



**UTAH LAKE COMMISSION (ULC)
PUBLIC ADVISORY GROUP**

Tuesday, November 13, 2012, 10:00 AM
Historic Utah County Courthouse, Suite 211/212
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission
Val Hale, Utah Valley Chamber of Commerce
Mel Smith or Keith Morgan, Utah Waterski Club
Carol Walters, Utah Valley Earth Forum
Garrick Hall, Utah Farm Bureau

ATTENDEES:

Neal Anderson, Utah County Farm Bureau
Carin Green, Executive Assistant

VISITORS

Kara Butterfield, The Nature Conservancy

Absent:

Bonneville School of Sailing & Seamanship, Utah Waterfowl Association, Saratoga Springs Owners Association, Sierra Club, Utah County Association of Realtors, and Utah Valley Convention & Visitors Bureau.

1 **1. Welcome and Introductions.**

2 Mr. Reed Price, Executive Director, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. He welcomed everyone in
3 attendance and asked each person to introduce the group each represented. He excused Mr. and Mrs. Todd and
4 Louise Frye from Bonneville School of Sailing & Seamanship and Mr. Taylor Oldroyd from Utah County Realtors.
5

6 **2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Commission Public Advisory Group minutes from August 14, 2012.**

7 Mr. Price asked if there were any questions, discussion, or corrections of the minutes from the August 14, 2012,
8 meeting. Mr. Neal Anderson motioned to approve the minutes of August 14, 2012. Mr. Mel Smith seconded the
9 motion. The motion passed unanimously.
10

11 **3. Update on Commission priorities.**

12 Mr. Price gave an update on the Utah Lake Commission priorities and projects.

13 ***a. Invasive Species:***

14 ***(1) Carp Removal:*** Carp removal has received more focused attention from the Governing Board. The
15 Department of Natural Resources (DNR) spoke with Mr. Price and the Governing Board seeking assistance in finding
16 a more beneficial manner to dispose of the carp and defray the cost of removal. Presently, it costs about \$1.5
17 million a year to remove the targeted numbers of five million pounds per year. Federal grants as well as matching
18 monies from the State Endangered Species Mitigation Fund provided the financial means. Increased awareness of
19 other possible endangered species is warranted as they potentially could be put on the list of endangered species,
20 such as sage grouse. Because of funding demands, the state needs to use money earmarked for carp removal to
21 focus on other endangered species.

22 Utah Lake Commission's Master Plan's goal of carp removal needs to happen. The state asked the Commission
23 to approach the legislature to seek funding to help the process move along. The State's Endangered Species

1 Program has done research and the best choice is to seek funding for a carp processing facility to create fish meal
2 from the harvested fish. Fish meal is a highly valued and used commodity in Utah and around the world.

3 The Board directed Mr. Price to approach the state legislature asking for funding to construct the facility and
4 purchase the processing equipment. The facility will be put on state lands near Goose Point, where a lot of fishing
5 occurs. A strategy is being developed to garnish support from the state legislature. The Utah County caucus will be
6 approached at the beginning of December. Utah County Council of Governments (COG) has heard of the plan.
7 Several mayors are on the Commission's Board, but all mayors are members of COG. The Utah Valley Chamber of
8 Commerce (UVCC) supported the goal as one of their top priorities for 2013. There are still questions to be
9 answered, but the Commission is meeting requirements to get the needed appropriation of \$3 million dollars to
10 cover costs of the construction, extension of utilities, and equipment. A shortfall of \$500,000 is anticipated and
11 needs to be provided the first few years to fund carp removal. The plant is a productive, creative way to use the fish
12 rather than throwing them out. Carp removal helps water quality issues, helps the more desirable fish to grow
13 larger, and the endangered species to recover. The paybacks are the lake becomes a better, inviting environment;
14 and the economic benefits will be a greater place for businesses to relocate.

15 The goal is to remove 75 percent of the population within six to seven years, about five million pounds of fish
16 per year. Mr. Bill Loy, the fisherman, has good and bad days with as low as 10,000 pounds a day to as high as over
17 80,000 pounds at the same time. Seasons come and things change with winter being a productive but labor-
18 intensive season. He fishes through the ice, but winter 2012 was never safe to ice fish.

