



ATTACHMENT 1
COSAC IV Monthly Meeting Minutes – DRAFT
Summit County, Utah
June 23, 2015

- I. **ROLL CALL:** Staff Member Deters called the regular meeting of the COSAC Board to order at 8:36 a.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Monday, June 23, 2015.
 - a. Members in Attendance were Jan Wilking, Cheryl Fox, Council Member Liaison Andy Beerman, Kathy Kahn, Bill Cunningham, Cara Goodman, Rhonda Sideris, Tyler Dustman, Jim Doilney, Susanne Sheridan, Steve Joyce, and Meg Ryan.
 - b. Staff members present were Heinrich Deters, Open Space & Trails Manager, Mark Harrington, City Attorney, and Elizabeth Quinn Fregulia, Community Affairs Associate.
 - c. Members not in attendance were Chair Judy Hanley, Bronson Calder, and Charlie Sturgis.

- II. **Adoption of Minutes of March 23, 2015.**
 - a. The following edits to minutes were presented:
 - i. Kathy Kahn was not listed but was present at last meeting.
 - ii. It was determined that “man in gray shirt” at prior meeting was Charlie Sturgis.
 - iii. Two corrections were made by Susanne Sheridan:
 - 1. “Buy land from...using private money.” Delete “from”
 - 2. Strike “another group” and replace with a Mountain Accord sub-group
 - b. **Motion:** Jan Wiling moved approval of the minutes; Steve Joyce seconded.
 - c. **Vote:** Motion carried.

- III. **Staff Updates**
 - a. There were no updates made by Staff Member Deters or Harrington.

- IV. **Public Input**
 - a. Staff Member Deters ask if any members of the public had comments. Receiving none, the meeting moved on to New Business.

- V. **New Business**
 - Clark Ranch:** Staff Member Deters introduced the discussion by reminding the group that the Clark Ranch Open Space acquisition was finalized last



December. Committee Member Wendy Fisher and her staff of Utah Open Lands have been assembling initial baseline information of the property. Two main questions have arisen:

- i. Per SS91: the City might want to secure the property for other municipal needs (e.g., ball fields, slip ramp to get people to Park & Ride more efficiently, water treatment facility sites). City Council should weigh in on these decisions. One item of controversy was a RAB suggestion for an off-leash dog park.
 1. To this point, Committee Member Kahn did say it was in our visioning statement.
- ii. We should employ the matrix for characteristics vis-a-vis funding and preservation. As a committee, we should think about what uses COSAC might want to recommend to Council.
 1. Committee Member Kahn asked if it would be possible to have a site visit. Staff Member Harrington said this would be okay. Staff Member Deters said he would arrange this for the next meeting.

The following is the general time line for determination of uses:

- Staff Member Deters will present the property to City Council on the 16th as part of a work session, at which time he will suggest ideas. During August and September, COSAC will provide additional suggestions to Council. Council Member Beerman said that Council would love to have feedback before the work session. Staff Member Deters said he would like to put our recommendations into the report for council.

Committee Member Fisher then presented her baseline report (re: vegetation, wildlife patterns, and the like) to the committee. Her presentation was titled *Clark Ranch Current Conditions; Conservation Values*. Following is a summary of the presentation.

- **Wildlife**
 - Has some possible habitat for wildlife including ferruginous hawk, which love voles
 - Considered critical habitat for elk, deer, moose
 - U.S. 40 splits property in two, so could have bifurcated solution
 - Considered sage grouse area, but have not found any evidence of sage grouse, possibly because of habitat fragmentation
 - Summer and winter range for elk is pretty close
- **Vegetation**



- Sage brush flat, has been grazed for up to 100 years. There is a seasonal spring and wetland seep located on the east side of the highway, which is a unique opportunity in terms of wetland value.
- Birch leaf and curl leaf mountain mahogany
 - Provides winter habitat for elk, deer, and moose
- Four different aspen stands. Aspen forests are considered priority habitat by state. Have not seen a lot of regeneration.

