Board Members in Attendance: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson

Absent: None

Staff Present: Brian Hanton, Brian Kadziel, Justine Kadziel, Jess Kirby, Ben Liegert, Melissa O’Brien, Helaine O’Keefe, Bob Radke, Megan Suhadolc

Attending Guests: Ted Nolan-Summit Park, Pamala Snell-Summit Park, Bruce Glisson-Summit Park, Stuart Trimbath-Summit Park, Nancy Brades-Summit Park, Sharon Glisson-Summit Park, Jimmy Wilson-Summit Park, J Dewell-Summit Park

EXECUTIVE SESSION: PERSONNEL
At 6:04pm, Chair Kahlow called for a motion to enter into executive session to discuss personnel.

Chair Kahlow signed a closed meeting affidavit for discussion of personnel.

Those in attendance were: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson, Brian Hanton.

MOTION: To enter into executive session for the purpose of discussing personnel.  

At 6:23pm, Chair Kahlow called for a motion to close executive session for the purpose of discussing personnel.

MOTION: To close the executive session for the purpose of discussing personnel.  

The meeting of March 15, 2017 was called to order by Chair Kahlow at 6:26pm.
PUBLIC INPUT
Ted Nolan of Summit Park told the Board that he had been speaking with Wendy Fisher of Utah Open Lands and had some questions for staff regarding the process for the Toll Canyon trail alignment. Hanton explained that staff is in discussion and is taking consideration of all comments received. Nolan asked if it was true that the trail bids would go out in the month of March per the executive summary. Hanton responded that they would not. Nolan expressed his concern that, in the executive summary, it clearly stated that bids for the trail would go out in March and, if that was the case, it would appear that Board and staff did not truly care about the public process. He is hoping to get something in writing that would state that Board and staff do indeed care about the public process and do understand the stewardship plan. Hanton explained that these processes do need Board approval and since it is not on the Board agenda, it will in fact need to be approved at an upcoming Board meeting. Nolan said that Kottler drafted an email to him a week ago clearly stating that this was a staff level decision. Kottler responded that this opportunity is for public comment and not for Board discussion, as it is not on the agenda. This is a chance for Board members to hear comments but not to conduct a back and forth discussion. Kottler also took the opportunity to respond to Nolan’s comment about putting items in writing by reminding everyone that the meeting is on public record and will be formally approved by the Board. Nolan shared his concern that the Board meeting minutes were not available to the public before public comment took place. Nolan felt like a lot of the work was done in September through November of 2016 but was not available to the public until February of 2017. That amount of time seems very broad and much different than the stewardship process. Additionally, Nolan contacted Board members regarding the traffic situation in Summit Park and was told that it is not District staff’s issue but rather a County issue. He believes this is disingenuous, as the District is a subset of the County. He told the Board that he had written all of his concerns down. Kahlow responded that it is intended to be a public process and it is her understanding that Staff would be taking all public comment received and then would be summarizing and distributing back to the public.

Stuart Trimbath of Summit Park explained that he had no issues with the original plan put out a few months ago but has a major concern with the new realignment. He stated that there is no public parking at the end of the road and that putting an access point at the suggested location will only add to the parking problem within the neighborhood and seems to have been done without consideration of the owners. Kottler assured the public that Board and staff are not insensitive to the traffic and parking issues and that those concerns do go into the totality of what is being considered. He was appreciative of those concerns and assured the public that they would be considered but could not promise that they are determinative of the ultimate decision. With regard to roads not being under the District purview, Kottler clarified that it is not meant to brush the concern aside but rather that the District must have the approval of the County Engineer to receive the grading permit. The County Engineer can withhold or approve permits based on happenings on the road. Kahlow added that there have been conversations with the County regarding this issue.

J Dewell of Summit Park shared his concern regarding the process. His interest is in preserving Toll Canyon and not turning it into a bike trail. He understands the need for a connector but stated the trail that came out of the workshops months ago is very different from the current proposed design. He explained that the trail was flagged out by Basin staff and then an
environmental assessment was completed, talking about elk, which Dewell has rarely seen. He believes the environment assessment done was garbage. Kahlow asked if his concern was regarding the location of the trail or the type of use of the trail. Dewell responded that it was the location of the trail but that there was a discrepancy between the original trail layout and the one being proposed now. Kahlow added that plans are very conceptual at the start. She explained the desire of Board and staff to receive public comment concerning the new trail alignment. Dewell felt that it seemed to be very different from the original plan and that it would have been better to hire the environment consultant prior to flagging the trail. Radke responded that staff went out and hiked the area with the environmental consultant to get some general ideas regarding the ecological aspects of the area. With that information, staff flagged a sustainable trail. Radke added that this is not the finalized alignment but is the one recommended by the environmental consultant. To Radke’s understanding, when designing a trail in the Forest Service, flags are on the ground before a NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) study is done.

