

August 9, 2026

Ms. Wendy Gurr

Emigration Canyon City Planning Commission

P.O. Box 147700

Salt Lake City, Utah. 84114-7700

Dear Emigration Canyon City Planning Commission Members:

I am contacting you today to provide my comments on the Proposal to Create a Conservation Development Agreement. I am a resident of Emigration Oaks in Emigration Canyon and have serious concerns about this proposal. Therefore, I am in opposition to creation of this Conservation Development Agreement zone. My concerns are outlined below:

1. **Increased Fire Risk** – this area is land locked and would pose additional fire risk to Emigration Canyon. No fire trucks can access this area.
2. **Transportation to the Proposed Conservation Development Agreement Zone** – this area is land locked and there are no roads to transport materials and waste. Practically, this makes the proposal unworkable.
3. **Impact on Freeze Creek Water Supply** – The impact on our water supply from the Freeze Creeks wells would be greatly compromised. Waste from this proposed conservation development zone could significantly damage our well water quality.
4. **Adverse Impacts to the Quality of the Freeze Creek Trail and Emigration Oaks Subdivision** - Significant damage to the open spaces and trails that this conservation development zone proposal would create diminishes the recreational potential for this area.

I am against creation of a Conservation Development Agreement zone as described in the current proposal. Thank you for considering my comments as your review this proposal.

Sincerely,

Joan M. Gallegos

[REDACTED]

Salt Lake City, Utah 84108

[REDACTED]

From: [Herman Post](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Comments on Ryan Leick CDA for Planning Commission
Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 2:47:10 PM

Dear Emigration Canyon Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my strong disapproval of the Conservation Development Agreement with Ryan Leick that is being considered at the August 13th hearing. Not only do I disapprove of it, I am frankly incredulous that you would be even considering such an agreement.

You are surely aware, having recently gone through his recent application for Agricultural Protection Area, that almost everyone in Emigration Oaks is opposed to the development he proposes on his Freeze Creek property. There is no need to reiterate all of the specific objections that people have. You must also be aware of the lawsuit against The Oaks, Emigration Canyon and others, regarding his attempt to gain a right of way through our property to his land, which was recently dismissed.

I do not understand why the City would enter a development agreement with Mr. Leick at this particular time, while he still does not have the required access necessary to implement his plans. It makes no sense, and I can tell you that the residents of The Oaks feel betrayed. We are your constituents and you are supposed to represent us, not some non-resident landowner whose bizarre development plans are counter to goals and vision of Emigration Canyon.

We have been informed by our attorney that if you enter into this development agreement: "Leick will argue that City approval is governmentally recognized proof of vested rights as he returns his focus to the fight for access across land owned by Emigration Oaks and Salt Lake City." And there will surely be another lawsuit by Mr. Leick to gain the right of way and road that he needs. I repeat, why would you do this? Why would you jeopardize our ability to defend our privacy in The Oaks and contribute to the destruction of this beautiful canyon?

There is speculation that the City is entering this agreement to appease Mr. Leick and perhaps avoid further litigation, along with the attendant costs. If that is the case, then I can only say that I think that is a pathetic stance to take. Sometimes it takes money to protect our rights and do what is in the interest of our constituents. If the City needs money to defend itself, then let's raise the money somehow. Let's start a legal defense fund if that's what it takes, to defend the values of Emigration Canyon.

If you enter this agreement with Mr. Leick, and it ends up being a contributing factor to his gaining a right of way and a road, it will be a deep betrayal of your responsibilities to the residents of this Canyon. I sincerely hope you reconsider proceeding with this development agreement.

Thank you,

Herman Post

From: [Lisa Albright](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Cc: [Frederick Albright](#)
Subject: Conservation Development Agreement proposed by Applicant, Ryan Leick.
Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 10:30:45 PM

You don't often get email from lisa.cannon [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Wendy Gurr,

I strongly oppose the Ryan Leick development plan for his 40 acres.

