

APPROVED



Governing Board

Thursday, January 13, 2022, 7:30 A.M.
 Hybrid Public Meeting held via Zoom and anchor location at
 Central Utah Water Conservancy District
 1426 E 750 N St. 400, boardroom
 Orem, UT 84097

ATTENDEES:

Brad Frost, Chair, American Fork
 Eric Ellis, Utah Lake Commission
 Erica Gaddis, DWQ
 Ben Stireman, FFSL
 Michelle Kaufusi, Provo
 Kelly Smith, Cedar Hills
 Kari Malkovich, Woodland Hills
 Lon Lott, Alpine
 Jeff Lambson, Orem
 Laurie Backus, State Parks
 Julie Fullmer, Vineyard
 Brady Brammer, Utah House of Rep.
 Bill Lee, Utah County
 Shane Marshall, Spanish Fork
 Chris Carn, Saratoga Springs
 Russ Franklin, CUWCD
 Brittney Bills, Highland
 Chris Condie, Lehi
 Carolyn Lundberg, Lindon
 Brian Hulet, Payson
 Craig Jensen, Springville

INTERESTED PARTIES / VISITORS:

Sam Braegger, Utah Lake Commission
 Isaac Paxman, Provo
 Soren Simonsen, JRC
 Tyce Flake, Vineyard
 Elisabeth Currit, BYU student
 Shannon Lambson, BYU student
 Ben Abbott, BYU
 Greg Carling, BYU
 Ryan VanGoethem, Eutrophix
 Neal Winterton, Orem
 Allison Biggs, Conserve Utah Valley
 Sullivan Love, Vineyard
 Andrea Rosborough
 Carol Jackman, Provo
 Colter Rosborough
 Josh Lemonte, BYU
 Rachel Buck, BYU
 *139 online participants via Zoom

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

ABSENT: DNR, Salem,

- 1
- 2 **1. Welcome and Call to Order**
- 3 A. Chair Frost called the meeting to order at 7:36 A.M. and welcomed everyone. New board members
- 4 were introduced.
- 5 **2. 2022 Legislative Session: Proposed Utah Lake Authority Bill – Rep. Brady Brammer**

APPROVED

- 1 A. Representative Brammer updated the board. Changes discussed in the December board meeting were
2 submitted to bill drafter, Rep. Brammer expects new bill any day. Utah Lake has been identified as a
3 priority with the local caucus.
4 B. Mayor Fullmer reported on her efforts of working with the various cities. Mayor Kaufusi is having a
5 mayor’s meeting later today to discuss the ULA bill.

6
7 **3. Conserve Utah Valley / Dr. Ben Abbott & Craig Christensen Presentation**