Sharon Glisson of Summit Park asked if staff flagged the connector trail area. She also suggested extending the public comment period to allow for public to view District minutes pertinent to this issue. She added that very few people in the neighborhood knew about this. Kahlow said that there has not been Board discussion on this matter. Kirby added that staff shared the project with the neighborhood HOAs, posted on District website and social media, and shared with Wendy Fisher in hopes she would share to her contacts. Glisson said that traffic and speeds are a major concern in the neighborhood. Resnick asked the public if they had submitted their concerns in writing and they answered that they had. He inquired as to why they are interested then in extending the comment period. They explained that other impacted neighbors had not had a chance to leave comments. Glisson added that Toll Canyon should be preserved and the proposed trail does not accomplish that goal. Resnick shared that any specificity provided from public comment would be greatly appreciated as there will be competing interests, desires and needs, as indicated in the surveys that have been done. Nolan commented that a connector trail which allowed bikes was always in the stewardship plan, but that it should not be a destination trail and there should be no establishment of additional trailheads within the Timberline, Summit Park, or Pinebook neighborhoods. He questioned what a connector trail truly means, the shortest distance or a flow trail. Glisson added that there should be a balance of biking trails compared to hiking trails. She also mentioned that the flagged trail was not the first option suggested from the environmental study. Nolan voiced concern regarding documentation as to why there was deviation from the original preferred route of District staff. Radke responded that staff rationale of that deviation will be provided to the public.

Bruce Glisson of Summit Park said that he commented extensively on some of the environmental concerns. He shared he is an environmental consultant and botanist. There is a high priority noxious weed in the area where the trail is proposed to go called garlic mustard. It is an aggressive weed that can take over entire areas. He shared that cutting a trail in the area of this noxious weed seems counter to the District’s guidelines of noxious weed control. Glisson encouraged the Board and staff to become familiar with this issue. In the brief executive summary from the District, Glisson counted over 30 references to ecological integrity, sustainability, and natural resources, and yet it appears no one was aware that garlic mustard was present in this location. Anyone with basic botanical knowledge should have not missed this. He feels like the District would be enabling the spread of this noxious weed should a trail be put in
this area. Glisson feels that the environmental study was factually in error, misidentifying five of the 20 dominant plant species listed, raising questions and concerns of the quality of the environmental assessment. He mentioned a comment within the environmental assessment stating that the District looked at environmentally sensitive areas and avoided those areas with this alignment, and yet there was no data or criteria shown to determine that. It is Glisson’s opinion that this trail alignment is a thoroughfare for moose, which are predominant in that area. He encouraged the Board and staff to look at the NEPA process for a more rigorous approach. He feels this is an arbitrary expansion of the connector trail concept to essentially be a downhill flow trail. The District has an incredible trail network but it doesn’t deserve to be everywhere and is at odds with the original stewardship plans.

Jimmy Wilson of Summit Park said his main concerns were parking and traffic for his neighborhood. Regardless of whose responsibility it is, for the safety of his children and those who would be parking, he would prefer to not see increased traffic and parking. He would like more time to discuss. He commented that he loves the trail system in Park City but as the road is now, it would be very difficult for more traffic. He questioned whether there could be an issue of crime with a trailhead built so close to homes and therefore would like to see added patrols from the police. Wilson added that for future issues it would be helpful to understand how the bureaucracy of these types of processes work. His major concern surrounds the safety of his children. Kottler responded to the comments about this area being a trailhead and wanted the public to know that it is not the District’s intention. Kottler asked Radke about the current trail alignment and the distance from the road. Radke said there are two points that are close to the road at approximately 100 feet with an 80% grade. Wilson responded that, because it is not a trailhead, none of the proper parking areas or grading are provided which could make it more dangerous. Kahlow asked if there are people who might want to respond that didn’t know about the process with a different opinion from the ones shared tonight. Public felt that there would be many with the same concerns, but also others with potentially different concerns.

It was concluded that staff would be preparing a response and summary of the different concerns expressed. Dewell added that, after the response and comments are put out to the public, it might be worthwhile to allow the public to respond to that document. B. Glisson said that everyone on Parkview Drive has a vested interest in this project. He added that there could be the issue of increased vehicle shuttles with this being proposed as a downhill flow trail. Castro asked if the public would go back to their HOAs to find out why they weren’t notified properly. The public answered that they had, in fact, gone to their HOAs and Nolan said they disagreed on the type of response so they just posted on the website. Kahlow made clear that this is not a voting process but rather about the substance of the comments and how they affect the social and environmental attributes of the area.

