

Open Space Trust Fund Advisory Board Meeting

September 28, 2016 10:00 a.m.

Salt Lake County Govt Center, S4-700

1. Introductions

Board members in attendance: Joel Karmazyn, Paula Swaner-Sargetakis, Rhetta McIff, Sarah Bennett. Absent: Sheril Garn, Carl Fisher, Chris McCandless.

Staff: Ken Richley, David Clemence, David Johnson, Julie Peck-Dabling, Supreet Gill, Rolen Yoshinaga, Wayne Johnson

Public: Barry Nash, Kate Ferguson, Wendy Fisher, Heather Ross, Tony Andrew, Richard Carlisle, Dan Medina, Scott Earl, Stephen Denkers

2. **Public Comment period:** the public in attendance requested to speak at the time that the application is discussed.
3. **Approval of September 7 minutes:** Joel motioned approval of minutes, Rhetta seconded. All in favor: 4 Opposed: 0
4. Open Space Land acquisition
 - a. **Butterfield Canyon:** Parcel is currently being used by recreationalists and is adjacent County open space and BLM land. Does the parcel include sub surface mineral rights? Unknown. Asking price is \$12K acre. Staff observation: the parcel is not buildable, utilities are nonexistent, access is a problem, FCOZ would apply. The property is a long way from development. This property would be nice to have but not a priority especially considering the high asking price. Butterfield road is not open year around. Real estate estimate is \$7.5K/acre on the high end. And the range is usually \$5K-\$7K for watershed land.
 - b. Owl Meadow: 4.65 acres but UOL has a survey that the property is 5+ acres. Much of the adjacent land is protected. This property has heritage and scenic values. Development offers have been made on this property. Staff observation: This parcel is most immediately available for development. Appraisal and asking price are congruent. This parcel would be recommended from a valuation and developability standpoint. It's adjacent to Perkins flat and could be a potential trailhead? Wendy F UOL would like to protect scenic value; owls and hawks are nesting. Educational and interpretive value is considerable. Putting anything of a structural value would go against the scenic value.

Public comments – Heather Ross: Wetlands have grown, coyote came back, moose are present and Hawkwatch uses the property for education. Upper East Side residents don't have a rec center, swim pool, rec facilities, etc. Residents use these open spaces as recreation, as does a considerable number of residents who bike and hike the area. Being able to preserve that lifestyle is a gift. Steven Denkers: It's very important to preserve OS in this area. Wendy Fisher: Deadline for UOL is Nov 7th. We don't necessarily have to have the funding in hand but the commitments need to be in place. The community has raised \$36K in a very short period of time, and foundations have been very helpful. Request is based on the fact that other funding sources will be leveraged but \$250K County input is essential. Mr. Andrew spoke about his 12 years olds connection to nature because of the observations of wildlife on the site.

- c. Mark Farm: Application is for a conservation easement. Public comment/Barry: 16.68 acres. The process to place a conservation easement on the property was started in 2007. Greg will farm the property for another 2 years. They hope the property will be farmed after that as well. Currently it's alfalfa and corn. No water quality issues. Property has substantial water rights from the canal. No contamination from Sharon Steel. EPA report has been done to verify this some years ago. The County's role is critical to make an application to the federal government because the owner cannot make application for an ACEP grant to fund the easement. Owner wants to see the property conserved and not developed. If that does not happen the property will be developed. Barry stated that the ACEP application is due in January. Mark family will make a considerable contribution ~20-25% of the value.

Julie: Back in 2009 ag was not a priority. This discussion at that time spurred the Urban Farming program. Ag easements should be included as part of Open Space. It will be long process to see if we can get matching money from the USDA. The process has to get started now. The property has a rich heritage in Urban Farming and has beautiful views of the Wasatch front. SLCO would need an appraisal to determine the actual cost to County. Application includes various letters of support. Julie needs the project cost needs to be \$1.3M to make this viable, and so will have further discussions with Barry and the owner. Joel, Sarah, Paula: Property is adjacent to a super fund site. We need to see the EPA report. To qualify for ACEP or WRF through USDA they would have to do best management practices.

Staff observations – Rolen: there is definitely development potential in this area. Already a house on the site. Dave: Had considerable background on the parcel and adjacent parcels as he was staff at West Jordan City when the first application came through in 2008. Ken: From a Parks and Rec standpoint there won't be any recreation or potential alignments with trails so there is no argument for or against purchase of the parcel. Board said that they would want to see an updated appraisal and ESA to determine next steps with this application.

- d. Sandy City: 3.25 acres. Staff observation: Rolen: The parcel is old Keough subdivision which was originally approved back in 2000. The road is substandard and not adequate for service by the Fire Department. From a zoning standpoint, Wildland urban interface applies. A building would be difficult since it would need to be fire sprinkled. They have excavated and the land is full of boulders. Creek runs close to the property. Comes with 12 surface and subsurface water shares. They have utility access but would have to install septic system.

Public comment – Dan/Scott from Sandy City: It is important that we acquire this parcel for the BST. There is no other way around the rock outcrop and cliff than what has been GPS'd through this parcel; it is necessary to align the BST on north and south. Water shares are included in the price. Water co. is willing to buy back the water shares so can contribute to the purchase of the parcel. There is potential that the parcel could only have a conservation agreement on 2.0 acres and the rest is resold and funding put back into OS funds.

Julie: This is an important parcel for BST and there is room for negotiation so hopefully Sandy City and SLCO will not need to invest as much funding as is being requested.

5. Evaluation Sheets. Is there additional criteria on the evaluation sheet? Price per acre could be useful and applicable in certain cases. Matching funds and fund balance would be helpful. Add Good value? as well. The total score will be used to determine priority of parcels. The board is asked to test out the application and come prepared at the next meeting to share their observations on whether this sheet works or if weighting and other criteria need to be added. They can also write general recommendations/comments on the form to share at next meeting. Board members missing at this meeting can vote.

6. Other items: Next meeting has changed.
7. Next meeting: Short meeting to discuss score sheet: October 5th at 8 am. Meeting to discuss if the tool works. The meeting on the 12th will still be the final meeting to discuss and vote on recommendations to the Mayor and Council.
8. Joel made a motion to adjourn. Rhetta will second. All agree.