- 8 A. Ben Abbott presented on an overview of the history and status of the lake. He started with
9 perceptions of the lake, asking the audience for what words come to mind when they think of Utah
10 Lake. The research he presented on stemmed largely from the Utah Lake Symposium. His
11 presentation centered on the importance, history, present and future status of the lake. He provided
12 background on the significance of Utah Lake as a water source, removing nutrients, protecting air
13 quality, ecologically, culturally, etc. He highlighted Owens Lake and the difficulties associated with it
14 drying up and the resulting affect on air quality. He displayed several photos of the lake, taken by
15 local photographers.
16 B. For the history of the lake, he started by sharing background of Lake Bonneville. He then covered the
17 human history, detailing the interactions of the indigenous people with the lake, Mormon
18 settlement, etc. He explained the ownership of the lake, public trust doctrine. Highlighted some of
19 the cultural history: recreation like the SS Sho Boat, drying out lake levels during the Dust Bowl, etc.
20 Summarized the federal government trying to drill for oil, State of Utah protecting their ownership of
21 the lake, the 1980’s Utah Lake Authority (not related to Rep. Brammer’s current bill) and discussion
22 around changing the lake which did not go forward. The ecosystem shifted, due to the negative
23 impacts of carp, phragmites, etc. In the 1970’s, lake shifted from underwater vegetation to more
24 algae-based growth in the lake. Conservation in the lake started in the 1970’s, Clean Water Act in
25 1972, June sucker was listed as endangered in the 1980’s, Utah Lake Commission formed in 2007, etc.
26 He recognized many of the partners doing restorative work at the lake.
27 C. For the current status of the lake, he summarized four points: habitat/biodiversity increasing
28 currently, water flow increased due to cooperative agreements/senior water rights, algae blooms
29 intensity, extent and frequency are decreasing for the lake as a whole and the public is becoming
30 more aware of the lake, though there are still negative perceptions. He compared Utah Lake water
31 levels, and the protections and improvements versus the situation at the Great Salt Lake. He
32 displayed several slides regarding research that shows that Utah Lake, regarding algae blooms, is one
33 of the cleanest in the nation and in the middle ground for the state of Utah, and a paper by Shanae
34 Tate that shows that for the lake as a whole, blooms are declining, but along the eastern shoreline
35 are getting worse. Utah Lake sediments are healthy in most areas of the lake. He mentioned that
36 more research is being done on sources of nutrients for the lake and kudos to the downlisting of the
37 June Sucker.
38 D. For the future of the lake, he shared what we are looking toward now. He highlighted the resilience
39 of the lake: natural cloudy water protects against algae, shallowness prevents worst affects of
40 blooms (dead zones, etc.), evaporation and lakebed are constantly removing nutrients and the
41 population around the lake cares about conservation. He then shared some vulnerabilities:
42 population growth, a large watershed so lots of chance for impact, semiarid climate means high
43 demand for water, misunderstandings about the lake’s history, climate change and proposals to
44 dramatically alter the lake system. He then spoke about the Lake Restoration Solutions project,
45 providing a brief history since 2017. He spoke on HB272 from 2018, the Utah Lake Amendments
46 a.k.a. Utah Lake Restoration Act. He made some comparisons to other similar situations at lakes
47 around the world: Lake Balaton, Lake Taihu, Great Salt Lake, etc. He shared some best practices:
48 realistic restoration targets, long term approach, holistic assessment, reduction of nutrient loads,
49 protection of the lake’s natural characteristics. He shared some “worst practices”: idealistic

- 1 transformation targets, miracle cures & drastic interventions, limited acknowledgement of values,
2 dredging and boosting removal, modification of bathymetry, shoreline, hydrology, etc.
3 E. Chair Frost asked for questions. Mayor Kaufusi spoke to Provo City's resolution to the state
4 legislature, communicating their desires for protecting the lake.