S. Glisson shared that she wishes the District would just do the connector trail and Kahlow said they would consider. Nolan said the District had to consider, as it is part of the stewardship plan and there would be an injunction if not done. Trimbath expressed that a better map would be helpful for him to provide better feedback. B. Glisson asked if the existing jeep trail had been ruled out because Wendy Fisher indicated that she is receptive to that existing road being used as the foundation for the bike trail.
Chair Kahlow closed public input at 7:12pm.

Kahlow suggested that the trail committee help staff in preparing this document. Kahlow had questions of the role of Utah Open Lands in decision making in Toll Canyon. Newman asked how binding the stewardship plan is regarding the connector trail. Kirby answered that there is language in the stewardship plan that the District can do or not do anything that is stated in the plan. Resnick reminded the Board that there are two sides to this. One being the responsibility to the immediate neighbors, the other is the responsibility to the general population in terms of the resources expended on evaluating this process. Those two responsibilities must be balanced. Castro asked about this being posted in the paper and Kottler answered that this public comment period was not but that the stewardship plan was. Radke said that staff tried to reach out to the neighbors knowing that the final alignment would impact them the most. Kahlow agreed with Resnick in that it is important to remember that the District serves more than residents but rather the larger community. Resnick added that because of the different parties that came together to fund the purchase, including the District and individual donations, there is an obligation to many different parties to take a balanced approach. There are many people who hold equity in this process. Kahlow brought up the question of Wendy Fisher’s role in this effort and Hanton said it is an advisory role to help provide input. Kahlow clarified that individual donations and bond money were used to purchase the property that were represented under Utah Open Lands so there is some responsibility on its part.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES 2/15/17
Chair Kahlow called for comments or questions and a motion to approve the minutes of February 15, 2017.


APPROVAL OF INVOICES
Board members received payables to review from Stacy Carpenter in their Board packets prior to the meeting. Following review, Chair Kahlow requested a motion to approve.

Kottler asked about the two identical charges on the same day for Mutt Mitts. Suhadolc answered that it is due to a split that is allocated to two different departments, parks and trails.

Brown asked what DAS was and Suhadolc answered that it for staff credit cards.

Hanton apologized for not introducing Helaine O’Keefe, Fieldhouse Assistant Manager sooner as she is filling in for Matt Strader.

Brown asked about the Quester Gas amount and if this would be the new running fee. Suhadolc explained that it was high due to the construction but will decrease as expansion completes.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF EAST CANYON CREEK TRAILHEAD BUILDING AWARD
Board members received a staff report from Bob Radke in their Board packets prior to the meeting. Radke reminded the Board that, during the summer of 2015, staff began working on a project to add a restroom building to the East Canyon Creek Trailhead. The design and engineering work was completed in the fall of 2015 and the project went to bid in the spring of 2016. Only one bid was received and it exceeded the budgeted amount. The project was then redesigned to reduce cost and advertised for a second time in June of 2016. No bids were received at that time.

Staff sent the project out to bid again in February of 2017 and received one bid from Wadman Corporation in the amount of $250,000. The budget for this project is $318,885, with $20,000 of it received from a Way Point Grant.

Resnick asked how much functionality had to be removed to reduce the cost. Radke responded that there was very little removed and that this is a fully functioning winter-proofed building. O’Brien did mention that it was a little less beautiful than the original design but still functional.

Kottler asked what the original bid amount was and Radke replied that it was around $300,000.

Resnick asked if Radke had a hypothesis as to why it was favorable this time around. Radke answered that it could be a combination of changing the design slightly and timing for the contractors. Kahlow asked if the District has worked with Wadman Corporation and Radke said it has not but that it is a large company and he was impressed with its past projects.

MOTION: To award the contract for the East Canyon Creek Trailhead improvement project to Wadman Corporation and to authorize the District Director to execute all necessary documents that pertain to the transaction. [Resnick/Newman] All in favor: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson. None Opposed. Absent: None. Motion carries.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF JOB DESCRIPTIONS
Board members received a staff report from Megan Suhadole in their Board packets prior to the meeting. Suhadole explained that there are four revised job descriptions and two new job descriptions for Board approval. The District’s Personnel Policies state that all job descriptions shall be reviewed and approved by the Board, and the majority were recently presented and approved during the December 2016 Board meeting.

