



**COSAC V: Citizens Open Space Committee
February 23, 2016
Park City Municipal Corporation, Council Chambers**

I. Meeting Called to Order 8:36 am by Vice Chair Steve Joyce

II. Roll Call

- a. City Staff & Council:
 - i. Elizabeth Quinn Fregulia
 - ii. Heinrich
 - iii. Andy Beerman
 - iv. Mark Harrington
- b. Committee Members:
 - i. Cheryl Fox
 - ii. Wendy Fisher
 - iii. Charlie Sturgis
 - iv. Meisha Lawson
 - v. Bill Cunningham
 - vi. Marian Crosby
 - vii. Jim Doilney
 - viii. Jan Wilking
 - ix. Kathy Kahn
 - x. Carolyn Frankenburg
 - xi. Bronson Calder
 - xii. Cara Goodman
 - xiii. Rhonda Sideris
 - xiv. Meg Ryan
 - xv. Suzanne Sheridan
 - xvi. Brooke Hontz
 - xvii. Steve Joyce

III. Adoption of Minutes

The following comment was made:

Add Emergency Egress "Requests": "People will be coming to us with emergency egress requests"

- a. Motion made to adopt minutes as amended:
 - i. Rhonda Sideris
- b. Second:
 - i. Jim Doilney
- c. Minutes Approved Unanimously
 - i. Except for those not present at the January meeting

IV. Staff/Board Communications

- Mr. Deters passed around the new COSAC committee contact list.
- He welcomed Ms. Hontz and Ms. Crosby.
- He announced that this Thursday, City Council would be approving the dog task force. Five members are being recommended for appointment, including one old COSAC member.
- Mr. Deters brought the group up to speed on the Recreation Master Plan:
 - Open House March 2nd
 - MARC 11-1
 - Basin Rec 5-7
 - The consultant team is looking at Silver Creek, the MARC, Quinn's, other existing facilities. They are exploring which programs conceptually fit in which locations. They will use a matrix to determine which uses will meet various goals. They want to site something that will not add to traffic congestion. Mr. Deters recommended the committee following up.
 - A consultant is looking at county, city, and school-owned properties. On the matrix for Clark Ranch is a dog park and trailhead. NO consideration for anything greater than that. Are looking at UPCM parcels adjacent.
 - Mr. Joyce asked if anything could be done on the Richardson Flats parcel for a decade, since it's tied to cleanup. This continues to evolve. The OU boundary does not include all of the Talisker parcels.
- Special Service Contracts Due March 31st
- Mr. Deters thanked Ms. Ryan for her service and presented her with a gift. He said we will all miss her.

Mr. Joyce asked if there was discussion about annexing the Clark Ranch land. Mr. Deters said yes, and have had request from Planning Commission: one side is within the ADA, but the other side is not. We would need to extend it to take in East Side properties. Mr. Joyce said we could possibly change the ADA to take in Thaynes—do everything at once. Mr. Beerman said would it be easier to take care of everything in one fell swoop. The former council was deadlocked about extending, but the current council will take up the issue again.

It was asked if the annexation could also include northern parts of Round Valley. Mr. Harrington said this may take care of itself if the parcels proceed through development, but other factors could complicate the process. Ms. Fox mentioned the hunting issue. Mr. Deters said Planning is taking the lead on this. With regard to Risner Ridge or Old Ranch Hills and the Gillmor Property: this is composed of a two-step process:

- declare annex at some point
- annex

V. Public Input

- a. There were no members of the public present.

VI. New Business: Clark Ranch Recommendation: March 10th

Mr. Deters referred everyone to Exhibit D of the packet, which is the summary that Ms. Ryan put together. He asked the group to verify that it represents their recommendations. Mr. Joyce asked for comments.