5
6 **4. Lake Restoration Solutions presentation – Jon Benson**

- 7 A. Jon Benson introduced himself and his company. They would love to present alongside the
8 opposition presentations to present their work. He began by introducing a few members of his team,
9 including a few staff from Geosyntec Consultants, a geotechnical engineering firm contracted by Lake
10 Restoration Solutions (LRS). Geosyntec came on last year; took the proposal from a citizen led effort
11 and enhanced it in many ways with their background. LRS also has contracted with SWCA
12 Environmental Consultants. Jon provided background next. In 2017, HCR26 was passed, urging
13 restoration of Utah Lake. It started extensive dialogue on what the lake needs and possible solutions.
14 A consistent theme from those discussions was that the state does not have the resources for a
15 comprehensive restoration. The recent efforts are great, but each has been at the margin, not a
16 comprehensive effort. At end of 2017, LRS submitted their idea to the state. The state sent our a
17 request for competitive proposals. In 2018, HB272 was passed as the Utah Lake Restoration Act.
18 Later in 2018, the state accepted the proposal, LRS assembled their team of scientists, engineers, etc.
19 The crux of HB272 is the restoration objectives, which Jon read a few: restoring water quality and
20 clarity, preserving water storage, removing invasive species, restoring and conserving fish, improving
21 navigability, improving the lake's use for residents and visitors. These serve as the benchmarks for
22 LRS to meet to qualify for the land transfer.
- 23 B. He continued with a brief project overview. There wasn't time for an in-depth overview at this
24 meeting. The original proposal in 2017 was over 250 pages, outlining the vision and some concepts.
25 The application to the Army Corps of Engineers is over 500 pages, focused more on science and less
26 on photos and concepts. He shared some of the lakes history. In 1850, when pioneers arrived, the
27 lake had a thriving ecosystem. Many of the fish species are gone now; based off decisions from back
28 then. There was abundant submerged aquatic vegetation and there a clearer water state than it is
29 today. There were decades of human-caused decline. The introduction of carp and phragmites, loss
30 of natural filtration from aquatic vegetation, decades of high nutrient inflows sit in the top 24-30
31 inches of the lakebed, annual algal blooms result from excessive nutrient levels and a broken food
32 web, the lake cannot recover without intervention.
- 33 C. The Utah Lake Restoration Project is a comprehensive restoration plan. Dredging removes nutrient
34 loaded sediments already in the lake. Dredge containment areas (islands) store and sequester
35 sediments and provide the economic engine. Restoration of native habitats and ecosystem functions.
36 He shared some of the benefits of dredging and island creation. Remove, store and sequester
37 nutrient loaded lakebed sediments. The project would conserve water, approx. 30 billion gallons per
38 year at Utah Lake. It would restore submerged aquatic vegetation for natural filtration and habitat: it
39 reduces wave forces and improves light penetration. It would expand the shoreline, 190+- new miles
40 of shoreline, creating new habitat and more wetlands (better filtration of nutrients). It will improve
41 navigability and recreational opportunities. The project layout has been updated. Under review with
42 scientists and engineers: impacts to water circulation was improved, Provo Bay was requested to be
43 protected, so no work will be done there now. The total size of the island acreage decreased from
44 20,000 acres to 18,000 acres. The project will be completed in 5 phases: dredging is anticipated to be
45 a 15-year time table. Phase one would be near Vineyard as a proof of concept to show the project
46 works. There are three land types. The first two are for public use and benefit: estuary islands protect
47 against wave action and ice damaging the shoreline as well as providing habitat for fish and birds. The
48 second type of island is for public recreation: marinas, trails, picnic and camping areas. The third type
49 is the community islands, developed environmentally responsibly, to provide a funding source for all
50 the restoration work. Even on the community islands, there are lots of public areas as well: trails,

1 parks, marinas, etc. Jon then displayed some conceptual renderings. The first was a primitive estuary
 2 island, showing the habitat for birds, populated with native vegetation, etc. The next two images
 3 were of one of the recreation islands: a glamping rental cabin, a beach, trails and docks shown for the
 4 use of the public, it could be a state park, etc. Next he displayed a rendering of one of the islands
 5 close to Vineyard’s shoreline, the island does not block the view of the mountain. The viewscapes will
 6 be a part of the NEPA process.

