

APPROVED- 2/26/2009



GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Thursday, January 22, 2009 – 7:30 AM.
Historic County Courthouse Ballroom – 3rd floor
51 South University Avenue, Provo, Utah

ATTENDEES:

Mayor Lewis K. Billings, Chairman
Larry A. Ellertson, Vice-Chair
Reed Price, Utah Lake Commission
Mark Atwood, Pleasant Grove
Don Blohm, Highland
Dick Buehler, Forestry, Fire & State Lands
Stephen Clark, House of Representatives
Mayor Jim Dain, Lindon
Chris Finlinson, Central UT Water Conservancy District
Mayor Howard H. Johnson, Lehi
Leah Ann Lamb, UT Dept. of Environmental Quality
James Linford, Santaquin
Dean F. Olsen, Springville
Mayor Timothy Parker, Saratoga Springs
Mayor Heber Thompson, American Fork
Mayor Jerry Washburn, Orem
Steve Densley, Provo/Orem Chamber of Commerce
John Hendrickson, Eagle Mountain

Other Interested Parties

Bruce Chesnut, Orem
Greg Beckstrom, Provo
Dave Grierson, Forestry, Fire & State Lands
Stephen Schwendiman, Attorney General's Office
Gene Shawcroft, Central UT Water Conservancy District
Dave Wham, UT Dept. of Environmental Quality
Michael Mills, JSRIP
Robert West, Provo
Rick Cox, URS, Inc.
Marsha McLean, Utah Valley Sierra Forum
Laura Snow, Utah Valley Sierra Forum
Matt Clark, Utah Waterfowl Association
Joel Racker, UT Valley Convention & Visitors Bureau
LaVere Merritt, Consultant
Bob Trombly, Provo

ABSENT:

Genola, Mapleton, Vineyard, Woodland Hills, UT Dept. of Natural Resources

1. Welcome and call to order

Chairman Lewis K. Billings welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 7:35 A.M. He noted that additional agendas were available. He asked if anyone was in attendance for the first time.

2. Review and approve the Utah Lake Commission minutes from November 20, 2008

Chairman Billings asked everyone to review the minutes from November. There wasn't a December meeting. Mayor Heber Thompson moved to approve the minutes and Ms. Chris Finlinson seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Review and approve the monthly financial reports of the Commission for Nov. and Dec. 2008

Mr. Price reported that the Commission is fully funded for the fiscal year having received all the payments from all the entities. Because the Governing Board did not meet in December there were two financial reports presented.

For the month of November the Zion's Bank Checking Account balance was \$1,532.79 and the Zion's Bank Money Market balance was \$272,775.10. The Expenses for November totaled \$38,606.58. The Budget Report shows that there was 63% of the year remaining with 58.3% of the fiscal year outstanding.

The December 31, 2008 report shows the Zion's Checking Account balance was \$2,121.27 and the Zion's Bank Money Market account was \$254,287.51. Expenses for the month of December totaled \$18,455.86.

The Budget Report shows that 58% of the budget was remaining with 50% of the fiscal year outstanding.

Mayor Timothy Parker moved to approve both financial reports and Mayor Jim Dain seconded the motion. The November and December financial reports were approved unanimously.

4. Report from the Executive Director (10 min)

Mr. Price referred to the copy included in the Governing Board packets of a letter dated January 7, 2009 from the Director of the local government division of Office of the State Auditor. The letter states the financial review for year ending June 30, 2008 submitted by the Commission to them was in substantial compliance with reporting requirements. Mr. Price commented that in these difficult financial times the Commission is doing its best to stay within the budget. With the Master Plan budget not being a part of next year's budget he anticipates that the budget allotments should remain the same, if not decreasing. He suggested, at this point, the members should plan on budgeting the same amount as last year.

He turned the floor over to Mr. Michael Mills to report on the June Sucker Recovery Implementation Program (JSRIP). Mr. Mills reported that the carp removal project is continuing to make progress with over 700,000 pounds of carp having been removed so far. Back in November about 250,000 pounds had been removed. As the lake started to freeze, the progress slowed down a little. The fishermen have been able to fish through the ice a couple of times now. Loy Fishery who is conducting the carp removal has been in contact with some Minnesota fishermen that have several years expertise. One of the fishermen is coming out to Utah next week to share his expertise. The goal is to remove 2 ½ million pounds of carp by June.

