PARK CITY
1884

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH 84060

September 21, 2023

The Council of Park City, Summit County, Utah, met in open meeting on September 21, 2023, at 9:00 a.m. in the City Council Chambers.

SEMI-ANNUAL STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT

I. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Status
Mayor Nann Worel Council Member Ryan Dickey Council Member Max Doilney Council Member Becca Gerber Council Member Jeremy Rubell Council Member Tana Toly Matt Dias, City Manager Margaret Plane, City Attorney Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder	**Present**
None	**Excused**

II. PUBLIC INPUT (ANY MATTER OF CITY BUSINESS NOT SCHEDULED ON THE AGENDA)

Mayor Worel opened the meeting for any who wished to speak or submit comments on items not on the agenda. No comments were given. Mayor Worel closed the public input portion of the meeting.

III. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE & UPDATE

<u>1. Review Previous and Current Council Survey Results:</u>
Matt Dias, City Manager, reviewed a prior Council survey was given, and although it was not statistically relevant, it was very helpful and helped kick off the Homestake Affordable Housing project, the peak day traffic mitigation plan, the landscaping incentive program, soil remediation, childcare subsidy, trails, and other projects. Internally, the City was becoming more efficient with health insurance and the

procurement process was overhauled. The new Council survey showed different findings, and Dias cautioned Council that any new programs would compete with the budgeted items already in progress.

Jed Briggs reviewed there were seven strategic impact areas in the survey, including Housing, Recreation, Equity, Transportation, Environment, Organizational Infrastructure, and Resort Economy Balance. Within each of these categories, questions were asked and Council prioritized them. There was discussion on increasing the workforce affordable housing goal to a number higher than 15%. Working on other modes of transportation was prioritized. Council Member Gerber noted car-optional parking had been discussed for years, but now it seemed like a reality. Regarding the environment, wildfire mitigation efforts and soil remediation were the top priorities. Council Member Doilney noted zero waste was important, but since there was success in that area, it was not considered a priority. He encouraged the group to continue making it a priority. Council Member Rubell thought the City should be the example in waste mitigation initiatives. Then other organizations should step up to continue the push.

Equity included questions on finding an ongoing funding source for a childcare subsidy and having a public/private partnership with the seniors for a senior center and senior affordable housing. These both ranked high. Mayor Worel hoped the City could create a multiculture committee, but noted it did not rank well amongst the Council. There was agreement that the City could work with other organizations on this need for the community. There was also discussion on refocusing efforts on the health, safety, and welfare of the community. This was not highly prioritized because the City was doing very well in this area.

Regarding Balance Resort Economy with Community, a question was posed about Council continuing its role in the application process and public hearings. Dias noted the State Legislature continued discussions about reducing the number of public hearings for some land use issues. Some cities and towns only held public hearings on what was statutorily required. Council Member Rubell noted strides were made in balancing the priorities of the community with the priorities of the resorts. He supported streamlining simple land use approvals. Council Member Gerber suggested having a review of what needed to go to Council. Council Member Toly asked if those approvals could be on the Consent Agenda. Council Member Doilney stressed public input should not be stifled for development, but there were simple processes that could be looked at.

There was support on Recreation questions giving residents first priority for recreation facility access as well as charging higher fees for non-resident recreation users. Council Member Doilney asserted the City should be linked with Basin Rec and continue the reciprocity agreement within the school district boundary. Mayor Worel indicated the trails were overused and those should be looked at. Council Member Dickey stated the new facilities would have a minority of resident users, and he hoped to look at ways to cost share.

Briggs indicated the questions that scored higher than four would be considered priorities, questions scored between three and four would come back to Council for clarification, and questions scored under three would not be considered in the budget process.

IV. LONG-RANGE PLANNING INITIATIVES

1. Park City's General Plan:
Rebecca Ward reviewed the Planning Department's progress on code amendments, including the creation of an appeal board and the review process for plans such as plat amendments. She stated the General Plan was a community plan based on community engagement. It needed to take into account the surrounding communities and developments and it should be aspirational and goal oriented. She reviewed previous General Plans and indicated the current General Plan created neighborhoods for residential, commercial, and resort areas. It prioritized Main Street as the heart of the community, local businesses over chain businesses, open space, and affordable housing.