- 7 D. He then spoke on permitting. In December 2021, LRS filed their USACE permit application. They
 8 anticipate at least a 18-24 month NEPA process, controlled by the US Army Corps, in consultation
 9 with the EPA, USFWS, DNR, DEQ, DWQ, etc. There will be a public release of all science and data;
 10 there will also be multiple public comment periods as a part of that process. He then spoke to
 11 misinformation. He wanted to correct a couple specific things and stressed that opposition should
 12 follow the permitting process in place. Fiction: Utah Lake evaporation is our source of precipitation;
 13 fact, Utah’s precipitation comes from the Pacific Ocean. Fiction: Utah Lake contributes to lake effect
 14 snow; fact, lake effect only occurs from the Great Salt Lake. Fiction: dredging will harm Utah Lake;
 15 fact, comprehensive restoration including dredging will help restore and enhance the Utah Lake
 16 ecosystem. Fiction: LRS team has no scientists or researchers; fact, they have a team of PhD
 17 scientists, engineers and researchers with real-world experience restoring waterways.
- 18 E. Jon made three requests of the Governing Board. 1, he requested to present on the project to the
 19 various city councils, and asked that if they are going to hear from an opponent to their project that
 20 they be given a chance to present as well. 2, he asked that the permitting and scientific process be
 21 followed; they are undergoing a rigorous scientific review. 3, he asked that all information presented
 22 be fact checked, including the info he and his team says. He expressed his excitement to be a part of
 23 the project and gratitude for the chance to present today. He asked for questions from the board.
- 24 F. Bill Lee inquired about the NEPA process; is the info given to the Army Corps protected or can it be
 25 shared or not till the 18-24 months is over. Jon responded that it could be as soon as 30 days from
 26 now, depending on when Army Corps decides it accepts the application. Scott Walker added
 27 additional clarifying details on the timeline and public involvement. Bill Lee invited them to come
 28 present to the County Commission. Kari Malkovich requested that the link for the permit application
 29 be shared with the Board when it is published and also asked how the 15 years of dredging are part
 30 of the 5 phases. Jon explained that there may be changes still but that phase 1 would be almost
 31 completely finished before starting phase 2 or 3. The 15 years of dredging is to balance storage
 32 capacity, evaporation and the downstream water rights by dredging at a rate that maintains as best
 33 possible consistent lake levels and available water for downstream rights. Dredging happens during
 34 each phase. Scott Walker added that the Army Corps hires a third party to do the EIS, which will
 35 evaluate the LRS proposal, to keep it unbiased during evaluation. Chair Frost asked because the NEPA
 36 is methodical and slow, does it hold Army Corps liable for anything that could go wrong with the
 37 project? Jon responded that he doesn’t know. Scott Walker explained there are four public comment
 38 periods, the Army Corps can’t issue a permit until all concerns raised have been addressed. The
 39 contractors doing the work are held to the stipulations of the permit. Jon added that LRS will be
 40 bonded as a protection for the lake as well.

41
 42 **5. Eutrophix: Algae Bloom Treatments – Scott Schuler and Ryan VanGoethem**

- 43 A. Ryan VanGoethem introduced himself and Scott Schuler. Eutrophix has spent the past two summers
 44 mitigating algae blooms on Utah Lake. He reported on what conditions were like during treatments,
 45 i.e. low water levels, etc. Monitoring showed bloom started in Provo Bay in June/July; due to funding,
 46 the project didn’t start until August. Two different treatment types were performed, weekly. SeClear,
 47 a copper based algicide, and a peroxide based algicide. Ryan described the process of application,
 48 displayed photos. He detailed the kinds of blooms seen, explained how the treatments reduced
 49 cyanobacteria levels, etc. He showed that at AF Marina within one day they had a 70% reduction in
 50 cyanobacteria, water clarity improved as well. He explained that their experience in treating during

APPROVED

1 2020 and 2021 endured different circumstances to test their treatments. In 2020, high water levels,
2 blooms were usually under 50,000 cells/mL at marinas, they started earlier (in June), treatments
3 averaged 80% or more effective for days-weeks, the water exchanges reduces longevity. In 2021, low
4 water levels and many storms, blooms averaged around 200,000 – 1,200,000 cells/mL at marinas,
5 they had a late start in August, treatments averaged 40-70% effective for only a few days, water
6 exchange also reduces the longevity.