19 Mr. Mel Smith asked if they expect fish processing to be money making after a few years. Mr. Price said they
20 hoped it would. Costs would be significantly reduced by producing a useable product. Mr. Garrick Hall said it
21 wouldn't be profitable as it was trying to cover \$1.5 million, however, with the \$1.5 million it presently costs, shows
22 it really is profitable. Mrs. Carol Waters said if a \$500,000 shortfall is anticipated, there is \$1 million year revenue.
23 Mr. Price concurred with her understanding, stating it was the projection of the model.

24 The Governing Board backs the project. The strategy is to gather support from various organizations such as
25 COG, UVCC, universities, and then approach the legislature. A few key legislators in the area will be approached
26 over the next few weeks to brief and seek their assistance. There is funding available through a Division of Forestry,
27 Fire, and State Lands, (FFSL) sovereign lands account. Seeing something of this magnitude move forward is exciting
28 and it will help the region. He called for questions on the carp processing plant.

29 Mr. Smith asked when all the carp were removed if the facility would be out of business, or if it was a long-term
30 effort. Mr. Price said there would always be a removal effort; they want to get rid of it quickly, but fish would
31 always be there and other fish would take over. As the carp is removed, the white bass is being harvested with the
32 carp. It would be another predator fish. Mr. Val Hale said if the bass population could be increased, it would attract
33 fishermen, as it is a very popular sport. Mr. Price said the money is in the human consumption. If the white bass get
34 larger, there is potential to harvest fish for fillets for human consumption and doing it at the same facility.

35 Mrs. Walters asked about the edibility of the Utah Lake fish as there are health warnings attached to them. Mr.
36 Price said carp and bullhead catfish are only two fish with warnings attached. Health advisory comes from PCBs,
37 found all around the world. The Health Department and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which monitors or
38 regulates the commercial industry, follow different regulations. He equated PCBs to marbles; the Health
39 Department's limit is six marbles per fish; FDA is 200. Utah Lake Carp and Black Bullhead catfish have seven
40 marbles, and so they are barely over the Health Department's limit has but well under the FDA limits. Carp fish meal
41 has been tested for PCBS, can't be found, and is below detection limits. PCBs do not go away.

42 Mr. Hall asked if the state would be able to purchase all the fish meal produced. Mr. Price said yes. Fish meal is
43 only one component of fish food. The amount of fish meal the state currently uses is being imported and Utah's
44 needs exceed the amount the plant would be able to produce. Mr. Hall asked if it was being used in state fish
45 hatcheries, etc. Mr. Price concurred. Mr. Hall said it sounded like the business would generate \$1 million a year but
46 not cover the costs to remove the fish. He asked if this was an opportunity for a private business or partnership.
47 Mr. Price said the Commission wanted to create a facility and lease it out to a private business to process, as the
48 state does not want to run it. The issue is trying to get businesses interested in doing something with the fish. Lots
49 of people want to take it, but don't have resources to start up; cash flow is not there to sustain the facility and is
50 seen as a short-term venture. Companies have expressed interest and stated if a building and/or equipment were

1 provided, they would run it, but no contracts are in place. Mr. Smith asked for the type of facility, description, and
2 location. Mr. Price said the location would be on the shore near West Mountain/Goshen. He had reservations being
3 close to the shore and in an undeveloped area. Though it is not being used now, in 20 years, everybody will ask why
4 a building was put there. The answer is it is state land so no acquisition costs are incurred. It is an area where the
5 anglers fish on the south end. There are no utilities and they have to be brought in, which is an ordeal. Rough
6 estimates of the size and cost are completed, but a rendering is not available. When an agreement is in place with
7 funding, then the specific questions will be answered.

