



**Citizens' Open Space Advisory Committee (COSAC IV)**  
**Council Chambers, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah**  
**December 15, 2015**

- I. **Meeting called to Order 8:37 am by Vice Chair Steve Joyce**  
(Chair Hanley was absent.)
- II. **Roll Call:**
  - Bill Cunningham
  - Bronson Calder
  - Susanne Sheridan
  - Jim Doilney
  - Cheryl Fox
  - Erin Bragg
  - Charlie Sturgis
  - Rhoda Stauffer
  - Kathy Kahn
  - Jan Wilking
  - Steve Joyce
  - Andy Beerman
  - Meg Ryan
  - Mark Harrington
  - Carolyn Frakenburg
  - Wendy Fisher, via teleconference
  - Elizabeth Quinn Fregulia
  - *City Manager Diane Foster joined the meeting late.*
- III. **Adoption of Minutes:**
  - a. Mr. Joyce asked if there were any changes to the minutes of August 25, 2015.
    - i. Ms. Frankeburg stated that her name was not listed on the roll call, but she was indeed present.
  - b. Mr. Cunningham moved approval of minutes with stated amendment.
    - i. Ms. Kahn seconded.
    - ii. Motion approved unanimously.

**IV. Staff & Board Communications and Disclosures**

Mr. Deters announced that there will be a work session starting at 5:15 during the December 17 City Council meeting. The animal-control ordinance will be discussed. No decisions will be made, but this is a good opportunity to hear what the county has achieved and identify potential options for City Council. Mr. Beerman said that he knows many people utilize Library Field and

don't comply with the leash requirement; this is one example of what might be discussed. Time-permitting, public input may be allowed during the general session.

**V. Public Input**

***{All comments were regarding a potential conservation easement on Library Field.}***

- a. **Mr. Ed Parigian**, a member of the community, read a prepared statement asking COSAC and city staff to place an item on a future agenda for consideration of a conservation easement on Library Field. His statement has been included as an attachment.
- b. **Ms. Sharon Christensen**, a member of the community, echoed Mr. Parigian's sentiments. *"This is our Central Park, where families can come and do two or three things at once, whereas City Park is programmed,"* she said. *"It's good to have a place where you can do anything."*
- c. **Mr. Jeff Stern** has lived here for five years and owns a condo on Woodside. He met Mr. Beerman and other people from the city at Library Field. It's a great meeting place: a place just to learn about the town.
- d. **Ms. Maureen Moriarty** came to work for Chateau Après in 1971 and now lives next door. She said it has been interesting to observe the types of use the park gets and it gives him a lot of pleasure. The use has been ramping up last few years—whether it be dogs, casual meetings, or the 4<sup>th</sup> of July.
- e. **Ms. Mellie Owen** lives at Norfolk and is *"here to represent the youth of the neighborhood: 18 children. This is their playground. The field gives young folks the opportunity to sled, hit the ball, etc. As an adult, it's self-serving, but taking away the playground of the children would make a big impact. One of Park City's goals is diversity, and the children don't have a voice at the table—they are at school and their parents are at work. But they are the future of the city. Thank you for looking at this; we hope you will consider all of our perspectives."*
- f. **Sarah Hartley** *"will just say ditto to everything that has been said. I use the park all the time, see kids using the park all the time. This item needs to be carefully considered."*
- g. Mr. Joyce asked if there was any other public input. Ms. Ryan asked how the group arrived at COSAC, and gently reminded those present that it has been stated—in the newspaper and elsewhere—that the Library Field is *"off the table"* for development. Mr. Parigian responded that it's off the table now, but what about for 20 years from now? Mr. Parigian said he understands that running the land through the matrix is the first step, so he wanted to approach COSAC. Ms. Ryan said that all at-large members are up for re-appointment, so this might need to be pushed off until the new committee is fully in place. Mr. Deters said he would work with city manager to determine if this merits a conservation easement, but it may take a while, especially given the pending transition on the COSAC committee. At next meeting they need to have direction from Ms. Foster to proceed. Mr. Beerman said that Council is feeling the urgency on entry corridors: large spaces that could be built on. This is their focus. We have multiple urban parks, all of which may be up for consideration,

but right now, this is not where they are focused. Other areas have more urgent needs. Mr. Parigian said it would be judicious to get the process started now. He asked COSAC to ask city staff to please put the item on agenda.