- 7 B. Another technology they tested at the lake, at the Utah Lake State Park marina, was a bubble curtain.
8 Bubble curtains reduce water exchange at chokepoints like marina entrances. Using an air
9 compressor and 12 diffusers, it implements a bubble curtain to impede spread of algae without
10 impeding boat access. There was visual confirmation on the first day after install, a bloom entered
11 the marina and was stopped at the bubble curtain. He then showed data quantifying the impact of
12 the bubble curtain on treatment effectiveness.
- 13 C. Conclusions. Utah Lake is a dynamic shallow lake that sustains high abundances of toxic
14 cyanobacteria. Algaecides can control cyanobacteria at high densities in Utah Lake’s water chemistry
15 and conditions. Treatment at lower cyanobacteria densities are more effective and need less algicide.
16 HAB management needs to start late May, early June before high abundances occur. In marinas,
17 water exchange significantly impacts treatment longevity. Large-scale treatments would have
18 improved longevity.
- 19 D. Recommendations. Short term: a whole lake treatment program, marina modifications and intensive
20 management at marinas. Whole lake treatment program: 2-5 partial treatments throughout season,
21 up to 50% of the lake area in bands and strips, greater longevity of treatments. Rough cost of \$4-12
22 million/yr for copper-based algicides or \$10-30 million/yr for peroxide-based algicides. There would
23 be less lake closures, lower toxins and a better ecosystem each summer. Marina modifications:
24 expanding jetties and seawalls to protect better from winds and water currents, dredge marinas to
25 increase depth and water volume/enhance use/ waste could be reused in jetty construction, bubble
26 curtains at marina entrances to reduce water and cyanobacteria scum intrusion and isolate
27 treatment inside the marina. Intensive marina management: marinas are a priority (they are the main
28 point of contact with the lake and public), frequent treatment and monitoring of marinas are needed
29 to mitigate HABs (frequent manual applications, automated treatment systems), phosphorus
30 mitigation to limit the availability of phosphorus as a food source for blooms.
- 31 E. Next Steps. Funds available to continue treatments into the 2022 season, the Commission’s support
32 and guidance towards the goals and recommendations made. He then asked for questions from the
33 board. Rep. Brammer asked about impact of copper on aquatic life. Ryan agreed there have been
34 concerns for what the copper does in the environment, but data collected shows the impact is
35 negligible to humans, wildlife and the environment. Brammer asked if there was before/after
36 monitoring for impacts. Ryan reported that they checked for copper in the water column during
37 treatments and it showed a very short term impact. Russ Franklin asked about safety profile for
38 peroxide and its impact on ecosystem. Ryan shared benefits of peroxide is that it is a safer and more
39 beneficial method for treatment and lesser impacts on ecosystem. Lon Lott asked if aeration/ oxygen
40 levels help the process. Ryan, aeration is very beneficial. More oxygen helps nutrients become less
41 available through mineralization, as well as countering the oxygen reduction caused by blooms. Bill
42 Lee asked if calm water or movement in water to help disperse. Ryan, still water works, mixing fine as
43 well for their application type. Injection application does require more mixing. Ryan and Scott shared
44 their contact information.

45
46 **6. ULC Technical Committee Report on ULA Discussion – Kari Malkovich**

- 47 A. Kari reported on the discussion. Three concerns were raised. 1, clarification on the chamber of
48 commerce seat. There are ten chambers of commerce, they all are members of the Association of
49 Utah County Chambers, and suggested that as a wider representation for that seat. 2, grateful that

APPROVED

1 most controversial issues were removed from the bill. 3, although feedback was request, the
2 committee will wait until the bill comes out for a review.