Group Discussion

- Committee Member Doilney asked how far up the property goes:
 - Staff Member Deters explained the property location/characteristics, noted a field trip may be in order. He noted that it's in the Jordanelle Special Service District, which means they have water right entitlements. From a visual perspective it was noted that you can see most of the property from various different points: it's highly visible from I-40. This means that it has a lot of aesthetic and visual value. Even though there are a lot of trails, you can't see them from the road.
- Committee Member Ryan asked about liability regarding hazardous materials, vis-à-vis the dump road.
 - Staff Member Harrington answered that most of the OAU property is on other side.
 - Member Fisher said that Utah Open Lands did have an assessment done as part of their initial assessment, and found that there is some lead.
 - Staff Member Harrington said there is also a lot of old glass, possibly from shooting. Park City Heights ran into a slurry line (from mining activity), so the City had this area looked at to make sure there was no continuation of the line. As part of baseline, we could get copy of report. Park City Heights did do a voluntary cleanup with the state. Council Member Beerman said that the city researched this as part of their due diligence because they did not want to buy property with residual environmental issues.
- Staff Member Deters said the dairy is still there (SS91). The Gillmors bought the dairy from the Clarks.
- **Other Characteristics:**
 - Frontage road has some invasive species.
 - Roads: fair amount on east side
 - Recreational Opportunities: unique in terms of educational features. Habitat on west side at ridge. Phenomenal views, especially on west side.
 - Trailhead Possibility:
 - trails



- restrooms
- off-leash

- **Community Character:** Gillmors have grazing on either side. Ranching heritage, Western landscape feel. An important source of locally produced food. Gillmors have 10,000-acre ranch, and would like to see ranching continue. Have had conversations about sensitive species, especially on west side. Currently they have a 5000-acre lease on Mayflower side, so they bring their sheep over, and sometimes come back in fall as well.
 - Question from Member Joyce: do we have a contractual obligation? Member Deters answered yes, but the grazing lease ends December 31, 2016.
 - Member Fisher remarked that this raises the issue of Wendy: this brings up the issue of conflicts with preservation-versus-heritage land uses. There is also a lot of refuse on the property.

- **Natural Characteristics:** there is a spring that runs most of the year. Significant source of water: if continue to do grazing, would want to fence off, but then would need to figure out how to water sheep. Provides habitat for wetland animals: northern harrier nests. Ground-nesting hawk.

At this point in the presentation, Committee Member Fisher played the wildlife camera. It showed a deer crossing close to US 40: possibly a break in the fence? There was also an image of a northern harrier catching vole and an elk on the east side of the parcel at night.

Recreation uses right now don't seem to interfere with wildlife conservation, but off-leash dogs could indeed change this. The SS91 parcel is fairly far away from all of these wildlife areas.

- A question was posed by Committee Member Dustman: Is there any trail connectivity to Wasatch? Staff Member Deters answered, yes, there are paved trails, and backcountry trails have been proposed during the Wasatch/Park City joint planning process as part of Mayflower Development. The Two Fingers Trail could connect on the west side. Then on the east and west sides, the trails master plan calls out roads. We are working with Wasatch County and have done a trail plan. We proposed paved and dirt connections on west side. Elements on East side were not included in JSPA. Possibly coming from Park and Ride: rails-to-trails connection. Committee member Doilney pointed out that there is a shooting range as well to the East.