8 Mrs. Walters asked what the Group could do to help the cause. Mr. Price said to wait until after he meets with
9 the Utah County Caucus on December 5, and see how they react. Mr. Hale asked if another meeting was scheduled
10 with any legislators prior. Mr. Price said yes; assignments were given to Commissioner Larry Ellertson, Mayor John
11 Curtis, and several other Mayors to reach out and get specific legislators onboard. Mr. Hale said it would help to get
12 advocates in the group. Mr. Price said they wanted one of the legislators to lead the charge. Those targeted are
13 Mrs. Becky Lockhart, Mr. Curt Bramble, Mr. John Valentine, and Mrs. Deidre Henderson of Spanish Fork.
14 Commissioner Ellertson will approach the governor to make him aware and not catch him by surprise. A game plan
15 is in place and everyone is anxiously waiting for the caucus and the meeting with the legislature. He will keep them
16 posted on the progress. If the Group can think of any helpful ideas, they should contact Mr. Price. There has been
17 great support and he didn't expect any pushback, but legislators may have different perspectives.

18 ii. **Phragmites:** In August, the Phragmites Removal Team (PRT) treated 750 acres from the outlet of the Jordan
19 River around to the Lindon Boat Harbor. The difficult aspect was coordinating with private landowners and
20 obtaining permission to access their land. Other projects, PRT was able to access through state or public lands on
21 other projects. This area had 45 land owners to be contacted. Permission was obtained from all but one to treat the
22 phragmites on their lands. The north acreage was funded by the Department of Agriculture and Food (DOAF) grant.
23 PRT received \$119,000 to treat 750 acres with the aquatic-rated glyphosate. Recently, crews have been creating
24 fuel breaks. PRT hopes to join forces with FFSL to burn the north end after creating the fuel breaks. FFSL, who has
25 management responsibilities for the sovereign lands, will conduct the burn sometime winter/spring.

26 Mrs. Walters asked what the air pollution would be if there was a burn. Mr. Price said phragmites burning
27 causes a very dark black, nasty smoke and certain environmental conditions are required, usually with a storm
28 moving in to push out released particulate matter. If the conditions or permits from the Division of Air Quality were
29 not obtained, the burn could not happen. The phragmites still biodegrades, but it would take longer; however,
30 when the lake level comes up, it biodegrades faster covered with water. PRT can begin reseeding and other efforts
31 to improve the shoreline when it is removed. Ms. Kara Butterfield asked if state lands would conduct the burns. Mr.
32 Price said yes, and Utah County would assist them. Another 750-acre area was treated with the helicopter in the
33 south end near the Utah Lake State Park. This area cannot be burned because of the close proximity to the airport
34 and residential areas. Ms. Butterfield said The Nature Conservancy has 108 acres. She is meeting with landowners
35 to discuss phragmites. A landowner asked her if private owners could have treatments done. Mr. Price said yes, but
36 to contact him personally. They have already helped some private landowners with the helicopter using the extra
37 chemical to spray the owner's land. Ms. Butterfield said the landowner felt phragmites was out of control and goes
38 into the lake, beyond the shoreline. Mr. Price said they are not against helping landowners as PRT is trying to build
39 momentum. Things are moving forward, with a lot of support from various organizations who support the efforts.
40 Ms. Butterfield asked if they would still be too close to do burns this winter. Mr. Price said they wouldn't want to
41 burn this winter because the land had not been treated, if it is treated, it can be burned. Ms. Butterfield asked if
42 they were still too close to residential to burn after treatment. Mr. Price said it would depend.

43 Mr. Smith asked about the single landowner who did not want to have his acreage treated and the amount of
44 land it represented. Mr. Price said it was 30 acres. Mr. Smith asked if it posed a problem for PRT. Mr. Price said the
45 owner would have to treat and the laws are written in a way PRT could compel him to do it. Mr. Neal Anderson
46 asked the owner's concern for not participating. Mr. Price said it was the government on his property; although
47 adjacent landowners tried to convince him it was a good project for the region. He also claimed his cows would eat
48 the stuff and it was feed for his cows. Also, if phragmites was removed, what would PRT replace it with, and at that
49 time, we didn't have answers for him. PRT is trying to go in and reseed in areas where agriculturalists don't farm.
50 The time frame was short to move forward on the project. PRT received notification the grant was awarded in June,

1 and treatment would begin in the middle of July. There was only a month to coordinate with the landowners. Mr.
2 Smith asked if he would be targeted next year. Mr. Price said yes.

