



**Citizens' Open Space Advisory Committee (COSAC IV)  
Council Chambers, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah  
January 16, 2016**

**I. Meeting Called to Order at 8:40 am.**

**II. Roll Call:**

- a. Heinrich Deters
- b. Elizabeth Quinn Fregulia
- c. Mark Harrington
- d. Meg Ryan
- e. Andy Beerman
- f. Tyler Dustman
- g. Charlie Sturgis
- h. Cheryl Fox
- i. Wendy Fisher
- j. Cara Goodman
- k. Jim Doilney
- l. Rhonda Sideris
- m. Bronson Calder
- n. Carolyn Frankenburg
- o. Steve Joyce

**III. Adoption of Minutes**

- a. Mr. Deters asked if there were changes to the minutes of December 15, 2015.
  - i. Rhonda Sideris corrected her name from Rhoda Stauffer
  - ii. On page 3, p.3 Maureen Moriarty should be referred to as a "her" not "him"
  - iii. On p.6, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph "If 2/3 of the group..." should be "here" not "hear."
- b. Approval of Minutes with stated changes
  - i. Ms. Sideris made the motion to approve
  - ii. Ms. Fox seconded
  - iii. Motion approved unanimously

**IV. Staff & Board Communications**

Mr. Deters asked if anyone wanted an update on the dog ordinance. Seeing none, the session was closed.

**V. Public Input**

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

There were no members of the public available.

#### **VI. New Business: Clark Ranch**

Follow up from August 25<sup>th</sup> COSAC recommendation meeting. Ms. Fisher put together a report based on environmental information and the committee's recommendation. Mr. Deters would like to submit a recommendation based on the staff report and minutes of December 15.

*Ms. Fisher pointed out that the resource inventory guide in the packet is not as updated as the draft. Mr. Deters made a note of this.*

Ms. Ryan pointed out that the consensus that was vetted should be brought to Council as they sort through all the vetted interests. We started back in February on the recommendation. The staff report is a wonderful summary, but she would like to add a one-page preface reminding Council that they asked COSAC to go through this process and that these are our recommendations. Having reviewed all of the old minutes, Ms. Ryan said she would be happy to put together the one-page summary.

Mr. Doilney said he thought this was a great idea. Ms. Fox confirmed that this was the "statement" that the committee wanted to put forth. Mr. Joyce mentioned again that we should go to them both sooner and later: Ms. Foster had said council is not yet ready to hear our recommendations, but this is not a "one and done." We can go now and then go back again in August or September to clarify and refresh our points. Mr. Beerman said the committee could put in a request to present at any time, but he does not see why we couldn't make two recommendations. He does not see any reason why this group couldn't be the presenters even if there are new members. Mr. Harrington said Ms. Foster withdrew her recommendation to wait and suggested going sooner rather than later because the more information Council has the better. As one example: it was determined fields and dog areas would be completely inappropriate, so they should be made aware of this now.

Mr. Deters confirmed that Ms. Foster will schedule the presentation on March 10. Ms. Goodman said this means the preface should be really clear.

Mr. Calder asked about other competing interests besides fields and dogs. Mr. Dustman identified snow storage, sheds, other municipal interests. Ms. Ryan said also housing: from her perspective, it seems that every open piece of city-owned property is up for grabs for affordable housing. Lastly, Mr. Joyce mentioned drying beds.

Ms. Fox suggested to Ms. Ryan that she enumerate all of the things we took off the table. *"We recognize there are these interests, and this is our recommendation after reviewing all the competing interests."* We should draw a distinction between Mr. Deters' summary and the committee's recommendation.

Mr. Doilney pointed out that the primary goal is aesthetics. As it is just over the county line, people will be coming to us with emergency egress requests. He wondered if it makes sense to keep this in mind. He also asked whether we need to have the emergency egress go through to Mayflower. Mr. Deters responded that we have looked into this from both sides. With existing easements, there is little-to-no impact, but, yes, it could be an issue with egress. There are two sides: the west side would be a 40 access road. There is also subsequent emergency access for the Morningstar estate. The access road was put in in the early 1980s when 40 went in. We are trying to limit this area. With regard to the subsequent Mornignstar easement, it was asked whether can we preclude additional access of this. Mr. Harrington said we should frame our recommendation as “expansion of existing rights.” We can’t take away rights. The language should be framed in terms of preservation. Ms. Fisher said this is especially important on the east side of the parcel because there is an access easement, but it is more of a stock easement. We need to codify the scope of rights: there is no desire to expand.

Mr. Doilney asked that the group give Ms. Ryan feedback so she can include the wording in her letter. Ms. Fisher said she could help pull together maps and other material for the recommendation.

Ms. Ryan said she does not know how the Utah Open Lands inventory is presented to Council. Ms. Fisher said they put this together as a tool for evaluating different permitted and restricted uses for easement. This will help them understand what is on the property. It is a supplemental or supporting document to our recommendations. As the city starts to look at restoration or agricultural uses, this could help in that process. She is still hoping to put together conservation easements—west and east—as well as a management plan, but this hard to do this before Council gives direction.