- Committee Member Joyce asked whether there is a conflict between the sheep and trail riders? Staff Member Deters answered no, they have not interacted. Luke moved the sheep to the east side. Two lots have come into Rising Star lane, but there is an illegal trail there. Yes, there are some issues in planning documents and some connections in the JSPA for connectivity. Committee Member Fisher said that one dog did kill a sheep, but this occurred on Mayflower. Also, a mountain lion was killed close to the property. Staff Member Deters said that dog walkers bring up to 12 dogs at a time and let them roam free. They have also had hunting in the past, and we will need to address this as well.
- Committee Member Ryan asked if we could get an overlay of proposed trails. Staff Member Deters said yes, but they are similar to what is there now. Open space hard to plan for because we never know which plots will come up for acquisition. But the trails master plan essentially uses the current trails as its starting point.
- Committee Member Ryan asked about the Mayflower connection. Staff Member Deters said that this section has a resort emphasis—ski in, ski out. They may use underpasses for cyclists, etc. They have contemplated whether to provide a paved path, which would connect straight in to Park City Heights. Council Member Beerman said that the only trail that exists right now is Two Fingers. Committee Member Fox as if paved road was there, would e-bikes be allowed on it? Staff Member Deters answered yes, according to current code. Committee Member Dustman asked whether it does not depend on the type of trail. Because E bikes are defined as motorized vehicles, Committee Member Fox said that we should make sure e-bikes go only on the paved path.
- Committee Member Joyce asked who owns the stretch of frontage road. Staff Member Deters answered that UDOT owns the frontage road and the county determines the uses. The road kept sloughing off.
- Council Member Beerman advised the group that should put this discussion in context—where there will be growth and where there won't be. To the west is Park City Heights. On east side is a 1200-acre buffer that does not have development rights; it will stay undeveloped. Talisker owns it, and there are restrictions per the agreed-upon development. To the east of that is Mayflower. Committee Member Dustman asked whether it is base zoning or rural residential. Staff Member Deters said that there are 700-900 acres as well adjacent to Clark per the development agreement for recreational use such as horses, golf courses or open space.
- Committee Member Jan Wilking asked about snow storage as a use. Staff Member Deters responded that this has been resolved.



The discussion turned to SS91. Should this be included in conservation easement and used for municipal uses instead? Staff Member Deters said we should take the considerations back Council goals: affordable housing push/pull with open-space preservation. The school master plan will likely use Treasure Mountain fields. If we even use one or two, need to find others to replace them: it's all about balance. There are restricted parcels for recreation uses: the east part of SS91. These could be ball fields, off-leash dog park, slip ramp to get people straight to Park and Ride. All city departments are trying to look at the parcel holistically. We need to present the information to council and have them make decisions.

Committee Member Ryan reminded everyone that COSAC's mission is still to preserve land. Committee Member Fisher said that, with regard to seeps and springs: would the city be interested in considering this area from a habitat and wetland perspective, since it is more valuable from a conservation perspective? The spring is year-round and a unique feature. The city has deed restrictions on this property, but this should be played into larger conversation about the easement. It is Talisker (UPCM)-owned. Staff Member Harrington said that the Talisker Empire Canyon development agreement limits uses to golf (private) or golf (public), or conversion to open-space easement. They would be near the Park & Ride site. We cannot make a lot of assumptions until the deal is finalized. The county hated that we put these restrictions on the deal. Committee Member Dustman asked if is there a sunset on the decision of whether the property is converted to goes golf or open space. Staff Member Harrington said no. The EPA has not even started the Lower Silver Creek cleanup yet, so they are not even close. The 1999 development agreement was renegotiated with regard to parking in 2007.

Committee Member Joyce said that even though the city does not have an immediate need for property, right now all the free space is being chewed up. There is not much left in Park City-proper. He feels strongly that it is in the city's best interest to carve out a piece of land out and let it sit there. We need the flexibility: the city can come back later and decide what to use with it. He would also rather protect the area on the other side that is not part of the easement. He wants to see the Park and Ride be successful. Park City Heights is also across the street. Committee Member Wilking said he supports this perspective.

Committee Member Ryan offered a point/counterpoint: we should take a conservative hard-line approach, just thinking globally. The visual open-space corridors from Heber City to Mountain Dell will be fully developed. This is one of the last pieces in that element. It also ties into wildlife corridors to continue access. There are aesthetic, open space, and environmental issues here.



Also, there are a lot of infill parcels within the city that could be better utilized. The argument regarding municipal resources could be to carve out the visual portion in the front piece then put municipal use behind or just develop all the way. She would argue that we have opportunities that we have not used yet within our city. Also, this is a regional issue. If you put affordable housing here, it exacerbates the transit. Committee Member Sheridan interjected to say not if people used the park and ride.

Committee Member Joyce said he is not especially attached to affordable housing. He is concerned from a city perspective about municipal needs five or ten years from now.

Committee Member Fox said she wonders if, as we grow, about the possibility of swapping municipal uses. Some uses can be slotted in to other places. A lot of property there can be acquired through development agreements. Maybe all 45 acres doesn't get placed into an easement, but as long as it's open, it's open and it's everybody's target. If we don't put a conservation easement on, we should at least put some restrictions on the property. There are far more efficient land uses that we don't employ because we have open land.