3 Mrs. Walters said Mr. Larry Ballard expressed concern and wanted assurance about the glyphosate. The same
4 company that developed glyphosate (the active ingredient in the chemical used by the PRT) also developed Agent
5 Orange and was dishonest about the safety of that product so the company is not to be trusted on this product. She
6 asked if there was independent research, not producer-based, that may provide reassurance for people who have
7 concerns about the AquaNeat. Mr. Price said he didn't have an answer to the question. He met with Mr. Ballard to
8 discuss his concern and he understood PRT was following instructions according to the label. Mr. Ballard was
9 referred to DOAF. Mr. Price's understands and trusts that DOAF and other agencies have done the research and
10 determined it is safe. PRT complies with regulations and works with Utah County's weed experts who follow the
11 label. Mr. Anderson said Glyosphate is regarded as one of the safest chemicals. As soon as it contacts soil, it breaks
12 down; so glyosphate is relatively safe. Mrs. Walters asked about the water setting. Mr. Anderson said AquaNeat is
13 an aquatic-rated chemical designed for water. He was sure extensive research had been done, but he has not seen
14 it. Mr. Hall said the product has been out for years, so research should be there, but it is a matter of finding out who
15 has it. Mrs. Walters said she would talk to the people at the Extension Agency. Mr. Price said they had been very
16 careful to make sure they follow all protocol and requirements of the label in applying the chemical because they
17 don't want to do something wrong and being wrongfully accused. He didn't dismiss Mr. Ballard's concerns.

18 County crews will be out on the projects all winter working on the area with the Land Tamers. Mr. Smith said
19 there was a significant increase in visibility and PRT should be commended for what has been achieved. Mr. Price
20 estimated 5500 acres had phragmites and they have treated almost 2000 acres. Mr. Smith asked if in 2013,
21 treatment would be about the same level. Mr. Price said it would depend on grant availability. Mr. Smith asked if
22 grants were available if they anticipate treating another 1000 to 1500 acres again. Mr. Price said plans are to
23 continue into Provo Bay down around the south end. Mr. Anderson asked if there was going to be continued money
24 available for maintenance as prevention is easier than removal. Mr. Price said in their focus areas already treated,
25 PRT would assure of maintenance with retreatment. Mr. Anderson asked what product they would use to re-seed.
26 Mr. Price said they did not know, but it would be in next year's grant. He asked for suggestions from Mr. Anderson.
27 PRT is encouraging more desirable species like cattail and hard-stem bulrushes, native species that will not take over
28 the shoreline, that can be fertilized, provide habitat to fish, and sediment stabilization. A lot of the area is open
29 beach and to keep it open by treatment would be best. Ms. Butterfield said she could check with her preserve
30 manager to see what he uses. They may have been doing willow planting. There were no other questions.

31 **b. Transportation:** The Westside Connector, connecting University Avenue exit with the airport, is expected
32 to start construction sometime this fall, but it hasn't started yet. Funding is in place for the project and it should be
33 moving forward. Mr. Harward with Utah Crossing has not contacted anyone with the bridge, but the application is
34 still active. Mrs. Walters asked if there was expiration on the applications. Mr. Price said rules were not set up at
35 present, but FFSL are trying to see if a rule could be implemented and be retroactive for applications to expire, but
36 currently, there is not one. There has been no significant progress made on trails over the past three months.

37 **c. Land Use:** The model ordinance has been discussed in the past. Mr. Price has been working with Provo
38 and Springville, which are both moving forward. Springville is moving a little faster. Provo had someone over the
39 project retire, and the new person is getting familiar with the adoption process of the model ordinance. He sits on a
40 Provo City Sustainability Committee who meets monthly and they are suggesting to the Planning Commission to
41 make it a priority. He was hopeful it would move forward.

42 Mrs. Walter said her group has been asking people to write to the County Commission/city organizations to ask
43 them to adopt the model ordinance. She wondered if it was helpful. Mr. Price said he didn't know. People he met
44 with have not said they are receiving calls, which would be the best indicator. He can ask who has heard from
45 concerned citizens. Mr. Smith asked who in Provo would be the best person to contact. Mr. Price said Mr. Bill
46 Peperone.

47 **d. Public Education and Outreach:** An application for a National Park Service Grant was made, which would
48 provide consultation services aimed specifically at creating a conceptual plan for a nature center/research facility
49 adjacent to Utah Lake. He received notice Utah Lake Commission was awarded the grant. The Commission will be
50 inviting key stakeholders and the public to give ideas what they would like to see in a facility. They will also consider

1 various sites for location, and the final product will be a document identifying the Commission’s vision for the
2 facility. Then they would approach partners to get the land, for construction, staffing the facility, etc. One of the
3 key components envisioned is as a trailhead, so it would serve as a nature center and/or research facility where
4 people can park to bike/walk to the area or park for biking/walking. It would be the gathering point for the Utah
5 Lake Trail System, which will eventually circumnavigate the lake. Ms. Butterfield asked if he was working with Ms.
6 Marcy DeMillion. Mr. Price said yes, and she is a key person. Mr. Smith asked the amount of the grant. Mr. Price
7 said there was no money attached, but consultation services. The staff is dedicated to helping communities to plan
8 for recreation and trails-oriented goals. Two people are assigned to the region consisting mostly of Utah and part of
9 Wyoming. They are able to fund five or six projects per year. The staff works together with the communities during
10 the planning process to produce the document to make recreational improvements. This goal is multi-faceted. With
11 the Nature Center/Research Facility and the expected trail system, there are partners of federal, state, and local
12 community leaders. He received several letters from Group members supporting the concept. Mr. Anderson asked
13 if Utah Lake Commission was interested in having other trails come into the perimeter trail. Mr. Price said the
14 building would be a hub to the trail. Other community trails could feed into the main Lake Trail. Mr. Anderson said
15 he is President of an irrigation company, and are in the process of discussion and working with Spanish Fork City on
16 taking a trail down the irrigation canal, eventually coming down the Spanish Fork River to the lake. The easement of
17 the irrigation trail would go from the mouth of Spanish Fork Canyon to within three miles of the lake. Mr. Price was
18 positive with the idea.

19 The National Collegiate Bass Fishing Tournament was a very successful and fun event. There was great weather
20 with an occasional storm but the lake cooperated and it wasn’t dangerous at any point. Footage was taken, edited
21 together, and was recently broadcast. Mr. Smith asked who won. Mr. Price said California State Long Beach. The
22 winning total was 22 pounds, averaging seven pounds a day. The program noted it was not the ideal time of the
23 year to be fishing on Utah Lake. The Commission was fortunate they utilized the lake and with the exposure, the
24 economic impact was about \$70,000 with the crews who spent money on hotel rooms, restaurants, etc. As
25 executive director, he hoped to do it again in the future. He will send the broadcast link to the Group. The program
26 is 45 minutes, portrays the Lake and citizens well, and it should receive positive attention.

27 The Commission’s website needs updates with fresh stories each week. He asked for ideas to highlight about
28 Utah Lake, individuals using the lake, etc. Mrs. Walters has a neighbor who has been fishing at the lake. She will get
29 Mr. Price his contact information.

30 **e. Coordination:** The Commission is to coordinate state agencies, federal agencies, and local municipalities
31 to assure all are on the same page and moving forward, as in the carp processing plant endeavor.

32 **f. Other:** At the last Governing Board meeting, a frank dialogue was held concerning goals to make Utah
33 Lake more inviting. It is difficult to complete projects based solely on grants. The Commission needs to come up
34 with a long-term solution, with a dedicated funding stream to make a real difference in Utah Lake goals/projects.
35 Ideas discussed were creating a special district, making the Commission an authority, or approaching municipalities
36 to see if a charge could be put on wastewater treatment. Whatever method is decided, an estimated \$5-6 per
37 household would generate \$1 million a year, which could accomplish a lot. The Commission is considering ways to
38 get a dedicated, long-term funding stream to accomplish what has been identified in the Master Plan. No one likes
39 to give government money, but if framed correctly to show the benefits to our area, the money would promote the
40 area. Recreational-type amenities seem to be embraced and supported. The process is just beginning to figure out
41 what would be the best way to spread the responsibility to create these improvements on Utah Lake, and what
42 mechanism to do it. He asked if any in the group had experts who knew about of fund raising and he would be
43 happy to talk to them. The county has staff he has been working with. Utah Lake Commission needs to grow up and
44 start focusing on things needing to happen, and not just hope funding will come from nowhere or the state will fund
45 everything. Mr. Smith felt it was a wise move. Mr. Price will keep the Group updated on the process and progress.

