

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project Summary Results of Phase 3- Public Meeting Presentations and Feedback

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Project Goal: The purpose of the Open Space Project is to develop strategies and actions for addressing open space needs in each planning district in Utah. The focus is on protecting lands that are critical for providing *amenity* (e.g., parks, recreation, and esthetics) and *ecological service* (e.g., wetlands and wildlife habitat and corridors) values based on the opinions of local and regional officials, professionals, and residents. These results will complement other critical land initiatives such as agricultural land protection and biophysical studies of critical wildlife habitat.

Phase 1

On February 17, 1999, over 250 people, from all areas of the state of Utah, attended the Utah's Great Outdoors conference in Salt Lake City. The second half of the conference featured small (nominal) group working sessions facilitated by trained personnel from Utah State University's Institute of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism (IORT) and the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation. Conference participants were assigned to breakout groups based on within which of the seven planning districts, into which the state of Utah is divided, they lived. Five of the seven planning districts were represented by one group of 8-12 conference participants each. The Wasatch Front and Mountainland Planning Districts were represented by eleven and three groups respectively. Open space and outdoor recreation issues were identified by group participants in an initial brain-storming session. Group participants then voted on the importance of those issues. The product derived from each facilitated group discussion was a list of prioritized issues related to open space (non-agricultural land) and recreation and tourism on both a planning district level and a community specific level, time-framed over the next 20 years. The specific questions posed to conference participants in the working groups in order to generate discussion and the lists of issues were:

Question 1: What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next 20 years?

Question 2: What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?

The majority of responses to these two questions were the more general open space and recreation issues and areas of concern intended to be the product of this exercise. However, some group participants identified specific open space protection or management projects as being important to them. We did not want to discount the importance of these specific projects so they were included in the results of Phase 1 and were carried over to be used in the mail-back survey in Phase 2.

Phase 2

The lists of issues related to open space and recreation and tourism and the few specific open space protection or management projects produced in Phase 1 were used to prepare a mail-back survey for each planning district. Surveys were sent to conference participants, as well as professionals, officials, and key stakeholders who were identified as having an interest in or knowledge of open space and recreational issues in their planning district or community. Survey participants were asked to rank how important they felt each open space issue was, using a 7 point Likert scale. They were also asked to rank how useful established tools for open space protection or management would be in addressing those issues identified in their planning district or community. State-wide, a total of 287 surveys were sent out, with 182 returned, for an overall response rate of 63%. The products of Phase 2 are planning district specific prioritized lists of issues and areas of concern related to non-agricultural open space lands, as well as prioritized lists of the management tools that would be useful in addressing those issues. Survey respondents were also given the opportunity to list open space or recreation issues that they felt were important but had not been included as part of the survey.

PHASE 3

This phase of the Open Space Project has two purposes. First, to present the prioritized lists of issues produced in Phase 2 at a series of public meetings in each planning district throughout the state. Second, to identify specific projects for open space protection and management that fit into the framework of issues presented for each planning district.

Terminology

Certain words and phrases used in this report have appeared in various references and similar reports concerned with identifying the need for better management of public space- ranging from community parks and green ways to vast expanses of lands managed by federal agencies. For purposes of clarification: *open spaces* are non-agricultural critical lands having both inherent and development value; *protection* is used in the broadest sense, referring to applying the best possible management practices to benefit the greatest number of present and future users of land areas; *amenity values*, such as scenery and fresh air, contribute to the non-commodity uses of open spaces; *ecological service values*, such as watersheds and wetlands, contribute to the overall health of land areas and the human communities that depend on those areas; and, *environmental education* refers to the formalized program of instruction, now appearing in public schools, which is intended to produce a more informed public, resulting in more responsible management and use of open space areas.

Methodology

Meetings chosen for the Open Space Project presentations were those that occurred during the period October 1 to December 31, 1999 and offered the best coverage of each planning district in order to reach as many district residents as possible. Besides having the Open Space Project

presentation listed as an agenda item for each meeting, separate invitations were sent out to Phase 2 survey participants encouraging them to attend at least one meeting to hear the results of Phase 2 and to participate in Phase 3 of the project. Phase 3 presentations were made at 18 meetings with a total of 353 attendees. The presentations were planning district specific (e.g., no issues relating to the Southeast Planning District were presented at meetings in the Wasatch Front Planning District).

Each presentation was planned to consist of two parts: a 15 minute summary of Phases 1 and 2, including a review of the top 10 ranked issues, and; a 45 minute workshop to be held after the meeting adjourned. The purpose of the workshop was to generate the list of specific open space protection and management projects which meeting attendees felt fit into the framework of issues and areas of concern identified for their planning district or community. After the first two meetings, it became apparent that although most meeting attendees were interested in the results of Phase 2, many could not stay around after the meeting and help identify specific projects as part of the Phase 3 workshop. In order to obtain as much input as possible to the list of specific projects, a worksheet was developed and handed out to meeting attendees at the beginning of the 15 minute summary of issues, allowing those who could not remain for the workshop to list specific projects they were aware of and identify the open space issue or area of concern to which each project related. Those who filled out the worksheets were also asked to give the status of each project they listed (e.g., conceptual, planned, waiting for funding, etc.), in order to help Open Space Project administrators determine what strategy or action could be applied to each project. For example, someone could be identified who could help with planning a project still in the conceptual phase or assistance in finding a funding source could be provided for a project which has been planned and is awaiting funding. An example of a planning district worksheet is included as Appendix A. In some cases, in addition to specific projects, individuals participating in the workshops or filling out the worksheets listed open space or recreation issues or areas of concern that had not been included in the lists produced during Phases 1 and 2. The additional issues and areas of concern provided by public meeting attendees and mail-back survey respondents have been compiled by planning district and are included as appendices to this report.

The three sources of the specific open space and recreation protection and management projects listed below are; 1) the open space conference and subsequent mail-back survey, 2) worksheets handed out to attendees at the public meetings at which the Phase 2 results were presented, and 3) workshops conducted following those public meetings.

Results

The results of Phase 3 of the Open Space Project have been separated by planning district and are presented on the following pages. In each case, a brief description is given of the public meetings at which the open space project presentation was made, including the number of attendees. Following that is a list of the top 10 ranked (including ties and if 15 or fewer issues and areas of concern were identified all are included), planning district specific open space and

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 3 Results

recreation issues and areas of concern prioritized in response to Question 1 from the Phase 2 mail-back survey. That list is then broken down and the specific open space and recreation protection or management projects identified from that planning district are inserted based on what issue or area of concern they address. The same information is presented for those issues and areas of concern prioritized in response to Question 2 from Phase 2. Also included for each planning district is a summary of the results of Phase 3 and how those results integrate into the information obtained from the Phase 2 mail-back survey. Finally, where possible and appropriate, how well the open space protection and management tools prioritized for each planning district could be applied to the kinds of specific projects identified is discussed.

BEAR RIVER PLANNING DISTRICT

Counties: Box Elder, Cache, and Rich

Bridgerland Travel Region, Logan, November 18, 1999

The 13 people who attended this meeting included members of the Travel Region Executive Board and staff and other presenters. At least two individuals at the meeting had attended the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference and participated in the Phase 2 survey. The information presented was thought to be pertinent and applicable in this planning district and several specific open space protection projects were discussed during the meeting and included on worksheets turned in by meeting attendees.

Bear River Association of Governments, Brigham City, November 23, 1999

Fourteen of the 24 people who attended this meeting were members of the Association of Governments Council, and the other attendees were council support staff, other presenters, and members of the general public. Even though the information presented was very well received, there was some concern among meeting attendees about from where the funding would come to support the myriad of potential open space protection projects in this planning district. Some of the specific projects were discussed during the meeting and others were identified on worksheets turned in or subsequently mailed back.

Golden Spike Empire Travel Council, Perry/Brigham City, December 10, 1999

Of the 20 people who attended this meeting, it is estimated that half of them were residents of the Bear River Planning District, with the other half living in the Wasatch Front Planning District (the Golden Spike Empire Travel Region transcends the boundaries of the two planning districts). The audience for the presentation consisted of members of the travel council, other presenters, and members of the general public. Although some attendees at this meeting had heard the presentation at the November 23rd meeting in Ogden, the information presented was still very well received and generated considerable interest and discussion on potential projects.

Framework of Issues and Concerns:

Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next 20 years?*

1. Maintain existing facilities
2. Preserve lands we have
3. Address local community growth planning
4. Educate people to take care of resources
5. Foster better relationships and communication among Federal agencies, local governments, and private individuals
6. Create more funding sources

7. Resolve problems between wildlife habitat preservation and development
8. Protect and acquire more access to public lands
9. Include small recreational opportunity ideas for smaller communities
10. Acquire land

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing **“Maintain existing facilities”**;
No specific projects identified
2. Addressing **“Preserve land we have”**
 - A. Plan to protect existing agricultural lands
 - B. Cache Valley roadways plan to minimize development along them
 - C. Wetlands protection project for Brigham City and Box Elder County
 - D. Bear River Resource Conservation and Development open space protection project in North Logan
 - E. Plan to protect open space around and access to Bear Lake
 - F. Preserve open space in Rich County for destination cultural-heritage tourism value
 - G. Maintain a corridor of open space from Logan to Wellsville Canyon- US 89/91
 - H. Improve and protect area between Mantua Main Street and reservoir
 - I. Improve and protect wetlands at north end of Great Salt Lake
 - J. Protect wetlands in eastern Box Elder County
 - K. Plan for hillside protection (Cache County)
3. Addressing **“Address local community growth planning”**;
 - A. Fruit Way growth and open space plan- along Highway 89 Brigham City south
 - B. Plan for most critical areas where development rights should be purchased
 - C. Amend city and county ordinances to mandate cluster housing with open spaces and trails
 - D. Plan for hillside protection (Cache County)
 - E. Create more community parks
4. Addressing **“Educate people to take care of resources”**;
 - A. Improve environmental/conservation education programs in schools and for adults
 - B. Watchable Wildlife programs along Bear River
 - C. Watchable Wildlife programs along Great Salt Lake
 - D. Recreation, outdoor use, and ethics curriculum in public schools
 - E. Company wants to start canoe rental operation on Bear River- education emphasis
5. Addressing **“Foster better relationships and communication among Federal agencies, local governments, and private individuals”**;
 - A. Establish a Cache County wide Recreation District for coordinated efforts
 - B. Logan City and USDA Forest Service partnering to get grants for mutual benefit

6. Addressing **“Create more funding sources”**;
 - A. Logan City and USDA Forest Service partnering to get grants for mutual benefit
 - B. Dedicate funding for Hardware Ranch
 - C. Utah State University students to write open space protection related grants as projects
 - D. Establish a Cache County wide Recreation District for coordinated efforts
 - E. Identify T21 (formerly ISTEPA) projects for funding

7. Addressing **“Resolve problems between wildlife habitat preservation and development”**;
 - A. Plan for most critical areas where development rights could be purchased
 - B. Wetlands protection project for Brigham City and Box Elder County
 - C. Watchable Wildlife programs along Bear River
 - D. Watchable Wildlife programs along Great Salt Lake

8. Addressing **“Protect and acquire more access to public land”**;
 - A. Logan City and USDA Forest Service partnering to get grants for mutual benefit
 - B. Plan to protect open space around and access to Bear Lake
 - C. Assist private land owner in developing trails in foothills of Hyde Park

9. Addressing **“Include small recreational opportunities for smaller communities”**;
 - A. Cache County bicycle/walking trails along canals
 - B. Establish a Cache County wide Recreation District for coordinated efforts
 - C. Regional park in Tremonton
 - D. Development of 2 regional parks (Cache County)
 - E. Development of 3 mini parks (Cache County)
 - F. Develop a park on Box Elder Creek below Mantua Dam
 - G. Create more community parks