I oppose his plan for construction of roads, bridges, and parking lots, and "agricultural" buildings. I oppose his production of biochar, his plans for a lumber mill, apiaries, solar arrays, helicopter access, a septic drain field. None of this is appropriate for this area and his proposal should not be approved.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lisa Cannon Albright

From: [Lindy Burton](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Deny Conservation Development Agreement
Date: Monday, August 10, 2026 9:48:04 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Wendy Gurr,

I am a resident of Emigration canyon and have lived with my family in the canyon for over 30 years. The proposal that Mr. Ryan Leick keeps trying to push through is an outrageous violation of the rule of law in place to protect Emigration canyon. It would change the nature of the canyon. We and the residents of the canyon are very united in wanting to protect the area, protect our way of life, protect the reasons we moved here. Mr. Leick has shown complete disregard for the residents and for the rulings that have already been made in opposition. Please end this threat to our precious community.

Thank you,

Lindy and Mark Burton

--

Email is not considered a secure medium. Therefore, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

Lindy S. Burton, L.C.S.W.

[REDACTED]

From: [edward ganellen](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Leick development
Date: Sunday, August 9, 2026 8:04:28 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

I don't know Mr Leick and have no personal vendetta against him. If he wishes to have a farm in an area that seems completely unsuitable for agriculture, I have no issue with his venture. However, if his folly requires building a road through property he does not own and in the process potentially damage a stream and a fragile ecosystem I strongly oppose his venture. Further, if he wishes to undertake burning on property in an area at high risk for forest fires without reasonable precautions or ability to contain or control fire I oppose activity which could threaten an entire community. If he wishes to bring in tourists without adequate transportation, sanitation, or parking, I oppose his project. His fantasy of a farm in this area benefits only him while jeopardizing an ecosystem and a neighborhood. Approval of this potentially damaging and dangerous project offers a potentially devastating precedent for other landlocked properties. I can see no benefit to the community in approving this development.

Thank you for your attention

Edward Ganellen

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Date: Leick Property Emigration Canyon
Monday, August 10, 2026 9:21:00 AM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

I thought Emigration Canyon City Council already rejected the proposed improvements to this property. Nevertheless, I strongly encourage the EC Planning Commission and the EC City Council to as strongly worded as possible REJECT this proposal for the following reasons:

1. Construction of the magnitude proposed by Mr. Leick would require building a road and bridges in the Freeze Creek drainage across property Mr. Leick does not own nor has access to. The proposed projects would require more than a simple two-track road. Construction materials and continued operation would require a heavy duty road suitable for dump and logging trucks. This drainage is critical to the culinary water supply of Emigration Oaks and to Emigration Canyon. Any construction in this drainage should never be allowed.
2. When Mr. Leick purchased the property he knew it was land-locked and beyond the reach of any improvements, and he has been "kicking against the pricks" ever since.
3. The proposed project flies in the face of every conceivable notion of fire mitigation and environmental damage.
4. It's a totally dumb idea.

Jack Christensen
[REDACTED]
Emigration Canyon, UT 84108
[REDACTED]

From: [Lynne Kerr](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Leick proposal
Date: Sunday, August 9, 2026 7:55:14 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

These comments are from Lynne Kerr and Hunter Jackson, residents of Emigration Oaks, [REDACTED], Emigration Canyon.

We have chosen to live in Emigration Oaks so that we have access to Freeze Creek hiking trails. A permanent road to the Leick property would destroy the value of those trails. That area is used by many, many people in the area and is treasured as a beautiful and peaceful.

It is unthinkable that a road and the traffic that road would accommodate, together with the commercial activity at the end of that road, would be allowed in that space. And the argument that the road is somehow justified by the need for fire protection access is ridiculous. Why don't we just pave the whole 40 acres as a truly effective fire-mitigation strategy? We feel very strongly that the proposed development should not be allowed.

From: [Jaymison Petersen](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: NO to development from Mr Leick
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 8:08:08 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good evening,

I am writing to oppose the creation of an Agricultural Protection Area at 1475 N. Pinecrest Canyon Road. After reading through the provided documents, I still have questions that I hope will be answered at the public hearing. As of today, I have many concerns pertaining to the project.

