



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL OFF-LEASH TASK FORCE  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL  
445 MARSAC AVE.  
PARK CITY, UTAH  
MARCH 28, 2016**

**Heinrich Deters, Trails and Open Lands Manager, Staff Liaison - Park City Municipal asked for a motion to open the meeting of the Park City Municipal Off-Leash Task Force at approximately 3:30pm**

**Alison Childs, moved to open the meeting;**

**Eric Hoffman, Recreation Advisory Board seconded the motion.**

**Task Force Members in Attendance:**

Becky Burns - At large  
Alisha Niswander - Recreation Advisory Board  
Alison Child - At large  
Eric Hoffman - Recreation Advisory Board  
Brian Hanton - Snyderville Basin Recreation District  
Kate Sattelmeyer - Summit Land Conservancy  
Barbara Maw – At large  
Rusty Millholland - Utah Open Lands  
Heinrich Deters - Staff Liaison, Park City Municipal Corp.  
Craig Sanchez – Community Engagement Liaison, Park City Municipal Corp.  
Ken Fisher - Recreation Manager, Park City Municipal Corp.  
Councilwoman Becca Gerber – Council Liaison  
Councilman Tim Henney - Council Liaison Alternate

**Excused:** Andrew Latham - Park City Police Department  
Cynthia Sandoval - Recreation Advisory Board  
Charlie Sturgis - Mountain Trails Foundation  
Clay Coleman - Summit County Animal Control  
Tod Frohnen - At large  
Ed Parigian – At large

Heinrich Deters asked the Task Force members to introduce themselves; Deters introduced Craig Sanchez as the facilitator for this evenings Task Force meeting.

### **Adoption of Minutes of March 14, 2016 Task Force Meeting.**

**Alison Childs motioned to approve the minutes of March 14, 2016; Eric Hoffman seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously**

**Staff and Board Communications:** There were no comments.

### **Public Input:**

Heinrich Deters asked if there was any public input, there were no comments. Deters welcomed the public and thanked them for attending.

### **Evaluation Form and Data Collection:**

Heinrich Deters began the meeting with the continuation of the evaluation forms and data collection discussion that began at the last meeting, March 14. Deters stated that since the last meeting members of the group had used the evaluation app and asked if those members would share their experiences.

Barbara Maw stated that she was out with her dogs the previous two weekends in Round Valley. She did not use the app although had conversations with dog owners and users. Ms. Maw felt that her experiences were mostly positive; she did have a few constructive comments to make regarding what she saw and experienced.

She mentioned the dog owners were picking up after their dogs; there were joggers, dog owners and riders, all were pleasant; She felt signage could be improved, suggesting stating 'this is an off-leash park' should be placed closer to park entrance prior to parking; signage should be clearer, larger print and possibly bullet listed, using fewer words (is your dog under voice control, do you have your leash, is your dog licensed); the information board was very crowded quite a bit of information, most people are probably not reading it.

Deters interjected that he has submitted a budget request for new kiosks.

Becky Burns also spent some time up in Round Valley Way over the weekend. She stated that most users were nice; she experienced a few negative interactions. Ms. Burns spoke with a few residents from Summit Park and Salt Lake City, she asked if they had used Run a Muck Dog Park none of them had, they come up to Round Valley, she thought that was very interesting.

Alison Childs also used the app a few times over the last week Childs was curious if the information she inputted in the app was received. Deters stated that he received about forty-one observations inputted in the app and would let Childs know if hers was recorded. Childs asked for clarification on aspects of the app primarily the 'incompliant, compliant' section which Deters responded to stating that her understanding of the application process was correct.

Alisha Niswander shared a recent experience: places she and her skiing clients had visited recently dogs were either on leash or the owner had pulled the dog off the trail to allow her group to pass even when they had the right-of-way; her experiences were very positive and very encouraging. She also shared that they encountered a dog walker with eight dogs running at

large off leash and it made her clients a bit uneasy and nervous around the dogs. Niswander also shared she runs the Glen Wild trails and everyone she encountered on the trail with a dog had their dog on a leash or pulled their dog off trail to let her pass, very positive experiences.

Deters encouraged the task force to continue to use the app and spent a bit of time reviewing the notes section of the app with the group. He reminded everyone that the notes section is a great way to explain what went on, describe a onetime encounter with a trail user.

