

SUMMARY OF THE GREAT SALT LAKE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

January 14, 2009

Department of Environmental Quality, Room 201

GREAT SALT LAKE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Dan Eastman, Chairman	State Senator
Lynn de Freitas	Friends of Great Salt Lake
Leland Myers	Central Davis Sewer District
David Livermore	The Nature Conservancy
Don Leonard	Utah Artemia Association
Neka Roundy	Mayor of Kaysville
Bonnie Baxter	Westminster College
Bill Fenimore	Wild Bird Center of Layton
Corey Milne	Great Salt Lake Minerals Corporation
Colleen Johnson	Tooele County Commissioner

OTHERS PRESENT

Leah Ann Lamb	DEQ/ Division of Water Quality
Jodi Gardberg	DEQ/ Division of Water Quality
John Whitehead	DEQ/ Division of Water Quality
Jeff Ostermiller	DEQ/ Division of Water Quality
Mike Styler	Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Mike Roberts	The Nature Conservancy
Mike Mower	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Kelly Payne	Kennecott Utah Copper
Jill Houston	Central Davis Sewer District
Rock Simpson	Great Salt Lake Yacht Club
Allen Harrison	Bear Lake Commission
Mayor Lewis Billings	Utah Lake Commission
Robert Adler	University of Utah
Bill Ross	Bill Ross and Associates
Jim Kramer	Puget Sound

1. Call to Order:

The Chairman, Senator Dan Eastman called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance.

2. Review of the Meeting Agenda and Purpose – Facilitator Bill Ross

Jodi Gardberg, DWQ mentioned that the Dia Art Foundation generously donated the Robert Smithson's spiral Jetty Book to the Council Members. She reviewed the handout, Outcomes of the

12/09/2008 meeting and explained the Google Calendar that was set up for the council to view sub committee meetings. Bill Ross, Bill Ross and Associates reviewed the handout, Potential Direction and Path Forward for the Great Salt Lake Advisory Council. He also reviewed the meeting agenda that covers ecosystem management and subcommittee work.

3. Ecosystem Based Management – Jim Kramer

Jim Kramer gave a presentation titled “ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT, LEARNING FROM OTHER REGIONS”. The presentation is posted at this web address:

<http://www.GSLcouncil.utah.gov/>

Comments/Questions from the Council:

David Livermore, the Nature Conservancy mentioned that there are some examples of commissions that have the authority to supercede local and state ordinances. He gave the example of the federally mandated Lake Tahoe Regional Commission

Bill Ross, Bill Ross and Associates added that the Columbia River commission also has that authority. He said that these are models to consider for Great Salt Lake, ones that aggregate all agency authorities and others that network authority using transparency and accountability to manage the resource.

Leland Myers, Central Davis Sewer District asked if the Puget Sound Partnership was advising or directing funding. He also asked how are priorities/funding for general purpose governments that have multiple issues managed.

Jim Kramer replied that the Partnership advises, tracks, and encourages funding rather than direct it. State agencies have to submit their budgets to the Partnership. Local governments are encouraged to contribute and receive when local practices affect the overall system.

Corey Milne, Great Salt Lake Minerals remarked that accountability is achieved through reporting and conjoling rather than enforcement

Jim Kramer said that accountability in the partnership is currently achieved through incentives and disincentives. If a group received money and finished the project then they will be eligible for additional funding. If not, then further funding will be held.

Senator Dan Eastman said that he does not foresee a future GSL group that oversee agencies and manages or expends budgets. He likes the idea of a group that reviews budgets. He sees that as helpful information that could influence decisions.

David Livermore, the Nature Conservancy asked what would be a good make-up of the commission to get noticed and how does a commission handle agencies with conflicting mandates.

Jim Kramer replied that the composition of the governing body is important because they need to bring the necessary attention to the issues.

4. History and Perspectives of Great Salt Lake Management – Robert Adler, University of Utah

Robert Adler, University of Utah gave a presentation titled “WATERSHED-BASED PLANNING FOR GREAT SALT LAKE”. The presentation is posted at this web address:
<http://www.GSLcouncil.utah.gov/>

Comments/Questions from the Council:

Bonnie Baxter, Westminster College remarked that it was discouraging to hear the number of times a governing model has been introduced and not implemented for Great Salt Lake and urged the council to look at authority models to make sure that this new model will be implemented.

David Livermore, The Nature Conservancy asked if the networked model that relies on conjoling rather than authority can work, especially where federal acts can trump state and local actions.

Jim Kramer said using the Puget Sound Partnership as an example that having the parties come together to agree on solutions has worked better than mandating the parties to work together due to the a federal act such as the Endangered Species Act.

Robert Adler added that the CALFED and Everglades programs were created after the Federal Government sued the State Government over compliance with the Clean Water Act. Neither the State nor the Federal Government wanted to cede authority to the other. Changes in administrations changed the visions of the programs.