Ward stated in the Vision 2020 report the question asked was, "What are the tangible and intangible elements of the community, that if lost, would fundamentally change the character of Park City?" The report established five pillars and called for bold action on Environmental Leadership; Transportation Innovation; Sustainable Tourism; Arts, Culture, and Local Economy; and Affordability and Equity.

Ward indicated last September, Council gave direction to move forward with the Bonanza Park development. Studies were being conducted and community input was gathered to determine future focus for the area, and they would be finished by March, 2024. While this plan was being completed, staff recommended issuing an RFP for a consultant to help draft a new General Plan.

Council Member Dickey stated the State Legislature had considered making General Plans binding and he asked if an amendment should be made to the current General Plan to clarify some ambiguous areas. Ward thought that would be a good idea. Council Member Toly asked if the next General Plan would be smaller than the current one. Ward hoped some items would be consolidated. Council Member Toly asked how the bold solutions would fit in the General Plan. Ward stated the outlook would be for at least 10 years, and the plan could be updated at any time. Council Member Toly asked if there would be an Olympic focus in the RFP, to which Ward affirmed.

Council Member Rubell asked if a fixed bid with more weight on desired outcomes could be in the RFP. He asked that Planning could make a list of Council requests, the progress, and what next steps would be needed to move each request forward. Ward stated she could provide that information. Council Member Dickey did not want to overload staff. Council Member Doilney thought the 2014 General Plan goals and objectives were still relevant today. Mayor Worel stated the 2014 General Plan process was arduous. She was pleased that part of the process would include ensuring the new General Plan aligned with the Land Management Code. Council Member Gerber asked to see more sustainable goals in the new General Plan.

Matt Dias stated Council had two options: Option One was to do everything in the new General Plan that was done before; and Option Two was do what was statutorily required, with those definitions. Council Member Dickey favored Option Two. Council Member Rubell suggested asking the bidders those options and have them bid on both.

2. Potential Historic Park City Area Plan:
Erik Daenitz, Economic Development Manager, presented this item and stated renewed investment in the historic area was needed. He reviewed $20 million had been invested in this area in the last 20 years. A lot of the funds went to China Bridge parking, pocket parks, Old Town stairs, sidewalks, and natural gas sources.

Daenitz reviewed sales tax revenue on Main Street was still on a positive trend. Deer Valley was a big source of sales tax revenue. He noted visitors from the Wasatch Front or out of state were the top visitors and the City should seek to maintain those visits. He proposed infrastructure was needed, especially waterlines and sewer lines. Parking maintenance for China Bridge and waste management contracts were other needs. He thought an area plan would go into more detail on needs in this area and asserted Main Street had a potential for $1 billion in growth.

Council Member Rubell asked if analysis was done to determine how proactive the City needed to be with infrastructure improvements, and gave an example of utility replacement on known streets versus making sidewalks wider or narrower without knowing what was underneath. Daenitz stated the known infrastructure could be replaced and plans made so construction wasn't duplicated. He felt this could be done in conjunction with the General Plan update and could follow the results of the Bonanza Park study when it was completed.

Council Member Dickey thought instead of siloed small area plans, this should be looked at as part of the General Plan. He liked the idea of the Main Street plan in general because the work needed to be done. Council Member Doilney stated the City should be proactive in addressing the needs of the area, but the recent focus had been Bonanza Park. The City didn't have the resources to do all projects. He favored replacing infrastructure but wanted to maintain the focus on Bonanza Park for now. Council Member Rubell felt the City could learn from the Bonanza Park process. If Option Three was preferred – a utilities analysis and construction plan with future growth in mind, along with an area plan - he wanted a narrow scope and noted this area did not need the vision other areas needed.