The After School Program Site Supervisor and the After School Program Activity Coordinator were finalized after the December Board meeting and therefore need Board approval.
The revised job descriptions eligible Board approval include: Recreation Coordinator (Recreation Department), Recreation Coordinator (Fieldhouse Department), Fitness Program Coordinator, and Marketing and Information Technology Specialist.

Kahlow asked Suhadolc for an org chart to help understand where positions fall within the organization. Suhadolc said that she would provide one in the future and briefly explained to the Board where the “at-issue” job descriptions fall. Resnick asked for the key factors differentiating an exempt versus non-exempt position. Suhadolc answered that it depends on how much independent authority the position has which can be a bit subjective. Castro asked if when staff is making that determination, are the hours they are putting into that position being analyzed. Castro mentioned a point of contention in other organizations where people who are characterized as non-exempt but are, in fact, doing exempt work file a lawsuit alleging the incorrect classification. Suhadolc felt that most people would only file a lawsuit if they were being paid as exempt and not getting overtime pay when their position was truly non-exempt. Resnick asked if contracts are renegotiated when there is a switch and was that the case with J. Kadziel. Suhadolc stated that it was more about the job description not accurately reflecting what J. Kadziel does for the District. Castro asked if staff has the authority to do that without involving the County Human Resources Manager. Suhadolc said it is the Board who approves the job descriptions but that she did run it by Brian Bellamy. Newman mentioned that the After School Coordinator position did not have “other duties as assigned” and he suggested going through to make consistent. Suhadolc said that it would be helpful for the Board to allow her to clean up some of that inconsistency without bringing it back to the Board for approval. Board members agreed that if there weren’t significant changes, Suhadolc could make those edits without bringing it back to the Board for approval.

**MOTION:** To approve the six job descriptions as presented in the Board packet with said changes. [Newman/Castro] All in favor: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson. None Opposed. Absent: None. Motion carries.

**QUESTIONS ON DEPARTMENT UPDATES**

Kottler asked about the timeline for completion of The Fieldhouse. O’Brien said that Strader’s staff report is current and that Okland is still on track. Hanton said he would set up time with Board members to view the new expansion area.

Castro commented about the dramatic drop-off from January to February in admittance. O’Keefe explained that it was due to problems with the computers.

Newman requested a staff birthday list.

Stinson said thank you for the open windows in the cycle room.

Newman mentioned that it would be great to consider the possibility of having an after-work Ladies Who Lift program.
UPDATES FROM DISTRICT COMMITTEES
The District Director Liaison Committee met and reviewed initial draft material for Director Hanton’s 2018 Personal Evaluation Plan, as well as provided some mentoring feedback to him. The final draft for the Board’s review will be provided prior to the April Board meeting.

The Trails Committee met and discussed several ongoing projects. The committee talked about the East Canyon Creek bathroom, as well as the Toll Canyon issue. Resnick encouraged the District to take a proactive position in contributing District insights based on our knowledge of trails and managing open space to the County in its interaction on the Bonanza Flats property. It could be a complex relationship that forms and, based on the District’s knowledge and experience, Resnick feels there could be a lot for the District to contribute. Kahlow added that the Trails Committee is working on finalizing the Trails Plan to take to County Council for its review. Newman asked if it would be prudent when staff is on KPCW next to discuss Toll Canyon. Hanton responded that he did discuss it last time he was on and would bring up again on Monday.

Kahlow, Kottler and Hanton met with County Council to communicate on what is going on with the District and County. One area that was discussed was the future growth in the area concerning trails and parks. The District will need to brace itself for this growth and be prepared to face challenges to meet the needs of the community in a transparent way. The County is very supportive of the District and appreciates being informed on its happenings.

Castro asked that, since the dirt work is complete in Silver Creek, was there a time frame for the future fields. Hanton responded that the District has not been deeded the property yet. Until the property is deeded to the District, staff has yet to develop a timeline. O’Brien added that the District has signed an MOU but that it has not been recorded yet.

DIRECTOR’S COMMENTS AND REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS
Staff went to St. George for the Utah Parks and Recreation Conference (URPA). This conference is a great networking opportunity and educational experience for staff. Resnick asked about any big or innovative ideas that came out of the conference. Hanton talked about the adaptive playgrounds in St. George and Orem. Hanton and Kadziel were on a panel about health and wellness. They discussed the District’s cooperative agreements with Park City Recreation and the Park City School District.

Hanton reminded the Board that moving forward all Board meetings will take place on Thursdays.

Hanton, J. Kadziel, Kahlow and Resnick met with Julie Booth from the County regarding a communication plan on projects, as well as the District’s Emergency Plan. The County is very supportive and willing to help.