- h. **Mr. Cunningham** said he is in favor of preserving Library Field.
- i. **Ms. Kahn** said she served on the RAB board for nine years. In that time, they considered the library field a number of times. She knows this is not a dog issue, per se, but right now everything is a dog issue.
- j. Mr. Harrington asked to agendize the item. At that time, the committee can then address specific issues such as dog uses. He asked Mr. Deters to please confirm that it will go on a future agenda.
- k. Ms. Kahn asked to make this a motion.
  - i. Mr. Wilking moved to make a motion to future agendize the Library Field for consideration.
  - ii. Mr. Doilney seconded.
  - iii. The motion was approved unanimously.
- l. Mr. Parigian added a final comment: “The city will do what the city will do, in terms of dogs. We don’t want to make it a dog park, is what I’m saying.”

Ms. Deters asked if we could switch the agenda to go over the new business item. Mr. Joyce approved.

## **VI. New Business**

Mr. Deters introduced New Business by summarizing the tenure of COSAC IV: *“We did not get a lot done from the acquisition side of the equation, but we did make a lot of progress in terms of conservation easements.”*

The initial term for COSAC IV committee members is expiring at the end of the year. Mr. Deters asked if there was a question regarding timing and policy. The review process should be easy if there are a reasonable amount of applications. Mr. Deters said he will review the applications to make sure they comply with the requirements, then take some recommendations to Council. Mr. Deters said they normally cancel the January meeting because of the Sundance Film Festival, but he could anticipate February being a busy meeting.

Ms. Sideris inquired about funding sources vis-à-vis committee makeup: *“Since there is not a great deal of funding left, will you just keep the at-large members?”* Mr. Deters responded that he had spoken with Council and they decided they wanted to provide the opportunity for the public to apply. There is a collective desire to be as transparent as possible. He underscored that all of the committee members are valuable, especially considering all of the work that was done to develop the matrix. Ms. Ryan asked for clarification—is everyone up for reconsideration? Mr. Beerman clarified that Council is very happy with COSAC’s performance. The universal reposting of seats is a standard procedure. All boards and commissions have times for review. *“We encourage everyone who has been involved to reapply,”* Mr. Beerman said. *“We will have a few open seats regardless, so we thought it best to re-advertise the entire committee to the public.”* Ms. Ryan said she hoped the stakeholders do stay because she assumes the matrix will transfer

to the new board. Mr. Deters confirmed this. Mr. Beerman clarified that it is up to each stakeholder entity to put forth their respective representative.

Ms. Kahn stated that she has been termed via the RAB, but asked if she could apply for an at-large position. Mr. Deters and Mr. Harrington confirmed she could do this.

Mr. Deters said he would communicate regarding the planning commission person for Mr. Joyce.

Ms. Ryan asked whether the funding source replenishes itself. Mr. Deters said he is working off of an initial budget allocation, which runs through FY17. There is \$5-million of the original \$15-million allocation that was earmarked for open space. It does replenish every year. Mr. Harrington said there is every expectation Council will ask COSAC to continue, but there is no guarantee that there will be more money allocated to open space. Regardless, there will be an ongoing need for the group. There are also other sources of funds, including the impact fee. Mr. Beerman clarified that the fund only replenishes after about 10 years because the city needs to pay off the associated bonds. This amount fluctuates based on the amount of sales tax coming in, and City Council can decide to issue more bonds. The first thing the new COSAC committee may want is a refresher on where they are—in terms of funds and options. The upcoming budget cycle is a good time to evaluate the committee's long-term plan.

Mr. Beerman echoed that he believes Council will remain supportive of acquiring open space. If other opportunities pop up, they could identify other sources of funding at that time. They try to prioritize initiatives at their annual retreat, but one never knows when open space opportunities come up.

Ms. Fox made the observation that this incarnation of COSAC is different because they can look at parcels that are not acquisitions but could still decide what to do with them. The Gambel Oak (city-owned property) is a good example. She inquired whether COSAC will still do this in the future. Mr. Harrington responded that the group should not be too concerned. There was no staff recommendation to not re-appoint COSAC; the charter of the body is not changing. The question that was posed to Council was whether we should re-advertise or just extend current terms.

Mr. Joyce asked if there were any other new business items. Having none, he asked to move the meeting to Closed Session.

- Mr. Wilking posed the motion.
- Ms. Ryan seconded.
- The motion was approved unanimously.

### **{CLOSED SESSION}**

The meeting was reopened to continue the open session. Ms. Foster joined the meeting at this time.

