



Thursday, April 25, 2013, 7:30 A.M.  
Historic County Courthouse Ballroom – 3rd floor  
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

**ATTENDEES**

Mayor James Hadfield, American Fork City  
Mayor John Curtis, Provo City  
Councilman Dean Olsen, Springville City  
Councilman Jim Linford, Santaquin City  
Councilwoman Rebecca Call, Saratoga Springs City  
Mayor Randy Farnworth, Vineyard Town  
Councilman Ray Walker, Woodland Hills Town  
Mr. Mike Mills, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
(CUWCD)  
Mike Styler, Utah Department of Natural Resources  
(DNR)  
Dick Buehler, Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL)  
Don Nay, Utah County  
Representative Mike McKell, Utah State Legislature  
Senator Deidre Henderson, Utah State Legislature

**INTERESTED PARTIES / VISITORS**

Chairman Chris Keleher, Technical Committee (DNR)  
Henry Maddux, JSRIP/DNR  
Rick Cox, URS  
Greg Beckstrom, Provo City  
Bob Trombly, Provo City  
Neal Winterton, Orem City  
Pat Scouten, Big Fish Tackle  
Robert Krejci, Saratoga Springs  
Carolyn Krejci, Saratoga Springs  
Larry Ballard, Citizen  
Garrick Hall, Farm Bureau

**ABSENT:**

Lindon City, Lehi City, Mapleton City, Orem City, and Utah Department of Environmental Quality.

1 Mayor James Hadfield noted Chairman Mayor Jim Dain was out of town and Vice-Chair Mayor Bert Wilson had  
2 health problems, and the Governing Board needed to elect a Chairman Pro Tem to conduct the meeting.

3 Mayor John Curtis motioned Mayor Hadfield be nominated to act as Chairman Pro Tem; it was seconded by  
4 Mayor Randy Farnworth, and the voting was unanimously in favor.

5  
6 **1. Welcome and call to order.**

7 Mayor Hadfield called the meeting to order at 7:36 a.m., noting a quorum was present. He welcomed the  
8 members of the Governing Board and the visiting public. He excused Mayor Jim Dain, Mayor Bert Wilson, Mayor  
9 James Evans, Councilman Ryan Farnworth, and Mr. Walt Baker.

10  
11 **2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Technical Committee minutes from meeting of February 28, 2013.**

12 Mayor Hadfield asked for discussion, comments, or corrections for the minutes of the meeting held February 28,  
13 2013. On page 4, line 4, Councilwoman Rebecca Call asked for additional wording to explain her statement. She  
14 wanted it to read, "in favor of using unallocated funds."

15 It was motioned by Mayor Curtis to approve the minutes of February 28, 2013 with additional wording; and it  
16 was seconded by Mayor Farnworth. The motion carried and the minutes were unanimously approved.

1  
2 **3. Review and approve the monthly financial report of the Commission for February and March, 2013.**

3 Mr. Reed Price gave the February and March 2013 monthly financial reports:

4 **February:** The financial report dated February 28, 2013, shows 33 percent of the fiscal year remaining. The  
5 Zions checking account balance was \$1,608.50; the money market account balance was \$16,556.07; and the Utah  
6 Public Treasurers Investment Fund (PTIF) balance was \$239,544.16. The money market account balance received a  
7 rate of return at 0.25 percent, and the PTIF received a return of 0.61 percent. There were two transfers to checking  
8 for \$7,000 on February 6, and \$9,000 on February 20, 2013. Interest earned in February was \$119.03, bringing year-  
9 to-date interest earned to \$1,337.71. The expenses for the month are listed in the middle totaling \$15,743.63. The  
10 General Fund Budget Report is listed at the bottom, showing percents left in each of the accounts. An overall General  
11 Fund balance of \$121,922.26 showed 47 percent of the budget remaining.

12 Councilwoman Call moved the financial report for February 28, 2013, be approved as presented; it was seconded  
13 by Councilman Dean Olsen. The motion carried and voting was unanimous.

14 **March:** The financial report dated March 31, 2013, shows 25 percent of the fiscal year remaining. The Zions  
15 checking account balance was \$765.02; the money market account balance was \$16,559.59; and the Utah Public  
16 Treasurers Investment Fund balance was \$223,656.36. The money market account balance received a rate of return  
17 at 0.25 percent, and the PTIF received a return of 0.57 percent. There were two transfers to checking for \$7,000 on  
18 March 6, and \$9,000 on March 20, 2013. Interest earned in March was \$115.72, bringing year-to-date interest  
19 earned to \$1,453.43. The expenses for the month are listed in the middle totaling \$16,863.48. The General Fund  
20 Budget Report is listed at the bottom, shows percents left in each of the accounts. An overall General Fund balance  
21 of \$105,078.78, showed 40 percent of the budget remaining.