Mr. Dick Buehler asked where Mr. Loy is currently operating so he could go and view the process. Mr. Loy has been operating mostly in Goshen Bay. Yesterday, Mr. Loy moved to Lincoln Point. Mr. Mills explained that the fishermen cut a series of holes in the ice in long, straight lines. They then string nets under the ice. The gentleman from Minnesota who is coming out has higher technical equipment which are, in effect, mini-submarines that go under the ice to set up the nets. Mayor Parker suggested that this is a great publicity opportunity. Mr. Mills said they would like a few weeks before inviting the press.

Mr. Price said the Special Master has made a decision regarding the boundary settlement and asked Mr. Buehler to give an update on the proceedings. Mr. Buehler reviewed that Judge Dale Kimball appointed a Special Master a couple years ago to recommend a settlement of the remaining settlement properties on the lake. Mr. Goldsmith gave the landowners two opportunities to prove title, use and possession which were the same burdens given to the State. The Special Master considered the evidence from both sides and about a month ago he ruled that he would discount the evidence submitted by the landowners and will use the State's evidence to determine the settlement. The best case scenario will be a foot below compromise or the worst scenario would be a foot and a half feet below compromise, but maybe somewhere in-between. The Special Master wants to go out on the lake in the spring and look at each individual parcel. This suit was filed in 1997 and has been a long process. The State is hoping to conclude this litigation sometime this year. Chairman Billings asked if the landowners can appeal the decision following Judge Kimball certifying the settlement. Mr. Buehler said they can appeal the decision.

Mr. Price said the boundary settlement is one of the objectives and goals of the Master Plan. He said it was exciting to see movement towards settling the boundary dispute.

The removal of phragmites (invasive species) is another objective of the Commission and will be discussed further on in the agenda.

The Master Plan is progressing. It is hoped a final draft will be ready for approval next month. Some remaining decisions will be resolved in today's meeting.

The Utah Lake Festival planning will begin soon and the committee for that event with representatives from the participating cities and agencies will be meeting together.

Mr. Price is compiling a list of the important information about the Commission to share with the people who will be running for office this year. The Commission has a lot of energy and with the possibility that there could be changes of elected officials, Mr. Price said he felt it is important to educate those running for office earlier rather than following the election.

Mr. Densley asked if there were any mayors who had decided not to run for re-election. Mayor Parker stated that he is not going to be running again for office.

Chairman Billings commented that earlier in the month he met with Mr. Allen Harrison. Mr. Harrison has retired from the Bear Lake Commission, but as our Commission was being formed Mr. Harrison was actively involved in promoting the causes of Utah Lake.

5. Conduct election of officers (20 min)

Mr. Stephen Schwendiman as Council for the Commission said he had reviewed the Bylaws with Mr. Price in regard to the election of officers. He reviewed that the Commission came into effect after legislature authorized the State's participation which was followed by Utah County and the individual cities joining the Commission through their councils. This happened in the spring of 2007.

In April of 2007 there was an election of the Chairman and Vice Chair. Reading from the minutes of April 19, 2007 it states, "A motion was made to nominate Provo Mayor Lewis Billings to serve as Commission Chair for the balance of 2007 until the end of 2008 assuming the By-laws are approved as drafted." However, the Bylaws were not adopted until October, 2007. In the By-laws it reads, "The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be elected from among the official representatives on the Governing Board by a majority vote of the Governing Board. **Initial** elections of Chair and Vice-Chair shall be conducted at the first meeting of the Commission. Those individuals shall serve until the first meeting following the next full calendar year." Mr. Schwendiman's opinion was that the initial appointment of the Chair and Vice-Chair was basically an interim appointment. The By-laws continue reading, "Thereafter, elections shall be held bi-annually at the first meeting of the calendar year" which means every two years elections would be held. Mr. Schwendiman stated that the interim Chair and Vice-Chair were approved by the Board to serve until the end of 2007 with the intent that they would be officially elected in January, 2008. In checking the minutes there wasn't an election held in January.

