

COSAC IV Monthly Meeting
July 28, 2015

Meeting Called to Order by Vice Chair Steve Joyce at 8:03 am.

I. Roll Call:

- Heinrich
- Mindy Wheeler (UOL Consultant)
- Erin Bragg
- Rusty Millholland (UOL Staff)
- Andy Beerman
- Charlie Sturgis
- Meg Ryan:
- Jim Doilney
- Steve Joyce
- Kathy Kahn
- Julia Pace (UOL Staff)
- Arthur Morris (UOL Staff)
- Rhodan Sideris
- Cara Goodman
- Bill Cunningham
- Tyler Dustman
- Jan Wilking
- Elizabeth Quinn Fregulia
- Judy Hanley
- Suzanne Sheridan

II. Approval of Minutes June 23

Tyler Dustman motion approve
Seconded by Jan Wilking
Motion Approved.

III. Public Input: None

IV. Group then moved to site visit of Clark Ranch.

- Staff recommendation on SS91 values, uses discussion.
COSAC should apply matrix: qualities, tools, in making recommendation.

V. Regular Session: Committee returns from site visit 9:42

Staff Member Deters: Staff needs from COSAC a determination specifically for SS91. We are focusing on this parcel because this is the only one in which there have been identifying uses that are not compatible with classic conservation. There was also discussion about adjacencies next to Park City Heights. But this is subject to council discussion. So we need to focus on SS91 first and foremost. Beerman said that council bought this property with the

intention of largely preserving. SS91 is still the main question: keep open for alternative city uses.

Jan: contrarian opinion: having served on council, to him they are preserving a great deal of open space. Now is not the time to tie it up.

Suzanne seconded.

Steve said he likes to keep it freed up, but some restrictions, even if not identical. Restrictions such as piling snow but no buildings. A middle ground to give the city some flexibility. Question: are restrooms considered buildings? All of trailheads do not have restrooms and it's getting difficult.

Rhonda: considers PW a bridge too far if it

Judy: all for open land; this does not include soccer fields. Will affect wildlife. Bill Cunningham concurs.

Cara: don't want to see buildings or bathrooms. Not a high-use rec area, but can include some flexibility.

Charlie: some lower-level buildings, esp. if future use of city. (East side). Small percentage of the land should be fine, won't shackle entire aesthetic. You already have the movie studio. Ok for 1-level, city office space. Not a million trucks. Bill asked why not use the west side: once you go up Park City Heights you have a clean corridor. To have some small portion of the land being acquired be set aside for the city might not be a bad idea.

Tyler: understands need for flexibility moving forward, but disagrees with Charlie. Sees quadrant as having no buildings. Movie studio is not in same south/east quadrant.

Suzanne pointed out that there is development all above it. But Tyler said this is perhaps a reason to keep it even more preserved.

Heinrich: let's talk about the conflicting uses: wildlife, aesthetic. Pick out of the matrix one value: what's the primary one?

Bill asked if sage grouse would be migrating.

Arthur said it's still classified as occupied. There is a LEC within a few miles. Looks likely that sage grouse still use sometimes. It's important how it's situated between wet meadows is important to them.

Meg wanted to expand on what she said last week: what, again, is the mission of this board? We are supposed to make recommendations for open space.

Question on timing of recommendation was asked. Andy Beerman said he would defer to Utah Open Lands: the timeline is October, but can be modified.

Meg: we spent 6-8 months developing criteria. Also have council goals. #2: preserving and enhancing natural environment.

Matrix Tier 1: will it advance goals in general plan?

This area is designated as a critical area? Meg would argue that this parcel is one part of this. Also, given the other development pressures, this is one of the last central parcels. Let's preserve what we can. Jim also said (at site visit) this is our other entry corridor.

Matrix Tier 2: values and priorities: this parcel hits all four. Based on our criteria and given the development pressures. Meg said: Will Rogers: "It's land and they're not making any more of it." One thing Meg would fall off her sword for: the slip ramp.

Beerman said potentially there can be rapid bus and other restrictions. If give wiggle room for anything: would be transportation.

Suzanne: don't want to say no recreation period or no trailheads period. We can't save open space here then say you can't use it at all. They are already using the other side of the easement. Meg said yes, it should have some recreation uses.

Deters brought it back: sounds like everyone wants it to have some restrictions per an easement.... there could be different zones.

Meg said this is a clear: it's not a public works dump site.

Beerman: Let's continue the conversation.

Cara: if we did use for snow storage or off-leash dog, what impact will it have on wildlife habitat.

Arthur: the more activity out there, especially storage of salt and vehicles, the less valuable for sage grouse. Also: salt storage would affect small mammals, which re valuable for raptors. But there is a lot of uncertainty. Without having a specific target species, difficult. If sage grouse is target: do what the state says, which is to give a big buffer. With regard to raptors: give them a big buffer for nesting. With regard to movement of animals—having something on the north end won't affect. Deer are adaptable.