10. Addressing **“Acquire land”**;
 - A. Plan for most critical areas where development rights should be purchased
 - B. Extension of Logan River trail west of 10th West- possible purchase of additional lands
 - C. Remodel of a neighborhood park adding 5 acres along the southeast bench (Logan)
 - D. Negotiating with state for purchase of 200 acres for use as cemetery in northeast Logan

Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

1. Resolve issue- which should we spend money on first: improving current facilities or creating
new recreation options
2. Protect hillsides
3. Create more funding sources

4. As populations grow, so should recreation opportunities and open space
5. Sales tax for recreation extended to municipalities
6. Protect and improve natural areas
7. Cooperative wetlands banking
8. More linkage between open space areas, trails, bike paths, etc.
9. Address surface water contamination
10. Educate adults, communities, and children

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing “Resolve issue- which should we spend money on first: improving current facilities or creating new recreation options”;

- A. Establish a Cache County wide Recreation District for coordinated efforts
- B. Do carrying capacity study- quantity vs quality; state parks in area

2. Addressing “Protect hillsides”;

- A. Plan for hillside protection (Cache County)
- B. Assist private land owner in developing trails in foothills of Hyde Park
- C. Plan for most critical areas where development rights should be purchased
- D. Bear River RC&D open space project in North Logan
- E. Remodel of neighborhood park adding 5 acres along the southeast bench (Logan)
- F. Plan to protect existing agricultural areas

3. Addressing “Create more funding sources”;

- A. Logan City and USDA Forest Service partnering to get grants for mutual benefit
- B. Dedicate funding for Hardware Ranch
- C. USU students to write open space protection related grants as projects
- D. Establish a Cache County wide Recreation District for coordinated efforts
- E. Identify T21 (formerly ISTEAs) projects for funding

4. Addressing “As populations grow, so should recreation opportunities and open space”;

- A. Plan for most critical areas where development rights should be purchased
- B. Establish a Cache County wide Recreation District for coordinated efforts
- C. Regional park in Tremonton
- D. Development of 2 regional parks (Cache County)
- E. Development of 3 mini-parks (Cache County)
- F. Remodel of a neighborhood park adding 5 acres along the southeast bench (Logan)
- G. Plan to protect open space around and access to Bear Lake
- H. Amend city and county ordinances to mandate cluster housing with open spaces and trails
- I. Improve and protect area between Mantua Main Street and reservoir
- J. Fruit Way growth and open space plan- along Highway 89 Brigham City south
- K. Create more community parks

5. Addressing **“Sales tax for recreation extended to municipalities”**;
 - A. Establish a Cache County wide Recreation District for coordinated efforts

6. Addressing **“Protect and improve natural areas”**;
 - A. Identify river segments for enhancement projects
 - B. Plan for most critical areas where development rights should be purchased
 - C. Wetlands protection project for Brigham City and Box Elder County
 - D. Bear River RC&D open space project in North Logan
 - E. Cub River watershed comprehensive plan as part of water quality project
 - F. Plan to protect open space around and access to Bear Lake
 - G. Amend city and county ordinances to mandate cluster housing with open spaces and trails
 - H. Improve and protect area between Mantua Main Street and reservoir
 - I. Improve and protect wetlands on north end of Great Salt Lake
 - J. Improve and protect riparian areas along Bear and Malad Rivers, Black Slough, and Box Elder and Blue Creeks
 - K. Fruit Way growth and open space plan- along Highway 89 Brigham City south
 - L. Plan for hillside protection

7. Addressing **“Cooperative wetlands banking”**;
 - A. Protect wetland areas in eastern Box Elder County
 - B. Improve and protect wetlands on the north end of Great Salt Lake
 - C. Wetlands protection project for Brigham City and Box Elder County

8. Addressing **“More linkage between open space areas, trails, bike paths, etc.”**:
 - A. Cache County bicycle/walking trails along canals
 - B. Identify trails for non-motorized trails state grants
 - C. Extension of Logan River trail west of 10th West (Logan)- possible purchase of lands
 - D. Assist private land owner in developing trails in foothills of Hyde Park
 - E. Build Bonneville Shoreline Trail and trailheads in Box Elder County
 - F. Complete bike path from Brigham City to Bear River Bird Refuge Education Center
 - G. Build recreation trail from Brigham City to Beaver Dam on abandoned railroad bed
 - H. Build trail in Flat Bottom Canyon to Mantua
 - I. Build trail around Mantua Reservoir
 - J. Build trail around Willard Reservoir
 - K. Bonneville Shoreline Trail connecting Cache and Box Elder Counties
 - L. Bike Path around Bear Lake
 - M. Recreation trail from Garden City to Logan Canyon summit
 - N. Recreation trail in Garden City Canyon

9. Addressing **“Address surface water contamination”**;
 - A. Plan for most critical areas where development rights should be purchased

B. Cub River watershed comprehensive plan as part of water quality project

10. Addressing “**Educate adults, communities, and children**”;

- A. Recreation, outdoor use, and ethics curriculum in public schools
- B. Improve environmental/conservation education programs in schools and for adults
- C. Watchable Wildlife programs along Bear River
- D. Watchable Wildlife programs along Great Salt Lake
- E. Company wants to start canoe rental operation on Bear River- education emphasis

Other Projects:

- A. America West Heritage Center open space project
- B. Produce a landscaping plan for protection/rehabilitation of impacted travel corridors
- C. Complete improvements in Logan Canyon and Bear Lake Overlook

Points of Contact Mentioned:

- Rhonda Thompson- America West Heritage Center 797-1143
- Duane Chadwick- North Logan RC&D
- Dr. Gibbons- private land owner in Hyde Park foothills
- Jon Meikle- Smithfield (knowledgeable about projects) 563-5241
- Tom Fisher- Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization

Summary and Integration with Phase 2:

A total of 52 open space protection or management projects have been identified for the Bear River Planning District as part of Phase 3 of the Open Space Project. The kinds of projects identified are indicative of the open space and recreation issues and areas of concern prioritized for this planning district in Phase 2. And, in turn, the most important issues reflect the general environment of this part of the state: a combination of growing cities with developing suburban areas, small towns acting as bedroom communities, and large areas of agricultural lands with a rural influence. Many projects are concerned with protecting existing open space areas and connecting those areas with undeveloped travel corridors. As with other parts of the state that are experiencing rapid growth, important in the Bear River Planning District is the inclusion of open space areas and trails in new housing developments and on the verges of expanding urban and suburban areas. Several projects are specifically aimed at the protection of wetlands in different locations of the planning district. A great deal of attention is being given to quality of life considerations in this planning district, as evidenced by the numerous recreation-oriented projects, particularly those for trails and parks.

The highest ranked tools for open space protection and management for this planning district identified in Phase 2 were *Easements, Agricultural Land/Open Space Zoning, Purchase of Development Rights, Agriculture Protection Areas, Sensitive Lands Overlays, Exactions and*

Dedications, Urban Growth Boundaries and Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs. Without exception, these tools could readily be applied to many of the projects listed. For example, many of the trail projects identified would require *Easements* to make them happen and unspoiled travel corridors could only be realized through the *Purchase of Development Rights*. Given the sensitive nature of wetlands as special areas, the application of at least two types of tools (*Sensitive Lands Overlays* and *Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs*) to aid in the protection of those areas would prove to be very useful.

WASATCH FRONT PLANNING DISTRICT

Counties: Davis, Morgan, Salt Lake, Tooele, and Weber

Wasatch Front Regional Association of Governments, North Salt Lake, October 28, 1999

The 32 people who attended this meeting were a mix of county commissioners, mayors, staff and other presenters, and members of the general public. At least one individual in attendance had attended the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference and completed the Phase 2 survey. The presentation on the Open Space Project to this group was generally well received and considerable discussion occurred on the issues and areas of concern identified for the Wasatch Front. The most discussion centered around the numerous and different types of open space projects that exist in this planning district and how the work can be done to plan and fund so many. The idea was presented that projects would be prioritized and those highest ranked would be funded from year to year as possible. There was some discussion on how the projects would be prioritized, with no real consensus of opinion in that regard. This was the first meeting at which the project worksheets were used. In addition, three individuals stayed after the meeting to discuss the presentation in more detail.

Tooele City Council, Tooele, November 3, 1999

Approximately 19 people attended this meeting, including the city mayor and several of his staff members, the city council members, other presenters, and members of the general public. A presentation on the Open Space Project was done at this meeting to ensure we reached interested parties in the western part of the Wasatch Front Planning District. The presentation was very well received and several worksheets were returned at the end of the meeting. In addition, two people stayed after the meeting to discuss the presentation and to provide points of contact for more information on specific projects.

Golden Spike Empire Travel Council, Ogden, November 23, 1999

Most of the 30 people who attended this meeting were members of this travel council committee and supporting staff. Others in attendance included other presenters and members of the general public. The Open Space Project presentation was very well received and considerable discussion about projects occurred during the presentation and after the meeting.

Golden Spike Empire Travel Council, Perry/Brigham City, December 10, 1999

Of the 20 people who attended this meeting, it is estimated that half of them were residents of the Wasatch Front Planning District, with the other half living in the Bear River Planning District. The audience for the presentation consisted of members of the travel council, other presenters, and members of the general public. Although some attendees at this meeting had heard the presentation at the November 23rd meeting in Ogden, the information presented was still very well received and generated considerable interest and discussion on potential projects.

Framework of Issues and Concerns:

Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next 20 years?*

1. Protect and improve water quality
2. Protect and improve riverways
3. Protect and improve large open spaces that still exist within cities (not golf courses)
4. Protect and improve large enough tracts of land to maintain wildlife habitat
5. Active partnering among Federal, state, and local governments
6. Protect and improve native habitat
7. Protect and improve streams
8. Identify and secure a steady source of funding
9. Protect and improve watersheds
10. Protect and improve open space
11. Protect and improve riparian corridors

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing **“Protect and improve water quality”**;
 - A. Tooele City looking for new sources of culinary water
 - B. Clinton City development of a pond park in a needed water retention basin
 - C. Plan for use of Kennecott land after they shut down
 - D. Protection of water and fishing quality in Weber River drainage
 - E. Protection of water and fishing quality in Ogden River drainage
2. Addressing **“Protect and improve riverways”**;
 - A. Develop outdoor education facilities for Jordan River
 - B. Develop riparian parkways along area streams and rivers
 - C. Complete and purchase lands for Provo-Jordan River Parkway connection
 - D. Complete Jordan River Parkway Trail
 - E. Complete unfinished sections of Jordan River Parkway- Taylorsville, Midvale, West Jordan, Draper, South Salt Lake,
 - F. Ensure river access and develop trails along Weber River
 - G. Wetlands project along Jordan River- Sandy and Midvale
 - H. Wildlife viewing/study areas along Jordan River- Murray, West Jordan, Bluffdale
 - I. Weber River Greenway/Parkway
 - J. Ogden River Parkway west of Wall Avenue