22 Councilman Ray Walker moved the financial report for March 31, 2013 be approved as presented; it was  
23 seconded by Mayor Farnworth. The motion carried and voting was unanimous.  
24

25 **4. Report from the Technical Committee (TC).**

26 Technical Committee Chairman Chris Keleher, DWR, gave updates on activities and projects of the Technical  
27 Committee from their recent meeting. He stated there was good attendance with members, public, and lakeshore  
28 property owners.

29 The minutes were approved with minor changes. He stated Mrs. Carin Green, Executive Assistant, always does a  
30 great job with the minutes. Mr. Mike Mills, Recovery Coordinator of JSRIP, gave a presentation and update on carp  
31 removal including the history and current status. TC had a good discussion with three recommendations they  
32 wanted the Governing Board to consider. These included: (1) Approach the state legislature in the upcoming session  
33 and solicit funding for the carp removal effort to ensure it can continue; (2) Conduct a feasibility analysis or look into  
34 a feasibility analysis, with options for carp removal to include a fish processing plant or just removal and disposal, the  
35 way it was done and any other options; and, (3) Investigate the possibility of incentives with additional carp beyond  
36 what is currently being captured out there and to monitor the annual carp rates closely.

37 Mr. Price exhibited a public survey draft to use with the Utah Lake stakeholders, users, and the general public. It  
38 is hoped the results will be useful in directing priorities and implementing the Master Plan, by getting specific plans  
39 for the management objectives. Once the survey is completed, TC will review and test the survey with a small  
40 segment of the public; possibly modifying it as needed. The survey is designed to get information on potential  
41 beneficial improvements and the willingness to pay for them. Mr. Ben Bloodworth, FFSL, has a summer intern with  
42 expertise who may be able to assist to insure the results are statistically valid.

43 Mr. Bloodworth reported FFSL provided an update of the status of the private dock review process. A draft of the  
44 FFSL guidelines for boat docks on Utah Lake is currently going through an internal review with greater consideration  
45 for community docks on the lake. Once this goes through the internal process, it will be given to the TC for review  
46 and comment. It is anticipated to be finalized and added as an addendum to the Master Plan by early summer. The  
47 outcome will warrant an amendment to the management plan, with the amending procedure guidelines in place. All  
48 amendments include review and approval by the Commission's Governing Board and FFSL, because it serves as the  
49 management plan for both entities.

1 Mr. Price has requested additional funding for phragmites removal through grants with the focus area from  
2 Provo Bay south to Lincoln Beach. These will likely be granted, based on the past performance of the phragmites  
3 removal. FFSL stated changes to air quality standards were made by EPA that will make it very difficult to burn any  
4 phragmites in Utah Valley in the future. Mr. Buehler concurred.

5 Utah State University has been conducting research on how effectively to track changes to the carp population  
6 and other key ecological parameters on Utah Lake. This will be complete with a report and recommendations on  
7 monitoring. Their findings are due in May and the researchers will present their findings in a TC meeting.

8 Mayor Hadfield asked if there were any questions. There was none. He thanked TC for their continued efforts.  
9

##### 10 **5. Report from the Executive Director.**

11 Mr. Price stated the first set of 4<sup>th</sup> grade field trips was held on April 24, with six buses carrying over 300 students.  
12 Students attended 12 different stations with volunteer specialists. Two additional days are planned on May 1 and  
13 May 9. He invited anyone from the Governing Board to attend and observe the field trips. This event gets the word  
14 out about the value of Utah Lake and helps students understand what a great resource it is. There is an expectation  
15 of lesson plans created by the Commission that are focused on Utah Lake are taught to the classes. The curriculum  
16 was updated in 2012 to fit the new common core. Through an application process, the classes/schools apply. The  
17 Commission pays for transportation to the State Park for the field trips. It is anticipated almost 1000 will attend this  
18 year with some being turned away.

19 Utah Lake Festival is Saturday, June 8 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. with many participating Governing Board cities  
20 including Orem, Provo, Springville, Santaquin, the County, and others who help make the event successful and fun.  
21 There will be a boat show held in the parking lot area.

22 ULC was awarded a grant from the National Park Service to create a conceptual design for a Utah Lake Nature  
23 Center and Research Facility. Ideas are currently being gathered on what the nature center/research facility should  
24 include. These will be compiled of what is desired to take to potential partners. At the kickoff meeting in March,  
25 over 35 people attended including experts and citizens who are anxious to move the process forward. Follow up  
26 meetings are scheduled for May and June to specifically focus on each facility's aspects. Mr. Price encouraged  
27 interested parties with ideas to attend the brainstorming sessions.

28 Phragmites Removal Team (PRT) has requested almost \$200,000 in grant funding through Watershed Restoration  
29 Initiative as well as the Invasive Species Mitigation Grant through the Department of Agriculture. PRT had received  
30 both of these grants in the past. Word of grant awards should be received within a few weeks.

31 He created a public survey to reach out to the public to determine what improvements should be made on Utah  
32 Lake and to help achieve the vision of the Master Plan. Many objectives are broad and are not as specific as to what  
33 improvements would be desired. He cited one being addressed is the need to study improved access points. There  
34 are over 30 access points noted. These need to be prioritized by categorizing them into which are used, not used,  
35 and focus efforts on improvements. The survey purpose is to reach out to lake users with a random sampling  
36 throughout the communities to assess what the needs would be. It is anticipated to have it done this summer.