Council Member Toly stated this area was the focus of the community and all residents had ties to it. The Olympics were most likely coming, and they needed to decide if they wanted Main Street to be the hub of the Olympics. She wanted to look at parking in Old

Town and stated empty lots were an opportunity for a new direction. Council Member Gerber indicated she heard a lot regarding waterlines breaking and electricity going out and she wanted those needs addressed as soon as possible. Other items such as parking and waste management should be discussed with the Main Street businesses. She hoped to see alignment with the neighbors, businesses, and the City on future projects. While the General Plan was being updated, The Historic Park City Alliance (HPCA) could discuss and propose projects the businesses would like to see.

Matt Dias stated Main Street meant a lot to the community. There were a lot of infrastructure needs which would be disruptive to the community and would take years to complete. When the infrastructure was replaced, there would be opportunities to consider transformative projects. He liked prioritizing infrastructure replacement and thought other projects could be done sequentially or concurrently with the General Plan. Daenitz stated if vertical asset growth was combined with infrastructure replacement, funding could be set up to cover the cost of both.

Council Member Doilney asserted if the infrastructure replacement was an urgent need, the community needed to be made aware of the need and the project should move forward. He didn't want to miss opportunities, but the City could not do everything simultaneously and do it well. Council Member Dickey wanted to focus on specific opportunities. There was competition with Canyons and Mayflower for visitation, and visitation was important for Park City businesses. Council Member Rubell thought the City should focus on the core improvements, and then leverage City assets to revitalize visitation to the area. Daenitz stated key stakeholders would help determine the needed capital investments. Dias indicated staff would narrow the scope and bring that back to Council. Council Member Rubell recommended splitting the issue into two questions: "What are the critical infrastructure improvements and what opportunities are related to those improvements?" and "What are the opportunities that lie ahead once the City finished the critical list of improvements?" He suggested backing into the answer of the second question. Daenitz stated the questions posed in the presentation were needed. Mayor Worel asked for a timeline for those needed projects.

3. Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) Infrastructure:

Luke Cartin, Environmental Sustainability Manager, presented this item. He displayed the transmission lines in the City that tied into the Bonanza Park substation. The substation needed to be in the area because of the electricity demand. It could not be buried because it would conflict with water lines. He proposed a two-phase approach to the substation. One was taking the Snyderville line to the base of Boot Hill by Zions Bank underground. Then it would go above-ground to tie into the existing line. Cartin asserted that undergrounding lines was very expensive, so he didn't recommend undergrounding all the lines. This cost was estimated at $9 million. The benefits of Phase One were more plots would be available at the cemetery, the easement would be removed on City-owned land, and undergrounding lines would reduce wildfire risk. The con of the project was that it would have a high construction impact to the area.

Phase Two would require a new substation, undergrounding the Judge and Silver Creek transmission lines, rerouting all distribution lines, purchasing easements, and would have an estimated cost of $50 million. Cartin stated this phase was a five-10 year project. He indicated a feasibility study for this would take up to six months. Phase One would be one season of construction.

Council Member Toly asked if removing the line in Bonanza Park would allow the City to increase height and density. Cartin stated the current lines limited building height. If they were removed, the only building limit would be from the land use code. Council Member Rubell stated it would be unwise to waste this space as the area was being developed and he felt it needed to be moved. He also noted RMP had authority to turn off power during high winds. Undergrounding the wires could resolve episodes of not having power in the area. He thought there could be financial leverage on the projects and other projects could be done in conjunction with undergrounding the lines. He supported the project.

Council Member Doilney favored moving the substation, but he was concerned the community would not approve of the cost. Cartin noted RMP was upgrading towers on SR-224 and they might upgrade the towers on the back side of Boot Hill in an effort to mitigate wildfires. An alternative route could be considered but the City would have to compensate the landowner for an aerial easement. Council Member Doilney favored doing the feasibility study and Phase One. He hoped RMP would help with that cost. Council Member Toly favored Phase One as well. Council Member Rubell indicated the $50 million cost for Phase Two could be reduced significantly if the project was narrowed.

Council Member Dickey asked if the feasibility study would cover the questions about the substation move or just Phase Two. Cartin responded the feasibility study would cover Phase Two and would cost $300,000-$500,000 to lay out the entire plan. Council Member Dickey supported the feasibility study. Council Member Gerber stated there was always interest in moving the power lines off the five-acre site. She asked if part of the path could be above ground, to which Cartin affirmed. She favored moving forward with the feasibility study. Cartin asked if the study should include the overhead line assessment as well as undergrounding lines. Council Member Gerber asked for the cost difference with the options from the study.