Firstly, I read that Mr Leick has applied for use of the Upper Freeze Creek well, along with the ability to alter the creek stream to divert for watering, and to catch and use rain water for irrigation for the existing trees and future trees and plants/vegetables he intends to plant. This greatly worries me because we are regularly advised to reduce our water use just about every summer because the wells are dangerously low. This potentially new strain on water usage in the canyon in conjunction with the fact that they are continually building not only in our neighborhood, but throughout the canyon will only cause more water scarcity for everyone involved.

The documents state that Mr Leick intends to cut down the trees on his land to use them as lumber for the construction of a storage garage, storage sheds for housing supplies, housing for cleaning and packing produce harvested from his crops, etc. In order to achieve this, he intends to implement a personal sawmill to produce the lumber. This entire process is concerning; fire hazard from the equipment, medical hazard, water pollution, noise pollution. Additionally, the increased number of people that will be utilizing our private roads and trails, along with the traffic that will increase due to the requirement of supplies and employees needed for construction and the need for waste removal from his property down our trails and out of the neighborhood.

Another issue I have is with his intent for Agritourism and the commercial production of sugar/syrup and produce. Attracting visitors to his property to help in the production of his commercial enterprise in order for him to profit from it in and of itself is not objectionable to me. I think the educational experience provided by agritourism is great, but I do not want visitors driving, walking and hiking on our privately maintained trails & roads. Additionally, I highly object to access road construction to his property via the Freeze Creek trail. I know this entire trail very well - I hike it every day with my dog and occasionally with neighborhood friends and family. It is a very steep and narrow trail at times - I cannot fathom how it could ever be accessible to vehicles.

The bottom line, from his own words, Mr Leick bought a landlocked property for the purpose of recreational enjoyment for his family and over the few years that he has owned the property, he has decided to try and make it profitable. The most convenient way for him to access his property is through the private roads and trails of Emigration Oaks. He has disregarded the "No Trespassing" signs and the wishes of the residents of this community and now he is trying to ruin a community that has been here for over 40 years. As a resident of nearly 20 years in this canyon, I highly object to the approval of this property.

Thank you,
Jaymison

Jaymison Petersen

From: [Jaymison Petersen](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: NO to Leick development
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 8:04:24 PM

[You don't often get email from jaymisonp@mac.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Good afternoon,

Let me begin by stating that I am appalled by the fact that the property up Freeze Creek could be turned into a grazing area for pigs, goats and sheep. How will he handle it when his animals are threatened by the natural predators in the canyon? Will they invite more predators to our backyards?

Mr Leick not only wants access to the upper freeze creek well to water his non-native crops & animals, but he also wants to graze those animals in an area that could potentially pollute that water designated for the Emigration Canyon residents??? Water is such a struggle up here already & it's only getting worse. We are already fighting many types of non-native & invasive plants every spring and he now wants to introduce more?

His intended road & bridge to allow for the delivery of animals, supplies, equipment, etc. is ridiculous! Adding Agritourism visitors into the mix to trample all over the trails up there and leave their waste of every kind in our watershed area is extremely dangerous. The sign he has already posted regarding his Agritourism business leads me to believe that he intends to make this land very public. How many ways does he want to ruin Freeze Creek? This all seems like such a nightmare, the more I research, the more I fear this man and his economic dreams.

He purchased a landlocked property and is now trying to bully his way into a pristine canyon to pollute and develop such a beautiful area that would've remained untouched if it weren't for him. I truly cannot believe that one man could be allowed to disrupt the basic water necessities, lives, and enjoyment of so many of us living up here in Emigration Canyon. Hiking freeze creek every day brings me so much joy, I cannot imagine losing that, ever. Please help us to prevent this from happening. Mr Leick needs to develop his family farm elsewhere and leave us in peace. Or at least leave Emigration Oaks a private, peaceful neighborhood, like it's been for decades past.

Sincerely,
The Petersens

6 [REDACTED]

From: [MARK GIBSON](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Development Pinecrest Canyon Road
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 7:02:38 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

To the ECC Planning Commission regarding proposed development at "1475 N Pinecrest Canyon Road in Emigration Canyon" by Ryan Leick.

I strongly **object** to this proposal for the following reasons:

The proposed development plan is pure fantasy with respect for its stated goal of "habitat restoration". It would entail significant habitat degradation. The conversion of a parcel of wild riparian woods and open areas of native grasses and forbs into parking areas, buildings, a road and septic field etc. is not habitat restoration, it is habitat destruction. The parcel lies across a unique ecotome in the Freeze Creek canyon where I have seen Great-horned owls, Snowshoe hares, fox, deer, coyote and numerous species of passerine birds. This is a special habitat that needs no "restoration" and that would be degraded by the buildings, clearing and road building proposed in Mr. Leick's proposal. This goal in the proposal is stated to make the proposal more palatable to the Planning Commission and clearly has no basis in plainly observable fact. ***The Commission should disregard this justification for the proposed site development. It is, politely, baloney. The unique physiographic nature of the site and its access, would prevent any development from occurring without significant environmental harm,***

The proposed development plan is nonsense with respect to its stated goal of fire mitigation. This is a small holding in a vast area of treed riparian habitat surrounded on its upper slopes by sage and oak brush country that extends from Wire Mountain on the West to the Highlands of Lookout Mountain to the East – and beyond. Any impact of fire mitigation (whatever that means - parking lots?) would be so miniscule as to be completely irrelevant to the region. The presence of roadbuilding equipment, vehicles, and electrical apparatuses would increase the risk of fire in the watershed. This goal in the proposal is stated to make the proposal more palatable to the Planning Commission, has no basis in plainly observable fact, and in fact contends something opposite to what is true. ***The Commission should disregard this justification for the proposed site development. It makes no sense whatsoever, and is not only a false claim, it is opposite the truth.***

Road development for Parcel Access would be environmentally disastrous. Freeze Creek is a pristine wild waterway. It wends in a very narrow, steeply cut defile on an east-west axis that would demand the choice between deep road cuts in the banks or slopes above, or crossings, both harmful to the stream. The drainage would be forever

degraded by a road that would have to be either narrowly proximate or if away from it perched high above it on steep unstable slopes. The Freeze Creek below the parcel lies in an extremely steep defile, and any road building on the slopes adjacent would be ruinous for Freeze Creek in terms of sediment entry. In many areas the steep (45 degrees or more) shaley slopes are in constant movement downslope and unstable. Winter plowing would of the very deep snows in the shadowed and cooled watershed would produce snow and road debris overburdens threatening normal creek flow, vegetation, and wildlife routes. Road access mandates a review by a road engineer familiar with road systems near water on wild public lands (<https://www.fs.usda.gov/t-d/pubs/html/02251202/02251202.htm>) with respect to ecologic risks and feasibility.

Professional assessment of roadbuilding environmental impact on Freeze Creek should be mandated by the Commission before further consideration of the proposal by Mr. Leick.

Septic provisions in this application are not defined in terms of adequacy to protect the pristine water of Freeze Creek. Ultimate use of the proposed development requires clarification by the applicant. Extensive parking areas suggest possible commercial ambitions. The extent of development suggests future dwellings. Either of these would be objectionable, but more importantly necessitate further definition and specifications for septic provisions. The septic field shown by the developer requires review, both for dimensions relative to anticipated loading and proximity to Freeze Creek. Subsoil in this area is likely gravelly and porous. It is not clear that sufficient septic setback is possible on the applicant's plot. ***The Commission should mandate clarification of planned septic loading and review of septic plans for this proposal by a qualified septic system engineer before further consideration of this proposal.***

As a final note, I would urge members of the Commission who have not visited this site, to do so, as this would make the concerns expressed in this statement of opposition plainly evident. Review of maps and plots is, I think, insufficient for appreciation of the damaging consequences and risks entailed in the projects proposed by Mr. Leick.

IN SUMMARY: Mr. Leick's hobby farm in the delicate and unique habitat of the Freeze Creek watershed would be extensively destructive to its plant communities and wildlife, introduce risk of fire, add vehicular noise and toxic effluvia, and detract from the enjoyment of hunters, skiers and backcountry hikers who use this area. The presence of significant parking provisions suggests a plan for visitors, perhaps customers of some sort. The latter would be highly objectionable and clarity should be sought on this question. Mr. Leick should sell his property to a conservancy, and take his project elsewhere, where it would not defile a riparian gem in wild lands accessible to the people of Salt Lake and its environs.

Professor Emeritus
University of Utah School of Medicine

I am writing to raise my concerns about the Conservation Development Agreement proposed by Applicant, Ryan Leick. Which “shall govern the use of approximately 40 acres of property located at 1475 N Pinecrest Canyon Road in Emigration Canyon. **The proposed use is forest conservation and management, including fire mitigation and natural resource renewal strategies.** The Conservation Development Agreement is applicable only to the 40 acres privately owned by Ryan Leick. Presenter: Claire Gillmor, Land Use Attorney “

As a resident of Emigration Canyon (specifically Emigration Oaks subdivision) I have grave concerns about this proposal. As it stands now **the draft proposal is incomplete and the decision to bring it before the planning commission is premature.**

Several key areas of the conservation agreement are incomplete and marked “**verification pending.**” **Exhibits A and D are not attached, nor is the referenced grant.**

The Freeze Creek Property Natural Resource Assessment and Forest Activity Plan (“Forest Activity Plan”) for the Property attached hereto as Exhibit A. **is not attached** but is accessible as part of the previously denied APA application.

Upon review of that document the proposed activities in the Accessory Conservation Activities (Attachment B) attachment B such as bee keeping, certain non-habitable structures, private roads, bridges, a solar array, observation deck, greenhouse, biochar and silviculture management (collectively, the “Accessory Conservation Activities”) appear to be supported by the Forest Activity Plan. Several are contraindicated.

I also do not see how parking lots, roads, buildings, biochar production and solar arrays would be considered forest conservation and management considering much of the forest will have to be destroyed to create these things. This proposal should not be construed as forest preservation.

So why would the planning commission approve activities which are not specified and may not even be consistent with the primary plan document?

I am also concerned that

The stated purpose of the request is inconsistent with the current state of the property

“The Property consists primarily of forest, riparian areas, and natural vegetation. Without appropriate management, the conditions on the Property increase fire risks to City and surrounding properties.”

Actually it is the development of the property which presents increased fire risk which must be mitigated. No one can possibly think that the addition of generators and biochar production will not increase the risk of fire.

There is currently no electric, sewer or road access to the property so the only fire mitigation activities possible are hand clearing of dead wood which would be hauled out over miles of trail.

The building of new structures in the absence of water, electricity or road access by fire crews poses a serious fire risk to the surrounding area.

The plans outlined would only seem feasible with use of, chain saws and other construction equipment although the Forestry activity plan specifically states

“ Limited equipment access to the property will prolong the processing timelines and movement distance of wood as a local product. Most processing will be conducted by hand using small, portable tools to which personal injury potential must always be mitigated.”

Implying that all proposed activities would be conducted by hand

So the planning commission is considering approving activities which are not feasible, safe or in keeping with the 10 year forestry activity plan. Or the proposed use of the land.

Several barriers exist to executing the requested activities including

- **Health & Watershed Approval:** You must obtain written approval from the board of health ensuring zero damage to the natural watershed before any site plan or permit moves forward. [1]
- **Access Issues:** Many FR-20 parcels in upper or remote parts of the canyon (such as Freeze Creek) lack dedicated public road access or require crossing neighboring private/municipal properties, making legal and physical access difficult. [1, 2]
- **Steep Slopes & FCOZ:** Strict limits apply to grading, driveway grades (often capped under 18%), and building footprints to mitigate severe wildfire risks and erosion. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

Additionally the agreement specifies only bringing a helicopter in once per quarter. With no roads and 4 helicopter trips a year none of these things can be accomplished.

The agreement states that the city supports the Forest Activity Plan yet the Accessory Conservation Activities are not consistent with the Forest Activity Plan.

I do not believe that the Forestry Activity Plan includes any of these structures or activities (with the exception of biochar and bee keeping) and in several places highlights potential problems these activities could create.

The forestry activity plan outlines family recreational activities , modest gathering of native fruit, hand clearing of fallen vegetation and building structures by hand for the purposes of family recreation. with available materials. The plan highlights the limited water and drought conditions (2 of the 3 springs are dry one only flows in spring) and specifically highlights the dangers of introducing non native species, soil erosion, and disruption to wildlife that clearing land can cause. As well as risks of building in a remote land locked location.

The plan clearly expresses the intention of the land to be limited family recreation

. “The owners are enjoying the property as a recreational destination that involves camping, observing nature and outdoors play. On-property work, in some forms, are valued as “recreational escape” enabling quality family time together as well. The single, established on-property trail may gain some improvements. New trails may be established to facilitate fire breaks, emergency responder access, recreation and property management work. Recreation may impact riparian resources negatively, so actions should be assessed for unintended outcomes. Recreation may increase or develop more broadly as the owners and guests become connected to the land. Amenities such as equipment storage caches and **non-permanent tents/yurts** may enable increased recreation and longer-duration stays.”

Here are a few more examples of activities which do not seem to be in keeping with the Forestry Activity Plan, are not currently feasible or present a danger to the watershed.

This section seems contrary to the clearing of plants to create defensible spaces around the buildings and show an intention of only modest low impact cutting of trees.

Commercial timbering is not feasible due to the lack of roadway access and needed heavy equipment to conduct operations. The white fir stands are relatively small and volumes are not sufficient for third-party commercial interests in wood fiber. Wood decay diseases are abundant, affecting tree longevity and structural capacity to remain standing. Wood decay diseases reduce lumber quality and durability. White fir wood fiber will begin to be utilized on the property for constructing small structures and amenities. Deciduous (oak) wood may be used as feedstock (fungal inoculation sites) for cultivating edible mushrooms. Wood may be collected and use as heating and cooking fuel. Limited equipment access to the property will prolong the processing timelines and movement distance of wood as a local product. Most processing will be conducted by hand using small, portable tools to which personal injury potential must always be mitigated.

.

This section highlights concerns about impacts of clearing, paving and building to the ecosystem

Browsing wildlife, especially Shiras moose may utilize rangelands year-round. Spring and fall season forage is rendered for mule deer and elk on south and west-facing slopes that offer diminished snowpack. Gamble oak yield acorn crops on favorable years to black bear in the autumn season. Several shrub plants provide fleshy fruit to wildlife and birds. Access to springs and nearby flowing water provides important habitat for pollinators and wildlife dependent on the range resources. Rangelands can be negatively impacted by establishment and expansion of non-native, invasive plant species.

I do not believe that the impact of introduction of non native plants has been adequately considered

Noxious weeds (state recognized non-native invasive plants) are considered harmful to wildlife habitat and native plant communities. Invasive plant species can have a significant impact on an array of ecological facets. Invasive plants reduce species richness, plant diversity, and plant community productivity. Wildlife forage and cover species may be degraded; soil erosion and

stream sedimentation may result; soil moisture and nutrient levels may be depleted; and wildfire regimes may be altered by invasive plant species.

These sections makes me wonder what impact the changes to the land will have on our watershed

Drought has and will continue to be a significant agent of forest succession and health in the longterm. Drought is a re-occurring phenomena that has influenced plant communities in northern Utah for millennia. A severe drought is underway in the region and will likely affect perennial woody plants negatively by reducing vigor or defense mechanisms or by causing damage to waterconducting vascular system tissues – including rapid hydraulic collapse.

The property is assigned to Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC8) UT16020204. Water in creeks, springs and underground flow are recharged primarily from winter snow accumulation. Rainfall also adds to water resources. Three springs exist on the property. Within the current drought cycle, two are not producing water, while one is rendering surface flow in the spring and summer season. Freeze Creek collects and transports water which flows to Emigration Creek. Waters descend to the Jordan River and eventually deposit into the Great Salt Lake. Records suggest that underground water diversions and surface wells may be associated with the property. (Emigration Creek TMDL, Utah Division of Water Quality, 2011) **Water rights are not yet assigned to Freeze Creek property ownership.** Hydrologic processes (as relates to forest resources) on the property is influenced by species compositions, canopy structure and tree distribution patterns over time. The on-site hydrologic processes are a result of water interception, infiltration into the soil, evapotranspiration, soil moisture storage and hillside erosion. A shallow bedrock layer exists on the property and throughout the Upper Emigration Creek Sub-Basin. The Emigration Creek TMDL 9 identifies the potential for three or four overlapping soil constraints on the property which affect watershed values. Utah's Forest Water Quality Guidelines - A User's Guide for Landowners, Loggers and Resource Manager's – are voluntary measures that can be implemented to better protect the state's water quality where qualifying forest practices are being implemented. The Guidelines booklet is included in the Appendix of this plan.

Finally I have concerns about the position the Council puts itself in by signing an agreement which Mr. Leick can terminate at any time (Thus negating any commitments he has made about what he will not do on the land).

Thank you for considering my comments

Carolyn Lynch

[REDACTED]

Salt Lake City UT 84108

From: [Bruce Edgar](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: RE: Planning Commission Meetings of 8/13, 8/18; Proposed "Conservation Development Agreement"; Ryan Leick; 1475 N Pinecrest Canyon Rd, Emigration Canyon.
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 2:41:45 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Emigration Canyon Planning Commission Members -

As a resident of Emigration Canyon, I write to express my **strong opposition** to the "Conservation Development Agreement" proposed by Ryan Leick for his ~40 acre parcel located in upper Freeze Creek (1475 N Pinecrest Canyon Road) in Emigration Canyon. The development activities proposed in the draft Agreement, which include roads, bridges, multiple buildings, water development, a septic field, helicopter access, and even a lumber mill, pose extreme environmental risks to a presently pristine and inaccessible area of Emigration Canyon. I know the Freeze Creek area well, as it is near my residence and I walk there regularly. It is not obviously agriculturally tractable: the terrain is mostly very steep, rocky, and there is little water. It is also an important watershed for the Emigration Improvement District, and it is a high risk area for wildfires. Moreover, there is no road access to the parcel in question, and to my knowledge no clear right-of-way for road access. Indeed, to call this agreement a "Conservation Development Agreement" is an unfortunate and ironic misnomer, since the development activities proposed and road building they entail would in fact **RUIN** the environment, watershed, and recreational opportunities of the upper Freeze Creek area (which is mostly public land), and at the same time add substantial wildfire risk. For this reason I, my family, and many of my friends in neighbors in the Emigration Oaks neighborhood are strongly opposed to this "Conservation Development Agreement".

I would also like to point out that it is unclear why the commission is considering this proposal, given that a very similar application from Mr. Leick (for an "Agricultural Protection Area") was already rejected by the city. I urge the commission to reject the current proposal too, and protect

Emigration Canyon for all current and future residents.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Edgar

Bruce A. Edgar

[REDACTED]

Emigration Canyon

UT 84108

[REDACTED]

From: [Roger Bird](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Ryan Leick Conservation DA Agreement
Date: Sunday, August 9, 2026 12:53:53 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Sent from my iPad

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input regarding the above subject.

Let me get this straight. Mr. Leick buys forty acres of landlocked property knowing full well he can't develop it for any number of reasons except perhaps the forestry agreement he's proposing. But, he can only do that if he can gain access through adjacent private property, build a half to three quarter mile road and pretend to make us all safer by managing a tiny spec of land that doesn't amount to the smallest percentage of surrounding ground. He wants fire and emergency service access so he can be protected from his own mishaps and mistakes that may endanger the adjacent forest or nearby residents. What could possibly go wrong with this well thought out plan. There is currently no greater fire danger there than any of the surrounding land. There is no erosion problem other than the one he will create bulldozing a road, cutting trees, creating parking areas and distributing the natural environment as it currently exists. This pipe dream is probably one of the most ill conceived ideas I've ever seen. I only hope common sense prevails and this gets rejected in its entirety.

Regards,

Roger and Susan Bird

[REDACTED]

SLC UT 84108

[REDACTED]

From: [NORMAN COUNCIL](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Ryan Leick proposal
Date: Saturday, August 8, 2026 4:02:40 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Greetings,

Isn't this the same proposal that has already been rejected, repackaged in a slightly different form with a different designation? Zoning laws clearly should not be changed to the detriment of the larger community, including watershed and associated issues, simply to cover a single individual's financial gamble.

Is there any provision that legal costs associated with repeated, futile applications should be born by the petitioner?

So, count this long-term resident as being opposed.

Regards,

Norman Council,

[REDACTED]
Salt Lake City 84108