37 The Executive Committee discussed long-term funding options, including forming a non-profit organization, to  
38 receive donations and to help promote the lake. He is investigating the option as it would help promote the  
39 Commission's efforts.

40 Representative Jim Matheson's assistant reached out to the Commission, and is interested in learning more  
41 about Utah Lake and the issues we face. He and several of his staff want to go out on the lake to view phragmites  
42 and carp removal issues sometime in May. Mr. Price was pleased Mr. Matheson was interested in Utah Lake by  
43 trying to work with the constituency and improving it as a resource.

44 A BYU student desired to work on a meaningful project at Utah Lake. After several discussions with the student  
45 and Mr. Buehler, they decided creating an "Adopt a Shoreline" program would be a good option. He will be working  
46 free-of-charge at 10-12 hours a week all summer long putting the program into place. With improved open  
47 shoreline, the program is needed. The plan will be a key project the college student can be proud of as it will meet  
48 his goal and provide a valuable service to the Commission.

49 A recent ruling on the shoreline settlement boundary has been announced. Mr. Buehler worked hard on the  
50 finalizing the settlement, as it is one of the objectives of the Master Plan. He gave a history of the shoreline dispute

1 pertaining to ownership of the lakebed. Over 250 separate landowners were involved. In 1987, the US Supreme  
2 Court ruled the state owns the bed of the lake but a boundary was not set. Since that time, FFSL and others have  
3 been trying to figure out what was owned. Through negotiation, the majority of the land owners are settled.

4 In 1996, FFSL filed another suit in Federal District Court against Mr. Richard Davis, the Bureau of Reclamation, and  
5 the Army Corps of Engineers because the happenings on the south side of the lake. Judge Dale A. Kimball was the  
6 judge. Since 1996 until March 2013, the case has been ongoing. Both the state and landowners submitted  
7 considerable evidence. Judge Kimball appointed a special master to hear the case and make a recommendation.  
8 Professor Michael Goldsmith was assigned and worked on the case for four years, but passed away with Lou Gehrig's  
9 (ALS) disease, leaving the case unsettled. Judge Kimball determined another special master would not be appointed,  
10 and he would handle the case himself. Out of 250 landowners, only six have not yet settled. Another seven  
11 settlements are being finalized with Judge Kimball's permission. His ruling was based on evidence from state  
12 attorneys. They were trying to find the high water mark at statehood, the boundary FFSL owns, but no one knew  
13 where it was. After many years, Judge Kimball ruled the lake-wide boundary of the unsettled landowners was 2/10 a  
14 foot below the compromise level. The six owners left will have that value. Technically the six landowners have to  
15 find the 2/10 foot and get it surveyed with the help of the county surveyor. Initially, there were ten access points to  
16 the lake, and now there are 30 access points. FFSL is happy for these additional access points, the settlements are in  
17 place, and it may be ending soon.

18 Councilwoman Call asked if the ruling cleared the issue in Saratoga Springs. Mr. Buehler said no, it was not part  
19 of the settlement process. The attorneys will have to work with the land owners and revoke the HOA settlements,  
20 because they are illegal. Councilwoman Call said there was one property owner who currently has their home listed.  
21 Mr. Buehler said they had settled with Saratoga Development LLC before the first house was built in 1990s. HOA was  
22 to construct a trail all along the Saratoga Development, maintain the trail for perpetuity, and donate the trail from  
23 the upper side of the trail that wasn't already sovereign lands of the state. They did not do that. This caused  
24 landowners paying unwarranted property taxes, putting in illegal boat docks, and illegally keeping people off the  
25 public lands.

26 Mayor Farnworth asked where the 2/10 foot would be and if there were a description. Mr. Buehler said the lake  
27 is about 1.2 feet below compromise. Mr. Price explained compromise elevation is an agreement between both  
28 landowners and water rights holders to mitigate flooding. When the lake level reaches a certain elevation at 4489  
29 they are required to open the gates on the Jordan River and release the water, to maintain level at 4489. With  
30 negotiation, it is 0.2 feet below compromise. Mayor Curtis asked why it mattered. Mr. Buehler explained because  
31 people were claiming they owned land into the water's edge and into the middle of the lake. You cannot manage  
32 land based on a moving boundary. There are public property rights and the public has a right to know what they own  
33 and where the boundaries are.