Mr. Beerman returned to Mr. Calder’s question of threats: this property is representative of a philosophical discussion: do we expand our footprint or do we preserve these buffer zones? If we expand, would we do so on a case-by-case basis—whether it be affordable housing or otherwise? If COSAC could provide direction, that would be great. Mr. Joyce said it’s a balancing act, but debate within COSAC is about preserving entryway corridors. We’ve already picked off three corners: the movie studio, hospital, car shops. We’ve already made three decisions to develop, so this is why it’s so important to have a strong position from COSAC: this is it. One question is the Talisker property once it gets cleaned up 10 years from now. This is our last hope, and this is how we should present it. Mr. Calder asked about development restrictions on Richardon Flats: if they clean it up, can they develop it? Mr. Deters said it’s tied to a development agreement—it would be primarily golf course or open space. No density would be affiliated with it. However, this was done extra-jurisdictionally. The county should honor this, but the county is always more interested in leveraging properties. We should look to match the general plan and zoning language with this agreement, but this is the first time they have done this; it could change again. Mr. Joyce also said the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission has looked at Quinn’s and would like to focus

**Park City Municipal Corporation**

*Sustainability Department*

445 Marsac Avenue • P.O. Box 1480

Park City, Utah 84060

435.615.5201

there. They have just started having these discussions. Here is one more piece of loose long-term intent—either development or open space acquisition.

Ms. Fox said she liked the inventory document: it summarizes a lot of the committee's recommendations. This is important information for the Council to have, and we need to remind Council that we did a site visit—our recommendations are very well informed. We can reference the additional document in the one-page summary and reinforce that this is very scientifically based. This would help strengthen our recommendation: there is a lot of thought and research. It lends itself to the vetting process. Mr. Beerman said it would be appropriate to include the inventory document (either as an attachment or hyperlink). It is a very strong document. Mr. Joyce said the challenge is to give Council the information from the document that swayed our decision. View corridors are especially important. We want to make it simple for City Council: give them a synopsis of the most critical points. Ms. Fisher asked if we could give a powerpoint presentation with these key points. She said she would be happy to pull together the necessary elements. Ms. Ryan said the biggest thing was the field trip and all the experts. She would suggest Council does this, too. Mr. Beerman said Council did have two field trips before the city purchased the property, but he agreed the powerpoint would be great. Ms. Fox said Mr. Joyce's point about looking at the bigger picture is critical. This is Council's job.

Ms. Sideris again brought up Ms. Ryan's offer to draft the letter, and Mr. Deters asked how the group should proceed. Mr. Joyce said he would call Ms. Ryan (who had excused herself from the meeting by this point) to follow up with her, and ask her to circulate a draft. There will be ample time for review before its inclusion in the packet. Mr. Beerman said he would circulate his six points.

Specific points were mentioned as being critical for inclusion:

- Page 23: frontage road. This could be important—service to Clark Ranch not connecting to Wasatch
- Page 32: Pencil in an elk underpass location because that's where the water exists. Ms. Fisher said she likes the overpass rendering in the general plan. Ms. Fox said research shows that animals prefer overpasses. Ms. Fisher said these can be more expensive but they can also serve as a recreation amenity.

Ms. Sideris asked if we could meet prior to March 10, and Mr. Deters said he would schedule a February meeting. Mr. Calder said that the document does not put a priority on one parcel over the other, and asked whether we want to do so or just present it as one parcel. Both are equally important as open space, but he feels that one might have more importance than the other. Mr. Deters said they will probably be considered as two parcels, so he would suggest putting recommendations for each parcel. Ms. Fox was worried that this might weaken COSAC's recommendation. Mr. Deters responded that we should draw our line in the sand. Council will evaluate based on the information presented. Ms. Fisher suggested that perhaps we don't prioritize our pieces separately but acknowledge that they might have different conservation values. We should

especially highlight the east side and its visual vulnerability and entry corridor issues: *"It's hard to hide buildings."* This distinction will legitimize the entire recommendation. We should draw the distinction between ecological value and aesthetic value. This would be helpful guidance for Council. (The east side versus "Steve's Point"). Mr. Doilney said he felt Clark Ranch is a break in the development pattern to separate us from Wasatch County.

Mr. Joyce wrapped up the discussion by saying that Ms. Ryan will work on the one-page summary and presentation for the March 10 Council presentation. We will schedule a February meeting to review the documents.

Ms. Goodman asked if Ms. Fisher would be giving the powerpoint, would it be possible for her to give a dress rehearsal at the February COSAC meeting? Ms. Fisher said she could work with Ms. Ryan to prepare the powerpoint. Ms. Fox said she thought the COSAC chair and members should present, rather than Ms. Fisher. This would make it clear that it is the COSAC committee recommendation, not the open space group.

Mr. Beerman asked the group to select who should go: the entire group can be present in the room. Mr. Joyce is vice-chair and is the running meetings. Ms. Hanley won't be the chair moving forward because has moved out of town. Mr. Joyce will learn tomorrow whether he is confirmed to continue. Mr. Doilney suggested Ms. Ryan and Mr. Joyce be speakers, as well as Ms. Fisher.

#### **VII. Motion to Proceed with Plan as Laid out Above**

- a. Mr. Doilney made the motion.
- b. Mr. Dustman seconded.
- c. Motion approved unanimously.

#### **VIII. Motion to Adjourn**

- a. Ms. Sideris made the motion.
- b. Mr. Sturgis seconded.
- c. Motion approved unanimously.

#### **IX. Meeting adjourned 9:25 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 prepared was noticed by posting at least 24 hours in advance.*