In the Interlocal Agreement, Article 10.4 – Leadership, it reads, "The Governing Board shall have a Chair and a Vice-Chair elected by and from their members, whose term shall expire every two years." The question is when the term begins. In Mr. Schwendiman's interpretation the term should have begun January, 2008 because April to December was an interim period. Although the By-laws indicate that the Chair and Vice Chair terms would have been completed at the end of 2008, they were not formally adopted until October, 2008 which superseded the motion that carried that they would serve through 2008. Everything that has happened has been valid and he doesn't see anything that would be questioned. Mr. Schwendiman stated that it would be appropriate for the Governing Board to confirm that Mayor Billings and Commissioner Ellertson have served validly this last year and that they would continue through the end of this year.

Mr. Price stated that they realized last February elections should have been held in January, 2008. He agrees with Mr. Schwendiman that the original intent was for the term of the Chair and Vice-Chair to be 2008 through the end of 2009. He noted that there was a change made in the By-laws in the February, 2008 Governing Board meeting. That change appears on Page 4, Section 6.2 - Election of Officers and is as follows: "Those individuals shall serve until the first meeting **following** ~~of~~ the next **full calendar year.**"

Discussion followed. It was clarified that the term would continue to be two years. Since 2008 was the first full calendar year it would be appropriate that the terms for the Chair and Vice-Chair would be 2008-2009. Mr. Schwendiman suggested that the Board ratify that Chairman Billings and Vice-Chair Ellertson served appropriately in 2008 and to authorize the completion of the terms through the end of 2009.

Ms. Leah Ann Lamb questioned if the By-laws need to be changed back to their original language along with the other components and Mr. Schwendiman said it wouldn't be significant.

Mayor Parker moved that the Governing Board in recognition of the service of the current Chair and Vice Chair ratify that their service was legitimate from the beginning of their service and that they continue in those positions until the term ends as specified in the By-laws. It was seconded by Mayor Dain and approved unanimously.

Chairman Billings suggested that the By-law modification that has been proposed come forward through the ad hoc committee.

Mr. Price requested discussion on the term of office for the Chairman of the Technical Committee. He recommended that the Technical Committee Chair and Vice Chair parallel the terms of the Governing Board. There was discussion on the value of the terms not coinciding. The Technical Committee selects its own officers. Mayor Washburn questioned how the By-laws speak to this issue. Mr. Schwendiman quoted from the Interlocal Agreement, "Technical Advisory Committee members shall each be appointed for four year terms of office with the initial Members serving an initial two year term if the agencies' Governing Board Member is appointed to an initial two-year term and a four-year term if the agencies' Governing Board member is appointed to a four-year term. Reappointments and replacements shall be by appointment of the public agency who appointed the member being replaced or reappointed."

There are some restrictions as to what can be done regarding the appointment of officers of the Technical Committee.

Chairman Billings suggested that this be reviewed and brought back before the Board in the next meeting with options. Mr. Buehler commented that he didn't see any problems with the terms of office being the same for the Governing Board and the Technical Committee. The Committee makes the decisions and not the Chairman.

6. Conduct annual election of Executive Committee members (10 min)

Mr. Price referred to the By-laws, Section 10.2.2, regarding the Executive Committee. Therein it states, "The membership of the Executive Committee shall be reviewed and voted on in the January meeting of each calendar year." It also stipulates the following in 10.2.1:

"The Executive Committee shall include the Commission Chair, the Commission Vice Chair, a representative of the Department of Natural Resources, and up to four other members as determined by the Board..."

The members of the Executive Committee besides the Chair and Vice Chair currently are Mr. Mike Styler (DNR), Mayor Johnson (Lehi), Mayor Washburn (Orem), Mayor Parker (Saratoga Springs), and Mayor Thompson (American Fork). There are no term limits, but is up to the Governing Board every year.

Mayor Washburn questioned and was answered that the Executive Committee members serve annually.

Chairman Billings asked if anyone was willing to serve on the Executive Committee.

Mayor Parker replied that his work schedule makes it difficult for him to serve on the committee and asked if there would be someone willing to take his place. Mayor Thompson and Mayor Washburn stated they would be happy to continue serving on the Executive Committee. Mayor Johnson was not yet present and would be asked following the meeting.

Chairman Billings said it would be good to have diversity on the Committee in regard to municipalities' location. Mr. Schwendiman asked if Chairman Billings would explain what the Executive Committee

addresses. Chairman Billings said the Committee strives to define process and distinguish order for the Governing Board. They review personnel actions, and proposals. Meetings are usually held one week before the Governing Board monthly meeting beginning at 7:30 A.M.