Committee Member Dustman remarked that we are not a citizen strategic planning committee: we are not here to solve all the problems. We leave that to council.

Committee Member Goodman asked what tools we have at our disposal. Staff Member Deters said that we have used a lot of land-management instruments in the past that could be effective with approaching this parcel. Staff Member Harrington said that there are a lot of ways to be creative. The most helpful thing we could give council is a tiered recommendation based on land use. Some could be worthy of further use. There are many things we could do short of a permanent easement—there is a graduated scale. The good news is that the city's wants and needs have really declined because we found creative ways to address our issues. The flip side, however, is that the EPA is beginning a series of long-term cleanups, and the county wants to keep capacity at Richardson Flats for lower the Silver Creek cleanup. Talisker's financial uncertainty also adds to questions. Additionally, the Park City Fire Department is also desperately looking for space.

Council Member Beerman said there was a stampede when we first purchased the land because everyone wanted some space for a use or facility. So these requests will come back up. This group should either say we don't want to develop it or we should assign restricted uses. At this time, we need to put parameters on how we use this land.

Committee Member Sheridan asked if it looked upon for affordable housing. Council Member Beerman said that support for this use runs the spectrum on council. The



majority of council is favoring low-impact uses that don't harm view sheds. So COSAC's and community's input will be crucial.

Committee Member Ryan asked whether we could we switch with Talisker on rights. Staff Member Harrington answered that there was always a chance. The timing is not great right now, but things could change. He also mentioned the Osguthorpe property as an analogy: there was an original resolution prior to easements. We carved out barn; the resolution would still be in place. There could be a permitted use that could trigger that, but he doesn't think so.

Staff Member asked the group to wrap up the discussion. He summarized by saying what he heard was that this is an open-space group, so we should be concerned about open space through some mechanism. We need to develop recommendations as a group. Council Member Beerman said that, prior to the work session, the group should take a site visit and also discuss the property at again at the next meeting. Committee Member asked if Committee Member Fisher had any comments. Member Fisher responded that we should do an even greater visual analysis. SS91 and PP21 are very visible. They don't have as many ecological values, but are still important. Perhaps we just put in a scenic easement. She said her group will continue to do a visual analysis to determine uses. It's important to preserve entry corridors so people don't feel like they are recreating in suburbia.

Committee Member said there is no timeline. We should be aware of the global discussion happening in terms of growth, Envision Utah, etc. From our standpoint, it's open space. Also, there always seem to be outs, so we should be hard-core in our stance: wiggle room always leads to dilution. Committee Member Joyce said that the city made it clear that when they bought property, they did not use only funds earmarked for open space. We need to remember this when developing our recommendations. But council needs to determine the value of open space, from a wildlife perspective, recreation uses, and visual corridors. Not all open space is equal. It's our responsibility to determine highest and best uses for each parcel. To keep credibility, we can't draw too hard a line.

Committee Member Kahn compared the process to what we identify as a powder day these days. She also said RAB's vision is not to build another off-leash dog park like we what have at Quinn's. They want a substitute for Round Valley that is completely off-leash. Round Valley can't change its uses. She also mentioned that there is the triangle parcel available for fields.

Council Member Beerman had a question for Committee Member Fisher: Could we put city needs next to development at Park City Heights—the Clark Ranch piece abutting



City Heights? Member Fisher said that that parcel is very visual and starts to rise. So it is visually vulnerable. It also has a habitat value: the more you carve into it from a development perspective, the more you carve into the habitat. Committee Member Sheridan asked whether we could annex this parcel, and Council Member Beerman responded that there has been talk about it. A dog park could also work here because it would have only low structures.

VI. Adjournment

Council member Simpson moved to adjourn the meeting
Council member Beerman seconded
Approved unanimously

VII. Closed Session Memorandum

The committee met in a closed session at approximately 9:50 am. Members in attendance were all those present for the open session.

The meeting for which these minutes were prepared was noticed by posting at least 24 hours in advance.

Prepared by

Elizabeth Quinn Fregulia
Community Affairs Associate