4. Public Input on Long-Range Planning Initiatives:
Mayor Worel opened the meeting for public input.

Cynthia Washington 84098 asked Council to do intersectionality. There were a lot of projects, and they could be done in collaboration to save money.

Mark Fischer indicated he sold the five-acre parcel to the City five years ago. Moving the substation was the only way to unlock the full potential of the parcel. He wanted compensation for having an aerial easement over his property because it wasn't fair if the City performed work to help their property, but as a result his property would be encumbered. Phase One could be done and it would increase the value of the land. It would also be beneficial if the Olympics came to town.

Bill Ciraco 84060 agreed with Fischer and stated moving the substation would increase the value of the property greatly.

Angela Moschetta 84060 supported Phase One with the underground option. She indicated property owners could be asked to help fund the project since their land value would be increased.

Dick Grannis 84060 lived behind Boot Hill and stated there was a great fire risk to that area. He supported Phase One of the undergrounding project. He noted moving forward with Phase Two would give the City an extra .8 acre to do something else with.

Ed Parigian via Zoom supported Phase One to remove the power station. He thought the Bonanza Park area should be developed properly and this step was needed.

Mike Sweeney supported burying power lines and thought it was the way of the future.

Jane Riley 84060 indicated there would be no regrets with burying power lines.

Mayor Worel closed the public input.

V. LEADERSHIP PARK CITY CLASS PROJECT - "LET'S TALK"

Council Members Tanja Hanson and Malena Stevens, Summit County Council, attended the "Let's Talk" discussion with the City Council members.

VII. MAYOR'S TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVES

1. Winter Peak Traffic Mitigation Efforts Update:
Andrew Leatham stated there was a lot of success last winter using the traffic mitigation efforts and a lot of the same efforts would be used this year. He discussed the different approaches. A peak day calendar would be posted online and color coded to show 66 peak days, which were 27 days less than last year. The days where traffic was not as bad were removed in order to allow staff to focus on other priorities and ramp up for the noted peak days. Residential protection would remain a focus as well as re-routing traffic on 14th and 15th Streets for the entire winter season.

Leatham indicated some temporary traffic control measures would be implemented on Christmas, MLK Day, and Presidents' Day. These controls would affect right turns at Deer Valley Drive and Bonanza Drive, and Bonanza Drive and Kearns Boulevard.

2. Regional Transportation Convening and Emerging Disruptors Committee Updates:

Mayor Worel explained they had been meeting monthly on ways to improve traffic along the Wasatch Back. Alex Roy, Senior Transportation Planner, stated last fall the group got together and regional agencies were working to support each other. Discussions focused on project lists, which he would bring to the City Council in the future. Council Member Rubell asked if the SR248 bus lanes were functioning. Roy stated buses were using the shoulders, but further improvements were needed to make them full lanes.

Hannah Pack, Transportation Planner, stated a study was done for emerging disruptors to transportation. She displayed a list of ideas being considered. The committee discussed the top eight ideas individually and the findings would be presented to Council in November.

Herve Lavenant and Casey Christ, Emerging Disruptors Committee Members, presented some options. Lavenant reviewed visitor data in Park City. He promoted a non-stop bus connection from the Salt Lake City Airport to Park City. The airlines would book tickets to Park City and then handle getting the luggage from the planes to the buses. He indicated the resorts would need to partner to pick up their visitors and take them the last mile to the resorts. Christ stated the key to this idea was being able to provide dependable service. The service needed to be high-frequency and 24/7 year-round. It would also need to have a cost advantage over renting a car. The last mile challenge would be knowing when the bus would arrive and if the resort's visitors were on the bus. He felt this idea would set Park City apart from other destinations.