Ms. Finlinson requested that she would like to continue to attend the meetings and or would volunteer to be a member of the Committee if there is room.

The By-laws read, "up to four other members" can serve on the Committee. Mr. Styler will continue to represent the State. Chairman Billings asked if there was anyone from the southern part of the County who would be willing to serve and Mr. Price suggested Mr. Dean Olsen, Springville. Mr. Olsen accepted the invitation to be on the Committee. Mayor Parker said he would step down in order for Mr. Olsen to sit on the Committee. Mayor Parker moved that the Executive Committee consist of Chairman Billings, Vice Chair Ellertson, Mr. Styler, Mayor Thompson, Mayor Washburn, and Mr. Olsen. It was seconded by Commissioner Ellertson and approved unanimously. Mayor Johnson will be asked to continue and pending his acceptance Mayor Parker would be the alternate. This final action will be approved in the February meeting.

7. Request appropriation of funding for Phragmites Removal Pilot Project (5 min)

Mr. Price referred to the Financial Report, listed under the Budget Report as Account 6500-Special Projects. This account was budgeted with \$45,000 with the intention of piloting a phragmites removal project. The Commission has joined with Utah County, the Division of Wildlife Resources and the Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands (FFSL) with a pilot project proposal for phragmites removal on the east side of Utah Lake, directly west of the new trail by Geneva Steel. They have identified a 112-acre parcel that the County was going to move forward with removal efforts last year, but the plans fell through. They have found a source of funding through the Utah Partners for Conservation and Development (UPCD). They have a grant program that is aimed at restoring watershed. Mr. Price gave a presentation to them two weeks ago and the project was moved forward in ranking. It is anticipated that the project will receive just over \$20,000 in a grant that will be used for chemicals and chemical application. FFSL and the County will be participating by providing manpower and equipment to perform burns and preparation for treatment. The Utah Lake Commission will be providing oversight, coordination and administration of the project. They are calling it a pilot project while they work on formulating a long-term project for the removal of phragmites around the lake.

The County had to cut back on their seasonal employees so Mr. Price told the Committee he would request \$4000 be approved by the Commission for the project which will pay for the seasonal employees. If the grant funds don't come through and the project needs to begin in the spring, he told the Board he may have to come back and request an additional \$20,000 for this project to be completed. He will know if the grant is appropriated by April. A prescribed burn has to take place in the early spring or the window of opportunity will be missed and then the effort would have to be postponed for a year.

Mr. Buehler added that FFSL has been involved for quite a few years with phragmites removal and litigation. He agreed that the timing has to be met. He announced that there are more phragmites increasing around the lake every year. Mayor Parker said he thought it was a low risk to extend the \$4,000 before knowing about the grant approval. If the grant doesn't come through there would still be the opportunity to withdraw from the project.

Commissioner Ellertson said his understanding is that the project is projected to cost about \$60,000-\$65,000. He added that he has read about other such programs having been effective such as in Willard Bay. It was affirmed that this project will be similar.

Mr. Buehler said the money has come through the Division of Wildlife Resources for many of those projects and they have money set aside for programs for invasive species control. Some of those areas that were successful in phragmites removal have an advantage in that they are able to control the water level. Because that is a disadvantage at Utah Lake it may take a couple of burn and chemical treatments and possibly some mechanical treatments as well to complete the job. The County did some effective treatments south of the Lindon Marina and the difference is apparent.

Mayor Dain offered support and suggested the Board allocate the \$24,000 for the project up front if needed. Chairman Billings affirmed his support, but expressed his desire to see "leverage" dollars for the project. Mayor Parker added that he believes the Commission's role is in guiding the other agencies. Discussion continued. Mr. Buehler expressed that he felt the Commission could have influence on UPCD to make their decision as soon as possible so the window of time for the prescribed burn is not missed. Ms. Lamb suggested that knowing the Commission had approved \$4,000 might aid in UPCD allocating the grant. Mr. Price said that definitely would help raise the ranking. Mr. Densley asked where the funding came from for the other phragmites removal. Mr. Buehler said the funds were in the budget of the Division of Wildlife Resources.