34 Mayor Farnworth asked about the boat dock issue. Mr. Buehler said the boat docks are on sovereign lands and  
35 on public property. They need to be managed because of the navigation issues, the public interest and trust, and  
36 accommodating the upland owners but not detract from the public use and attributes of the lake. Councilwoman Call  
37 said landowners have beautiful property and have a very well kept dock. Residents do not want to build illegal boat  
38 docks. People move to Saratoga Springs because they enjoy being able to utilize the lake, so they bought property  
39 abutting the lake to enjoy the views and the recreation. They are willing to abide by whatever restrictions. Mr.  
40 Buehler said the problem is public property, not private. Councilwoman Call said if the docks had restrictions, rules  
41 established, with a required registration of the docks, and a permanent placard on the dock, residents would abide by  
42 them; it is no major issue. Someone said there would be those who will not abide by the rules. Mr. Buehler said that  
43 was the reason FFSL was going through the process to make sure the upland owners are accommodated, but not  
44 intrude on the public rights. It should be remembered it is a public lake, and it doesn't belong to the adjoining  
45 property owners. FFSL has to balance the actions, and it is trying to do so. Mr. Price said his advice was it was going  
46 through a public process right now, and let it take its course. Mayor Farnworth asked if FFSL was still struggling with  
47 people in Vineyard on boundary settlements. Mr. Buehler said no.

48 Mr. Price completed his report by welcoming Senator Deidre Henderson to the meeting. He stated the Board  
49 was excited to work with her through the coming months.

1 Councilman Jim Linford asked how much grant money was left in the current budget for phragmites. Mr. Price  
2 said most of the money is spent, but there is \$40,000 buffer left to spend and it has been contracted out.  
3 Councilman Linford asked if it would carry the Commission through to June, and Mr. Price said yes. He asked on the  
4 Festival how many people attended in 2012, and Mr. Price said 3,000.

5 Councilwoman Call asked if additional applications for field trips had been turned down. Mr. Price said a school  
6 had to be turned away. As explained, it depends on volunteers, park availability, school schedules, and good weather  
7 at the end of April/May. If the nature center goes through, it will be open year round and the students can come on  
8 a regular basis. Councilwoman Call asked when the field trips are completed if there was a way to send out a list of  
9 the schools that participated and the ones turned away. Mr. Price said yes, he would be happy to supply a list.

10  
11 **6. Consider approval of The Nature Conservancy (TNC) as a member of the Public Advisory Group (PAG).**

12 Mr. Price explained the history of PAG being formed as a function to give lake stakeholders and special interest  
13 groups a voice with the Utah Lake Commission. They meet on a quarterly basis to discuss the direction of the  
14 Commission, and in turn, receive input from PAG members to evaluate issues from their perspective. TNC has been  
15 attending the meetings, and were encouraged to be recognized as an official member. Currently they are involved in  
16 environmental issues around the state. They have ideas to find funding for a nature center and are anxious to  
17 support the Commission in the process. He recommended the Board approve The Nature Conservancy as a  
18 recognized member of PAG.

19 Mayor Hadfield called for questions of the Board. Mayor Curtis asked Mr. Price to confirm the role of PAG. Mr.  
20 Price said PAG consists of a wide variety of organizations interested in seeing Utah Lake progress and give feedback  
21 to the Commission. If they had important issues to discuss with the Board, they would do so. Mayor Curtis said the  
22 list of the members, the goals, and the mission of the Utah Lake Commission, it shows it is well-balanced. He asked if  
23 Mr. Price felt in TNC's environmental arena, if they were supportive. Mr. Price said PAG has a good cross-section and  
24 balance of developers to preservationists to recreationists, etc. TNC is a well-established environmental organization  
25 who would offer another level-headed voice to the issues environmentalists are concerned about, their ability to find  
26 and raise funds, and TNC would be beneficial to the Commission.

27 Councilman Linford asked if the by-laws restricted the number of PAG members. Mr. Price said no because it was  
28 a manageable number. If there were too many, he would request the Board limit the members of specific types of  
29 groups. There was discussion on the numbers, and Mr. Price said the determining factor was when he felt as  
30 Executive Director, things were getting unmanageable, and it would be limited to a number the Board set.

31 Representative McKell asked if criteria had been established to guide membership selection. He stated a lot of  
32 advocacy groups are meticulous, and as a representative, he was concerned. If the Board decided not to allow TNC,  
33 and other environmental groups were allowed, there could be issues. Guidelines should be in place for the Board to  
34 approve applications. Mr. Price said no criteria had been set, but has been open to any applicant. Representative  
35 McKell asked if anyone had been denied membership in the past. Mr. Price said no because the applicants are  
36 screened beforehand. Mr. Price said PAG was formed to provide an option for groups who were requesting to  
37 become ex officio members of the Board. The Board wanted to provide a meaningful way for the groups to  
38 participate, be involved, and yet keep it manageable. Councilwoman Call asked if a group becomes a member, if they  
39 are members in perpetuity. Mr. Price said the Governing Board approves PAG membership every January.