Ken Fisher stated that he had been asked about trash cans being placed deeper into the Round Valley area. Deters shared that more trash bins could be acquired although they need to be used, and often times they aren't, they then become a maintenance issue. He stated that there had been cooping programs with sections of town and the city with limited success.

**Review - Continue Defining the Problem/Provide the Solutions:** Deters then moved on to the next portion of the meeting. He acknowledged that the last meeting created a bit of frustration and it was a hard exercise. He went on to state the point staff has been trying to get the task force to was to realize this is not all that easy, that each user has different input and each location a different attribute.

He reminded the group that of the many ideas they will present to council only a few will be selected to move forward and be implemented.

Deters stated that he has targeted April 14<sup>th</sup> as a Council mid-year update to include a few components: the evaluation form, the website, PSA's and outreach and a second component being where the group is as a task force.

He mentioned that the task force will not have all of their recommendations identified by the mid-year update although he would like to have a few listed to present to Council on the 14<sup>th</sup>. During this meeting and the April 11<sup>th</sup> meeting Deters would like the group to pinpoint possible deliverables.

Deters asked if there were any questions, Jon Benoist, public wanted to know how the group will be defining the numbers regarding the communities attitude on the dog issues; he feels that the City Council is going to want that information.

Deters responded that he recently had a conversation with Councilman Beerman on evaluating that information. A community wide survey will be implemented and the information collected will be useful toward that goal. Deters also mentioned that gathering data on other communities regarding the number of formal dog parks there are per capita and other statistics will be useful information.

Rusty Millholland commented that he had attended most of the previous public hearings on this topic. He shared that what he took away from those meetings was not more or less off-leash areas but instead incentivize good behavior and penalize bad behavior. He went on to say that much of the focus on previous tasks forces has been on off-leash areas. He believes there are other strategies that can be implemented as well in terms of what and how the city will enforce the code to incentivize people to do the right thing as opposed to handing out citations.

Deters interjected that education and enforcement were both topics the task force had touched on although as yet not in-depth.

He mentioned that Council was aware they made a large area of Round Valley off leash and were concerned there may not be enough specific areas for people that didn't want to be around dogs.

Deters reviewed with the group the matrix they created during the last meeting and how it will become the jumping off point for this next session.

Sanchez reiterated stating that he would like the group to begin discussion on:

**Dog Prohibited Areas:**

Craig Sanchez stated that he is a home owner in Moab and spends quite a bit of time there. He shared that the City of Moab does not allow dogs off leash; the community parks and playgrounds do not allow dogs on or off leash, they are prohibited. He mentioned that there are local kid entrepreneurial that will watch your dog during an event outside a park, check your dog in, offer shade, have a separate kennel area and provide water.

He went on to say that once you're out of town and on BLM land most dogs are off leash.

The group briefly discussed Moab's dog management program then moved on to Park City's dog prohibited areas.

Sanchez asked the task force what their thoughts were on the south end of City Park, is it a dog prohibited area; City Park is a venue for numerous events throughout the year does the idea of dogs running free or leashed with children around work.

Deters mentioned the Skate Park at City Park, Fisher stated that dogs are not allowed in that area, he added that dogs are not allowed in the Creekside Park.

Maw mentioned how crowded City Park can be with bikers, walkers and cars. The playground at City Park does not allow dogs and is monitored by City staff.

Brian Hanton, Basin Recreation stated that he is preparing to present to their board changes to their policy concerning dogs on leash and no dogs off-leash. Sanchez inquired if they had discussed no dogs at events. Hanton replied that this had been discussed and depending on the event would determine if dogs were allowed or not.

Sanchez asked Deters if there were events in the city that did not allow or discouraged dogs. Deters stated that Silly Market and July 4<sup>th</sup> Fireworks were two events that discouraged dogs. Ken Fisher interjected that during the summer dogs were not allowed at the Deer Valley concerts.

Fisher also stated that having your dog off-leash in areas of City Park or the softball field at certain times of the day when little was going on worked, mornings and evenings', timing is important.

Childs stated that Summit County may not have thought the electronic collar policy through. An owner can have their dog on an electronic collar and hope that their dog is under sight and voice control; if the dog is on a physical leash the dog will not run off to chase wildlife or children, electronic collars are a very different animal.

Burns had questions about closed loop trails that are not connector trails; if there were areas that were not thoroughfares connecting many possible directions this could be a positive move. Deters interjected that there will be trails in the future similar to that type of trail; possibly a trail designated as 'no dogs'.