3. Addressing **“Protect and improve large open spaces that still exist within cities (not golf courses)”**;

- A. Plan and instigate Syracuse City open space zoning ordinance
- B. Tooele City regional park (27 acres)
- C. Use of impact fees to purchase areas for community parks
- D. South Salt Lake desires to acquire funds to help preserve remaining agricultural lands
- E. Draper City- Corner Canyon Park preservation of 200+ acres
- F. Dimple Dell Regional Park- need plan for controlling use and new education center
- G. West Jordan needs plans and funding for neighborhood parks
- H. Funding for open space protection in Brownfield project in West Jordan
- I. Plan and funding for Taylorsville park on old landfill
- J. Taylorsville neighborhood parks, trails/bikeways, sports fields
- K. Harrisville needs funding for nature park, historical trail, and wildlife habitat area
- L. An overall plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space protection
- M. Plan for more Salt Lake City greenspace- reclaim City Creek Park parking lot
- N. Build a network of multiple use parks along Wasatch Front
- O. Establish a huge regional park in metro area- 8 to 10 times bigger than Liberty Park
- P. More city and county parks in Sandy area
- Q. Develop community recreation areas in Holladay

4. Addressing **“Protect and improve large enough tracts of land to maintain wildlife habitat”**;

- A. Plan to protect Tooele area canyons from dumping, off-road vehicles (ORVs), vandalism, parties
- B. Division of Wildlife Resources purchase of land for wildlife enhancement near East Canyon
- C. Funding for programs and upkeep for new Salt Lake County Wildlife Center
- D. Wildlife viewing/study areas along Jordan River- Murray, West Jordan, Bluffdale
- E. Harrisville City needs funding for nature park, historical trail, and wildlife habitat area
- F. Plan for maximizing opportunities for wildlife interaction- urban nature trails, fishing

5. Addressing **“Active partnering among Federal, state, and local governments”**;

- A. USDA Forest Service and Snowbasin cooperative effort to guarantee access through recent land exchange
- B. Division of Wildlife Resources purchase of land for wildlife enhancement near East Canyon
- C. Joint project with Utah Transit Authority and Sandy/Midvale for corridors within/between new housing areas
- D. Build an association of interested non-profit organizations
- E. Plan for use of Kennecott land after they shut down
- F. State purchase and develop Blue Lake (Wendover) for underwater park

6. Addressing **“Protect and improve native habitat”**;

- A. Tooele City hillside and hilltop preservation project

- B. Plan to protect Tooele area canyons from dumping, ORVs, vandalism, parties
 - C. Division of Wildlife Resources purchase of land for wildlife enhancement near East Canyon
 - D. Wildlife viewing/study areas along Jordan River- Murray, West Jordan, Bluffdale
 - E. Wetlands project along Jordan River- Sandy/Midvale
 - F. Harrisville needs funding for nature park, historical trail, and wildlife habitat area
 - G. Plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space protection
 - H. Open space protection plan for west Salt Lake Valley
 - I. Great Salt Lake protection/preservation plan- including buffer zones
 - J. Improve access to Bells Canyon
7. Addressing **“Protect and improve streams”**;
- A. Corner Canyon Creek Parkway- preservation of 1 mile of creek corridor
 - B. Willow Creek Parkway- Draper
8. Addressing **“Identify and secure a steady source of funding”**;
- A. Build an association of interested non-profit organizations
9. Addressing **“Protect and improve watersheds”**;
- A. Tooele City hillside and hilltop preservation project
 - B. Plan to protect Tooele area canyons from dumping, ORVs, vandalism, parties
 - C. Protection of water and fishing quality in Weber River drainage
 - D. Protection of water and fishing quality in Ogden River drainage
10. Addressing **“Protect and improve open space”**;
- A. Acquire land in support of Mt. Green master plan concentrating on preserving open space
 - B. Acquire land to ensure open space and trail systems for Ski Lake Development- Ogden Valley
 - C. Plan to cluster zone new developments in Morgan County- leaving open space preserved
 - D. Morgan County wants to preserve 50 acres of open space adjacent to golf course
 - E. Plan for use of Kennecott land after they shut down
11. Addressing **“Protect and improve riparian corridors”**;
- A. Trail system and riparian protection along Weber River (Riverdale)
 - B. Corner Canyon Creek Parkway- preservation of 1 mile of creek corridor
 - C. Harrisville project to protect riparian areas
 - D. Develop a plan for riparian parkways along area streams and rivers
 - E. Protection of water and fishing quality in Weber River drainage
 - F. Protection of water and fishing quality in Ogden River drainage

Question 2: What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?

1. Have a strategy or policy in place (especially in foothills) along Wasatch Front and other places where private development is closing access to public land
2. Preserve open space corridors
3. More matching grant funds for programs like land and water conservation, trails, riverways, or urban forestry- budget for state and local match
4. Protect and improve open space on Wasatch Front
5. Protect and improve river corridor habitat
6. Protect and improve Wasatch Front canyons
7. Require city planning and ordinances to include open space in new housing developments
8. Educate the public on the need for responsible land ethics
9. Protect and improve native habitats
10. Implement new zoning ordinances for new development that would require open space and public access to trails
11. Protect and improve wetlands

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing **“Have a strategy or policy in place (especially in foothills) along Wasatch Front and other places where private development is closing access to public land”**;
 - A. USDA Forest Service and Snowbasin cooperative effort to guarantee access through recent land exchange
 - B. Trail development plan along Wasatch Front mountains in addition to Bonneville Shoreline
 - C. Ensure river access and develop trails along Weber River
 - D. Improve access to Bells Canyon
2. Addressing **“Preserve open space corridors”**;
 - A. Syracuse City preserving open space corridors for walking trails
 - B. Joint project with Utah Transit Authority and Sandy/Midvale for corridors within/between new housing areas
 - C. Development of parkway associated with Legacy Highway
 - D. Complete and purchase lands for Provo-Jordan River Parkway connection
 - E. Develop more community trails and interconnections with urban “island” parks
3. Addressing **“More matching grant funds for programs like land and water conservation, trails, riverways, or urban forestry- budget for state and local match”**;
 - A. Use of impact fees to purchase areas for community parks
 - B. Plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space protection
 - C. Build an association of interested non-profit organizations

4. Addressing **“Protect and improve open space on Wasatch Front”**;
 - A. Syracuse City open space zoning ordinance
 - B. Mt. Green master plan concentrating on open space reservation- acquiring land
 - C. Open space and trail systems planned for Ski Lake Development- Ogden Valley
 - D. Tooele City hillside and hilltop preservation project
 - E. Tooele area regional park (27 acres)
 - F. Tooele golf course expansion project
 - G. Plan to cluster zone new developments in Morgan County- leaving open space preserved
 - H. Morgan County wants to preserve 50 acres of open space adjacent to golf course
 - I. South Salt Lake desires to acquire funds to help preserve remaining agricultural land
 - J. Draper City- Corner Canyon Park preservation of 200+ acres
 - K. West Jordan needs funding for neighborhood parks
 - L. Funding for open space protection in Brownfield project in West Jordan
 - M. Taylorsville park on old landfill- regional park on land owned by state
 - N. Taylorsville neighborhood parks, trails/bikeways, sports fields
 - O. Harrisville needs funds for nature park, historical trail and wildlife habitat areas
 - P. Plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space
 - Q. Open space protection plan for west Salt Lake Valley
 - R. Great Salt Lake protection/preservation plan- including buffer zones
 - S. Funding for Wasatch Front parks maintenance- especially access
 - T. Plan for more Salt Lake City green space- reclaim City Creek Park parking lot
 - U. Build a network of multiple use parks along Wasatch Front
 - V. Plan for use of Kennecott land after they shut down
 - W. Establish a huge regional park in area- 8 to 10 times bigger than Liberty Park
 - X. More city and county parks in Sandy area

5. Addressing **“Protect and improve river corridor habitat”**;
 - A. Trail system and riparian protection along Weber River (Riverdale)
 - B. Weber River Greenway/Parkway
 - C. Ogden River Parkway west of Wall Avenue
 - D. Complete unfinished sections of Jordan River Parkway
 - E. Corner Canyon Creek Parkway- preservation of 1 mile of creek corridor
 - F. Willow Creek Parkway
 - G. Wildlife viewing/study areas along Jordan River- Murray, West Jordan, Bluffdale
 - H. Harrisville City protection of riparian area project
 - I. Develop riparian parkways along area streams and rivers
 - J. Protection of water and fishing quality in Weber River drainage
 - K. Protection of water and fishing quality in Ogden River drainage

6. Addressing **“Protect and improve Wasatch Front canyons”**;
 - A. Plan to protect Tooele area canyons from dumping, ORVs, vandalism, parties
 - B. Division of Wildlife Resources purchased land for wildlife enhancement near East Canyon

- C. Draper City- Corner Canyon Park preservation of 200+ acres
- D. Plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space protection
- E. Plan for use of Kennecott land after they shut down
- F. Improve access to Bells Canyon

7. Addressing **“Require city planning and ordinances to include open space in new housing developments”**;

- A. Syracuse City open space zoning ordinance
- B. Mt. Green master plan concentrating on open space preservation- acquiring land
- C. Open space and trails systems planned for Ski Lake Development- Ogden Valley
- D. Use of impact fees to purchase areas for community parks
- E. Plan to cluster zone new developments in Morgan County- leaving open space preserved
- F. Funding needed for West Jordan neighborhood parks
- G. Funding for open space protection in Brownfield project- West Jordan
- H. Joint project with Utah Transit Authority and Sandy/Midvale for corridors within/between new housing areas
- I. Taylorsville needs funding for neighborhood parks, trails/bikeways, sports fields
- J. Plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space protection
- K. Build a network of multiple use parks along Wasatch Front
- L. More city and county parks in Sandy area
- M. Develop community recreation areas in Holladay

8. Addressing **“Educate the public on the need for responsible land ethics”**;

- A. Improve environmental education programs in Ogden area schools
- B. Development of wetlands education program- Draper
- C. Dimple Dell Regional Park- need plan for controlling use and new education center
- D. Support needed for new Salt Lake County Wildlife Center- funding for programs and upkeep
- E. Harrisville needs funding for nature park, historical trail, and wildlife habitat areas
- F. Plan to maximize opportunities for wildlife interaction- urban nature trails, fishing
- G. Develop an outdoor/environmental education program and delivery system for area schools
- H. Increase environmental education opportunities on the west side of Salt Lake Valley
- I. Wendover Interpretive Center
- J. Establish a series of nature learning centers along Wasatch Front
- K. Develop outdoor education facilities for Jordan River
- L. Provide hunter education and gun ranges in Salt Lake County and other areas

9. Addressing **“Protect and improve native habitats”**;

- A. Tooele City hillside and hilltop preservation project
- B. Plan to protect Tooele area canyons from dumping, ORVs, vandalism, parties
- C. Division of Wildlife Resources purchase of land for wildlife enhancement near East Canyon
- D. Wildlife viewing/study areas along Jordan River- Murray, West Jordan, Bluffdale

- E. Wetlands project along Jordan River- Sandy/Midvale
- F. Harrisville needs funding for nature park, historical trail, and wildlife habitat area
- G. Plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space protection
- H. Open space protection plan for west Salt Lake Valley
- I. Great Salt Lake protection/preservation plan- including buffer zones
- J. Improve access to Bells Canyon

10. Addressing “**Implement new zoning ordinances for new development that would require open space and public access to trails**”;

- A. USDA Forest Service and Snowbasin cooperative effort to guarantee access through recent land exchange
- B. Trail development plan along Wasatch Front mountains in addition to Bonneville Shoreline
- C. Ensure river access and develop trails along Weber River
- D. Improve access to Bells Canyon
- E. Syracuse City open space zoning ordinance
- F. Mt. Green master plan concentrating on open space preservation- acquiring land
- G. Use of impact fees to purchase areas for community parks
- H. Plan to cluster zone new developments in Morgan County- leaving open space preserved
- I. South Salt Lake desires to acquire funds to help preserve remaining agricultural land
- J. Funding for open space protection in Brownfield project- West Jordan
- K. Plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space protection
- L. Open space protection plan for west Salt Lake Valley
- M. More city and county parks in Sandy area
- N. Develop community recreation areas in Holladay