3
4 **7. Action Items**

- 5 A. Review & Approve Previous Meeting Minutes: Chair Frost asked for a motion to approve the minutes
6 from the Governing Board meeting December 9, 2021. Michelle Kaufusi made a motion to approve
7 and Lon Lott seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor of approving the minutes.
- 8 B. Review & Approve Monthly Budget Reports – Nov-Dec 2021: Chair Frost asked for a motion to
9 approve the Monthly Budget Reports – Nov-Dec 2021. Kari Malkovich made a motion to approve and
10 Bill Lee seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor of approving the monthly financial
11 reports.
- 12 C. ULC Chair and Vice-Chair Elections:
- 13 a. Chair Frost thanked all he worked with as the Chair. He then nominated Mayor Kaufusi from
14 Provo City to be the next Chair of the ULC. Craig Jensen seconded. Shane Marshall nominated
15 Julie Fullmer from Vineyard City for Chair, Carolyn Lundberg seconded. Kari Malkovich asked
16 for each nomination to state why they would like to serve as Chair. Mayor Kaufusi stated that
17 Provo is a heavy hitter, connected to the lake in many ways, wants to be really engaged in the
18 conversation. Mayor Fullmer stated that Vineyard also has a lot of public lakeshore, the city is
19 very involved in the lake, working with the Walkara Way project and other similar projects to
20 enhance the lake shoreline. Vineyard is investing millions into restoring the lakeside near the
21 Geneva Steel plant; they want their shoreline to be public interaction with the lake. She is
22 involved in the community and state interactions with the lake. The LRS proposal starts in
23 front of Vineyard, there is a need for Vineyard to be at the front of the Commission effort.
24 Chair Frost added why he nominated Mayor Kaufusi. Chair Frost asked for a vote for/against
25 for Mayor Kaufusi, began a roll call vote. Partway through the roll call, Rep. Brammer raised a
26 point of order. He requested that instead of having everyone vote for/against Mayor Kaufusi
27 and the vote be calling for a vote for Mayor Kaufusi or a vote for Mayor Fullmer at the same
28 time. Shane Marshall agreed. Roll call vote started again with the new format. Results of the
29 vote are below.
- 30 b. Voting for Chair: Alpine, American Fork, CUWCD, DWQ, FFSL, Orem, Payson, Provo, Saratoga
31 Springs, Springville and State Parks voted for Mayor Kaufusi. Lindon, Spanish Fork, Utah
32 County, Utah House, Vineyard and Woodland Hills voted for Mayor Fullmer. With the vote at
33 11-6, Mayor Kaufusi was elected as the new Chair.
- 34 c. Voting for Vice Chair: Lon Lott nominated Mayor Fullmer for Vice-Chair; Shane Marshall
35 seconded. No other names were nominated. Chair Frost called for a voice vote. Voting was
36 unanimous for electing Mayor Fullmer as Vice-Chair.
- 37 D. ULC Resolution 2022-1 – Discussion and Approval: Mayor opened the discussion. Russ Franklin made a
38 comment, line 34 identified the Utah Lake Restoration project specifically, he suggested more general
39 language. Kari, the drafter of the resolution, agreed with the edit. Kari explained that her purpose in
40 proposing this resolution is that this topic is being discussed in many venues and there has been
41 confusion as well. It is important for the Commission to have consensus in what we support; scientific
42 and conservation based work on the lake. See the resolution for more details. She motioned for the
43 resolution to be passed. Mayor Kaufusi asked for comment from the board.

APPROVED

- 1 E. Eric added that a suggestion from Deputy Mayor Paxman before the meeting was added as well.
2 Mayor Fullmer asked for clarification on the phrase “support consideration of legislative
3 amendments...”. He explained that citizen groups feel the LRS project has too much a green light and
4 want legislative amendments to further protect the lake. His suggestion was intended to be open to
5 further legislative process to protect the lake, not just support the existing review process for such a
6 project. Mayor Fullmer suggested the review processes for all the other current projects at the lake
7 has gone well, suggested that the language refrain from tying people’s hands from objectively
8 considering something. Shane Marshall shared similar hesitation to Mayor Fullmer, bur clarified that is
9 more legislative amendments happen that it be science based. Craig Jensen proposed tabling the
10 discussion for now. Mayor Frost added he was comfortable with the resolution with the suggested
11 additions. Kari Malkovich asked for it be passed today, to pass it during the legislative session since the
12 board doesn’t meet again until after the session is over. Rep. Brammer had concerns over Isaac
13 Paxman’s added language; referring to amendments, only amendment considered apply to the LRS
14 project, then we are speaking in opposition to the project, also the discussion on scientific based
15 approach and who defines that. He suggested saying a more general term such as “legislation” instead
16 of “legislative amendment”. Bill Lee echoed Rep. Brammer’s concerns. He suggested we add
17 “legislative process” into the section stating support for the other state and federal processes. Mayor
18 Kaufusi asked for comment on that suggestion. Discussion amongst the board on where it best fit. Kari
19 Malkovich agreed with Bill Lee’s suggestion. Mayor Fullmer made a motion to implement Bill Lees
20 suggestion. Discussion on all of suggested changes, for confirmation. Seconded by Kari Malkovich.
21 Mayor Kaufusi did a voice vote; voting was unanimous. DWQ abstained from the process.
22

23 **8. Governing Board Meeting schedule for the year**

- 24 A. March 17, 2022
25 B. June 16, 2022
26 C. September 15, 2022
27 D. December 8, 2022
28

29 **9. General comments from board members and the public**

- 30 A. Mayor Fullmer suggested considering another public meeting in February, during the legislative
31 session. Board agreed that they would stay open to having a meeting in leiu of scheduling one now.
32 B. Greg Carling, commented on the UIC website, Why Dredge Utah Lake, sharing an article from LRS. His
33 research was the only research suggested in that paper, and felt his research was taken out of context.
34 His research suggested targeted dredging not lake-wide dredging.
35 C. Colter Rosborough, concerned over water conservation proposed with LRS project. Residents of
36 islands would consume more water than is conserved by the project.
37 D. Mayor Frost said the ULC website should be free of content from any one group. When he visited the
38 website recently, the island project was front and center; he suggested it be removed. Eric Ellis
39 clarified that the ULC website is meant to be informative on any and all projects that are going on at
40 the lake, the intent was not to highlight anything. Today the front page is the Winter Fishfest, when a
41 new blog post is posted, it is featured on the home page and it goes down on the list as soon as it is
42 posted. It is no longer there. The LRS project is included on the projects page, along with all other
43 projects on the lake.
44 E. Richard Foggio, asked if the ULC asked if the ecosystem has improved over the last decade and if
45 efforts should be changed. Also asked what the status of the two new trail segments along Saratoga

APPROVED

1 Shoreline, contractors walked off the project when it wasn't completed. Mayor Kaufusi reminded that
2 this is a comment period not question and answer, but that questions can be emailed to staff.

- 3 F. Jared Myers, a local resident, only learned a little about the LRS project so far. Can't imagine any
4 scenario building islands in a natural lake that would conform with science. Providing residents a place
5 to live by constructing islands would cause environmental issues; tread carefully. He is extremely
6 concerned about the project.
- 7 G. Peggy Climenson, comments on HB272. No quantitative standards for restoration, that should be set
8 specifically for the legislative to evaluate the project. Propose instead of a land grant, a long-term
9 lease of the land to LRS with specific requirements for maintenance of the islands. Once recreation
10 islands are done, what happens if phragmites populates on the islands, who takes care of it? Request
11 LRS to give name of NEPA filing, she can't find it online.
- 12 H. Philip Jensen, concerned over proof-of-concept of LRS project coming in front of Vineyard where he
13 lives, wants it in a more remote location. Question of liability on the LRS project, they should be
14 required to put up a bond, have a plan for who is responsible if the idea doesn't work.
- 15 I. Kael Weston, feels things are being rushed. Need more due diligence to respect public trust doctrine
16 on the island project.
- 17 J. Andrea Rosborough, says the name Utah Lake Restoration Project is ironic, it doesn't restore the lake
18 to its original state, it's a development project.
- 19 K. Cami Kenworthy, in favor of repealing HB272, it will be an issue for the courts. Save money and time,
20 stop the process now.

21
22 **11. Next Governing Board Meeting**

23 Chair Kaufusi reminded the board that the next Governing Board Meeting will be on March 17, 2022 at
24 7:30 AM in the CUWCD District Offices.

25
26 **12. Adjourn**

27 The meeting was adjourned at 10:33 A.M.