40 Mayor Farnworth asked if there was a history of TNC's pattern or actions. Mr. Styler said he had dealt with TNC  
41 for a long time -- they avoid litigation, are compromising, come forth with answers rather than questions, have  
42 suggestions, and they are very helpful. His personal experience was TNC is the most moderate and helpful of all the  
43 environmental groups. Mayor Hadfield said it was a powerful recommendation. Mayor Farnworth said he was  
44 sensitive to a disruptive reputation because groups in Idaho cause havoc. Mr. Buehler also supported TNC because of  
45 a program called Forest Legacy Program where TNC has helped secure forested lands, and has worked well with  
46 DWR. He noted they talk about money and TNC could bring money to the table, it would be a good thing as well. Mr.  
47 Price said TNC is a well-respected environmental group. Representative McKell clarified he was not concerned with  
48 TNC, but was concerned about the future. It would be helpful to establish criteria and put a cap on members. Over  
49 time, other advocacy groups may have issues and not be as workable. He agreed TNC was different as they are more  
50 helpful. If a different advocacy group is denied, if the Commission may be subject to litigation unless criteria is

1 established at the outset. He recommended for future applications, there should be clear criteria for new members  
2 to join. Councilwoman Call asked what would be the process, how long would it take to happen, and could the  
3 current application be approved pending establishing criteria. Mr. Price said the by-laws state they can take  
4 applications any time for review. The Commission can create criteria for future applications. Mayor Hadfield said he  
5 felt it a wise move based on the discussion of the Board. Mr. Price said by-laws could be amended to establish  
6 criteria. Mayor Curtis suggested contingencies and guidelines to help with ideas for criteria. Mr. Price said he would  
7 follow up with Provo City Attorney Robert West.

8 After the discussion, Mayor Hadfield called for a motion to approve The Nature Conservancy as a member of the  
9 Public Advisory Group. Councilman Linford moved the Nature Conservancy be approved as a member of the Public  
10 Advisory Board as presented; it was seconded by Mr. Mike Styler. The motion carried and voting was unanimous.

11  
12 **7. Presentation by Mr. Mike Mills (JSRIP) on Carp Removal.**

13 Mr. Mike Mills, JSRIP Local Coordinator, reported on the history and progress of carp removal of Utah Lake.  
14 Taking an illustration from the book, "*Ecology of Shallow Lakes*," by Martin Scheffer published in 1997; he showed  
15 two different water states that exist in shallow lakes, like Utah Lake. The two water states are clear and turbid. The  
16 primary productivity in a clear water state has a lot of diversity in terms of emergent and submerged aquatic  
17 vegetation with a healthy bird community, a variety of fish species, and different wildlife. Utah Lake may currently be  
18 turbid, where historical evidence shows Utah Lake was once in a clear water state. Turbid water states show there is  
19 a definite reduction in biological diversity and with the main driver wrapped in algae, as seen on Utah Lake. There is  
20 a loss in the varieties of vegetation, fewer birds, and the fish community is dominated by bottom-feeding fish. The  
21 majority of the primary productivity is wrapped up in the production of filamentous or green algae. Common carp,  
22 the bottom-dwelling fish, have pushed Utah Lake into a turbid water state where primary productivity is dominated  
23 by algae and lead to water quality issues. Carp stir up sediment, remove vegetation holding sediment in place, and  
24 are ecological engineers driving the system into a turbid state. Carp was introduced into the Lake in the late 1800s.

25 Literature concerning shallow lake ecology suggests three different drivers push a lake from clear water state to  
26 the turbid water state. First is water level fluctuations -- Utah Lake is managed as a reservoir and it has experienced a  
27 lot of fluctuations in the past. JSRIP funded a study to look at future fluctuations at the Utah Lake water level. Based  
28 on the study, it predicted once the Central Utah Project is complete, fluctuations would be greatly reduced and mimic  
29 the initial historical fluctuations; hence, water level fluctuations are the main area of focus if we want to change Utah  
30 Lake. Second is the nutrient loading – Utah Lake has a significant issue. Third is bottom feeding fish -- the issue of  
31 carp in Utah Lake and JSRIP focuses on is June sucker recovery. JSRIP have the responsibilities over fish and wildlife,  
32 whereas the nutrient loading responsibility rests with other entities.

33 A picture of Ventura Marsh, Iowa, dissected by a dike showed two sides where carp were removed on one side  
34 and not the other. The side that underwent carp removal resulted in a vibrant blue lake, and the other side still with  
35 carp was a dull olive green. A distinct difference was visible and the benefits extended beyond the color of the water.

36 After JSRIP was organized, a study was done to look at the non-native fish in the lake, which fish posed the  
37 biggest impact to recovery, and to the health of the Utah Lake ecosystem. The common carp were implicated as  
38 being the main problem. Different control options were researched. During carp assessment period, the decision on  
39 whether mechanical removal was a feasible alternative was discussed. The majority of fish pulled out was carp and  
40 they dominated the Utah Lake fish community. A lot of feedback and information suggested a large scale commercial  
41 seining would be a meaningful and removable program and have an effect on the common carp population. It took a  
42 long time to implement something, and finally in late 2009-2010, JSRIP was ready to implement a full scale, carp-  
43 removal-program on Utah Lake. The information received revealed in order to make a difference in Utah Lake, over  
44 five million pounds should be removed annually, to achieve a 75 percent reduction in the population within six years.

45 All the targets are based on what is known as a Ricker curve. In Utah Lake's case, the model was pushed to the  
46 edge, and found the point where the population was impacted instead of sustaining and driving it down. Other  
47 things indicate once 75 percent reduction is achieved, some maintenance effort is necessary to maintain the reduced  
48 population. Approximately 600,000 pounds a year would need to be removed in order to maintain the reduced level.  
49 The focus of 75 percent reduction is what the literature suggests is needed in order to return to a clear water state.

1 Fishing is done throughout the year. Wintertime, when the lake ices over, it is a bit more work to seine, but it can  
2 be more efficient and productive. In 2009, there were 80,000 pounds, the largest carp catch received in one day. He  
3 explained the harvesting process and the improved mechanisms Loy Fisheries have implemented utilizing better  
4 technology and improving efficiency. Results throughout the past several years were evaluated from September  
5 2009 until the present. February and March in 2013, showed a tremendous start being removed early in the year.  
6 Funding was a concern, but DNR and Bureau of Reclamation, stepped up and keep things going through 2012.  
7 Residual funding is still available, and JSRIP is covered through the end of February 2014, this fishing season.  
8 Everything removed from September 2009 to the present shows it is just shy of 11 million pounds. A table and  
9 graphs of monthly catch rates, showed winter is the best time. He noted the frustrations of weather, frozen lake, and  
10 other problems incurred causing a lower harvest.

11 JSRIP had chosen to focus on five million pounds a year with a six-year time frame in order to carry out a carp  
12 removal program. If the harvest were sustained at about three million pounds a year, it would take ten years to meet  
13 the 75 percent. Based on the models, 11 million would yield a 20 percent reduction, and have a much more  
14 increased risk. With a ten-year carp removal program, many things can go wrong. JSRIP will continue to push  
15 forward needing to reach the five million pounds a year in order to make a difference. Some issues faced are disposal  
16 of the fish. The commercial fisherman reports if they had a close reliable facility to deliver the carp, they would be  
17 more efficient. Through efforts of Utah Lake Commission, Mr. Price led this effort with support from Representative  
18 McKell, to pursue funding from the state legislature to create a processing plant down on Utah Lake. Unfortunately,  
19 it was not successful, but some good was done in bringing the issues to the attention of the legislature, getting a  
20 discussion initiated, and familiarizing them with the need to do something about the carp issue.

21 Some criticism was received such as private industry making a profit off of the Utah Lake fish. After meeting the  
22 maximum for carp, another fish for human consumption could be processed. It is believed fish meal holds a lot of  
23 promise with the product. Some people suggested going after the money to get the project completed. There are  
24 pros and cons to either option. The efficiency would be good if there was a close facility to take the harvested fish. It  
25 would be cheaper in the long-run to build a facility and gain some revenue back off of the carp in order to reduce the  
26 costs. There is some element of feeling good with what is being done with the fish by creating a product with a  
27 better use than what was previously done by turning them into compost, feeding them to minks, or using them for  
28 fertilizer. If a facility existed, the maintenance necessary long-term after the reduction is achieved, shows there is  
29 always a need to feed the facility and as a result have an outgoing product to sustain it. If funding for removal only  
30 was chosen, JSRIP is ready to go. There is no start-up and no concern about building a facility near Utah Lake, no  
31 permitting, and an ongoing history of four years. Concerns about having to bring in a third party to work with Loy  
32 Fisheries was discussed, who would work with the state lease the facility and run it. There are tradeoffs with both  
33 options. Mr. Mills said JSRIP would like feedback and suggestions of which option is better.

34 Catch rates are still trying to be improved. Over 100 carp in the lake are tagged with telemetry tags. Utah State  
35 University track the fish. Loy Fisheries could look at the data, find areas where the tagged fish are congregating, and  
36 target those areas to fish in order to get a better catch. Loys need to be more trusting in the data received, and be  
37 more adventurous in fishing those areas. It has been discussed about bringing in additional commercial fishing  
38 companies during the good months, to harvest an additional 20,000 pounds a day as there is plenty of catch to go  
39 around so there would not be a lot of conflict. An incentive program was also discussed.

40 The commercial fishermen are hesitant to fish Friday, Saturday, and Sunday during the summer months because  
41 of the large number of recreationists. When they are fishing, everyone is interested in what is going on with the  
42 fishing, therefore, causing problems. Loys reserve fishing for week days and avoid high use days. They felt a better  
43 public outreach campaign about getting the word out why the fishing was going on would reduce the potential for  
44 conflicts. It would be easy for JSRIP to implement starting next month to try to reduce any conflicts.

45 Funding is always an issue. Funding is good through the end of 2013 and into 2014; but beyond that, there are  
46 no guarantees of keeping the program going. It has been difficult to operate on a year-to-year basis as it creates a  
47 concern for everyone that is part of the program. The bottom line is to make a difference in the fish community of  
48 Utah Lake; the carp population needs to be addressed. They are the subject that drives and causes so much damage  
49 to the ecosystem that it is hard to imagine something changing at Utah Lake without addressing the carp. He called  
50 for any questions.

1 Councilman Linford asked about the starting carp population. Utah State is working on a study analyzing data  
2 they collected of the carp population, trying to reassess it, and then give JSIRP an estimate to see if the removal has  
3 made a difference thus far. The report will be forthcoming in the next few months.

4 Mr. Buehler said through the boundary settlements, FFSL ended up with land on the west side of the lake close to  
5 100 acres. FFSL is willing to donate the land for the fish plant. Mr. Price said they are seeking input. He will continue  
6 to work with Representative McKell and Mr. Henry Maddux on the issue, seeking input from the Board to understand  
7 the best direction to pursue such as looking for funding to create a fish meal plant or seek funding to dispose of the  
8 fish. He asked how JSRIP/ULC could strategize to approach the legislature, which is the ultimate caretaker of the lake,  
9 and is ultimately responsible for it. When the previous request was denied, in discussion with Representative McKell,  
10 it was determined there has to be a way to approach Utah State Legislature and help them realize it is their  
11 responsibility to manage the resource. In particular, the Utah County Caucus should be approached to help them  
12 understand it is a state resource, and everyone needs to work together to make the identified Utah Lake  
13 improvements identified through public process with the FFSL and the Commission. One of several objectives in the  
14 Master Plan is to improve water quality, help remove carp, invasive species, improve the fishery. These have been  
15 identified, and it needs to happen. The purpose was to seek responses from the Board to help direct what they want  
16 ULC to do.

17 Councilwoman Call said the costs could be defrayed with implementation, but when it reaches the maintenance  
18 level, if it would still operate in the negative; if the plant were still in the negative at maintenance level, would the  
19 same negative be the same as the cost of fishing. Mr. Mills said he did not know. Part of the vision is the processing  
20 facility would have to take fish from other species and other lakes around the region in order to keep the process  
21 running and not be fully dependent on Utah Lake carp. Councilman Linford asked if people would take what was  
22 processed. Mr. Mills said they would take the fishmeal as stated by several producers. Fishmeal is very costly and  
23 seems to be going up. The idea of using trash fish is appealing based on the amount of harvested carp. Mr. Maddux  
24 said in the analysis of profitability, fishmeal has gone up about 30 percent, it has sustained the level, and it would  
25 defray the costs.

26 Councilman Linford said it was a good idea if some type of funding for either a payback or reduction in costs were  
27 found. Mr. Mills said they did the early research and prepared to go to the legislature. They did the math on costs,  
28 savings, processing, building the facility, and running the program for six years. If a removal option were chosen,  
29 over a period of six years, the cost would be \$7.2 million. The facility will pay for itself. JSIRP could achieve the  
30 savings of \$2 million to pay for it, and sell the fishmeal. Councilman Linford asked where the site would be of the  
31 plant. Mr. Mills said they had struggled with several locations. Councilman Linford asked about the machinery. Mr.  
32 Mills said the machinery alone is around \$800,000. In order to have the location based out, they are looking at \$1  
33 million for that. Councilwoman Call said if ULC were soliciting funds from the legislature, they would need hard data  
34 to back up the request. She would be supportive of more research being done so hard numbers could be taken to  
35 the legislature.

36  
37 **8. Discuss and consider approving a preliminary budget for FY2014.**

38 Mr. Price referred to the proposed budget documents submitted to the Board. The Commission is required to  
39 adopt a preliminary budget prior to approval of the final budget for fiscal year 2014 which begins in July. ULC  
40 membership contributions remain the same as last year resulting in the same revenues totaling \$232,770. It is  
41 anticipated ULC will receive \$2,000 in interest. Some of the fund balance will be used to bring the total revenue to  
42 \$276,000. The \$41,230 from fund balance uses up the unused funds of \$26,800, that should used rather than exceed  
43 the 25 percent fund balance allowed. In actuality, only \$15,000 of the fund balance is being utilized.

44 The recommended preliminary budget for the different accounts was listed under expenditures. The proposed  
45 employee wage increase was 4.6 percent, including a three percent merit increase for employees who have a  
46 satisfactory evaluation, as well as 1.5 percent COLA. It increases the account from \$109,500 to \$114,500, and it  
47 increases the benefits six percent from \$66,570 to \$70,500. Most of the expenditures stay the same. A 14.3 percent  
48 increase was recommended for mileage totaling a \$500 increase, so the Executive Director can be able to view issues  
49 at the lake, go to the state legislature, and state offices more frequently. The other accounts remain the same.  
50 Planned project 6500 accounts show increases. Utah Lake Festival budget increases from \$5,000 to \$6,000, with

1 \$1,000 for partner funding of the Utah Lake Symposium that historically has been put on by JSRIP. As partners, the  
2 symposium will become more Utah Lake centric, rather than with a June sucker focus.