Sanchez asked the group about wildlife protection; Deters mentioned there were a number of areas in Colorado where calving takes place and the trails are closed. He continued on stating that there are provisions in the Quarry Mountain easement that states if there is evidence of calving taking place trails can be closed. Sanchez interjected that Sun Valley will also shut down areas during calving season.

Millholland brought up a question about water sheds and what that means to Park City. Utah Open Lands have a few conservation easements that have spring protection zones (no dogs allowed in these areas). Can it be determined where the drinking water comes from and not allow dogs in the area? Sanchez interjected that water is from two different source locations: the Weber and East Canyon, the golf course by Spiro has a gate splitting to East Canyon and to Weber, the two different water districts.

Mullholland felt there could be a policy that defined 'off-leash dog area within 150 of a stream' is prohibited. If trails ran through that same area maybe that determines no dogs or possibly the trail is moved to offer more of a buffer between trail and water source.

Sanchez stated that East Canyon is a good example, dogs are not allowed because it's a water shed for Salt Lake City.

Sattelmeier interjected that the area near Glen Wild is a 'no dog area' due to the stream.

Hoffman had inquiries regarding HOA's and private areas would the City accommodate them. Maw stated that those spaces are privately owned and confined by their CCR's, rules and regulations.

Maw stated that liability could be an issue to the City.

Deters shared with the group that on City Tour a few years back Ketchum was the destination; he received numerous calls from some of the Park City attendees stating that Ketchum did not have a leash law. Deters followed up with the City of Ketchum and found that Ketchum does have a leash law the city does not enforce it.

### **Formal Dog Parks:**

Deters began by giving a brief over view of Quinn's Dog Park (formal dog park); Quinn's Dog Park does not enjoy the support of the community in terms of the condition it is in. Many on the Task force agreed.

Fisher stated that when the park was being created they did quite a bit of research. Staff found that many of the materials that would have been ideal for the area would have put the cost in the \$250,000 range.

Childs stated that the park serves a purpose for a particular type of user, many people use the area.

Fisher mentioned that a private group had raised approximately \$10,000 to pay for a shade structure and trees.

He also stated the process in identifying and creating this space for a park was quite involved and it might have become the next best location. Other areas suggested that were closer to town were not seriously considered for numerous reasons.

Maw inquired if there was going to be a dog park in Park City Heights and was it going to be private. Fisher informed the group that the park will be public and the city will own it.

Conversation ensued regarding dog parks.

Sanchez stated that the dog park in Moab was always full of people.

Fisher shared that for dog parks to be successful they need to be in a neighborhood, no one has to get in their car and drive, less energy use.

Park City is pretty close to build out, is there still opportunity to create dog parks in Park City. Sanchez asked if the group agreed that additional smaller parks in neighborhoods would be a positive idea; the group agreed.

The Library Field was mentioned as a very popular space; Fisher stated that in the earlier stages of the plan it was to be a 'formal dog park; the neighbor's asked to have it left as is, they did not want a fenced park. Sanchez stated that 90% of the people using the Library Park are locals in that neighborhood.

Millholland feels that a convenient 'formal dog park' in neighborhoods would create less demand on the natural areas such as Round Valley.

Rotary Park was suggested as a possible location for a formal dog park although it is used throughout the summer season as a rental space; perhaps winter only use, December 1<sup>st</sup> through March 31<sup>st</sup>.

Sattelmeier suggested an HOA may be able to create a 'formal dog park' with the help of City support.

Sanchez inquired as to the size needed for a dog park. Fisher stated that Quinn's is approximately 2 acres; Willow Creek is approximately 2.5 acres; Trailside is close to an acre. Sanchez reiterated that 2-2.5 acres would probably not work in a neighborhood at this time because of build out.

Benoist, Public stated that controlled use would determine size or needed area; this brought up 'exercising with your dog or exercising your dog'.

Sanchez identified vacant lots in upper Main St. as possible locations.

### **Informal Dog Parks:**

Deters asked the group to discuss the management and times of an informal dog park and make suggestions as to possible locations.

City Park was suggested if the use was early in the morning or later in the evening. The City Golf Course was mentioned; Sanchez commented that use on the golf courses in early winter when the temperatures are in the freeze range is not ideal because it kills the grass. Additionally there is quite a bit of wildlife on the course to take into consideration.

McCleod Creek near the Huntsman parcel was suggested although there are quite a few houses in that neighborhood.

Fisher mentioned the ponds at Deer Valley, it is public area and they encourage use.

