

APPROVED



## Governing Board

Thursday, January 21, 2021, 9:00 A.M.

Electronic Meeting held via Zoom

### **ATTENDEES:**

Brad Frost, Chair, American Fork  
 Eric Ellis, Utah Lake Commission  
 Erica Gaddis, DWQ  
 Jamie Barnes, FFSL  
 Michelle Kaufusi, Provo  
 Laurie Backus, State Parks and Recreation  
 Kari Malkovich, Woodland Hills  
 Chris Finlinson, CUWCD  
 Lon Lott, Alpine  
 Chris Condie, Lehi  
 Denise Andersen, Cedar Hills  
 Brittney Bills, Highland  
 Jeff Lambson, Orem  
 Craig Jensen, Vice-Chair, Springville  
 Julie Fullmer, Vineyard  
 Brian Hulet, Payson  
 Chris Carn, Saratoga Springs  
 Brian Steed, DNR  
 Jeff Acerson, Lindon  
 Tanner Ainger, Utah County

### **INTERESTED PARTIES / VISITORS:**

Sam Braegger, Utah Lake Commission  
 Rich Mickelson, TSSD  
 Renn Lambert, Limnotech  
 Scott Daly, DWQ  
 John Mackey, DWQ  
 Rodd Mann, Highland  
 David Bunker, American Fork  
 Ezra Nair, Utah County  
 David Barlow  
 Rep. Brady Brammer, Utah House  
 Scott Darrington  
 Troy Fitzgerald  
 Craig Peterson  
 David Peterson  
 Ashley Peck  
 Jacob McHargue, Vineyard  
 Kate Bradshaw  
 Gretchen Gordon, Cedar Hills  
 Sullivan Love, Vineyard  
 Leland Myers, WFWQC  
 Chandler Goodwin

**MEMBERS NOT EXPECTED TO ATTEND:** Utah House of Representatives, Utah Senate

**ABSENT:** DNR, Lindon City, Salem City, Utah County,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

### **1. Welcome and Call to Order**

- A. *\*The work session is not an action item meeting. No one attending the meeting should rely on any discussion or any perceived consensus as action or authorization. If such an action is suggested, it would take place at a future Governing Board meeting.*
- B. Vice-Chair Jensen called the meeting to order at 9:16 A.M. and welcomed everyone. He read the above statement, 1A, to clarify the purpose of the meeting as a work session.