Mr. Scott McLachlan, a property owner on the north end of the lake, did some spraying and mechanical treatment. It worked, but then grew back overtime because there needs to be a maintenance program. The phragmites grow in the water. The most effective process is to use a three step procedure; burning, chemical and mechanical removal.

Mayor Thompson asked for clarification of the purpose of the pilot program. Mr. Price replied not only is it to demonstrate that these treatment steps are effective for Utah Lake, but without long-term funding it is important to show success to get public support for the future. That is also why a visible area was selected. Commissioner Ellertson asked if there is a plan to dispose of the volume of remains from the process. Mr. Buehler said they are working on finding a purpose for the bio-mass.

Mayor Washburn moved to accept Mr. Price's recommendation to commit \$4,000 to the phragmites removal pilot project with the understanding that the Commission will not be responsible for additional contributions if other funds are not realized. Mayor Thompson seconded the motion and Mr. Price was in agreement. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Buehler noted that Commission member Mr. Mike Styler is a member of the UCPD and can encourage their support.

8. Request and consider approval of applicants to the Public Advisory Group (5 min)

Mr. Price reviewed that in October, 2008 the Governing Board formed the Public Advisory Group and approved seven initial participants. In the By-laws it states, "After initial approval of membership in the Group, applicants must re-apply annually to officially participate in the Group." All seven groups have expressed a desire to continue to participate in the Group and Mr. Price recommended that they be approved as members of the Public Advisory Group for 2009. A new application for membership has been received from Joel Racker of the Utah Valley Convention & Visitors Bureau and the Executive Director recommended that they be included in that group as well. The membership of the PAG would now be eight. Chairman Billings asked when the Ex-Officio members would become members of the PAG. Ex-Officio members of the Governing Board that are not governmental organizations and do not have the option of joining the Governing Board will remain Ex-Officio members until the end of June, 2009. They will then transfer to being members of the PAG. Those organizations are the Provo/Orem Chamber of Commerce and the South Utah Valley Municipal Water Association (SUVMWA). Both of those representatives have already been attending the PAG meetings.

Chairman Billings acknowledged those present from the PAG.

Mayor Parker moved to accept the eight applicants as presented for membership in the Public Advisory Group for 2009. It was seconded by Mr. Buehler and approved unanimously.

9. Review and consider tentative approval of three areas of the Master Plan (60 min)

It was explained by Mr. Price that the Technical Committee has tentatively approved three areas of the Master Plan and turned the floor over to Mr. Greg Beckstrom, Vice Chair of the Technical Committee. Mr. Beckstrom reviewed that the Master Planning process began a year ago. Initially there was a lot of information gathering, data collection, and map preparation for the creation of the Statement of Current

Conditions. There were several Open Houses, a Visioning Workshop and the Opportunities and Constraints Workshop. Ideas from those meetings were all assimilated and components of them were put together in a preliminary draft of the Master Plan. That draft was sent to all the Board members in October, 2008.

In September the Technical Committee presented to the Board their recommendation for tentative, preliminary approval of Vision Statements which were reviewed, modified and approved. Included in that recommendation was an Overall Vision Statement and a Vision Statement for each of the primary elements of the Master Plan.

In October the Technical Committee recommended to the Board some Specific Vision Statements. There were thirty statements that the Board reviewed, modified and approved which evolved into goals of the Master Plan.

In early November the initial draft of the Master Plan was made available to the Board electronically and the policies that would be included were reviewed. There was much feedback at the November meeting and since then there has been significant discussion from the Steering and Technical Committees, and input from the public at the December Open Houses. There were subsequent drafts of the Master Plan with the most recent being December 30, 2008. That draft has been forwarded electronically and is also on the Commission's website.

Three documents were reviewed for approval in today's meeting. Mr. Beckstrom expressed acknowledgment and gratitude to Mr. Price, many people from the State Department of Natural Resources, Technical and Sub-Committee members, and Mr. Rick Cox and the consultant team. He stated that he feels the document has the input of all the interested stakeholders and will be effective for the Commission. Discussion proceeded on the three documents for review and modification. Chairman Billings asked Mr. Beckstrom to outline an allocation of time in order to adjourn by 9:30 A. M.

a. Executive Summary (Section 1)

General Policies

Policy 1 – wording is unchanged. Originally in Natural Resources Policies but determined to be broader in nature and, therefore, moved into the General Policies.

Policy 2 – slightly re-worded.