Summit Park was suggested as a possibility although the neighborhood is private. Brian Hanton stated that they are working on a use agreement for that area above Summit Park, Toll Canyon.

The park at Gorgoza might be another consideration, during the summer the area is heavily used primarily because of the pond. Summit County Animal Control had stated previously they have been issuing citations at Gorgoza.

Prospector Park was suggested; Rail Trail was also suggested although it is a State Park.

Mill Creek was brought up as an example of odd, even day use for dogs.

Ridgeview was another area suggested; although it is a trail and at this time may not be suitable for this type of use.

The Peterson parcel was also suggested although hay is grown in the field during the summer and probably not the best location.

Discussion continued regarding informal and formal dog leash parks; the group felt that Round Valley was probably enough space for off-leash, informal dog park use.

Fisher suggested Park Ranch which is located on both sides of Hwy. 40 south of State Rd 248, behind Park City Heights; the City owns this property as of December 2014.

Lance Anderson, Public stated he had a problem with the name 'Informal Dog Park'. He doesn't believe Round Valley is an 'informal dog park' it is an area where dogs are allowed to go and be off-leash. A 'formal dog park' is for the dog, the 'off-leash areas' are multi use areas. Anderson also added that he would like to see citations given out if a dog is not under sight or voice control; this would create more awareness, and better enforcement.

Sanchez brought up the enforcement of an area; who will police the area, would it be a volunteer program. He shared with the group that many years ago when Osguthorpe brought his sheep down from grazing and spotted a dog disturbing the sheep he shot it, everyone knew this would happen, no questions asked.

Kate Sattelmeier mentioned that one tool of the task force could be to ask for more enforcement.

Further discussion on enforcement continued.

Childs inquired in to the possibility of a full time dog catcher employed by the City to address the off-leash concerns.

Fisher reminded the group of the ambassador program that volunteered time at City Park to answer questions, educate, walk around the park, he felt they added an element of safety at the park; this may be an option at the dog parks.

### **Education:**

Sanchez asked the group if they would be interested in the tag program, it's a revenue generating program. All dogs using any of the dog parks would be required to wear a tag, which identified them as having been licensed and vaccinated (other condition could apply). The fees collected could be used to pay for a dog catcher, maintenance of the dog parks.

Councilwoman Gerber shared a program that is used in the dog parks in Madison Wisconsin. When users enter a park they fill out a form, put the form and fee money in an envelope and drop the envelope in a box. The fee is \$45 for a year allowing access to all dog parks identified in your area; the tag is mailed to you by the City. The fees go toward mending fences, water dishes, cleaning up trash and helps offset enforcement costs. Some of the dog parks have dog play apparatus; she felt that the program works well and it was self-sufficient.

Sanchez stated if the tag program was implemented it would be part of the general fund. General Fund because funds would be requested - income coming in and refund going out.

Deters further stated - there are two aspects to the tag program: infrastructure and education/vaccination; he spoke to the education aspect.

Some cities require the dog owner view a training video, attend dog training certification classes on obedience, have all vaccinations current and be licensed. The program can be designed and created by the needs and requirements of the city. He further stated that the idea of this program came out of the County although was not implemented.

There was a brief conversation regarding the video; Fisher stated that there would be value in having owners view the video it could create more accountability and awareness.

Childs was interested as to the liability; if the dog trainer under the tag program trained her dog, certified he was trained then her dog bit a person or another dog could the city be liable, would the owner be liable.

Would visiting guests with dogs wanting to use the parks also pay a fee; it was agreed that they would.

Lance Anderson, Public stated he felt this program would offer consistency and give dog owners ownership and accountability.

Deters asked the group if they felt they were going too far with regulations, any comments. Hoffman stated that enough community buy in by dog owners was important, communication was important and setting an expectation for owners was very important.

Sanchez began to wrap up the meeting stating that he's receiving positive feedback from the task force members regarding the tag program; the task force agreed.

Deters stated that the group should identify a few items for discussion at the meeting on April 11<sup>th</sup> and additionally for the City Council meeting on April 14<sup>th</sup>.

Deters thanked the group and reminded them of the next Task Force meeting April 11, 2016 at 3:30pm in the Council Chambers.

Meeting minutes prepared by Jody Morrison

**The meeting of the Park City Municipal Off-Leash Task Force was noticed on Friday, March 25, 2016 on the Park City Municipal website, Utah Legal website and posted at City Hall, Park City.**