- The group all agreed that Mr. Joyce, Ms. Fisher, and Ms. Ryan did a great job distilling the message into a succinct and accurate summary of the research and their discussions, with all of their recommendations.
- Ms. Fox asked about the last bullet point: “We recognize that you get to make the decision.” She said she thought this language feels like it’s backing away from our strong point of view. Ms. Ryan clarified that she meant the point to convey, “We know you have competing interests; this is why we are here. We didn’t do this in a vacuum.” She said would rephrase the sentence to be more forceful.
 - Mr. Beerman said we should lead off with COSAC’s stance: we don’t need to acknowledge council’s role.
- Ms. Fisher said we should lead with Ms. Ryan’s summary.
- Ms. Kahn said she doesn’t think the tongue-in-cheek approach works and recommended taking the last phrase out. She said the document should just say, “This land is critical to preserve and manage for the future.”
- Mr. Wilking asked about RAB’s recommendation. Ms. Lawson said they have not discussed this in detail.
- Mr. Beerman had a few more comments:
 - Point 8: Council does not really rank these
 - “It’s a top priority.” Take #2 out
 - Item 4 under East side: E-bikes discussion: we had this for both sides of the road. Don’t make this specific to both sides.
- Mr. Doilney mentioned the emergency egress request that we will undoubtedly receive; he doesn’t see it being addressed in this document. Do we truncate at the Mitt Romney turnoff, or is this a UDOT easement? Mr. Beerman said the frontage road is a UDOT easement, but Mr. Deters said Summit County manages it; it stops at the edge. As you head west, we control it. Emergency access coming out isn’t going to change, but it would be good to clarify that this does not provide additional access to Frontage Road. We also do not intend to accommodate egress on the West side. Mr. Deters said we can’t do anything regarding established rights, but we can put marker in the sand with for the future when writing easements. The language can read as such: “We do not wish to facilitate emergency egress into Wasatch County on both sides of the parcel. If there is an existing easement, we don’t have the right to take it away, but we will not allow it to hook into an existing road in the future.”

Mr. Joyce confirmed we don’t need a motion to edit the document in these ways.

Mr. Beerman mentioned two more points:

- Our Finding, #6 (purchasing more properties, especially surrounding properties): he asked if we should make recommendations in this regard.
 - He said this can also refer to #6, our conclusions
 - If the goal is to limit growth, everything adjacent to the East side is possibly developable. This could also include property under the consideration by BOSAC: they had been focusing their efforts in the center

of the Snyderville Basin, so they aren't concentrating in this area. But COSAC and BOSAC could possibly collaborate in this area.

- #6: should we expand beyond Talisker property? Ms. Sideris said she thought the language reads well as-is.

There was a question about language in the past minutes: "However, this was done extra-jurisdictionally." Mr. Harrington said that a condition of the annexation regarded property in Flagstaff. As part of this, the city got Talisker to agree to restrictions in Richardson Flats, which is in Summit County. The county's language in their general plan matches ours in this area, in terms of development, so the two codes are aligned. It was asked, "Do we recommend the city go beyond this to acquire more property?"

Mr. Joyce also said there are surrounding private properties that come to a point at the hillside at 40 (a number of smaller private lots, especially near the stock lumber yard). There were two suggestions for the document:

- 1) Acquire Talisker
- 2) Go beyond and acquire so that hillside isn't lit up with houses.

Mr. Doilney said this is the entry corridor and asked whether we should we have an approach because we can't address all specific parcels. Ms. Ryan said she would enter this language. Mr. Harrington said we are talking about one property; should we also recommend to the new COSAC group to look at adjacent parcels? Mr. Deters said that when COSAC IV did their prioritization, they presented it to Council in closed. We will do this again for COSAC V.

Mr. Cunningham asked if we could see this list. Mr. Deters said we could do this at the next meeting. It is not a criteria discussion, but we will look at maps over the next few months, along with the Library Field.

Ms. Ryan asked whether she should rework the language in #6 to make a stronger statement regarding entryway corridors, as well as mentioning wildlife corridor opportunities.

Ms. Fisher said we should strengthen the aesthetic part of the letter—this defines the open space. Ms. Ryan said she would add a few bullet points under findings. Mr. Deters emphasized how important this point is—COSAC is supportive across the board. Ms. Fisher said this was so foremost in our minds that we forgot to put it down on paper.

Mr. Deters clarified that we will present on March 3rd during a work session. Ms. Ryan will send the edited document by end of day. She also asked about all of the exhibits. Mr. Deters said staff is cognizant of how to present these exhibits. She listed the ones that she considers most important:

- general plan
- priorities
- buildable map

Mr. Deters said he would include links to these.