11. Addressing “**Protect and improve wetlands**”;

- A. Development of a pond park in a needed water retention basin for wetlands- Clinton City
- B. Development of a wetlands education program- Draper
- C. Wetlands project along Jordan River- Sandy/Midvale
- D. Plan to acquire and preserve non-farmable land for open space protection
- E. Great Salt Lake protection/preservation- including buffer zones

Other Projects:

Trails;

- A. Morgan County bike/walking path along the Old Highway in Mt. Green
- B. Developing a non-motorized trail system throughout Ogden Valley
- C. Bonneville Shoreline Trail in Weber County
- D. Ogden Canyon pathway using old Bamburger railroad bed
- E. Protection and enhancement of Ogden Valley trail system
- F. Tooele City trail system with water drainage washes incorporated
- G. Trail around Tooele City
- H. 10 mile trail development in Clinton and West Point- funding for land acquisition

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 3 Results

- I. Clinton City walking trail project
- J. Sandy City trail system plan- including Bonneville Shoreline Trail connection- trailhead parking
- K. Midvale City trail development project
- L. Trail system in Ogden Valley area of Weber County
- M. Complete Bonneville Shoreline Trail
- N. Funding for Wasatch Front trails maintenance
- O. Increase east-west trail opportunities in Salt Lake County
- P. Establish convenient off-road and off-highway vehicles trails
- Q. More developed jogging trails
- R. Develop plan to use canal system for trail network
- S. More focus on national historic trails in area- Pony Express, Mormon Pioneer, etc.
- T. Complete the Antelope Island trail system
- U. Establish canals to trails in Taylorsville

Miscellaneous:

- A. Develop urban-based camping opportunities in Davis County and Ogden area
- B. Plan to increase recreation opportunities on west side of Salt Lake Valley
- C. Plan for protection of prehistoric and historic resources along Wasatch Front
- D. Legacy Highway
- E. South end access to Antelope Island

Points of Contact Mentioned:

- Golden Spike Empire- Jay Hudson at (801)479-5992
- Friends of the Bear River Refuge
- Ogden City Parks Commission
- Ogden City Convention and Visitors Bureau
- Danny Potts- Salt Lake County Fish and Game Association at (801)596-1536
- Curtis Christiansen- Weber County Planning Engineer
- Mayor Auger- Taylorsville at (801)963-5400
- Michael Maloy- Tooele City Planner at (435)843-2103
- Larry Harrison- Tooele City Director of Parks and Recreation at (435)843-2141

Summary and Integration with Phase 2:

A total of 95 specific open space protection or management projects have been identified for the Wasatch Front Planning District as part of Phase 3 of the Open Space Project. The projects fit into the framework of issues and areas of concern prioritized for this planning district during Phase 2; especially those projects related to the protection of water quality and quantity and those that take action to ensure corridors to access public land are maintained and open space is included in new housing developments and urban areas. Even though an issue related to trails in this planning district did not show up in the top 10 ranked issues identified in response to either

Question 1 or 2, there were at least 23 issues related to trails, parkways, and paths that appeared in the complete list of issues and areas of concern for this planning district.

The kinds of open space protection and management tools thought to be most useful by Phase 2 survey respondents support the projects identified for this planning district during Phase 3. For example, the acquiring of *Easements* would certainly support the great need for trails, parkways, a variety of multiple use and interconnected paths, and access corridors to public lands. The *Purchase of Development Rights* and the use of *Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs* would help establish open space areas in developments and neighborhood parks in urban areas. The instigation of *Sensitive Lands Overlays* and *Exactions and Dedications* would allow for the protection of wildlife habitat, riparian corridors, and natural areas. And, finally, the bringing together of open space managers and interested parties through *Intergovernmental Agreements* would help in the efforts to complete plans and find sources of funding for these projects, particularly those of a larger scale that transcend jurisdictional boundaries.

MOUNTAINLAND PLANNING DISTRICT

Counties: Summit, Utah, and Wasatch

Mountainland Association of Governments, Executive Council Meeting, Heber City, October 28, 1999. Approximately twenty individuals attending the meeting, including mayors, county commissioners, staff, other presenters, and the general public. Two individuals had attended the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference and completed Phase 2 surveys. The presentation was generally well received with some questions and discussion, interest in IORT and the Open Space Project in general, but some concern expressed regarding funding for the implementation of projects and initiatives, and purpose related to other "similar projects" such as "Envision Utah," "Quality Growth," and "Enlibra."

Mountainland Resource Conservation and Development Council, Orem, November 19, 1999. Approximately twelve individuals attending the meeting. One individual employed by Utah State Parks and Recreation had attended the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference and completed a Phase 2 survey. The presentation was generally well received and tied into some of the council's agenda items.

Framework of Issues and Concerns:

Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

1. Educate the public on general use and responsibility
2. Preserve good open space in and around towns for use as parks
3. Educate the public on the need for conservation and multiple use
4. Identify, protect, and secure access to current open space
5. Create new community trails and connect existing trails
6. Identify funding sources for outdoor recreation and open space needs
7. Maintain public access to canyons and foothills
8. Protect and improve clean and open waterways
9. Protect and improve river and stream quality
10. Control development on benches
11. Protect the integrity of the Provo River watershed

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Surveys:

1. Addressing "**Educate the public on general use and responsibility**";
 - A. Highland City Land Use Master Plan
 - B. Find out what already has been done; much of this duplicates Mountainland Association

- of Governments work
- C. Oakley is revising development code in general plan to encourage open space preservation through zoning/density incentives, transfer of development rights (TDRs), etc.
2. Addressing **“Preserve good open space in and around towns for use as parks”**;
- A. Alpine and Highland City Green Space Design—Swaner Design
 - B. Open space subdivision / 50% open space with clustering—Highland City
 - C. Purchase of 80 acres from state for Adventure Park—Highland City
 - D. Adopted Town Center Master Plan—Park’s open space—Highland City
 - E. Acquisition and development of Zone 1 park in Lindon City
 - F. Pheasant Brook Park Development and Squaw Hollow Basin Park—Lindon
 - G. Mapleton has a clustered development ordinance which is resulting in the donation of park lands and the creation of privately owned, but conservation easement, protected open space.
 - H. Oakley City recently purchased 76 acres in town to develop as a park, collaborating with the local school district, etc.
 - I. Charleston Town—develop new community park next to our town building
 - J. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is working with the Swaner Corporation to place 700+ acres into a permanent easement; project is just north of Park City; NRCS is putting \$1+ million into this effort.
 - K. In Pleasant Grove, a private property owner is attempting to preserve his land at the mouth of Grove Creek Canyon, on the base of the west slope of Mt. Timpanogos. Efforts include annexing all of his land to the city, developing a third of the land, giving some of the land to the city for a park, and selling roughly two-thirds of the land to the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) with the help of the Trust for Public Lands. This effort will allow the USFS to develop a trailhead/base camp with parking and related facilities, and preserve permanent access to Timpponeke Trail Road, Great Western Trail, Chicken Ranch Trail, and Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Annexation Name: Grove Creek East Addition; Subdivision Name: Mahogany Ridge at Grove Creek; Property Owner/Developer: Cornerstone Group, Inc., P.O. Box 922, Pleasant Grove, UT 84062; Agent/Owner: Joe Smith at 785-3319.
3. Addressing **“Educate the public on the need for conservation and multiple use”**;
- Oakley is revising its development code in general plan to encourage open space preservation through zoning/density incentives, TDRs, etc.
4. Addressing **“Identify, protect, and secure access to current open space”**;
- A. Oakley is revising development code in general plan to encourage open space

preservation through zoning/density incentives, TDRs, etc.

B. Oakley and Eastern Summit County and other communities are going to study cooperative TDR programs to designate growth areas, etc.

C. Oakley City is studying Weber River preservation with public trail access; designing a wastewater/water reuse plant to enhance river water quality and irrigate our parks.

D. Oakley has approximately 200 acres in a Utah Open Lands Trust to protect watersheds and owns 225 acres more that will remain open space.

E. Provo City is interested in establishing an open space corridor on the north and east boundaries of our airport through the acquisition of development rights, conservation easements, etc.

F. Provo City is also seeking to purchase development rights for targeted agricultural lands; the owner will maintain fee title and be responsible for operating and managing the land.

G. Charleston Town—looking at installing a sewer system; we need to be sure we leave areas for open space as growth comes to our community after the sewer is installed.

H. Lehi Dry Creek Corridor/Trail—city is actively trying to preserve this area as a future open space corridor/trail; designated as open space in Lehi City General Plan Land Use Map.

I. North Utah Lake Trail

J. Murdock Canal Trail

5. Addressing **“Create new community trails and complete existing trails”**;

A. City and regional Trail Map—working with Mountainland Association of Governments

B. Development of city-wide trails system in Lindon City

C. Mapleton is now requiring trails in subdivisions, but needs funding for a trail system study for Master Plan.

D. Charlston Town—walking/jogging/biking trail along Provo River

G. Mountainland Resource Conservation and Development Council has a Trail Steering Committee and a Trail Planner, Trish Murphy (in Oakley at 435-783-5490; in Salt Lake City at 801-521-6877), working on a project to develop a trail system for the Kamas Valley because of the many benefits trails have to offer communities.

H. Lehi Dry Creek Corridor/Trail—city is actively trying to preserve this area as a future open space corridor/trail; designated as open space in Lehi City General Plan Land Use Map.

I. North Utah Lake Trail

J. Murdock Canal Trail

K. See land preservation effort at mouth of Grove Creek Canyon, on the base of the west slope of Mt. Timpanogos, in 2(k) above.

6. Addressing “**Identify funding sources for outdoor recreation and open space needs**”;
None identified.

7. Addressing “**Maintain public access to canyons and foothills**”;
A. Trails to American Fork Canyon—trailhead parking lot constructed
B. Development of Dry Canyon Trailhead and Park—Lindon
C. In Provo City, we are seeking to acquire lands that will allow public access to Slate Canyon and for the construction of a new trailhead there.
D. See land preservation effort at mouth of Grove Creek Canyon, on the base of the west slope of Mt. Timpanogos, in 2(k) above.

8. Addressing “**Protect and improve clean and open waterways**”;
A. Lindon marina and park development
B. “Sandy Beach” of Utah Lake—acquisition and development; partnership with county and state recreation area
C. Clean-up/development of Utah Lake
D. Oakley City is studying Weber River preservation with public trail access; designing a wastewater/water reuse plant to enhance river water quality and irrigate our parks.
E. 176,000 acre Chalk Creek Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Plan is being implemented with eight different funding sources (east of Coalville).
F. Tri-Valley PL-566 Watershed Plan is being implemented in Heber Valley using USDA funding (249,000 acre watershed plan).

9. Addressing “**Protect and improve river and stream quality**”;
A. Oakley City is studying Weber River preservation with public trail access; designing a wastewater/water reuse plant to enhance river water quality and irrigate our parks.
B. Oakley has adopted a sensitive lands ordinance to restrict development on the upper Weber River and foothills areas.
C. 176,000 acre Chalk Creek Watershed Coordinated Resource Management Plan in being implemented with eight different funding sources (east of Coalville).
D. Tri-Valley PL-566 Watershed Plan is being implemented in Heber Valley using USDA funding (249,000 acre watershed plan).