Ms. Foster gave an update on the Clark Ranch easement process. She stated that she understood that COSAC provided their recommendation on August 25, but they have been delayed in talking to Council. She first thanked the group for serving then explained why the recommendation has not yet gone to Council. She said she hopes in 100 years that the Park City community looks at the current Council, staff, and COSAC committee and says they did a good job. Right now the city has significant challenges for municipal services. One example is the bus barn: they put eight acres of buildings on a five-acre site. She added that there simply aren't many parcels adjacent to city limits. The staff and Council are trying to look out past 10 years. If the past indicates the future, the need for municipal services may grow. *"We're not looking for a ton of ground, but we want to make sure we're planning it right,"* she said. *"We have the needs of 13 departments to consider. We're not trying to stall; we just want to make sure we're doing the best job we can."*

Ms. Sheridan asked if there was anticipation that the problem would grow. Ms. Foster said that this was her *"biggest nightmare"* because of how we are funded, but it is a trend in mountain towns. We need to grow bus service to mitigate traffic impacts, for example. Ms. Sheridan said that this is just during key periods, but Ms. Foster responded that this may be the case, but that the trend for resort towns is an increase in sales tax, regardless of season. In 2009/2010, Park City saw the largest sales tax growth of any resort town: Vail was at 6%, Park City at 26%. Last year saw a 12% year-over-year increase. In September alone we saw a 15% increase. We're on this pace to be a year-round destination. City Council has been clear that when we are serving locals, second homeowners also benefit.

Mr. Doilney said that the group had identified a 10-acre parcel as the target for municipal services and asked Ms. Foster if she thought this would be adequate. Ms. Foster responded that 10 acres is an arbitrary number at this point, and the city is trying to get a more specific handle on probable uses. She used the example of the need to truck waste at the water-treatment plant. *"If we can put in drying beds to solve this problem,"* she said, *"we can reduce our transportation costs and carbon impact. Drying beds are a fairly low-impact, low-visibility solution. For each suggested use, we need to give Council the 'what and why.'"*

Mr. Sturgis said there was resistance to the 10 acres being set aside during the easement discussions, but a lot of this was based on what the future use would be. He asked Ms. Foster if she would be willing to give limits on the 10 acres. Ms. Foster responded she does not know, but felt this was the role of the Planning Commission. She gave the example of the Gordo property: part of it is used for recycling, but cannot be seen from the road. Mr. Beerman said that the committee spent a great deal of time coming up with the recommendations, and asked if they could present it to Council before the current incarnation of COSAC dissolves. Ms. Foster said she is not intending to stop the recommendation: the intent is to provide Council with all the information they need. She said they could invite the current committee members to a work session. Ms. Ryan asked why they cannot present the recommendation, and Ms. Foster said this is indeed what they want to do. Ms. Ryan said it sounds like there is a timing issue. She said she is completely cognizant of competing interests, and that the group has spent a lot of time talking about this. She said that she *"feels like we spent five months discussing the easement parameters and would at least like to present what we were asked to do. In our recommendation*

**Park City Municipal Corporation**  
Sustainability Department  
445 Marsac Avenue · P.O. Box 1480  
Park City, Utah 84060  
435.615.5201

*we analyzed competing interests and gave alternatives. We recognized that we wanted it to be in the discussion so that voice was represented.*" Ms. Foster said it was her understanding that Council wants to re-advertise the committee seats to benefit the public process. It is her expectation that the new COSAC committee could represent the easement. She said she couldn't put a date on it because this would be irresponsible. It could possibly be done in the next six months, but could not at this time agendaize it for the January 7 meeting. Mr. Doilney said that one of the things they unanimously recommended was concentrating the infrastructure to "Steve's Point." Could the group present this idea? Ms. Foster said she has heard that the argument for presenting the recommendation earlier rather than later is that the group is going to go away, but this is not the case. Ms. Sideris said she thought it would help guide the discussion with our recommendations. Ms. Foster said that Mr. Deters is present during these discussions.

Ms. Ryan asked why they have to wait until the whole packet is ready. Ms. Foster responded that part of her job is to make sure Council is not set up to be embarrassed. She would hate for a large group of people to show up and say pass the vote: this would put council in a bad place.

Mr. Joyce said that when they did the votes for the east and west parcels, there were near unanimous votes on all components. Therefore, if two-thirds of the group is hear four months from now, he would rather have City Council hear story when they are ready to think about it, as opposed to presenting the recommendations now, then having to present the same thing again in three-to-four months. If the votes had been closer, it would be a different story, but since the votes were all nearly unanimous, he is not concerned about timing. He would rather have the Council hear it when they are ready to discuss it. Ms. Ryan asked whether Council wasn't discussing it now and Mr. Deters said there are a lot of concurrent discussions. Mr. Wilking said Mr. Deters can be a good liaison to staff since he has been present in the discussions all along.