Ms. Ryan reiterated that anyone who can attend this presentation should—it will be important to show strength in numbers. Mr. Deters said he would try to schedule the session to be at 5:15 or so, and that it would take approximately 45 minutes. Mr. Beerman underscored the strength

in numbers point and suggested adding the map to the packet, annotating it with identifiers such as the springs and other landmarks to orient council. Ms. Fisher said this is in the powerpoint.

Ms. Fisher said she would include five maps in the packet and she will add navigational points.

- Growth maps
- Talisker property
- 10 acres close to PC Heights
- wildlife/conservation

She reminded the group that this is a summary and we don't want to bury the important ones.

Ms. Kahn asked to include the photo with the fictitious building. Mr. Joyce asked to include the one that makes it look really bad.

Ms. Fisher then went through the powerpoint that will be presented to Council. She will print out the overall map for each council member. (It was determined that Ms. Ryan and Mr. Joyce).

Powerpoint Presentation:

- The Matrix
- #1 concern is aesthetic/scenic: it's on the entry corridor; high degree of visual vulnerability; buffer for open space; helps define community character
 - This is why we should have no large buildings: they will be an eyesore
- Critical Conservation of Wildlife Habitat
 - general plan addresses corridors; this is certainly significant in this regard
 - springs
 - aspen forest
 - sage grouse—a hen has made it all the way over to Jordanelle area but could not be confirmed on Clark ranch specifically.
- Recreation
 - Passive
 - Unique
 - Alternative transportation
 - Hiking/mountain biking: informal
 - Frontage road was considered
- Community Character
 - The committee determined that farming (grazing) was not ranked terribly high, but did acknowledge utilizing agriculture/grazing as a management tool.
- COSAC Recommendations
 - Preserve aesthetics over building
 - Protect high-value conservation areas
 - Encourage passive recreation; no active
 - Agriculture/Grazing: management tool but not conservation value
 - Consider additional acquisition(s)

- Underscore defined limited scope of existing access easements to limit emergency access to Wasatch County
- Ms. Hontz said there are 800 proposed units (pre-application): they are in Summit County and would be accessed from the Richardson Flats road or 248, not within the Jordanelle special service district. There are another 60 on the east side that would also need egress. Ms. Fisher said she will bold the last two bullet points; Ms. Goodman suggested mentioning this point (additional opportunities for open space) earlier in the presentation. Ms. Fox said also asked that we show the map earlier.
- Mr. Wilking said Talisker also submitted a plan near to what Ms. Hontz was pointing out.

Ms. Ryan suggested a handout summarizing the points. Mr. Beerman suggested adding “aesthetic” in the second-to-last bullet. Ms. Ryan suggested adding “anchor.”

Ms. Goodman said she really liked the point “Three of the four corners have already been developed.” She said this is a powerful phrase to mention to Council. The other phrase that she said also has potency is “They are not making any more land; this is our last shot.” She said the point Ms. Hontz made is also important. JSSD is going to sell off surplus parcels in the next few months, and a 22.5-acre parcel next to 248 will probably come available. Ms. Fisher that we probably can purchase other parcels just by paying back their fees, but this approach may cost more than the land.

Mr. Joyce asked about these parcels that are coming available—how do we address these when they come up on such short-notice? Mr. Deters said we rely on our relationship with the Wasatch County Planning Director. He said he also relies on this group, too. He mentioned that the parcel Ms. Hontz mentioned changed hands to JSSD several years ago. But there are ones that we miss, especially in Wasatch County. Members of the public also occasionally reach out to Mr. Deters. Mr. Joyce asked, should we just contact Mr. Deters directly? Mr. Deters responded that people can contact either him or the city’s Planning Department. Mr. Beerman added that folks could also go to the two land trusts; sometimes action can be taken more quickly by them.

VII. Move to Adjourn:

Mr. Joyce asked if there were any more comments. Having none, he asked the group to wrap up.

- Mr. Cunningham made the motion to adjourn.
- Ms. Goodman seconded.

VIII. Meeting Adjourned 9:35 am

These minutes were recorded and prepared by Elizabeth Quinn Fregulia, Community Affairs Associate for Park City Municipal Corporation. The meeting for which these minutes were recorded was noticed at least 24 hours in advance.