46
47 **4. Discuss ideas/concerns of the group.**

48 Mr. Smith wanted to brief the group about a proposal that would benefit their water ski club. The Utah
49 Waterski Club with 75 members has a permit to install slalom courses in a couple of places along the lake. One of
50 the best courses is at the end by the airport. A slalom course is a series of six buoys. The water skier goes behind

1 the boat skiing through the buoys back and forth across the course. Several people in the club have skied nationally,
2 and slalom is one of the main activities of the club. A serious water skier on the open lake would find it very
3 dangerous with the other boat traffic, when cutting at high speed of 30 miles an hour behind a boat and generating
4 speeds at 50-60 miles an hour. The proposed location is good, but a problem is when the lake goes low, the water
5 level goes down, and it becomes dangerous for skiers in 18 inches to 20 inches of water. The club wants to propose
6 to FFSL to dredge the area for the course.

7 The club has potential funding opportunities, with recommendations for the removed mud and silt. The Club
8 will be asking for the Commission's support if they move forward. Mrs. Walters asked if there was any perceived
9 environmental impact. Mr. Smith said there might be and a study will be required from FFSL, but was unsure what it
10 would entail. Mr. Price said because of the dredging, a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers would be required.
11 An environmental impact study would need to be done. Mr. Price said the Commission's Master Plan identifies a
12 need for dredging in well-defined areas for the benefit of recreation. Mr. Smith said it was actually done in the
13 harbor and other areas. Mr. Price proposed they use the Master Plan to justify the need for the recreation purpose.
14 He said the Ski Club is looking at dredging 2-3 feet across the whole area and it would be done in a way it would
15 have limited impact on fish in the area. Mr. Price said there were experts at the state, US Fish and Wildlife Service,
16 and Army Corps of Engineers to tell them what is required. The Commission will help figure out how to get through
17 the process, review it, and offer the Commission's input.

18 Mrs. Walters said whatever improves the visibility of the lake for the communities are good things. Mr. Smith
19 said they wanted to meet the requirements. Mr. Price asked if there was potential to have national competitions.
20 Mr. Smith said he didn't know. He would like to have the competition at Skipper's Bay area. There are various
21 tournaments held in Utah. The Ski Club would like to have a three-event set up with the ability to jump.

22 Mrs. Walters asked for a quick update on the Provo River Delta plans. Mr. Price said the last update had Utah
23 Mitigation Conservation Commission, a federal agency who oversees projects, working with the landowners to find
24 willing sellers and working trades with those who didn't want to sell. It is still in a review process. They are working
25 behind the scenes with landowners to mitigate or appease their concerns so they can move forward. Mrs. Walters
26 asked for a reference and Mr. Price said he would send her the contact information of Mr. Mark Holden. Mr.
27 Anderson asked if there were any condemnation powers resolving the matter. Mrs. Walters said there were
28 condemnation powers but they were trying hard not to use them. Mr. Price said the Commission recommended
29 decision-makers do everything possible not to use the condemnation powers. Mr. Anderson said from his
30 perspectives, one of their concerns was if the property rights were to be upheld. Mr. Price said it appeared the
31 landowners were working well with the Mitigation Commission. If the project moves forward, they will continue to
32 work together.

33
34 **5. Confirm the next meeting will be held in Suite 211 of the Historic Utah County Courthouse on Tuesday,**
35 **February 12, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.**

36 The next meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, February 12, 2013, at 10:00 a.m. in Suite 211 of the Historic Utah
37 County Courthouse.

38
39 **6. Adjourn.**

40 Mr. Price thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m.