Ms. Foster mentioned other concurrent areas of study, including the recreation master plan (due in April), the slip ramp (which is being studied by Nelson/Nygaard), and the other areas besides Clark Ranch. She said that when the recommendations were presented to Council, she wanted the process for approval to be as easy as possible. Mr. Deters said that he would also bring the set of recommendations back to COSAC before presenting to Council. He said he will explain what the staff has determined. Ms Foster said she thought this would be helpful and explain the timeframe.

Ms. Fisher clarified that COSAC has also made the recommendations based on the reference and resource guides compiled by Utah Open Lands. She said she assumes that when Council discusses the set of easement recommendations, the reference, resource, and baseline information will be available as well. Ms. Foster said of course.

Ms. Fox said that the same thing happened with the Gambel Oak easement: COSAC made the recommendation, but seven months passed until it was agendaized. There was confusion with what had happened in the past. She asked if there was a way to keep everything clear in people's minds so that both the momentum and institutional knowledge are not lost. Mr. Deters said preserving this momentum was his responsibility. Ms. Fox said this loss of institutional

**Park City Municipal Corporation**  
*Sustainability Department*  
445 Marsac Avenue · P.O. Box 1480  
Park City, Utah 84060  
435.615.5201

memory is her exact concern: she said that going back to Council six-to-twelve months after the fact makes it hard for people to remember the details, and makes it difficult for the committee to be as relevant as they would like. Mr. Joyce said, though, that the likelihood of remembering details nine months after the fact is not great, and said he preferred “striking while the iron is hot.” Ms. Fox said this was all the more reason to go back and reread minutes. Ms. Kahn asked if it’s typical to issue an outgoing statement, since this is our last meeting. Mr. Harrington said that this had been a very healthy discussion, but there is some danger of losing depth. He pointed out, however, that if the group presented their recommendations at the last council meeting of the year, there would be only three of the five council members of the upcoming council. He recommended using the meeting minutes to prepare a closing report, and add in Ms. Fisher’s documents to create a transition packet—either for council or through the liaison. The technical data may surprise them, so no one should wait to read them until the last minute. We should also give Council as much information as possible. He said the committee could also make its own motion and ask the council to consider something different.

Ms. Fisher suggested putting together a resource guide (ecological inventories, baseline information, reference information, and minutes), as a closing report. Mr. Joyce asked if there is a legal mechanism for someone to object to something via email. Mr. Harrington said we could delegate comment collecting to a sub-committee or chair. Mr. Beerman said that the group could meet in early January to discuss.

Mr. Doilney again asked for the process to move along expeditiously: *“The longer we take, the more people will forget, and the less open space we will have.”* Ms. Foster responded that her goal is to set the target date.

It was decided that the group would meet January 12 to go over the entire packet.

Ms. Fox asked if a motion in the minutes is the best way to communicate to Council or whether this is a job for the liaison. Mr. Beerman responded that the best thing would be for the committee to get in front of Council. Ms. Foster said that if we talk and decide we have to go now, we’ll figure out how to take it now. This is not her preference but she will make it happen.

Mr. Joyce asked if we have the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup>, could we work through the details then. *“Do we as a group feel we need to get in front of City Council at a meeting before they are ready for everything else, which could be six months down the line?”* he asked. Ms. Foster suggested presenting to Council on January 28<sup>th</sup> but keeping the COSAC meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Fox said presenting to Council would also be a nice way to honor the people who have served on the committee, especially with regard to the matrix. Ms. Ryan suggested discussing this on the 12<sup>th</sup> of January.

Ms. Foster said she is simply asking for a bit more time to do the planning. She acknowledged Mr. Doilney’s concern and stated that staff is here to implement Council’s direction. Staff is also equally passionate about preserving open space. Ms. Ryan said that the committee just wants their voice to be heard among the competing interests.

Ms. Ryan suggested making a motion to have a special meeting on January 12 at which Mr. Deters could provide a wrap-up of Clark Ranch. She requested having Ms. Fisher send the resource packet well in advance of this meeting. This meeting could also provide an opportunity for those whose tenures will be ending to give closing statements.

- Mr. Doilney made the motion.
- Ms. Sideris seconded.
- The motion passed unanimously.

{Ms. Fox asked to receive the packet as early as possible and Ms. Fisher said she would send it out this week.}

**I. Adjourn**

- a. Mr. Doilney made a motion to adjourn.
- b. Mr. Wilking seconded.
- c. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:18 a.m.

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