Policy 3 & 4 – essentially the same.

Policy 5 – originally in Natural Resources Policies.

Policy 6 – new policy that has been added. Mr. Hendrickson requested that some wording be added to emphasize the Commission as a leveraging organization. Commissioner Ellertson suggested adding to the Policy the word “leveraging” to read, “...to implement and accomplish provisions of the Master Plan through **leveraging** private and public sources.”

Chairman Billings returned to the Executive Summary and requested changing the word “reference” to “resource” in the first paragraph referring to the Commission to read, “It also acts as a resource for its member agencies...”

Land Use and Shoreline Protection Policies

Policy 1 and **Policy 2** - were slightly reworded in recognition of feedback received from the Governing Board and Technical Committee.

Policy 3 and **Policy 4** - are virtually unchanged.

Mr. Beckstrom did note that there has been an effort to keep the future tense the same throughout the document.

Policy 5 is a new policy that has been added since the Governing Board November meeting. There had been discussion in the Technical Committee whether or revise Policy 2 or to create a new Policy.

The Technical Committee decided to leave Policy 2 as written and create a new policy to address the issues now in Policy 5.

Mayor Thompson remarked that he thought Land Use Policy 3 was to be included in the General Policy 4. There was discussion and Mayor Washburn suggested that Land Use Policy 3 should be removed and the language in it used to enhance General Policy 5. Mr. Price said the Technical Committee's intent was to have a specific Land Use Policy give added emphasis on importance to facilitated planning around the lake. Mayor Washburn said that if that is the case then Land Use Policy 3 should be more specific.

Chairman Billings had concern with the language in Land Use Policy 5 and discussion followed. Mayor Washburn suggested the Policy to be changed to read, "The Commission encourages **that any** recreational and commercial development projects ~~that~~ are consistent with this Master Plan."

There was further discussion in reference to Mayor Thompson's concerns as to either incorporate the wording of Land Use Policy 3 into General Policy 5 or to revise Land Use Policy 3. That change will be reviewed by the Technical Committee.

Transportation Policies

All the Policies are essentially the same as they were in the November draft with one exception.

Transportation Policy 1 – had much discussion and the current best draft was as presented.

Transportation Policy 2 – Chairman Billings referred to the wording of "proactively involved" in the Policy. He suggested that the intent should be more in the sense of proactively monitoring. In discussion, Mr. Linford recalled that this issue had previously been discussed and that the word proactive was added to show that the Commission would have input and involvement. Mr. Buehler suggested changing the phrase to read, "The Commission will be a proactively ~~involved~~-participant in transportation planning efforts..."

Natural Resources Policies

Natural Resources Policy 1, 2, and 3 - are essentially the same with the exception that there were some specific references in the November draft that have been deleted and the language rewritten in a more general format.

Natural Resources Policy 4 and 5 – are essentially the same.

Natural Resources Policy 9 – was modified to encourage research efforts without proposing a specific facility.

Natural Resources Policy 6 -10 – had mild rewording of some of the language.

Natural Resources Policy 11 and Policy 12 – are additional policies that are new that evolved from the resolution that was adopted by the Commission in August, 2007.

There was discussion on the language in Policy 5 and if it included everything that needed to be mentioned.

It was asked what the form for accomplishing Policy 4 would be and Mr. Beckstrom answered the intent would be to coordinate with local and state agencies to achieve consistency around the lake.

Mr. Cox said the Commission will take the lead in facilitating the process amongst the various municipalities.

Mayor Washburn asked for clarification of Policy 11 and Mr. Beckstrom replied that the wording was in accordance with the language in the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Resolution.

Commissioner Ellertson commented in regard to Policy 10 that it says the Commission will encourage action. He pointed out that some actions the Commission may not be in support of and he suggested it be modified. Mr. Beckstrom said previously the Technical Committee had been directed to make

this Policy more general. Following discussion, Mr. Cox suggested adding the word “appropriate” to read, “...and encourages appropriate actions...”

Ms. Lamb had an editorial comment that in Policy 11 Total Dissolved Solids be spelled out prior to the acronym TDS for more common understanding. Mr. Buehler said that his interpretation of Policy 4 doesn't seem to be interpreted as consistent, but more as the Commission encouraging signage for the benefit of the public.