**2. Presentation of Utah Lake Authority – draft legislation – Rep. Brady Brammer**

- 1  
2 A. Representative Brady Brammer described briefly the key aspects of the Utah Lake Authority bill. The  
3 Board makeup would have local representation with several Utah Valley cities with seats, two seats to  
4 UCOG, another to the Utah Valley Chamber of Commerce, two seats to the State Legislature, others to  
5 the Governor’s appointment, etc. He also described that funding for the Authority would be through  
6 property and/or sales taxes. He included a few other details of the draft legislation and then opened it  
7 up to the Board for questions and discussion.
- 8 B. There was discussion about how to provide funding, as a statewide burden or just a local burden of  
9 taxing. Rep. Brammer commented that the Utah Lake Commission as it currently is, can’t bond or take  
10 advantage of most funding opportunities currently. Rep. Brammer expressed that this bill is not for or  
11 against the lake restoration project that was proposed several years ago, he wants this bill to move  
12 forward on fixing the lake regardless. He doesn’t want this bill to dictate to surrounding cities about  
13 land use, to affect water rights, etc.
- 14 C. Erica Gaddis asked if this bill would finance water quality improvements or would those be left as they  
15 currently are. Rep. Brammer said keeping it as they are. Erica asked about the Governor appointed  
16 seats on the Authority board, Rep. Brammer said it would be up to the Governor to decide who would  
17 sit in those seats.
- 18 D. Brian Hulet, asked how the outlier cities would be involved. Rep. Brammer commented that they  
19 didn’t want the board to be larger than 13; the outlier cities would need to lobby to have  
20 representation through the UCOG seats. Technical Committee from Commission could continue over.  
21 Jeff Acerson from Lindon also asked about representation on the Authority board. Rep. Brammer put  
22 the 5 cities with dedicated seats due to hwo much of their city boundaries falls along the lake  
23 shoreline.
- 24 E. Chris Finlinson, requested that Rep Brammer add a seat on the Authority board for water rights users.  
25 She also asked if he would delay the bill to allow for study to determine the impacts of the Authority  
26 and helping the lake improve, why does the lake need the state to step in such a sweeping manner.  
27 Rep. Brammer asked a few clarifying questions. He posited that the lake is a state level asset and the  
28 state needs to step up. The Utah Lake Commission doesn’t have a big enough shovel to make a dent in  
29 the work of improving the lake. They discussed back and forth the idea of a water rights seat on the  
30 board.
- 31 F. Brad Frost, asked about funding. Will there be one-time appropriations and ongoing appropriations  
32 from the state. Rep. Brammer anticipates a larger one-time appropriation this year, and smaller  
33 ongoing appropriation moving forward that would exceed what the state currently contributes each  
34 year. This bill would allow access to the lake like the state’s credit and other programs that the  
35 Commission doesn’t currently qualify for. Additional discussion about how funding would work.
- 36 G. Rep. Brammer added that a study doesn’t need to occur before the creation of the Authority, it could  
37 happen after.
- 38 H. Brian Steed, inquired how the Authority affects the current efforts of DNR, FFSL, etc. and their  
39 individual projects. Rep. Brammer proposed that the interaction from those agencies with the  
40 Authority would closely resemble the interaction with the Commission. He said that he planned to  
41 circulate the protected draft to the Commission board for feedback before making it public.
- 42 I. Brad Frost, concerned over the speed and transparency of the process. Requested that Rep. Brammer  
43 consider taking it to interim to be studies more until the next legislative session. He also asked if the  
44 state can dissolve the Commission. Rep. Brammer said yes that the state can dissolve the Commission.  
45 Rep. Brammer also responded to the concerns about speed and transparency, he added that this year  
46 is likely the best time to get financial resources this year that may not be available moving forward.
- 47 J. Brian Hulet asked a few questions about funding and if the Authority could dictate to cities about  
48 wastewater impacts. Rep. Brammer, no, they don’t dictate on wastewater. He also said that the hoped  
49 to help fund the Walkara Way project along with this bill.

APPROVED

- 1 K. Eric Ellis, asked for clarification on who can see the draft bill. Rep. Brammer said any board members  
2 of the Utah Lake Commission and the attorneys for the organizations they represent. Any other  
3 specific person, talk with Rep. Brammer and he can decide on releasing to them. Brief discussion on  
4 who can see the draft bill, if the bill will be cut if funding is cut first. Rep. Brammer said that the  
5 Commission doesn't have the tools or financing available to improve the lake; there was discussion on  
6 that topic.  
7 L. Rep. Brammer finished by restating the importance of moving this bill forward now while the timing is  
8 right and funding is available. Kari Malkovich asked if the Utah County caucus has seen it. Rep.  
9 Brammer said the caucus is aware of the structure of the bill and can discuss it.

10  
11 **3. Governing Board Meeting schedule for the year**

- 12 A. March 18, 2021  
13 B. June 17, 2021 (Budget Hearing)  
14 C. September 16, 2021  
15 D. December 9, 2021  
16

17 **4. General comments from board members and the public**

- 18 A. Craig Peterson, requested that Salt Lake City receive a copy of the draft bill and also Provo River Water  
19 Users Association. Rep. Brammer said he will handle sending it to the directors of those agencies.  
20 B. Denise Richardson, asked how the board will get back together after the board representatives and  
21 attorneys look things over. Mayor Frost asked Rep. Brammer to come back to another meeting with  
22 the board, Rep. Brammer agreed to attend. Rep. Brammer wants to send out the draft as soon as  
23 possible.  
24 C. Rich Mickelson, TSSD, commented on cleanup projects that are ongoing (carp removal, ULWQS). He  
25 described a study that TSSD is working on. He suggested that the lake should be considered a reservoir  
26 and study the effects of how it is managed. He suggested creating the Authority shouldn't be rushed,  
27 the state entities already exist.  
28 D. David Bunker, suggested it would be helpful to get the boundary map along with the draft bill. Rep.  
29 Brammer commented that he has discussed this topic with the Commission board before. There isn't a  
30 boundary map created yet.

31  
32 **5. Next Governing Board Meeting**

33 Chair Frost reminded the board that the next Governing Board Meeting will be on December 10, 2020 at  
34 7:30 AM in the Utah County Health and Justice Building, Room 2500.  
35

36 **6. Adjourn**

37 The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 A.M.