

*Public Meeting of Site Futures Committee
Subcommittee of Moab Tailings Project Steering Committee
Development of Alternatives Meeting -- Sessions 1 and 2 -- July 9 and 10, 2013
APPROVED MINUTES
Board Room, Grand County Public Library 257 E. Center St.
Moab, Utah 84532*

The following individuals were present:

Site Futures Committee (SFC) Members:

Norm Boyd, At-Large
Krissie Braun, Grand County (session 2 only)
Sabrina Henry, National Park Service (session 2 only)
Jason Johnson, Utah Fire, Forestry, and State Lands
Saxon Sharpe, At-Large, Vice Chair
Rock Smith, Bureau of Land Management
Russ von Koch, At-Large, Chair

Citizens

None

The following SFC members were absent and no designee was present on their behalf:

July 9 & 10 Donna Metzler, Moab City; Lee Shenton, UMTRA Steering Committee Liaison was out of town.

1. Call to Order -- The first session of the meeting was called to order at 1:02 p.m. on July 9 by Chair Russ von Koch.

2. Approval of Minutes -- Minutes of the May 20, 2012 meeting were approved by unanimous vote.

3. Discussion Items

A. Review of input received after May 20th meeting. -- Russ reviewed input from a citizen suggesting that the committee seek additional water rights from the Colorado River so that a pipeline could be built to Kens Lake to help assure adequate water for Moab and Spanish Valley in the future. Saxon reviewed additional input received on-line similar to earlier suggestions.

B. Consideration of themes for alternatives and development of alternatives including preliminary alternative maps.

-- Russ began by asking Saxon to review the comments received at the May 15 public meeting and during the subsequent comment period. Saxon reported that about 60

different comments were received and entered into a spreadsheet. Sabrina then reported that the comments were grouped into categories and that several themes had been identified including restoration, trails, community park, energy generation and development, and commercial use.

The committee reviewed the comments and begin the process of building the alternatives by going through the list of suggested uses and putting them on draft alternative maps. This process occupied the remainder of the meeting on July 9.

The first session of the alternatives meeting adjourned at 4 pm on July 9.

The second session of the alternatives meeting convened at 1 pm on July 10.

The committee returned to its task of developing draft alternatives by locating additional suggested uses on base maps. During this session, it was determined that a number of uses fit the site well, did not conflict with other alternatives, or would likely be relatively inexpensive to implement. These site uses were identified on a separate “common to all alternatives” map.

The committee also decided that the energy conservation and generation comments were a special type of common to all uses that could be addressed by matching the level of energy generation and conservation with the themes of each alternative. Consequently, it was decided to not develop a separate energy related alternative.

Several uses, including a beach area, fishing lake, and wind farm were identified as not reasonably feasible for site factor reasons (i.e., respectively -- outside muddy bend of the river, low depth to highly saline water, and lack of good potential for wind) and were consequently not included in an alternative.

By the end of the second work session, the committee identified the following four alternatives to present at the September 18 workshop for public review: 1) Restoration and Trails, 2) Community Park, 3) Commercial Use, and 4) Combined Use. The combined use alternative was identified during discussion as a vehicle for exploring how the site might be planned to accommodate most of the suggested uses while maintaining a reasonable degree of compatibility among uses. It was also agreed to present the common to all alternatives as a separate map to facilitate public review.

Russ agreed to write up descriptions of the alternatives and present them to the members via email for review and comment. Russ and Sabrina also agreed to work with NPS GIS staff to develop maps displaying the alternatives for committee review by email and subsequent public review.

C. Consideration of planning for September 18 After the Pile Alternatives public meeting

-- It was decided that the September 18 meeting would generally follow the same format at the May 15 public meeting, except that the SFC would review the comments received on future uses, briefly describe the alternatives developed by the SFC, and ask participants to complete a form evaluating the alternatives. As during the May 15 meeting, participants would be able to post their comments on the alternative using sticky notes and support other comments with stars. Sabrina volunteered to again have NPS produce the maps for public review.

D. Member updates and assignments. -- No reports were made.

E. Assessment of project timeline. -- Russ asked if any additional discussion was necessary and the SFC members agreed that the project was on schedule and no further discussion was necessary.

F. Future meeting dates and suggested agenda items. -- Russ asked for suggestions for a future meeting date to prepare for the September 18 public workshop. It was agreed that no meeting was necessary in August and that members would work via e-mail to review the alternatives and other documents to be produced for the September 18 workshop. The next meeting was scheduled for September 9, 2012 from 1-4 at the Library Board Room. (Note, due to subsequent member schedule conflicts, the meeting was re-scheduled to September 10 from 12:30 to 3 pm.)

G. Other non-action items of general interest.-- Russ queried the members for other items of interest. No other items were identified.

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote at 3:50 p.m. on July 10

Minutes prepared by Russ von Koch, Chair
Site Futures Committee