Recreation Policies and Public Facility Policy

These policies are virtually all the same as seen in the November draft with minor grammatical changes.

Recreation Policy 3 – Commissioner Ellertson suggested the word “strive” be replaced to read, “The Commission will ~~strive~~ encourage for ~~the~~ distribution...”

b. Prioritization of Goals (Section 5)

Mr. Beckstrom stated that the goals in Section 5 - Prioritization of Goals are essentially the same that were reviewed in October as Specific Vision Statements. The Technical Committee was not asking for approval of the goals as they have already been preliminarily approved, but the intent was to ask for approval of the prioritization of the goals. The prioritization was based on the consultant's review, public input, and the Technical Committee's evaluation.

The goals have been categorized into two different categories. There are sixteen goals classified as Immediate Goals which are considered the more urgent, higher priority goals. The second classification includes fourteen goals which are Intermediate Goals meaning they are still important, but they are the goals that will be pursued as opportunities present themselves. The initial focus will be on the Immediate Goals.

In the Technical Committee's review the first two goals were clearly high priority goals. The remaining goals are listed in a priority sequence, but the differentiation was less significant than the first two goals. Mr. Beckstrom asked the Commission how they would like to coordinate feedback on this Section.

Commissioner Ellertson asked if when the priorities were decided if it was discussed that over time some of the priorities could change classifications. Mr. Beckstrom said that was discussed and Mr. Price said that consideration is addressed in the Implementation Strategies on how the Commission is going to achieve these objectives. That portion of the Master Plan is an area that can be shifted around. The Master Plan states that it will be re-addressed every ten years. It was clarified that the goals are not sequentially listed in order of completion and that is why there are not numbered. There is also interrelationship between many of the goals.

There was discussion on the use of the word “Intermediate” in the concern that it might give the impression they are deferred goals. The word “ongoing” was suggested. Mr. Beckstrom said the Technical Committee was aware of this and so refrained from using words such as “low priority” or “deferred goals.” Other suggestions were made. It was stated that there needed to be two categories to assist in funding applications.

Ms. Lamb moved to title the two priority categories as High Priority Goals and Medium Priority Goals. It was seconded by Mayor Parker and the motion was approved.

c. Goals and Objectives Needing Further Review (Appendix D)

Mr. Beckstrom explained that the Goals and Objectives that are in Appendix D won't be included in the Master Plan document. Chairman Billings suggested any comments regarding Appendix D be relayed to Mr. Price within the next 48 hours. Following that input Mr. Price will work with Mr. Cox towards preparation of a final draft Master Plan for this document that will be available within the

next week or two. He asked the Board to discuss if they want to hold a Public Hearing on the final draft document before they approve it.

The remaining agenda for the Master Plan is that the Governing Board, after any revisions, will approve the document. That document will then be delivered to the State and they will initiate a 45-day public comment period which is required by FFSL for the document as their Management Plan. It is anticipated sometime in April or May there will be a joint ceremony with the Governing Board and FFSL to simultaneously adopt the Utah Lake Commission Master Plan and the FFSL Management Plan. There is no legal obligation to holding a public meeting.

There was discussion. Mr. Cox recommended holding a Public Hearing.

Mayor Johnson asked if anyone else had been contacted regarding the cross-lake transportation meeting being held tomorrow and said he had been notified by Mr. Leon Harward that he is in contact with a firm in Florida and is ready to proceed with his causeway proposal.

There was much support for holding a public meeting.

Mr. Beckstrom stated that the final draft will be forwarded to the members within the next few weeks electronically. All members should prepare any suggested, formal modifications for the February Governing Board meeting so at the end of the meeting there will be a formal document ready for the public. Mr. Beckstrom said members can submit suggestions before the meeting. Ms.

Lamb moved that the next Governing Board meeting be extended to a four hour meeting. Mr. Linford seconded the motion. There was discussion and it was approved unanimously.

10. Other business (10 min).

11. Confirm that the next meeting will be held at the Historic Utah County Courthouse Ballroom on Thursday, February 26, 2009 at 7:30 AM.

Restating the previous motion, the meeting for February 26, 2009 will be held from 7:30 A.M. until 11:30 A.M.

Adjourn

It was moved to adjourn the meeting by Commissioner Ellertson and seconded by Mr. Buehler. The meeting was adjourned at 9:48 A.M.