There was a Park Record Editorial regarding picking up dog waste. Staff is encouraging owners to be responsible by increasing signage.
BOARD MEMBER’S QUESTIONS/COMMENTS
Kottler said that the County gave clarification on the Trails Master Plan and what it would like to see going forward. The County would prefer to be given the general direction of the District, as it understands that there must be flexibility. The County would appreciate receiving any advanced information from the District regarding big or controversial projects. Kottler felt like this presentation would be good to do in conjunction with the budget presentation this year. Radke asked if the Trails Master Plan could be discussed with the Trails Committee before presenting to the Board and then to County Council. Kottler felt that would be a good process. Resnick stated that, should staff benefit from Board involvement regarding a specific project or task, that it would be logical to implement a sub-committee to spend some quality time before bringing to the entire Board to develop an implementation plan.

Castro asked if it would be beneficial to reach out to the HOAs with a conceptual plan for the Toll Canyon trail. Hanton said that it was a great idea and that staff did reach out to the neighborhood HOAs. Resnick recommended that if an entity has chosen to organize themselves legally, such as an HOA, that it would behoove the District to contact that HOA and bring information to the appropriate leadership channel. He suggested the Director or Board Chair send a brief, informal email both to the County Council and HOA explaining that the District enjoyed the input received from members of this community. This would educate the County Council and bring the HOA back into the conversation. Resnick felt it would be helpful to have clear documentation that the District interacted effectively with the HOAs. Kottler responded that if the District is relying on the HOA without knowing if the information is getting out to the neighbors, then it might not be the best place to put our effort. Kottler added that it would seem to be more effective for the District to put a sign up rather than involve the neighborhood HOA. Newman felt that the request for public input should have been placed in the Park Record. Kahlow said that the information should be disseminated in a variety of mediums to receive feedback.

Kahlow suggested that, once all of the comments are compiled, a discussion take place with County Council. Kahlow asked what would happen if the District did nothing. Radke said that the Discovery project is moving forward and he anticipates that trailhead to be built in 2018. In order to alleviate some of the pressure on Summit Park, this connector trail will need to be built. Kahlow mentioned mitigating this situation by waiting for the Discovery project trailhead to be complete before the connector trail is built. Radke said that could be an option. Resnick stated that waiting could adversely impact a large segment of the population that contributed resources to purchase Toll Canyon. Radke said that if the Toll Canyon trail was pursued now, it would not be complete until late fall. Kottler asked about the environmental assessment. Radke answered that staff did not ask for a NEPA study to be conducted because this trail is an allowed use and in the management stewardship plan. Staff wanted to follow the spirit of the conservation easement to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat. Kottler asked if the environmental assessment talked about the garlic mustard and Radke answered that he was not sure they saw it. Radke stated that this was the first-time staff put a trail project out for public comment. He said that in the future it might be helpful to hire a consultant to assist with the process. Kahlow followed up that the District is not required to have a public process and Resnick added that having a public process costs money and taxpayers’ dollars are being spent which is why a balance is needed. Resnick
felt like in this process the District had a very focused set of feedback from an involved community.

Stinson mentioned that she may be a little late due to the meetings being moved to Thursdays.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION: PROPERTY ACQUISITION**

At 8:31pm, staff was dismissed and Chair Kahlow called for a motion to enter into executive session to discuss property acquisition. Director Hanton was invited to stay for discussion regarding property acquisition.

The executive session to discuss property acquisition was recorded.

Those in attendance were: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson, Brian Hanton.

**MOTION:** To enter into executive session for the purpose of discussing property acquisition. [Kottler/Newman] All in favor: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson. None Opposed. Absent: None. Motion carries.

At 9:19pm, Chair Kahlow called for a motion to close executive session for the purpose of discussing property acquisition and adjourn the meeting.

**MOTION:** To close the executive session for the purpose of discussing property acquisition. [Kottler/Resnick] All in favor: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson. None Opposed. Absent: None. Motion carries.


**MOTIONS**

**MOTION:** To award the contract for the East Canyon Creek Trailhead improvement project to Wadman Corporation and to authorize the District Director to execute all necessary documents that pertain to the transaction. [Resnick/Newman] All in favor: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson. None Opposed. Absent: None. Motion carries.

**MOTION:** To approve the six job descriptions as presented in the Board packet with said changes. [Newman/Castro] All in favor: Nate Brown, Ben Castro, Cathy Kahlow, David Kottler, Aaron Newman, Gary Resnick, Marilyn Stinson. None Opposed. Absent: None. Motion carries.

Minutes prepared by Justine Kadziel

Clerk/Board Member Approval:

Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District
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