Bonnie Baxter, Westminster College asked Senator Eastman how a new structure perseveres through changes in the legislature, the governor and changes of administrations

Senator Dan Eastman replied that a solid plan that does not overstep the legislature would work best.

5. Utah Lake Commission – Mayor Lewis Billings

Mayor Billings spoke to the Council about his experience helping form the Utah Lake Commission and how it is functioning currently. Below are some key points from his talk.

- There was a lot of contention and little agreement amongst the Utah Lake Stakeholders. It was evident that a process was needed for better cooperation
- They created a library of studies and found there were multiple scientific studies
- They looked at best practices in other commission (ex. Lake Tahoe and Bear Lake)
- The state was not going to give up sovereignty and local governments would not give up control of the shoreline so they chose the Bear Lake model
- They set up an exploratory council that produced an executive summary of key issues
- The Utah Lake Commission is comprised of elected officials that are accountable to the people and involve key stakeholders players
- The budget (\$300,000) is pay to play meaning voting members pay dues to the Commission
- mandatory turn over in leadership
- The commission is supported by a technical committee

- They had a consultant due a Master Plan. It is an open process where people are willing participants because there is a value to be there.
- They are creating a public advisory group for those who are not direct members
- The commission has a 2 person staff, an executive director and assistant

Comments/Questions from the Council:

Lynn de Freitas, Friends of Great Salt Lake asked about the pay to play model and if everyone pays the same amount.

Mayor Billings responded that there a matrix model based on population, number of square miles and miles of shoreline. Out of a total budget of \$300,000, \$150,000 comes from municipal sources and the rest comes from state agencies.

Bonnie Baxter, Westminster College remarked that Great Salt Lake has very different issues and stakeholders than Utah Lake and wasn't sure that the GSL governing body should be only government representatives.

Mayor Billings said they faced the same issue when looking at the makeup of the Utah Lake Commission. They thought it was important to have people with authority at the table in order to bring change and involvement.

Mike Styler, Department of Natural Resources said that the Utah Lake Commission was created using the Interlocal Cooperation Act between cities and counties and had legislative approval. DEQ and DNR had to ask permission to be voting members.

Leland Myers, Central Davis Sewer District asked how the Utah Lake Commission resolves conflict

Mayor Billings used the example of the Causeway that some want to span the lake. The Technical committee provided many alternatives to the Causeway and presented to the commission that came up with a resolution. The resolution was communicated to the legislature. The commission takes a position on issues after it is thoroughly vetted backed with expertise. The commission provides input to the state.

6. Bear Lake Commission – Allen Harrison

Allen Harrison was the Executive Director for the Bear Lake Commission for 30 years. He just recently retired. He shared his experiences with the council. Below are some key points from his talk.

- Bear Lake Regional Commission was established by a Joint Powers Act and included mayors and county commissioners from both Idaho and Utah. About 10 years ago, 2 members were added, one that represented irrigation interests and another that represented environmental interests. The commission is bi-state (Utah and Idaho) and bi-federal (2 regions of EPA).
- The commission is small, made up of 10 people and has a 3 person staff
- The commission work is a local effort, focused on water quality and not a power building organization

- The commission receives state allocated funds and has never raised their budget. They also apply for federal and state grants and have created partners such as Utah Power and Light
- State agencies are ex-officio members. They are used as a great resource and there is great coordination and cooperation between the agencies
- Initially there were involved in planning efforts.
- Gained credibility from communities by putting together a natural resource planning process and on the ground projects
- Growth has been an issue. However when development started they were prepared. The goal is to manage growth

Comments/Questions from the Council:

Bill Fenimore, Wild Bird Center of Layton asked if groups address the commission.

Allen Harrison replied that the groups make recommendations to the commissioners who make the decisions.

7. Sub-Committee Responsibilities and Schedule– Facilitator Bill Ross

Bill Ross thanked those who addressed the council and said that he would compile a summary document that covered the 4 major points from Jim Kramer, and the 5 questions posed by Robert Adler and other recommendations. He asked council members their thoughts on what they heard from the speakers.

Comments/Questions from the Council:

Bill Fenimore, Wild Bird Center of Layton said the talks were very informative and that the council should reflect on how to move forward. He said he was concerned because he didn't want 10 years from now to have another GSL entity that wasn't successful.

Lynn de Freitas, Friends of Great Salt Lake said that she enjoyed the presentation that discussed the level of successful commissions. She said she hoped to translate the successes to this effort

Don Leonard, Utah Artemia Association remarked that the council has covered a tremendous amount of information and was on task to have outlines from the sub committees at the next meeting.

Neka Roundy, Mayor of Kaysville said that it would be useful to make a presentation to the county governments

David Livermore, The Nature Conservancy thanked the presenters and is inspired to work toward recommendations to the governor.

Senator Dan Eastman, Chairman said they were informative presentations and that the council should take Professor Adlers' recommendations.

Leland Myers, Central Davis Sewer District said he heard about many structures and models. The challenge facing the council is to come up with the right structure for Great Salt Lake.