3 There is a decrease in field trip and lesson plans, as the curriculum is up to date, so the \$5,000 is primarily for  
4 field trips. There is no change in website/outreach editorial plan, which helps us reach out to the public. With no  
5 fishing tournament, there are no requests. The communities that have not implemented the model ordinance make  
6 up the consultant budget with the contract balance rolled over for this year. Traditionally ULC sponsors phragmites  
7 removal in the amount of \$10,000 a year. In case grants aren't received, there is enough money available to  
8 purchase necessary chemicals to treat areas where phragmites are re-vegetating.

9 Last year, the Board agreed to partner with other agencies to fund a water quality research station, if  
10 coordinated with efforts of DEQ. As the year progressed, nothing was done despite ULC requests and so the money  
11 was put back into the fund balance because it was not a priority for DEQ to have the station at this time.

12 Mr. Price requested funding for two new accounts, one for the Nature Center and the other for conducting a  
13 public survey. The grant we received from the National Park Service was for consultation services, and so if expenses  
14 are incurred (e.g., conducting a public open house), ULC pays for them so \$3,000 was requested. The Utah Lake  
15 survey with direct mails and outreach to the public request is \$5,000. A contribution was recommended to the Utah  
16 Lake capital projects funds in the amount of \$20,000. The main purpose of the capital project fund has been to help  
17 to co-purchase equipment for phragmites removal and to save money for updating the Master Plan ten years after it  
18 was initially adopted, so in 2019, the process will be initiated again.

19 For the Utah Lake projects fund, the capital projects fund at the end of 2013 fiscal year, there should be a balance  
20 of \$74,907. There are no proposed purchases out of the capital projects fund this year. The contribution would leave  
21 a balance of \$94,907. Mayor Hadfield called for questions.

22 Mayor Curtis said it is hard to vote for wage increases beyond what the cities and state are doing. He suggested a  
23 comparative study of member cities/state over a several-year period be gathered to evaluate. He wonders what is  
24 happening to determine funds for a better fish processing plant. He finds it hard explaining it to the legislature. He  
25 didn't know about the impact of it and whether to abort it or not.

26 Representative McKell said the state agreed on a one percent salary increase this year when there have been no  
27 increases in the past several years. He would like to see a comparison work performance analysis, also.

28 Representative McKell serves as vice-chair on the committee for appropriations. Mr. Buehler and Mr. Styler  
29 attend every meeting. The policy and fiscal analysts in the legislature, questioned if the processing plant was critical  
30 for carp removal. It is a question needing an answer. On the surface, it is not critical to the removal project itself, so  
31 a clear answer has to be found. He suggested having an event and bringing Utah County political leaders and  
32 legislators together. He encouraged all the Board members to contact their associates to attend the event utilizing  
33 their political relationships. Utah Lake is owned by the state of Utah, and it is the state's responsibility as legislators  
34 to make sure it is maintained appropriately. It will take having an event, getting legislators to attend it and to make  
35 them aware. This year, the Commission needs to start earlier, get out in front, and receive support from the county  
36 representatives. Additional ongoing money was funded for invasive species phragmites removal.

37 Councilwoman Call asked about the Utah Lake survey for \$5,000, and she encouraged Mr. Price to use the  
38 printed direct mail in combination with social media, and others items that don't incur cost. Mr. Price said his idea  
39 was to send the same survey to different social and public entities. He wanted to specifically monitor one to have  
40 accurate data. The survey will involve calling on the phone as well.

41 Mayor Hadfield said voting will not be done on the tentative preliminary budget, but approval will be done later.

42 **a. Set date and time for a public hearing and final approval of the FY2014 budget.**

43 Mr. Price recommended the Governing Board set a public hearing at 8:30 a.m. on May 23.

44 Mayor Farnworth moved a public hearing and final approval of the FY2014 budget be set for 8:30 a.m. on May 23  
45 it was seconded by Councilwoman Call. The motion carried and voting was unanimous.

46  
47 **9. General Comments from Board Members and the Public.**

48 Mr. Maddux, June Sucker Program Director, said JSRIP would like to help fund the request to do a feasibility  
49 analysis of the carp plant, the building, and everything. He can work with the director.

1 Mr. Larry Ballard presented papers making the Board aware of his concerns and research of the toxicity of  
2 Roundup, which contains glyphosate. Glyphosate used in the AquaNeat is being sprayed on the phragmites.  
3 According to Mr. Ballard, Monsanto, the company that produced AquaNeat, has hid information. EPA has caught  
4 scientists deliberately falsifying test results at a research laboratory. Canada no longer allows Roundup to be used as  
5 an herbicide. He suggested the Commission push back on this particular issue as it could affect many things.  
6

7 **10. Confirm the next meeting of the Governing Board to be held on Thursday, May 23, 2013 at 7:30 a.m.**

8 Mayor Hadfield confirmed the next meeting is scheduled at the Historic Courthouse Ballroom (3<sup>rd</sup> Floor) on  
9 Thursday, May 23, 2013 at 7:30 a.m.  
10

11 **11. Adjourn.**

12 Mayor Curtis moved the meeting be adjourned; it was seconded by Councilwoman Call. The motion carried and  
13 voting was unanimous. Mayor Hadfield adjourned the meeting at 9:18 a.m.