Mindy: agree with Arthur: depends on level of activity—more activity, more disturbances. Off-leash dog-park would affect not only sage grouse but other inhabitants. Snow storage: doesn't know scale of what we are thinking. Extra water might do wonders for wet meadows, but also potentially introducing other things. But wetlands are a pretty goods sink and a pretty good filter.

Beerman: the city bought a parcel for our snow storage needs. This was just an example of a low-profile use.

Kathy offered clarification: RAB has never envisioned this being an off-leash parcel. RAB presented Clark Ranch to Council but not this parcel.

Deters: every specific use will have conflicts. Asked everyone to run decisions through the matrix. If you could only choose one, which would it be? If we determine recreation, what

kind would it be? We need to agree as a group what the one or two most important aspects are.

Meg said: it's a strong candidate for all four, plus the general plan.

Beerman, discuss specifics:

1. Structures or no structures (exempt bathrooms)? Meg said only wiggle room: slip ramp in future.
 - a. Charlie: appropriate structures that facilitate a good trailhead. Would not overrule low-profile buildings on frontage near existing road.
 - b. Kathy: agreement with Charlie: give wiggle room to Council to see future needs and not be hemmed in. Would like to keep open for fields.
 - i. Julie: This is too broad for a conservation easement if one to carve out for future needs.
 - c. Jan: permanent conservation easements tie the hands of the future. Jan thinks these are the appropriate types of easements. Up to the future community to say what to do. West side could be conservation, SS91: keep open.
 - i. Meg said this is not our purview. We are open space.
 - ii. Suzanne said this parcel was not bought with all open space money. Wendy said this piece had least wildlife value. Aesthetics yes but not wildlife.
 - d. Bill: once we make a decision we've pinned down other groups. If we make a decision to leave it open, future council may make bad decisions as well. Works both ways. Whatever decision you make—you've pretty much done it.
 - i. Jan: just saying let's not restrict it so much. This is not even 10% of total parcel.
 - ii. But it's part of the view.
 - iii. Charlie: sees development on northern end of property. Not fields but some building. Limit aspect on this parcel.
 - iv. Deters: at this point, it might not be worth assigning an easement should you allow too much.
 - v. Arthur: perspective on easements: you can carve out a piece to have other restrictions. Sometimes people carve out a building lot. They don't have to be restricted to parcels.
 - vi. Rusty: SS91 parcel is small piece of easement and landscape. Important to look at in relation to easement as well as restricted UPCM property around it. You are taking 60 acres adjacent to larger property. So is it appropriate to put something in the middle of this restricted area?
 - vii. Suzanne: counters: Talisker piece could be golf course or recreation. If this was already conserved, no it would not make sense to develop it.
 - viii. Judy: in Meg's corner. Keep open space open.
 - ix. Beerman: personal opinion (not council's): if we have properties without restrictions, hundreds of requests. Preserving land shapes you as a community in a particular

way, and then as a community you develop around it.

Personal: would like to see very limited use.

- x. Meg: give the city an acre near the frontage road and do whatever you want with it. Beware of the camel's nose under the tent.
- xi. Steve: moving toward preserving more. Two things: we don't know what's going to go on with Talisker piece. Protecting entry corridors is so ingrained in what we do, but now there are all of these buildings there. There's something to be said for leaving corner unscathed and protecting whole thing. SO then, when Talisker piece gets built out, if the city has built already, then it's easier for Talisker piece to get developed. AS much as he thinks this is the least interesting piece in Clark Ranch to protect, hopes to keep one corner of development unscathed. Will be only open entry corridor we have. Already talking about putting Peace House and fire station near hospital.

Deters summarized: Committee seems to want to put restrictions in the form of an easement on property, Thus SS-91 should have a preservation tool....just need to decide on values, prioritized so we can evaluate uses.

Chair Hanley called for a vote on structures or no structures for parcel (exempting bathrooms).

Bill seconded:

Motion: no structures on SS-91 exempting bathrooms.

Discussion

Kathy: punt back to Heinrich to refine conversation with points. The group is all over the map right now and we need more time.

Bill withdrew second. Chair Hanley withdrew motion.

Arthur: requested that you feed us questions for what you think is important? We can provide you with facts and opinions and make clear which is which.

Charlie: would be extremely sensitive with trails and would stay away from sensitive habitat such as wetlands. But trails introduce use. Are any and all uses too much? Maybe restrict trail levels: hiking only (e.g., Toll Canyon). Does not think it would be a good idea to have a dog park out there.

Meg: passive (trails with amenities) versus active (fields).

Kathy: would vote negatively on target shooting but yes on archery or remote-control

VI. Chair Hanley called for adjournment. Bill seconded.
Motion approved 10:37am.

Will try to reconvene within two weeks to continue discussion.