10. Addressing **“Control development on benches”**;
 - A. Lindon City—Hillside Preservation; acquisition of land and preservation of it
 - B. Mapleton has a “transferred development” program resulting in the donation of our bench lands to the city in exchange for increased development elsewhere.
 - C. Oakley has adopted a sensitive lands ordinance to restrict development on the upper Weber River and foothills areas.
 - D. See land preservation effort at mouth of Grove Creek Canyon, on the base of the west slope of Mt. Timpanogos, in 2(k) above.

11. Addressing **“Protect the integrity of the Provo River watershed”**;

None identified.

Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

Framework of Issues and Concerns:

1. Development an endowment program to address the lack of funding for recreation and open space.
2. Protect and improve functional watersheds (e.g., Upper Weber and Upper Provo Rivers).
3. Protect and improve urban forests.
4. Acquire easements for Bonneville Shoreline Trail, connect the pieces (in Provo-Orem-Springville).
5. Develop a comprehensive counties-wide trails system.
6. Trail needed to connect Wasatch County and Utah County.
7. Improve quality of Utah Lake recreation opportunities while preserving natural western shoreline.
8. Educate public on need for open space.
9. Prevent further scarring of Wasatch Front by off-road vehicles.
10. Address concerns with public relations problems for recreation and open space priorities.
11. Improve existing parks in cities for family use (e.g., soccer fields).

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing **“Development an endowment program to address the lack of funding for recreation and open space”**;
 - A. Town of Cedar Fort—100 acres of land needed for rural community for recreation, open space, protection of watershed, education of public on the need for open space, and control of development on benches.
2. Addressing **“Protect and improve functional watersheds (e.g., Upper Weber and Upper Provo Rivers)”**;
 - A. Oakley City is studying Weber River preservation with public trail access; designing a wastewater/water reuse plant to enhance river water quality and irrigate our parks.
 - B. Oakley has adopted a sensitive lands ordinance to restrict development on the upper Weber River and foothills areas.
 - C. Oakley City, Mountainland RC&D, and Summit County are studying a trails master plan in eastern Summit County including converting old irrigation canals to pressure irrigation with public trails over the top, a “ditches to trails” initiative.

- D. Chalk Creek Watershed Plan and Tri-Valley Watershed Plan; also an effort underway to develop a Coordinated Resource Management Plan on the Spanish Fork River Watershed in Utah County
3. Addressing **“Protect and improve urban forests”**;
 - A. Tree City USA—second year for Highland City
 4. Addressing **“Acquire easements for Bonneville Shoreline Trail, connect the pieces (in Provo-Orem-Springville)”**;
 - A. Trailhead constructed at mouth of American Fork Canyon.
 5. Addressing **“Develop a comprehensive counties-wide trails system”**;
 - A. Just hired a full-time Trails Planner through Mountainland Association of Governments.
 - B. Utah County trails system—development already underway
 - C. In Provo, new equestrian trails along the Provo River and at the mouth of Provo Canyon with trailheads
 6. Addressing **“Trail needed to connect Wasatch County and Utah County”**;
 - A. Murdock Canal Trail—connect to Provo River parkway.
 - B. Have trail plans for Utah, Summit, and Wasatch Counties
 7. Addressing **“Improve quality of Utah Lake recreation opportunities while preserving natural western shoreline.”**
 - A. Utah Lake Joint Venture, headed by John Fairchild of the Utah Division of Wildlife Habitat
 8. Addressing **“Educate public on need for open space”**;
 - A. Highland/Alpine Open Space Design—Swaner Design.
 - B. Open space owned by town; need information on options with low or no cost; don't know what to do with our open space.
 9. Addressing **“Prevent further scarring of Wasatch Front by off-road vehicles”**;
 - A. See land preservation effort at mouth of Grove Creek Canyon, on the base of the west slope of Mt. Timpanogos, in 2(k) in previous section above. This project will cut off access by off-road vehicles to the foothills in this area, a significant reason why the U.S. Forest Service is interested in this project.

10. Addressing “**Address concerns with public relations problems for recreation and open space priorities**”;

A. We need help on what to do and what is available as resources to maintain open space, i.e. what do we plant that is low maintenance, etc.?

11. Addressing “**Improve existing parks in cities for family use (e.g., soccer fields)**”;

A. Lehi City—has made extensive improvements to new and existing parks over the last two years with additions of pavilions, playground equipment, basketball standards, and trees; parks where improvements have been made include Wires Park, City Pool Park, Summercrest Park, and Stagecoach Crossing Park.

Points of Contact Mentioned:

- A. Mountainland Region has a regional, multi-county trails plan. Contact Sean Seager, Mountainland Region Planner at (801) 229-3837, fseager@mtnland.state.ut.us
- B. There are many other Provo Projects. For more information contact Roger Thomas, Parks and Recreation Center, or Richard Selrist, Planning and Community Development at (801) 852-6100.
- C. The City of Orem has a Draft Master Plan for the Lakeview Area southwest of the city. The plan has been prepared to give direction and provide a framework for guiding future decisions regarding growth in the Lakeview area. The plan establishes goals and strategies which will provide guidance in future development and open space preservation.
- D. Mountainland RC&D Council has a Trail Steering Committee and a Trail Planner, Trish Murphy (in Oakley at 435-783-5490; in Salt Lake City at 801-521-6877)

Summary and Integration with Phase 2:

From the information acquired from respondents in the Mountainland Planning District, there appears to be some good efforts and initiatives directed at meeting the concern of preserving open space through identification and protection, and securing and maintaining access to both land and water resources for recreational purposes. This can especially be seen in the creation of new trails and the completion of existing trails in communities throughout the counties in the district, the focus on maintaining access to mountain foothills and canyons, and the efforts directed at water quality improvement and provision of water-based recreational opportunities. However, little information was identified that would address the need for educating the public on general use, their responsibilities with regard to multiple use, and the need for conservation of resources. In addition, no information was identified addressing the need to identify funding

sources for outdoor recreation and open space needs. The state can be of great assistance in these areas, through the development and implementation of educational programs, and the provision of funding sources to help implement initiatives and projects. In addition, with all that is occurring in the district with regard to meeting recreational and open space needs, there may be a need for more over-all coordination among the different entities involved. This may be especially true for efforts associated with trail development and improvement. It appears that some communities have concerns and recognize needs, but do not have the fiscal nor technical resources to develop and implement projects to meet needs.

Counties: Daggett, Duchesne, and Uintah

Uintah Basin Parks and Recreation Board, Vernal, November 16, 1999. Approximately fifteen people attended the meeting, including the Director of the Uintah Basin Parks and Recreation, city council members from Vernal and Naples City, a member of the Uintah Basin School District, and seven other board members who are concerned citizens and residents of Uintah County. The project information presented was fairly well received, although there was some contention among a few of the board members over how the priorities were determined, as well as the priorities themselves. It was suggested that thirty potential respondents was not a sufficient number of people on which to base priorities for an entire region. One member of the board recommended that we do a random sampling of the region's residents if we want a true understanding of the local residents' priorities for recreation and open space. Most of their concern, however, revolved around the actual priorities themselves. The top two priorities for the Uintah Basin involve protecting watersheds and drinking water. One member of the board, in particular, did not feel this was a legitimate concern for the region. He stated that the Clean Water Act currently addresses these concerns, and that local farmers are already overburdened with regulations (e.g., the fifteen foot buffer zone in riparian areas and the many requirements for proper disposal of manure) and we do not need to implement more. This led to a discussion of the Federal government and the many regulations it imposes on the local timber industry and use of public lands. Many of the board members expressed anger toward the Federal government, as well as mistrust, over how decisions are made regarding the use of Federal lands in the region. The dependency of the local economy upon the use of public lands for oil production, grazing, and timber harvesting was a large part of the discussion, as was a concern that too many regulations limiting the use of public lands for these purposes will have detrimental effects upon the community. Many board members felt this issue (i.e., multiple use of public lands), was of much greater concern than any we had presented. It was requested that we add another issue to our list: More local government control over decisions effecting public land in the Uintah Basin.

Roosevelt City Council Meeting, Roosevelt, November 23, 1999. There were approximately twenty five people in attendance included the mayor, four city council members, the city manager, a secretary, and approximately twenty members of the community. We happened to plan the meeting on a night well attended by the local boy scout troop and many of their parents. There was much less discussion at this meeting than at the prior meeting in Vernal. Both the mayor and the city manager felt the priorities presented fit well with their concerns and plans for the future. Although, as in Vernal, they felt that the top two priorities (protection of watersheds and drinking water) did not pose a serious concern for the region, and that there were enough state and Federal laws in place to take care of any potential problems. It was mentioned, however, that the city will need to "keep an eye to the future for developing other water sources

for future developments.” While there was general agreement that the priorities presented were valid, they also requested that we add a few more to the list. These included: funding for a ten acre expansion of Constitution Park in Roosevelt; funding for facility construction at the Old Park in Roosevelt; funding for restoration of the community’s basketball courts; funding for a visitor center on the west end of town; and, additional rest areas on the road between Roosevelt and Salt Lake City.

Framework of Issues and Concerns:

Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

1. *Protect and improve:* Watersheds.
2. *Protect and improve:* Drinking water.
3. Figure out how to pay for operation and maintenance of aging infrastructures of recreational facilities.
4. *Protect and improve:* Wildlife.
5. Bring together the partners necessary to do planning studies to determine what opportunities should be provided for the area as a whole.
6. Instill in the community that open space and recreation have value.
7. Increase partnerships between private, local, Federal, and tribal entities.
8. *Protect and improve:* Agriculture.
9. Develop the funding to support the facilities and people that are currently being added.
10. Develop ways to keep public lands accessible yet protected so that everything does not become developed.
11. Develop an area wide (city, county, state, federal, tribal, and private) management plan for development, management, and protection of our resources, and then do it.
12. Establish community identity, community values, and quality of life.

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Surveys:

The Vernal City Planner was the only respondent from the Uintah Basin who gave specific information on current efforts in the communities to address the priorities identified for this region. According to him, the draft for Vernal City’s General Plan, which is in the process of being approved by the Planning Commission, does address items 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12. He also stated that Vernal City’s Capital Improvement Projects, listed in one, five, and ten year plans, and currently being reviewed by the City Council, will address items 2, 3, 7, 9, and 11.

During the Roosevelt meeting, it was suggested that the city may need to implement impact fees

to address concerns related to item 9. There currently is no funding mechanism for adding services to new homes in the area, nor are there funds for maintaining the current infrastructure. In regards to item 2, the Roosevelt City Manager felt the city was already addressing this through its “ongoing source protection plan,” which requires testing of the city water for contaminants on a monthly basis. The Roosevelt mayor suggested that in regards to item 6, residents of this community are already well aware of the inherent values of recreation and open space to their community, since tourism and recreation is their main industry. Another respondent from the Roosevelt area also mentioned the importance of completing the Uintah Basin Water Storage Units to help increase water recreation opportunities in the area.

It should be noted that the strongest message we received from this region, during the meetings and in our written responses, was the importance of maintaining the *multiple-use concept* for public lands in the area. The dependency of the communities in this region on the oil, timber, and recreation industries was stressed over and over. It was also stressed that these industries can and should be able to exist in harmony and no one industry should be deemed more important than the others. While it was not mentioned, this concept does relate directly to items 7 and 10. Unfortunately, no one shared with us how we can best address these items.

Question 2: What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?

1. Resolve access issues on public lands.
2. Less development of critical areas. Protect the critical, develop the marginal.
3. Strengthen partnerships.
4. Identify common goals.
5. Better county zoning and planning.
6. Develop an inventory of resources (e.g., water, recreation, wildlife) and protect the places that are most critical.
7. Identify and prioritize recreation needs and wants for each town.
8. Develop and establish a community identity and address issues such as quality of life, open space, recreation values, etc.
9. General funding for such things as open space and outdoor recreation facilities.
10. Equalize outdoor activities through education and promotion.
11. Develop additional pocket parks and green space in the Vernal area.
12. Establish bike paths in Vernal.
13. Privatize Dutch John.

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Surveys:

According to the Vernal City Planner, the city's General Plan for the development of the city, which is currently in the process of being approved by the Planning Commission, addresses items 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12. He also noted that item 11 for the city of Vernal will be addressed through the Vernal City's Capital Improvement Projects, listed in one, five and ten year plans, and currently under review by the city council.

As previously mentioned, Roosevelt residents were eager to share ideas on various open space and recreation projects needed for their community. This included \$200,000 in funding for a ten acre expansion of Constitution Park and construction of a new facility in the Old Park in Roosevelt. Other ideas identified were: funding for improvement and maintenance of the Duchesne City golf course; funding for a visitor center in Roosevelt that would serve the entire region by dispensing information to tourists and recreationists on available activities in the region; funding for more rest areas in the region to accommodate those traveling back and forth from Salt Lake City to the Uintah Basin; and, funding for restoration of the basketball courts at a local recreation area in Roosevelt.

Points of Contact Mentioned:

- A. For additional information on the Vernal City General Plan or the Vernal City Capital Improvement Projects, contact the Vernal City Planner, Russ Pearson, at (435) 789-2255.
- B. For information on projects already occurring in the Uintah Basin, it was suggested we contact the following people:
 - Clayton Chester, AOG Planner, (435) 738-1151.
 - Jim Lekes, Uintah Public Lands Council, (435) 545-2477.

Summary and Integration with Phase 2

In all three phases of the project, the issue of multiple-use of public lands was deemed to be very important for the Uintah Basin. Numerous respondents commented on the excess of public land and open space in the area and how "open space" is not a concern for residents of rural Utah. According to many of the respondents (especially those in Phase 3) land use restrictions due to Federal regulations is one of their biggest concerns. Many people felt that the decisions being made by the various Federal agencies in the region regarding the use of public land, could have detrimental effect on local economies. It was also apparent from the anger and frustration expressed by these respondents that they felt left out of the decision-making process, and helpless to influence decisions directly effecting their communities. These issues are directly tied to another issue that often surfaced during the various phases of this project; the need for

stronger partnerships between private, local, Federal, state, and tribal entities. Although this issue was listed as one of the top ten issues for both question one and two, and was frequently addressed during the other phases of the project, no ideas were offered on how to develop these partnerships and allow local governments and residents more say in the decision-making process for public land in the region.

Most written and verbal comments regarding the use of open space in the Uintah Basin agreed that public land should be “protected” for multiple-use. The region’s economy is based upon a mix of industries (e.g., oil, mineral, timber, and tourism) that are dependent upon both the area’s natural resources and access to public land. Some participants did express concern, however, that recreational use has not been deemed as important as other uses. This is reflected in item 6 of question one (Instill in the community that open space and recreation have value), as well as in comments received during Phase 2 of the project (“Validate recreation as a segment of economic development in the region”; “Comprehensive planning that includes direction on tourism benefits, local economic impacts, and marketing of developed areas”). Although the mayor of Roosevelt commented that residents in his community do understand the economic value of recreation, some of the comments in Phase 2 suggest this attitude may not be held region wide.

Lastly, the issue of funding to help communities develop and maintain recreational facilities was frequently mentioned in all phases of this project, but again, there was no clear indication of how communities are addressing this problem. It was one of the top ten priorities identified during Phase 2, and most of the responses from the Roosevelt meeting identified specific recreational needs for the community that require immediate funding.

There are three possible roles the state could play in addressing the concerns most frequently identified for the Uintah Basin. The first is to serve a liaison between the rural communities, the local industries dependent upon access to public land and resources, and the Federal agencies administering the lands. Their role would be to help facilitate discussions regarding the future use of public lands in this region, and ensure that all stakeholders are informed and involved in the decision-making process. The second role would be to help communities in the region prioritize their recreational needs, and serve as a funding source to help them meet these priorities. Lastly, through the use of the Utah Travel Council, the state could help to educate local residents on the benefits the region is already receiving from tourism and recreation, as well as additional ways they can develop this industry to further diversify their economies.

CENTRAL PLANNING DISTRICT

Counties: Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne

Six Counties Public Lands Forum, Richfield, November 9, 1999

Approximately 12 individuals attended this meeting of county commissioners and state and Federal agency land managers. One person had also attended the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference, and he helped provide historical context about the conference and past funding (such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund [LWCF]) for state parks and other land and recreation opportunities. He said that many of the planning district's existing recreation facilities and infrastructure are dated, and since new LWCF and other funds may become available, local and regional project ideas are needed. Another participant pointed out that a state fund exists to protect agricultural open space.

Five attendees stayed for a detailed discussion of existing or potential recreation and open space projects. The discussion focused on existing or potential water, trail, and state park projects. Key concerns were increasing access and activity opportunities, improving existing park and recreation infrastructure, and increasing the contribution of recreation and tourism to local economic development. There was opposition to designating additional public lands or restricting access to existing lands. (The Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument was cited as a bad precedent, although one person pointed out it was better to be involved in planning such actions, rather than "growling" about it after the fact.) Increasing cooperation between different agencies and jurisdictions and recognizing local needs were also concerns. While ensuring access and diversity of uses was a concern, so was the need to manage trail use to minimize conflict.

A couple of participants were concerned with the selectivity of survey respondents and that the study results were not representative of all planning district residents, and one participant felt that two of the most important priorities identified in Phase 1 should not be lost in Phase 2 results:

3. Establish an ongoing facility development and maintenance fund (13% Phase 1 votes, ranked 22nd in survey)
4. Spend available funds where highest use is occurring (12% of Phase 1 votes, ranked 30th in survey but with high standard deviation)

Six County Association of Governments Executive Board Meeting, Richfield, Nov. 10, 1999

This meeting was attended by 12 persons, including county commissioners, mayors, and other

presenters. Three individuals (including the chairman of this board) had attended the Public Lands Forum meeting on 11/9. There was little discussion, but four worksheets were returned. Most input suggested an emphasis on economic development and ensuring continued “multi use” and “joint use” of public land and open space. The economic development emphasis was also contained in other meeting agenda items related to open space issues (e.g., the Board’s desire to obtain rights-of-way for a railroad spur to move coal from the SUFCO mine to the IPP plant in the West Desert, and to encourage National Forest aspen harvesting to keep an aspen processing plant economically viable).

Framework of Issues and Concerns:

Question 1: What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?

1. Protect RS2477 roads
2. Develop outdoor recreation opportunities that will help support local economic development
3. Help Congress and legislature understand the needs
4. Protect and improve water resources
5. Encourage a united effort on the part of public land agencies
6. Address public and private access concerns
7. Educate trail users on the compatibility of off-highway vehicle and non-off-highway vehicle uses
8. Keep agricultural land agricultural
9. Offer a greater number of dispersed recreation opportunities
10. Maintain and complete existing program

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing “**Protect RS2477 roads**”;
 - A. Need to protect and control use of off-highway vehicles (OHVs) on public land.
2. Addressing “**Develop outdoor recreation opportunities that will help support local economic development**”;
 - A. Expand whitewater use in Marysville Canyon on Sevier River (with private operator)
 - B. Continue to develop and open beaches at Yuba Lake
 - C. Develop interpretive effort at ghost towns and gold mining sites on Tushar Mountain.
 - D. Expand Richfield golf course from 9 to 18 holes
 - E. Build new golf course in Wayne County

- F. Fort Deseret–restoration and interpretation Mormon mud fort near Delta
 - G. Paiute All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) Trail–needs infrastructure development (e.g., restrooms)–has potential for economic development
 - H. Lemington Coke kilns– need for restoration and development
 - I. Puffer Lake–has potential for development as State Park
 - J. Hatchtown Reservoir could be developed for water-based recreation
 - K. Help train and setup dude ranch facilities
 - L. Develop multi-agency information center in Torrey
3. Addressing **“Help Congress and legislature understand the needs”**;
No specific projects identified
4. Addressing **“Protect and improve water resources”**;
- A. Recreation development needs at Piute Reservoir. Current water allocation not enough to meet increased demand and recreational uses, dam safety, and flood protection
 - B. The Narrows Project–dam along Skyline Drive–\$16 or \$17 million project has potential for recreational sports but “bogged down” due to water rights disputes
 - C. Puffer Lake--has potential for development as state park
 - D. Replace recreation facilities at Fish Lake Basin
5. Addressing **“Encourage a united effort on the part of public land agencies”**;
- A. Educate governor and U.S. Congress to allow continued use of West Desert
 - B. Connect Paiute trail with Southwest Trail in Beaver, Iron, and Washington Counties (Bureau of Land Management land)
 - C. Develop a multi-agency information center in Torrey
6. Addressing **“Address public and private access concerns”**;
- A. Possible loss of “multi use” in West Desert (west of Delta) will cause hardship on Central West and Northern Utah. That space has been used for generations.
 - B. Connect Paiute trail with Southwest Trail in Beaver, Iron, and Washington Counties (BLM land)
 - C. Paiute ATV Trail–needs infrastructure development (e.g., restrooms)
 - D. We do not want wilderness areas in Mussentuchit Badlands, Jones Bench, and Limestone Cliffs
7. Addressing **“Educate trail users on the compatibility of off-highway vehicle and non-off-highway vehicle uses”**;
- A. Develop a multi-agency information center in Torrey

8. Addressing **“Keep agricultural land agricultural”**;
 - A. Meeting comment: existing funds available at state level

9. Addressing **“Offer a greater number of dispersed recreation opportunities”**;
 - A. Develop hiking/biking trails in Marysvale Canyon—continue to develop Marysvale to Joseph rail to trail effort.
 - B. Expand snowmobile trails and groom trails
 - C. Snowmobile trail grading--Manti-LaSal National Forest
 - D. Bicycle trails in Sanpete County.
 - E. Need to protect and control use of OHVs on public land.
 - F. Connect Paiute trail with Southwest Trail in Beaver, Iron, and Washington Counties (BLM land)
 - G. Paiute ATV Trail—needs infrastructure development (e.g., restrooms)

10. Addressing **“Maintain and complete existing programs”**;

Many of the items listed above address this priority, including 2A, B, and G, 4A,B, and D, and 9B and C.

Question 2: *What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?*

1. Develop a dependable funding source for operation and maintenance of the Piute and Great Western Trails
2. Protect landowner's rights
3. Increase funding for county infrastructure
4. Develop Skyline Drive in Sanpete County
5. Coordinate a master plan between cities and counties
6. Initiate conservation and recreation development at Piute Reservoir
7. Develop trails linking towns to public lands
8. Develop more urban trails and parkways for jogging, biking, etc.
9. Develop local funding opportunities (promotion groups, special interest organizations, etc.
10. Allow for better access management

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing **“Develop a dependable funding source for operation and maintenance of the Piute and Great Western Trails”**;

No specific projects identified

2. Addressing **“Protect landowner’s rights”**;
 - A. Open space protection methods should protect private property rights, give owners flexibility, and allow for adequate compensation in both present and future
 - B. In controlling growth, it is vital to protect the rights of property owners so they may obtain the best possible price for their land

3. Addressing **“Increase funding for county infrastructure”**;
No specific projects identified

4. Addressing **“Develop Skyline Drive in Sanpete County”**;
 - A. Skyline Drive in Sanpete county

5. Addressing **“Coordinate a master plan between cities and counties”**;
 - A. More jogging, walking, and biking trails around joint use with county and city use
 - B. Connect Paiute trail with Southwest Trail in Beaver, Iron, and Washington Counties (BLM land)

6. Addressing **“Initiate conservation and recreation development at Piute Reservoir.”**
 - A. Recreational development needs at Piute Reservoir
 - B. More jogging, walking, and biking trails around joint use with county and city use

7. Addressing **“Develop trails linking towns to public lands”**;
 - A. Continue to develop Marysvale to Joseph rail to trail effort
 - B. Snowmobile trail grading--Manti-Lasal National Forest
 - C. Bicycle trails in Sanpete County
 - D. Connect Paiute trail with Southwest Trail in Beaver, Iron, and Washington Counties (BLM land)
 - E. Paiute ATV Trail--needs infrastructure development (e.g., restrooms)

8. Addressing **“Develop more urban trails and parkways for jogging, biking, etc”**;
 - A. More jogging, walking, and biking trails around joint use with county and city use

9. Addressing **“Develop local funding opportunities (promotion groups, special interest organizations, etc”**;
No specific projects identified

10. Addressing **“Allow for better access management”**;
 - A. Need to protect and control use of OHVs on public land
 - B. Develop a multi-agency information center in Torrey

Summary and Integration with Phase 2:

The key themes from all three study phases for the Central Planning District are using recreation and open space resources to 1) help increase local economic development, 2) expand and improve infrastructure for roads and trails (for increasing and protecting existing access opportunities *and* providing unique recreational experiences), 3) develop and protect local water resources, and 4) develop or expand historic/heritage and state park developments that can help increase economic return or protect local/traditional lifestyles and uses.

While there are many existing individual initiatives to meet the specific open space priorities identified in Phases 1 and 2, there seems to be few initiatives relating to broader priorities such as funding, education, and coordination. Specifically, they include: providing a united effort among public land agencies, addressing private access concerns, protecting agricultural land and private landowner rights, coordinating plans between cities and counties and between public and private sectors, developing new funding opportunities for certain projects (e.g., trails and reservoirs), developing consistent funding for areas that have aging infrastructure or heavy use, and education of legislators, recreation visitors, and residents.

The types of open space projects and initiatives identified fit very nicely with the open space protection and management tools thought to be most useful by Central Planning District Phase 2 survey respondents. The highest ranked tools include; *Agriculture Protection Zones, Cluster Zoning and Conservation Subdivisions, Easements, Intergovernmental Agreements, Impact Fees, and Exactions and Dedications.*

SOUTHWEST PLANNING DISTRICT

Counties: Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington

Color Country Resource Conservation and Development Council, Cedar City, October 19, 1999. Approximately eighteen individuals attended this meeting representing a mix of elected officials and private citizens. Included were two individuals who had attended the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference and completed Phase 2 surveys. Some open space items were on the agenda, so the presentation was well received. Six to eight individuals stayed after the meeting to participate in the Phase 3 workshop.

Southwest Utah Planning Authority Council (SUPAC), St. George, November 2, 1999. Approximately thirty individuals attended this meeting. The agenda was quite full, meaning a very long meeting, with the Open Space Project presentation coming toward the end of the agenda before new business. Although the presentation was generally well received, the attention of the participants was waning.

Five Counties Association of Governments, St. George, November 10, 1999.

Approximately twenty individuals attended this meeting, including county commissioners, mayors, staff, and other presenters. The agenda was full, and because of the time constraint with other agenda items following, the Open Space Project presentation was a bit rushed. Several county commissioners from rural counties were quite negative with regards to the protection of open space, expressing the need for continued public access to recreation lands. However, the city planner in attendance from St. George was quite receptive to some of the findings since he was dealing with recreational needs and open space in city planning.

Framework of Issues and Concerns:

Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next twenty years?*

1. Find proper balance among development, recreation, dispersed recreation, and wilderness.
2. Better cooperation and communication among Federal, state, and local groups to plan and execute recreation programs for the future.
3. Establish a program to work with communities to develop community trail systems (e.g. Cole Creek).
4. Increase children and adult awareness for protecting and enjoying nature through education programs.
5. Coordinate, acquire, and construct the Three Rivers Trail in Washington County (Gunlock to Zion).

6. Protect and improve wildlife habitat.
7. Address staffing and facility issues based upon increased visitation.
8. Preserve farm land.

9. Locate and designate a trail system for off-highway vehicle (OHV) users to reduce conflict.
10. Enforce protection of archaeological resources.

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Surveys:

1 Addressing “Find proper balance among development, recreation, dispersed recreation, and wilderness”;

None identified.

2. Addressing “Better cooperation and communication among Federal, state, and local groups to plan and execute recreation programs for the future”;

- A. Issue for Zion National Park is the need to establish/provide a legal authority for adjacent towns and cities to establish conservation easements to protect open space. There are properties adjacent to the park that can and should be protected as conservation easements, but there does not seem to be any unified authority to do so.

3. Addressing “Establish a program to work with communities to develop community trail systems (e.g. Cole Creek)”;

- A. Kanab needs grants for funding trail development for all-terrain vehicle (ATV) users and hikers.

4. Addressing “Increase children and adult awareness for protecting and enjoying nature through education programs”;

None identified.

5. Addressing “Coordinate, acquire, and construct the Three Rivers Trail in Washington County (Gunlock to Zion)”;

Project specific

6. Addressing “Protect and improve wildlife habitat”;

None identified.

7. Addressing “Address staffing and facility issues based upon increased visitation”;

None identified.

8. Addressing **“Preserve farm land”**;

None identified.

9. Addressing **“Locate and designate a trail system for off-highway vehicle (OHV) users to reduce conflict”**;

None identified.

10. Addressing **“Enforce protection of archaeological resources.”**

A. Finish the Parowan Gap project and develop interpretation. Develop a statewide guide to all archaeological resources on all lands. Link these archaeological resources together and market as a package.

Question 2: What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?

1. Establish funding sources and technical assistance.
2. Urban sprawl—improper development into open spaces.
3. Address concern about the state legislature’s bias against acquisition funds.
4. Within city planning, emphasize recreation planning.
5. Increase funding for small communities for purchase of critical lands for development of recreation facilities (e.g. Confluence Project and Three Rivers Trail).
6. Develop new trails and enforce the use of existing trails for off-road vehicle (ORV) use in Washington County.
7. Volunteerism! Encourage and utilize human resources and talents.
8. Find and develop water resources.
9. Acquire property for park, recreation, and interpretive opportunities (e.g. Kanarrville City, Austin property, Boulder, Confluence, Washington County).
10. Protect and improve wildlife habitat and areas.

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Surveys:

1. Addressing **“Establish funding sources and technical assistance”**;

None identified.

2. Addressing **“Urban sprawl—improper development into open spaces”**;

None identified.

3. Addressing **“Address concern about the state legislature’s bias against acquisition funds”**;

None identified.

4. Addressing **“Within city planning, emphasize recreation planning”**;

None identified.

5. Addressing **“Increase funding for small communities for purchase of critical lands for development of recreation facilities (e.g. Confluence Project and Three Rivers Trail)”**;

A. Three Rivers Trail—this is a backbone of a trail system that goes from Zion to Gunlock. Along with this “main trail” is a network of trails that branch off and go to each community and some scenic wonders found within each community. In Ivins, for example, one of fourteen communities along the trail, there are six major trails and trailheads. Each community probably has similar numbers of trails and trailheads.

6. Addressing **“Develop new trails and enforce the use of existing trails for off-road vehicle (ORV) use in Washington County”**;

None identified.

7. Addressing **“Volunteerism! Encourage and utilize human resources and talents”**;

None identified.

8. Addressing **“Find and develop water resources”**;

A. Kanarraville Canyon, Kolob Reservoir, Sand Hollow Reservoir, Gunlock Reservoir, could all be developed for water based recreation and some possibly as state parks.

9. Addressing **“Acquire property for park, recreation, and interpretive opportunities (e.g. Kanarraville City, Austin property, Boulder, Confluence, Washington County)”**;

A. Kanarraville Canyon, Kolob Reservoir, Sand Hollow Reservoir, Gunlock Reservoir, Hatchtown Reservoir, Puffer Lake, Old Irontown could all be

developed for recreation and possibly state parks.

10. Addressing “**Protect and improve wildlife habitat and areas**”;

None identified.

Summary and Integration with Phase 2:

Unfortunately, as one can see, very little information was acquired from participants at the three meetings in the Southwest Planning District on specific projects that would address the identified issues. In fact, no worksheets were returned at all. Perhaps the lack of response was due to the very full agendas at the meetings that resulted in some very lengthy meetings. The little information gleaned focused on the areas of land protection issues surrounding Zion National Park, the need for funding for trail development at the regional, county, and community levels, interpretation of archaeological resources, and the development of water resources for recreational purposes. Perhaps one theme evident to the researchers from attending these meetings and interacting with the participants is that efforts in meeting recreational and open space needs must benefit local residents. Local control in decision-making is important to the residents of these largely rural counties, a “bottom-up” approach, rather than “top-down” decision-making from state and Federal agencies, without local involvement. It is evident that further research is needed in the Southwest Planning District in order to identify specific initiatives and projects that would meet recreational and open space needs.

SOUTHEAST PLANNING DISTRICT
Counties: Carbon, Emery, Grand, and San Juan

Canyonlands Travel Region Economic Development Committee, Moab, October 19,

1999

About half the 14 people who attended this meeting were members of the Development Committee. The rest of the attendees included other presenters and members of the general public. One individual in attendance had participated in the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference and the Phase 2 survey. The presentation was very well received and 6 people remained after the meeting for the project workshop. Many of the comments made during the presentation and the workshop related to the economic benefit derived by local communities from visitation to the public lands in this planning district. Therefore, most of the specific open space protection or management projects suggested by this group had a rural economic benefit slant to them.

Canyonlands Travel Council Community Development and Visitor Services Committee, Bluff, November 9, 1999

All of the 10 people who attended this meeting were members of the committee or supporting staff. Several of the other agenda items were directly concerned with open space issues and areas of concern, so the Open Space Project presentation was well received by this group. Committee members were most interested in discussing projects that had a basic economic development aspect to them. The chairman of this committee, a member of the governing council of the Navajo Indian Reservation, volunteered to report on this project to the tribal council.

Southeast Association of Governments, Price, November 10, 1999

Approximately 25 people attended this meeting and included county commissioners, mayors, supporting staff, other presenters, and members of the general public. Two individuals in attendance had participated in either the Utah's Great Outdoors Conference or the Phase 2 survey. The presentation generated considerable interest and a lively discussion among attendees. In addition to ideas for specific open space protection or management projects, several issues and areas of concern which had not been included in the Phase 2 survey were identified.

Framework of Issues and Concerns:

Question 1: *What do you feel are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space needs in your region of the state for the next 20 years?*

1. Go beyond talk and produce results
2. Establish long range plans that deal with recreational users
3. Protect public lands and resources which includes stewardship, education, and controls
4. Educate users on appropriate activities in region
5. Protect regional significant, historic, and heritage features
6. Protect and improve the quality of life for southeast Utah residents

7. Find long range funding sources for facilities and infrastructure
8. Acquire necessary funding to improve existing recreational areas
9. Increase collaboration- decrease polarization
10. Protect and preserve cultural resources
11. Protect and improve riparian areas
12. Wilderness issues need to be resolved
13. Protect certain areas from development

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing **“Go beyond talk and produce results”**;
 - A. Put some action behind the 21st Century Communities initiative
 - B. Give more decision-making powers to local communities to benefit local residents
 - C. Develop laws/regulations to benefit small companies in resource-related industries
 - D. Plan to transfer Federally managed lands to state ownership to maximize potential
2. Addressing **“Establish long range plans that deal with recreational users”**;
 - A. Plan to transfer Federally managed lands to state ownership to maximize potential
 - B. Collaborative efforts to better plan for sustainability of all resources, including recreation
 - C. Produce off-road vehicle use plan for San Juan County
 - D. Plan to protect access to open space areas for all uses- off-highway vehicles, roads
 - E. Feasibility study for San Rafael Swell Natural Area
 - F. Develop a region-wide cultural resources protection plan
 - G. Develop a recreation growth management plan for Emery County
 - H. Corridor management plans are needed to address open space concerns
3. Addressing **“Protect public lands and resources which includes stewardship, education, and controls”**;
 - A. Educate foreign visitors about open space protection tools and practices
 - B. Develop incentives for businesses to help preserve open space areas
 - C. Collaborative efforts to better plan for sustainability of all resources, including recreation
 - D. Improve outdoor education for children in planning district schools
 - E. Maximize funding for Forest Legacy Program for protection of privately owned forest lands
 - F. Watershed protection plan addressing timber harvesting on private land- Emery and Carbon
 - G. Develop a collaborative plan for management of sovereign lands along Green and Colorado Rivers

- H. Develop programs to interpret natural and cultural resources on public lands
- 4. Addressing **“Educate users on appropriate activities in region”**;
 - A. Educate foreign visitors about open space protection tools and practices
 - B. Improve outdoor education for children in planning district schools
 - C. Develop programs to interpret natural and cultural resources on public lands
- 5. Addressing **“Protect regional significant, historic, and heritage features”**;
 - A. Protect cultural resources on Cedar Mesa
 - B. Develop region-wide cultural resources protection plan
 - C. Watershed protection plan addressing timber harvesting on private land- Emery and Carbon
 - D. Need funds to protect prehistoric and historic resources from development
- 6. Addressing **“Protect and improve the quality of life for southeast Utah residents”**;
 - A. Need funding for mini-parks in development areas
 - B. Need funding for purchasing small open space parcels within cities and towns
 - C. Develop a plan for a more equitable distribution of sales and room taxes to rural areas
 - D. Develop a plan to maximize commodity uses of public lands to benefit local communities
 - E. Give more decision-making powers to local communities for benefit of local residents
- 7. Addressing **“Find long range funding sources for facilities and infrastructure”**;
 - A. Funding is needed for infrastructure in Green River
 - B. Plan to transfer Federally managed lands to state ownership to maximize potential
 - C. Develop a plan for a more equitable distribution of sales and room taxes to rural areas
- 8. Addressing **“Acquire necessary funding to improve existing recreational areas”**;
 - A. Develop a plan for a more equitable distribution of sales and room taxes to rural areas
 - B. Funding is needed for infrastructure in Green River
- 9. Addressing **“Increase collaboration- decrease polarization”**;
 - A. Collaborative plan for management of sovereign lands along the Green and Colorado Rivers
 - B. Collaborative efforts to better plan for sustainability of all resources, including recreation
- 10. Addressing **“Protect and preserve cultural resources”**;
 - A. Protect cultural resources on Cedar Mesa
 - B. Develop a region-wide cultural resources protection plan
 - C. Funds are needed to protect prehistoric and historic resources from development

11. Addressing **“Protect and improve riparian areas”**;
 - A. Funds are needed for creek preservation in developed areas
 - B. Develop a plan for methods to protect watershed areas- other than using zoning

12. Addressing **“Wilderness issues need to be resolved”**;
 - A. Collaborative efforts to better plan for sustainability of all resources, including recreation
 - B. Feasibility study for San Rafael Swell Natural Area

13. Addressing **“Protect certain areas from development”**;
 - A. Funding is needed to purchase property to preserve as open space
 - B. Funding is needed to purchase small parcels with cities and towns
 - C. Incentives are needed for businesses to help preserve open space areas
 - D. Mini-parks need to be included in development areas
 - E. Develop incentives for new home owners to help preserve open space areas
 - F. Collaborative plan for management of sovereign lands along Green and Colorado Rivers
 - G. Develop a plan for controlling development in Scofield area

Question 2: What are the most pressing outdoor recreation and open space problems or needs for specific towns and communities in your region of the state?

1. Include as part of the curriculum outdoor education programs in public schools
2. Improve and protect water quality on the rivers and reservoirs on the San Rafael drainage
3. Improve and protect water quality for Scofield Reservoir and Price River water drainage
4. Resolve wilderness issues so communities and businesses can plan accordingly
5. Protect cultural resources on Cedar Mesa
6. Coordinate the overall management of recreational growth in Emery County
7. Plan for the use of riverways
8. Develop funding sources for the development of recreation infrastructures and/or facilities
9. Set aside biases- think outside the box with regards to economic opportunity associated with recreational opportunities
10. Address the need to obtain land and funding for parks and recreation facilities

Results from Phase 3 Meeting Workshops and Worksheets and Phase 2 Survey:

1. Addressing **“Include as part of the curriculum outdoor education programs in public schools”**;
 - A. Improve outdoor education for children in planning district schools

2. Addressing **“Improve and protect water quality on the rivers and reservoirs on the**

San Rafael drainage”;

- A. Protect water quality on San Rafael drainage
- B. Watershed protection plan addressing timber harvesting on private land- Emery and Carbon
- C. Feasibility study for San Rafael Swell Natural Area

3. Addressing **“Improve and protect water quality for Scofield Reservoir and Price River water drainage”;**

- A. Plan for development in Scofield area
- B. Protect water quality in the Price River drainage
- C. Protect water quality in Scofield Reservoir
- D. Watershed protection plan addressing timber harvesting on private land- Emery and Carbon

4. Addressing **“Resolve wilderness issues so communities and businesses can plan accordingly”;**

- A. Collaborative efforts to better plan for sustainability of all resources, including recreation

5. Addressing **“Protect cultural resources on Cedar Mesa”;**

- A. Develop a plan for protection of cultural resources on Cedar Mesa

6. Addressing **“Coordinate the overall management of recreational growth in Emery County”;**

- A. Develop a recreational growth management plan for Emery County

7. Addressing **“Plan for the use of riverways”;**

- A. Collaborative efforts to better plan for sustainability of all resources- including recreation
- B. Restrictions on prolonged dispersed camping in Moab area
- C. Feasibility study for San Rafael Swell Natural Area
- D. Corridor management plans are needed to address open space concerns

8. Addressing **“Develop funding sources for the development of recreation infrastructures and/or facilities”;**

- A. Funding is needed for infrastructure in Green River
- B. Plan to transfer Federally managed lands to state ownership to maximize potential
- C. Develop a plan for a more equitable distribution of sales and room taxes to rural areas

9. Addressing “**Set aside biases- think outside the box with regards to economic opportunity associated with recreational opportunities**”;

- A. Collaborative efforts to better plan for sustainability of all resources- including recreation
- B. Collaborative plan for management of sovereign lands along Green and Colorado Rivers

10. Addressing “**Address the need to obtain land and funding for parks and recreation facilities**”;

- A. Funding is needed for infrastructure in Green River
- B. Plan to transfer Federally managed lands to state ownership to maximize potential
- C. Develop a plan for a more equitable distribution of sales and room taxes to rural areas
- D. Incentives for businesses to help preserve open space areas
- E. Plan to maximize commodity uses of public lands to benefit of local communities
- F. Develop laws and regulations to benefit small companies in resource-related industries

Other projects:

- A. State park and a visitor center around Recapture Reservoir
- B. Develop inter/intra-community trail facilities: Price to Castle Dale
- C. Develop trail system linking Moab with Spanish Valley
- D. Plan for management of coal bed methane areas west of Highway 10 (Emery County)
- E. Change the make-up of the state legislature to obtain more equitable rural representation
- F. Develop a plan for region wide wetlands preservation

Points of Contact Mentioned:

Calvin Balch, Mayor of Blanding
Ed Sharik, Monticello (San Juan County Planner)
Karen Jorgenson- Moab Bureau of Land Management
Southern Utah Land Users
Canyonlands Field Institute
Canyon Country Partnership
Seeking Common Ground

Summary and Integration with Phase 2:

Of the 42 specific open space protection or management projects identified for this planning district, almost one-third of them came directly from the Phase 2 survey. In addition, many of the projects identified at the public meetings or on the worksheets were not locally specific nor solely open space protection related; proposing, instead, such things as changes in tax revenue distribution or in the make-up of the state legislature to benefit rural areas. It

was apparent that these proposals were very important to local officials and residents and could have implications for open space protection, hence their inclusion in this report. A significant number of projects called for collaborative efforts in planning and management and many others proposed a realignment of the traditional land management structure. This is reflective of the general feeling among residents in this planning area to reduce state and Federal-level controls and influence and place more responsibility and authority in the hands of local decision makers and community and business leaders. Underlying many of the proposals and projects identified for this planning district seems to be a resentment that they are providing recreational opportunities for residents of the Wasatch Front counties and are not, in turn, receiving adequate distribution of state resources to help them provide those opportunities. More simply put, southeast Utah residents feel that the users, the majority of whom come from outside the planning district, should bear more of the costs associated with providing the recreational opportunities they enjoy. In addition, there was a strong sentiment among attendees at the public meetings that there are sufficient open space protection measures already in place and no further controls or restrictions are needed in this planning district.

Five out of the top six highest ranked open space protection tools were identified in the Phase 2 survey as being tools available only to local governments: *Agricultural Land/Open Space Zoning, Agriculture Protection Areas, Impact Fees, Sensitive Lands Overlays, and Special Areas Preservation/Mitigation Programs*. It is also within the power of both city and county governments to utilize the other highest ranked tool, *Easements*, for help with protecting access to public lands. This is further reinforcement of the desire of local officials and residents to maximize their control of open space and recreation resources within this planning district.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Regarding program priorities, it is obvious that open space issues are of vital concern in Utah. Literally hundreds of local and planning district level projects were identified through Phase 3 meetings, workshops, and worksheets, and many of the regular agenda items at those meetings dealt with open space related issues. The Open Space Project presentations were generally well received and often generated extensive discussion. Over 300 specific existing and potential projects were identified. While there was strong agreement in the meetings about the importance of the projects and initiatives, questions about the purpose, role, and administration of open space projects were sometimes hotly debated. These debates illustrate there is agreement on the value of open space in general, but differences of opinion exist concerning the importance of different open space *values*.

Utah's Great Outdoors Open Space Project: Phase 3 Results

There was a high level of correspondence between the projects and initiatives identified as part of Phase 3 and the general priorities and needs identified in Phases 1 and 2. However, most of the Phase 3 projects addressed relatively *specific* needs like trails, water projects, critical lands, and infrastructure needs, and few initiatives were related to the more *general* types of open space needs like funding, partnerships, education, and planning. Meeting discussions often related to the difficulties of funding and administering projects and methods for prioritizing and collaborating on projects. The role of the state government is central to both of these concerns, and they need to be incorporated in a defined open space mission and in grant criteria.

There was also a good fit between the kinds of projects identified and the open space protection and management tools felt to be most useful by Phase 2 survey respondents from each planning district. For example, many projects would require the use of *Easements* in order to make them happen. *Easements* was considered to be the most useful of these tools each planning district.

The list of specific projects in this report would be useful to the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation in updating the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) and helping develop sources of funds for these projects. In addition, the Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, as the state university outdoor recreation and tourism extension organization, could provide assistance of various types (planning, design, grant writing, etc.) to those entities responsible for the projects.