Josh Finken, Committee Member, discussed the one-way loop idea from Kearns to Park Avenue to Deer Valley Drive to Bonanza Drive. The group was not supportive of using this idea year-round, but there was interest in doing a pilot program. The PCCAPS students were looking at autonomous vehicle use in the City. Victoria Schlaepfer, Committee Member, reviewed the aerial gondola disruptive idea. The committee didn't recommend this idea for running along SR224 or SR248 because it would delay travel time. The recommended that gondolas go to the park and rides and then directly to the resorts. They were studying creative paths that could connect to the resorts.

Peter Tomai, Committee Member, indicated he looked at vehicle-free streets. The idea was really prioritizing people over cars. The group focused on temporary and special event street closures. They were looking at solutions for limited cars or timing of traffic. They thought this would encourage parking once and transit options. The locations being looked at were Main Street, Bonanza Park, and resort-type locations.

Steven Yevoli, Committee Member, stated the group was great to work with, but there were other constituencies who needed to be looked at. He thought the resorts could find other ways for visitors to enter, which would alleviate traffic. He also thought the ideas were 10-15 years away and the youth of today needed to be considered. With all the ideas, the City needed to remember to keep the City's identity. Pack stated the group needed to look at tunnels and then a final report would be written and presented to Council.

Council Member Toly asked if the group considered the street inclines in the study of vehicle-free streets. Pack stated they did consider that and were discussing some form of vehicles, such as the trolley, remaining on Main Street. Council Member Toly asked if a one-way street could be considered for travelling to the resort, to which Pack stated they did not consider that.

Council Member Dickey asked how to take the ideas deeper to become a reality. Pack stated the group was setting parameters for the ideas and then Council would decide how to advance them. Council Member Doilney asked if there was a problem for this type of solution. He knew there were peak day traffic problems, but he wanted to know if there were enough problems that required emerging disruptors. Council Member Rubell agreed. Pack stated the group discussed the problems that each solution would solve. They also wanted regional solutions. Council Member Rubell didn't know if the community thought there was a broad traffic problem. He asked for community feedback on their perception of the traffic problem.

Council Member Toly asked if they had talked to the schools and the associated problems with students getting into the school parking lot. Pack stated PCCAPS would work with their peers to understand that. Council Member Rubell asked the group to find out how the ideas would affect parking.

3. Gordo Property Feasibility:

Mayor Worel reviewed Council requested that staff look at the Gordo property as a possible park and ride. Heinrich Deters, Trails and Open Space Manager, reviewed the different land acquisitions in the area. There were two current uses, one was contaminated soils and one was that Public Works used the area for material recycling. The City acquired a surplus parcel from UDOT in 2016 and could acquire another parcel if Council favored that.

Ryan Blair stated he was working to perform a soil cleanup of the Gordo property. A soil sampling and a risk assessment were performed on the parcel. The recommendation was to haul off the contaminated soil. The next steps were to finalize the risk assessment and make a corrective action plan. Then site remediation would take place at a cost of $3 million-$4 million.

Council Member Gerber asked if hauling off the soil was better than capping it. Blair indicated the risk assessment determined the action. It was evaluated from a commercial and residential perspective and the assessment for both of those options was to remove the soil.

Sarah Pearce stated the site was currently used for Public Works, but they would discuss alternative uses. Alex Roy indicated they worked with Summit County to hire a regional park and ride consultant to determine where park and rides were needed. He projected the consultant would need a year to determine park and ride activation. He noted the study was funded by UDOT. Julia Collins reviewed the history of park and ride access on SR224 and SR248. John Robertson indicated the Gordo site was not included in the first study for park and ride sites because that site was designated for soils. The Gordo site scored high as an effective park and ride when analyzed. A rough cost estimate for that project was $31.8 million. The study didn't include pedestrian connectivity and safety, sustainability, etc.

Daenitz stated surface parking would provide more than 800 parking spaces, but the space could be maximized by building a parking structure to allow 200 affordable housing units and some commercial space. He noted this could be a public/private partnership and the housing developer would build the parking structure as part of the agreement. Troy Daley stated the Public Works Department was currently recycling concrete, asphalt, and other materials. He hoped to find an alternate space for this use that would not impact his department too much. Robertson stated next steps would be community outreach, rezoning if needed, acquiring consultant services, and finalizing construction documents. This project could be completed in 2026 if the City was very aggressive.

