said an authority would be different from a SSD. Mr. Beckstrom
25 said the authority has broader jurisdiction. When a special district is formed, where the money is spent is
26 defined at the time the district is created whether an SID or SSD. Generally, SIDs are for specific capital
27 projects. SSDs are for specific purposes with limitations in the state code as to what can be done. As an
28 authority, you have greater ability to deal with the evolving demands and needs not defined at the time of
29 creation, whereas creating a district the ability to deal with changes, new demands, and new funding needs is
30 more restrictive as a district than as an authority. Mr. Price said he knew Mr. Ellertson was planning on
31 having an attorney to help the discussion and understand the nuances.

32 Mr. Cowie said a key is to look at broader funding sources, such as a fee tacked on to fishing licenses.
33 These would be fees where all agencies have a lease with the state and maybe it is written they have to
34 charge a 50 cent rate for every boat put into the water. Those are areas where it may be successful, long-
35 term, stable funding. Mr. Winterton said if you want to put money into access points, a fee should generally
36 come from there. Ms. Ault said FFSL would have a hard time rewriting any leases. Mr. Cowie asked if by
37 state legislative action it could require an additional fee on current launches. Ms. Ault said they would have a
38 hard time doing it as many leases are written in perpetuity. The State Park is different from private launches.
39 Mr. Cowie said if a rate increase is levied at 5-10 cents, it could add another \$100,000 a year.

40 Mr. Price said he wanted this discussion to get all the ideas. Ms. Wilson said in reference to a license fee
41 increase, the division doesn't have the authority to increase or levy any type on the license, as it has to go
42 through the wild life board. It would require a significant amount to justify to the wildlife board. It would not
43 be impossible but it could be investigated. Mr. Keleher wanted more discussion on mechanisms to generate
44 long-term funding. He asked whether the white paper should be broader in scope or be focused at this point.

45 Mr. Hansen said the white paper should say there is a Master Plan the Commission is trying to implement
46 and carp removal is a key part of the plan. It should be organized and clear other projects have to be put into
47 action but carp removal is first. Mr. Keleher said it was a good way to embed it. Mr. Hansen gleaned from
48 the conversation it is a governmental function. He said the paper should say the Commission has a track
49 record rather than it is newly formed. If they can't see a way to do that, there is no reason to support this.
50 He felt the Commission should be converted to an authority. Members knew when the Commission was
51 formed it could be changed into an authority in the future. In the beginning, because no one was clear on

1 how it would operate, what it would accomplish, etc., it was decided on a Commission. Now with a Master
2 Plan, there are definitive plans on what needs to be done and it is time to convert the Commission into an
3 authority. Mr. Keleher said it should be on a future agenda with briefing the Technical Committee on what it
4 would mean, more as a political item.

5 Mr. Cowie asked how immediate the funding was needed for carp removal. If an authority was to be
6 created, the changes are still a couple of years away. Mr. Mills said the funding from the carp removal is
7 good for about 12 months. They are doing everything to get more money but they have one year. Mr. Cowie
8 said it was more immediate than an authority. Mr. Price said if this is the chosen route, they should go the
9 next legislative session to get funding. By the time it is approved and the building is constructed, the
10 Commission is up against a time restraint, and would exceed the 12-month time period because the money
11 would not be available until July 1, if it was granted. Mr. Hansen said with the idea of a building, utilities, and
12 other criteria, it should go before the legislature to get the funds started. It needs to be sold as a public
13 improvement. Ms. Ault added also as an investment in the future.

14 Mr. Keleher asked if Mr. Price needed more information and Mr. Price said yes. But he had received a lot
15 of information and he didn't expect to solve it in one meeting. He wanted everyone thinking about it and
16 getting ideas for the Governing Board where they will give a different perspective. He has received great
17 direction but after the Board receives an explanation, they will give him a better direction of how to move
18 forward.

19 Mr. Keleher said from his background and understanding, the carp removal was important to the ecology,
20 revitalization of Utah Lake, and is crucial from the Commission's perspective going for the funding the first
21 time. He believed the Commission should have everything well prepared and to be presented. If it needs to
22 be put in with the framework of the entire Master Plan and local funds utilized for it, but doesn't make it in
23 this year's session, he would rather go the following year and be more organized. Mr. Price agreed. As a
24 team, the Utah Lake Commission was the most appropriate group to go to the legislature. He didn't feel the
25 paper was as refined as it could and should be, and was more comfortable going with the broader scope and a
26 plan in place with a list of things the Commission would like to do. The Commission has been in existence for
27 five years, has been working with grants, but now needs a local funding stream to complete the remaining
28 projects. If the Commission were equipped with specifics, then the legislature would be more convinced.

29
30 **6. Other Items.**

31 Mr. Mills noted the Utah Lake Symposium usually held in October was postponed to January/ February
32 2013 due to scheduling conflicts. He values the input from the group, so invited the Committee's ideas,
33 input, or constructive criticism. He noted there has been decreased attendance over the last few years.

34
35 **7. Suggest canceling the November 5, 2012 meeting; confirm the next meeting is scheduled for Monday,**
36 **December 17, 2012.**

37 Mr. Keleher said the next scheduled meeting would be in two weeks and so it was cancelled. The next
38 scheduled meeting is Monday, December 17, at 8:30 a.m. in Suite 212 of the Historic Utah County
39 Courthouse; but due to the holidays, it may be cancelled.

40
41 **8. Adjourn.**

42 Mr. Hansen motioned to adjourn the meeting; it was seconded by Mr. Cowie. The motion unanimously
43 passed. Mr. Keleher adjourned the meeting at 10:16 a.m.