Matt Dias stated there was a demand letter and there would be construction going on to remediate the soils. He asked if Council wanted to see other activity going on at the same time when the site was disturbed. Council Member Doilney asked what soil was being moved. He wanted to act if the price was $3 million. Council Member Toly asked if the Public Works and trailhead uses could still be there in conjunction with the park and ride or mixed-use projects. Deters stated they would get direction from Council and proceed with a consultant. Council Member Gerber noted $4 million was set aside for soil remediation. Blair stated $4 million was set aside for Gordo specifically. The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) was doing a risk assessment to determine how much would need to be hauled off. The entire site would need soil remediation for commercial or residential development, including just building a park and ride.

Council Member Rubell supported soil remediation for Gordo. He wanted to see concepts of mixing different uses. Council Member Toly wanted to see a park and ride in some capacity at the site. Council Member Gerber wanted to see what commercial space would be at the site with affordable housing, and noted commercial space would draw more traffic. Council Member Rubell supported working in partnerships. Council Member Gerber asked if grants would be available for the park and ride. Pearce indicated all staff's work showed a need for an intercept lot. She thought this location would reduce traffic in town. Council Member Dickey thought this was a great place for a park and ride and he wanted to have partnerships on the project. He liked having an analysis of what could be partnered with the park and ride. He didn't think commercial uses were needed at that location. Council Member Doilney agreed and indicated benefits to the resorts were also benefits to residents. He liked having some commercial to make a good arrival experience.

Council Member Gerber asked if the 1,000 parking spots for that location were based on development needs to which Daenitz affirmed. Dias summarized there was consensus to come back with concepts for the property.

4. Public Input on Mayor's Transportation Initiatives:
Mayor Worel opened the public input.

Katherine Fagin 84060 asked if there was a parallel topic for in-City transportation needs. She didn't go to Main Street anymore. She didn't have an in-town gas station anymore. She didn't think having less traffic coming into town benefited the residents. She didn't like the idea of penalizing residents for using cars when buses came at 30-minute intervals.

Cynthia Washington 84098 stated she loved today's meeting. She thought of Aspen, Colorado, and Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts, which were similar cities to Park City. She favored transportation aligning with airline destinations and thought it was a brilliant idea.

John Greenfield 84060 stated a Gordo park and ride would not solve the SR248 backup from Highway 40. He asked if Council wanted to see a parking structure or a housing development in 10 years. He noted the Council survey scored more parking low. He favored only housing on the Gordo site. He suggested consulting with the new transportation director on this.

Ed Parigian supported Council's discussions today and he was proud the City was taking action to solve problems. He hoped infrastructure could be built on Main Street.

Angela Moschetta 84060 thought a parking structure in a housing development was dated. Everything pointed to taking cars off roads. The City had Richardson Flat for parking. She wanted to partner with MIDA and Extell to find solutions. Community engagement should look at Gordo along with other proposed projects.

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Request to Approve Park City's "For Argument" for the $30 Million General Obligation Bond on the November 21, 2023 General Municipal Election Ballot:

Council Member Rubell moved to remove Item One from the Consent Agenda. Council Member Toly seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Dickey, Doilney, Gerber, Rubell, and Toly

Council Member Rubell stated there was jargon on the aquatics and MARC remodel and it needed to be clarified to ensure voters knew that was not part of the bond. Council Member Dickey agreed. Dias stated it could be amended. Council Member Dickey didn't want to leave it out completely, but suggested language noting those projects were already approved using General Funds.

Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder, explained the City was required to produce a pro-statement for the bond. The City had solicited requests from active registered Park City voters to write pro-statements and con-statements regarding the bond. She noted she received one request to write a pro-statement. Both the City statement and the statement from the resident would be on the next agenda and Council would select which pro-statement would be used at the Octoer 26th public meeting to discuss and take comments for and against the bond.

Council Member Gerber moved to approve Park City's "For Argument" for the $30 million General Obligation Bond on the November 21, 2023, General Municipal Election ballot, in a form amended by the City manager as needed. Council Member Doilney seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Dickey, Doilney, Gerber, Rubell, and Toly

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder