PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 13, 2017

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Adam Strachan, Melissa Band, Steve Joyce, John Phillips, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm

EX OFFICIO: Planning Director, Bruce Erickson; Francisco Astorga, Planner; Anya Grahn, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney, Jody Burnett, Outside Counsel
==========

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Chair Strachan called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioner Campbell, who was excused. Commissioner Phillips arrived late.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

August 23, 2017

Commissioner Thimm referred to page 37, third paragraph from the bottom, and changed cold fired power plant to correctly read **coal** fired power plan. The correction appeared twice in the paragraph.

Chair Strachan referred to the motion for 352 Woodside on page 19 of the Staff report. He noted that Commissioner Suesser had made specific requirements in her motion, but it was not added as a condition of approval. He read, "Commissioner Suesser amended her motion to specify that a 4' reduction in length of the garage should be 2' on the east and 2' on the west". Chair Strachan pointed out that it paralleled Commissioner Thimm's suggestion. Chair Strachan recommended that the Planning Commission Continue the Minutes to the next meeting and have that change inserted into the Conditions of Approval and approve the Minutes at that time.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff looked at the Minutes and believed it was a clarification and not a condition of approval. He was not opposed if the Commissioners wanted to add it as a condition. He clarified that the Staff checked the Minutes because they were trying to work with the applicant on the requirement.

Asked if Commissioner Suesser intended for the requirement to be a condition of approval. Commissioner Suesser stated that she included it in her motion because Commissioner Thimm had made the recommendation. She personally did not have a preference as to

APPROVED 9.27.17

the configuration of the reduced 4'. However, she recalled that the motion was to make it a condition. Commissioner Thimm agreed that it was intended to be a condition.

Assistant City Attorney McLean recommended that the Commissioners continue the Minutes and have Mary verify the exact wording of the motion with the recording so it is reflected correctly. Chair Strachan agreed. However, since there was agreement among the Planning Commission that it was a condition, he believed the Conditions of Approval needed to be amended.

MOTION: Commissioner Band moved to CONTINUE the Adoption of the Minutes of August 23, 2017 to September 27th. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS
There were no comments.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson thanked the Commissioners who had sent back their direct deposit forms. He encouraged those who had not returned the form to do so or they would not receive their checks.

Chair Strachan announced that Louis Rodriguez was leaving the Planning Department and he would be greatly missed. Louis was going to Italy to teach English. Chair Strachan wished him the best of luck.

APPROVED 9.27.17

REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION

1. <u>339 Park Avenue – Abandonment of a Condominium Plat and reverting lot back to a single-lot of record</u>. (Application PL-17-03612)

Planner Anya Grahn noted that this application was a condominium vacation reverting the property back to a single lot of record.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Phillips moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for 339 Park Avenue, abandonment of a condominium plat based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Findings of Fact – 339 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 339 Park Avenue in the Historic Residential-1 Density (HR-1) District.

2. The subject property consists of the John Doyle House Condominiums approved by the City Council on September 10, 1987; it was recorded at Summit County on June 2, 1988.

3. On July 10, 2017, the Planning Department received a plat amendment application to vacate the John Doyle House Condominium plat; the application was deemed complete on August 8, 2017.

4. The John Doyle House at 339 Park Avenue was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as part of the Mining Boom Era Thematic National Register District in 1984; however, it was not listed at the owner's request. It has since had several major alterations that have diminished its historical significance and integrity. It is no longer eligible for the NRHP.

5. The property was designated as Significant on the City's Historic Sites Inventory in 2009.

6. The first renovation to restore the house occurred in 1986-1977 by then-owners David C. and Edward L. Cook, Jr. These owners converted the house from a single family home to a triplex.

7. On June 17, 1986, the Board of Adjustment (BOA) granted two variances to allow the Cooks to convert the single family dwelling into a duplex with an additional sleeping unit. The variances included an exception to LMC 7.1.3(a) Lot Size to reduce the minimum lot area for a duplex from 3,750 square feet to 1,990 square feet and to reduce the minimum depth of the front yard from 10 feet to 0 feet for the construction of a garage.

8. In 1986, a building permit was issued for the renovation of the house as well as an inline rear addition and the basement level garage addition.

9. On June 22, 1987, the BOA granted two additional variances as part of the rehabilitation of the property. They granted an exception to LMC 15 7.1.3(a) Lot Size to reduce the required lot size of a triplex from 5,625 square feet to 1,990 square feet as well as an exception to LMC 13.3(a) Required Off-Street Parking to reduce off-street parking demand from five (5) spaces to four (4).

10. The property was renovated again in 1996 by new owners, and it appears the illegal conversion to create a single-family dwelling was done as part of this renovation. The recorded John Doyle House Condominium plat had been recorded at the county in 1988 and was still in place at the time of the 1996 renovation.

11. On April 2, 2012, the Planning Department issued a letter informing current owner Chris Casey that there were issues related to his proposal to enclose a back staircase as the existing home exceeded allowable footprint and the proposal did not comply with LMC 15-9-6 Noncomplying Structures.

12. On January 31, 2013, Chris Casey submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Pre-application to enclose the rear stairwell constructed in 1986. On February 4, 2013, the Planning Director found that based on the applicable code requirements and existing conditions, the current structure was noncompliant in regards to footprint, setbacks, and allowed stories based on the requirements of the HR-1 zoning district and, therefore, the stairwell foundation could not be used to achieve an enclosed rear addition to the home.

13. On February 13, 2017, the applicant appealed the Planning Director's determination. The BOA voted unanimously to deny the appeal and upheld the Planning Director's determination on May 7, 2013. The BOA found that enclosing the existing exterior stairwell would increase the degree of nonconformity of a noncompliant structure.

14. On December 13, 2013, an appeal of the BOA's determination was reviewed by Third Judicial District Court. The Court found that the BOA had correctly interpreted the definition of building footprint and that the BOA's decision that the enclosure of the rear stairs increased the overall building footprint of the structure and thereby increased the degree of existing non-conformity that was reasonable.

APPROVED 9.27.17

15. The property owner proposes to vacate the John Doyle House Condominium Record of Survey that created a total of three (3) units.

16. A condominium is not a type of use but a form of ownership.

17. The proposal for a single family dwelling complies with the allowed uses in the HR-1 District.

18. Lot 10, Block 3 of the Park City Survey contains 1,877 square feet. This is greater than the minimum lot size required for a single family dwelling which is 1,875 square feet.

19. The minimum lot width in the HR-1 District is 25 feet; Lot 10 is 25.03 feet in width.

20. The required front yard setback is 10 feet in the HR-1 District; the existing garage has a 0-foot front yard setback as permitted by the variance of 1986.

21. The required rear yard setback is 10 feet in the HR-1 District; the applicant has a 17-foot setback.

22. The required side yard setback is 3 feet in the HR-1 District; the Existing building has a .95-foot setback on the north side and 1.17-foot setback on the south side due to the construction of the original historic house and addition.

23. A single-family dwelling is an allowed use in the HR-1 District.

24. The proposed vacation of the Condominium Record of Survey Plat is appropriate as the requested form of ownership is not detrimental to the overall character of the neighborhood. Further, it will memorialize existing conditions as the house was already converted to a single-family dwelling during the 1996 remodel.

25. Staff has met with the Building Department to identify and determine any noncomplying items that would prevent the existing triplex from being reverted back to a single-family dwelling. As the house was remodeled in the 1990s back to a single-family home, staff finds that the house has a single Kitchen, as defined by LMC 15-15-1.

26. A Kitchen is defined by the LMC as an enclosed Area for the preparation of food and containing a sink, refrigerator, and stove.

APPROVED 9.27.17

27. The applicant has proposed a Lock-Out Unit in his building permit plans for the house remodel. A Lock-Out Unit is defined by the LMC as an Area of a dwelling with separate exterior Access and toilet facilities, but no Kitchen. Nightly rental of a Lockout Unit requires a Conditional Use Permit in the HR-1 zoning district.

28. An Accessory Apartment is defined as a self-contained Apartment, with cooking, sleeping, and sanitary facilities, created either by converting part of and/or by adding on to a Single-Family Dwelling or detached garage. Accessory Apartments are a Conditional Use in the HR-1 zoning district. No Accessory Apartment has been approved for this site.

29. The site is not located within the Sensitive Lands Overly District. There are no known physical mine hazards.

30. The site is not located within the Soils Ordinance Boundary.

31. The process to vacate a condominium plat is the same as amending an existing plat amendment. Staff's finds that there are no non-conformities that would be created by the removal of the condo plat and the existing underlying lot of record complies with the requirements of the LMC.

32. The applicant recorded a Declaration of Termination to abandon the condo plat on April 28, 2017. It is Entry No. 01068385.

33. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Conclusions of Law – 339 Park Avenue

1. The Condominium plat vacation is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding vacating a condominium record of survey plats.
2. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed plat vacation.
3. Vacation of the Condominium Plat, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval – 339 Park Avenue

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the recordation documents for compliance with State law, the Land

Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.

2. The applicant will record the documents at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat vacation will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.

3. A Lockout Unit is an allowed use in the HR-1 zone; however, any Nightly Rental of a Lockout Unit requires a Conditional Use Permit.

4. The applicant shall not construct a Kitchen in the Lockout Unit, else it will become an Accessory Apartment. A Kitchen contains a sink, refrigerator, and stove; whereas a Kitchenette contains a sink, refrigerator, and an electric outlet which may be used for a microwave oven. No 220V outlet for a range or oven shall be provided in the Lockout Unit.

5. When the condo plat is vacated, the property will revert back to a single lot of record within the Park City survey. Only one (1) dwelling unit will be permitted within the structure.

APPROVED 9.27.17

2. <u>441 Echo Spur – The applicant is requesting to combine Lots 2 and 3 of the Echo Spur Subdivision addressed at 441 and 449 Echo Spur into one lot of record</u>. (Application PL-17-03641)

Planner Tippe Morlan reviewed the application to combine two existing separate lots into one lot of record. Each lot has its own address and its own utilities. Both lots are undeveloped in the Echo Spur subdivision. These lots were created with the Echo Spur subdivision in 2014. Each existing lot is approximately 2800 square feet. Each has an existing maximum building footprint of 1200 square feet. The proposed new lot is slightly over 5600 square feet. However, this request reduces the maximum building footprint to an overall 2,050 square feet or a reduction of 351 square feet in the total building footprint from what is currently allowed to what would be allowed under one lot.

Planner Morlan stated that the applicant would like to construct one single-family home instead of two on the subject property. However, it would technically allow for a duplex since the minimum lot size in the zone for duplex is 3750 square feet. A CUP approval would be required.

Planner Morlan reported that future applications that would be required if the plat amendment moves forward would be an HDDR for the design of the home, and a steep slope CUP.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council, finding good cause that this would reduce the density on Echo Spur from seven lots to six lots. Assuming that the family does build a single-family home, the number of units would be reduced to six units. It also reduces the building footprint by 351 square feet.

Chair Strachan asked where in the Conditions of Approval or the Findings of Fact it gives the maximum building footprint. Planner Morlan stated that the maximum building footprint of the proposed lot is 2,050 square feet as stated in Finding #14. Finding #15 identifies the reduction.

Commissioner Phillips noted that Planner Morlan had compared lot sizes from Ontario and McHenry. He remarked that Ontario and Echo Spur are zoned HR-1, and he asked about the zoning for McHenry. Planner Astorga stated that he was familiar with that neighborhood. He noted that Silver Pointe Subdivision was an MPD that is zoned HR-1 with a combination of Recreation Open Space and three or four other zoning designations. It starts on Echo Spur and moves on towards the east. He stated that the other subdivision that is closer to this site and accesses off of Deer Valley Loop Road is zoned R-1. He was unsure which side Commissioner Phillips was asking about.

Commissioner Phillips clarified that he was looking at the list of lot sizes that Planner Morlan used as comparisons. He asked if it was normal to look outside of the actual zoning where the specific property is located.

Planner Morlan understood that when the Echo Spur subdivision was approved it was a hot topic and many people were concerned with the lot sizes. This analysis was done when Planner Astorga originally did the Echo Spur subdivision. In case any neighbors or the Commissioners were concerned, she had updated the analysis and included it in the Staff report to show that the size of the existing lot fits in with the general area.

Commissioner Phillips asked if the concerns expressed with the original subdivision was that the homes would be too big. Planner Astorga recalled that it was somewhat of a different application that was proposed at that time with underground parking and shared access directly of McHenry. That application did not have traction from the Planning Commission and that concept was aborted by the property owner. The owner, Sean Kelleher, then moved forward with a seven lot subdivision. Planner Astorga recalled that it

APPROVED 9.27.17

was a difficult approval and it was based on the history of the development prior to Mr. Kelleher being actively involved.

Chair Strachan had the same recollection as Planner Astorga. He also recalled that the vehicular access to and from the lots was a major issue, because Echo Spur is a dead-end road and they could not find a way to feasibly make it work to get 15+ cars in there.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the Amending of Lots 2 and 3 of the Echo Spur Subdivision, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Findings of Fact – 441 Echo Spur

1. The property is located at 441 Echo Spur and 449 Echo Spur.
2. The property consists of Lot 2 and Lot 3 of the Echo Spur Subdivision plat.
3. The property is in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District.
4. The property is currently vacant.
5. The applicant proposes to combine the subject lots into one lot of record.
6. The proposed lot is 5,625 square feet.
7. The minimum lot area in the HR-1 District is 1,875 square feet for a single-family dwelling. The minimum lot area for a duplex is 3,750 square feet.
8. The proposed lot meets the minimum lot requirements for both a single-family dwelling and a duplex dwelling.
9. A single-family dwelling is an allowed use in the HR-1 District. A duplex is a conditional use.
10. The minimum lot width in the HR-1 District is 25 feet.
11. The proposed lot width is 75 feet, which meets the minimum lots width.
12. The proposed lot depth is 75 feet.
13. Front and rear yard minimum setbacks are 10 feet each and 20 feet total. Side yard minimum setbacks are 5 feet each and 18 feet total.
14. The maximum building footprint for the proposed lot is 2,050.3 square feet.
15. The proposed plat amendment reduces the maximum building footprint on the

subject property by 351.1 square feet from 2,401.4 square feet on two lots to 2,050.3 square feet on one lot.
16. A Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit is required for any structure in excess of 200 square feet if it is located on any existing slope of 30 percent or greater.
17. A Historic District Design Review application is required for any new construction on
18. The average lot width on the east side of Ontario Avenue is approximately 36 feet.
19. The average lot area on the east side of Ontario Avenue (including un-platted lot combinations) is approximately 2,800.7 square feet, which equates to 1.49 Old Town Lots.
20. The lots on the east side of Echo Spur/platted McHenry Avenue (Gateway Estates Replat Second Amended Subdivision and Silver Pointe Subdivision), which are also within the HR-1 District, consist of much larger lots.
21. The average lot size on the east side of Echo Spur is 10,076.5 square feet, which equates to approximately 5.37 Old Town Lots.
22. The existing Echo Spur Subdivision consists of five lots of 2,812.5 square feet, one lot 3,772 square feet in size, and one lot 3,858 square feet in size.
23. The average lot size in the existing Echo Spur Subdivision is 3,098.9 square feet, which amounts to approximately 1.65 Old Town Lots.
24. If the proposed plat amendment were approved, the new lot would become the largest in the Echo Spur Subdivision at 3,750 square feet, and the average lot size would increase to 3,615.4 square feet, which amounts to approximately 1.93 Old Town Lots.
25. The requested plat amendment is appropriate for this neighborhood.
26. The east side of Echo Spur, also within the HR-1 District contains significantly larger lots that yield larger structures.
27. The west side of Echo Spur, east Ontario Avenue contains a pattern of 1½ Old Town lot combination sites.
28. The mix of lot sizes provides appropriate transition between the larger lots and home sizes on the east side of Echo Spur towards the east side of Ontario Avenue.
29. The proposed plat amendment provides a good mix of different lot sizes within Echo Spur.
30. The massing and design requirements through the HDDR and Steep Slope CUP processes are intended to ensure that new structures are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Both applications are required and must be approved before the lot can be developed.
31. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Conclusions of Law – 441 Echo Spur

1. There is good cause for this Plat Amendment.

2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding lot combinations.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
4. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval – 441 Echo Spur

1. The City Planner, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.

2. The applicant will record the plat at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one (1) years' time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.

3. Modified 13-D sprinklers will be required for all new construction.

4. The applicant needs to coordinate with the Engineering Department to determine whether one existing water service and meter vault needs to be abandoned. The existing new water service needs to be verified sized for fire service.

APPROVED 9.27.17

NOTE: The Treasure Hill portion of the Minutes is a verbatim transcript.

3. Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit, Creole Gulch and Town Lift Mid-station Sites – Sweeney Properties Master Plan (Application PL-08-00370)

Chair Strachan: Next on the agenda is the Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit. Looks like we're all ready to go. Francisco, you leading us off, then?

Planner Francisco Astorga: Yes, I am. So, we'd like to start off with just outlining the Staff report that we prepared. And actually before we do that I just want to outline that since that last meeting in August we received six or seven additional public comments,

and they have been published on the website. So we all need to be following to, to read them because we don't, we don't print them as part of the Staff report, but yes, they are part of the record.

With that said, the Staff report is bifurcated into three sections. We are providing a transportation update. That's why I've got Matt Cassel and Alfred Knotts with me here. And also regarding some of the construction mitigation I've got Dave Thacker, Chief Building Official, in the back of the room, and he can come up later on if we need him up, up here.

The second portion is just a refinement of 17.2. And I don't want to spend too much time with it. I do want to show you some of the exhibits that were submitted for that. And I think that the applicant will spend a little bit more time on those. And the last portion of the Staff report is an update of the Planning Commission outstanding items.

So to start out with the transportation update, just to follow what we published in the Staff report, and that starts for the public or anyone listening, it starts on page 161 through page 167. We'd like to start out by focusing on those. And we've identified eight different items that we believe that we heard from the Planning Commission loud and clear as far as items that Staff needs to address and indicate where we stand on them. So, we start on page 161 with those. With the---yeah, let me, let me ask you to see if we can make it more of an interactive work session. Not work session but a portion of this meeting where we can provide any commentary or clarification regarding what we published, regarding what we co-authored, what we wrote from the Planning Department, the City Engineer's Office and the Transportation Planning Office. So I would like to just simply stop at that and leave it at, do you guys, does the Commission, do you have any questions regarding items 1 through 8 as listed on page 161 through 167.

Commissioner Thimm: Yes.

Planner Astorga: And, and if I could, just to keep the order, if we could try to limit to this portion and then we'll, and then we'll move on to the next one and so forth.

Commissioner Thimm: Good. Okay, so number one, it says that City Staff reviewed the assumptions made by the Triton report and find all the assumptions

APPROVED 9.27.17

reasonably acceptable. Does that include the percentages of reduction for all the traffic counts that were suggested in there?

Alfred Knotts: Yes. And that's why we put a heavy emphasis on effectiveness monitoring, also, to make sure that we can revisit those assumptions based on the actual operation of the facility.

Director Erickson: So for Mary's purposes and for members in the audience, I need to let them know who Alfred is and who Matt is. That was Alfred Knotts, Transportation Planning Manager. Sorry, Alfred, I've got to get it on the record.

Planner Astorga: So I don't know if it would be wise to simply, if, if we don't have any other follow-up questions on the Item 1 we could move on to the second item.

Commissioner Joyce: So, so Item 2. I, I didn't understand the piece on the cross section. It was kind of a statement that says we think it's adequate. As I read through the applicant's comments in the back it sounded like when we're repaving Lowell right now we're actually doing it three feet narrower than it's been historically. Is that true?

Planner Astorga: Actually, before Matt answers that, and I'll let him answer that, I just want to say, since you brought up the applicant's position paper, it was submitted to the City Friday about noon. So yes, we were able to put it in the packet, but that's about it.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay. So I'll ignore the applicant.

Planner Astorga: No, no.

Commissioner Joyce: Can you tell me whether the repaving of Lowell is of a different width than it originally was, or was a year ago?

APPROVED 9.27.17

Matt
Cassel: It---from a year ago?

Commissioner
Joyce: From four months before they started tearing it up and repaving it.

Matt
Cassel: No. It's the same. It is the cross section that we recommend in the 2011 Master Plan.

Commissioner
Joyce: So, but let me, let me, that's not what I asked. There was a road there four months ago.

Matt
Cassel: Right.

Commissioner
Joyce: I don't care what the plan said. There was a road there four months ago, there will be a road when they're done all the paving that they've done. Is the new well-paved road of a different width than it was this past winter?

Matt
Cassel: Yes, it will be narrower.

Commissioner
Joyce: And so can you explain----given all the things that we've seen and heard and witnessed personally about all the traffic and snow removal issues and parking issues, and people walking through the streets and stuff like that, how did you guys a) get to the conclusion that it was adequate; and b) get to the conclusion that making it three-foot narrower was a good idea?

Matt
Cassel: So, in---and that's one of the things we tried to articulate in Item 2 was how we came about making the decision to make the road narrower. It, it's, it was---I'm trying to think of how to say it, of collaboration amongst a lot of departments in the City to come up with what we thought, and what we believe is the right road section for Old Town Park City. This section of road is the same width as Empire. We've seen a lot of information showing worst case scenarios of, of what may happen, and that's something that happens

APPROVED 9.27.17

everywhere in Old Town. We don't design for worst case scenario. We actually should be designing for average case situations.

This here, the section as we were looking at it, we had to make decisions as to where we wanted to put people. Where do the pedestrians go, where do the bicyclists go? And in this, in the section I wrote up we talk a little bit about streets versus the roads. And our local streets are meant to access people from the homes to the higher mobile roads. Our Old Town streets are not meant for high speeds. They're meant to be used for people to access their homes, get to the higher mobile roads, such as 224 and 248.

One of the things we recognize is there's a common belief that greater width equates to safer, better roads. And in 2011 that's one of the things we fought was, is, you know, what does that really mean and what does that really look for our roads. What we really end up doing is we store snow on the roads. We use a part of the road during the winter months. Even though we're narrowing the asphalt section of the road, we're still keeping the area that we normally use for snow storage. So we may have less asphalt but we still have the same amount of snow storage that we had previously. And it's a road section that, that---for access to the homes we believe and have believed and have been building roads to that section that works for Old Town.

Now we've got to throw in Treasure, and the traffic trips that are going to be generated by Treasure. And that's one of the first things we did in 2015 when we started looking at redoing Lowell Avenue. Do we leave it as a local street or do we bump it up to a minor collector, which would give us more width and, and the ability to handle more trips? And in April of 2015 we had InterPlan evaluate with Treasure in place, with Bamberger in place, and 100% buildout, what the trips would be like. We did three scenarios. One with all trips on Empire, all trips on Lowell, and then all trips kind of spread evenly amongst them. And at no time did we exceed the capacity of the local street. And so that is why Lowell and Empire were built as local streets and why they're being narrowed.

Commissioner Joyce: So when you say that. We, we had some debate a while back about what, what was the capacity of a local street. And we had some numbers that seemed to go much higher than, than what was thrown out at that meeting. So what, how did that get resolved? Because it seemed like we were going to blow right through that based on everything we saw that night.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Matt Cassel: So one of the things in the---in Item, in Item #3 we talk about AADT, ADT, and peak, peak hour. The information that was captured by---normally when you design a road you design it for average annual daily trips. The information that Triton captured was peak. And so it's not---and one of the things we have asked is to take those peak hours, peak trips and convert them to ADT or AADT; Average Daily Trips, or Average Annual Daily Trips. And as we talk about it in this section, AADT is a lower number than ADT, and we feel for this it's appropriate to be designing for ADT. So if you just take those intersection numbers and multiply them by 12 hours, 16 hours, that's a number that was only for a three-hour time window. You can't necessarily multiply them by 16 to get the average daily trips for that.

Commissioner Joyce: Yeah, but I remember that just for what it's worth, it was like if you just took the peak morning hour and the peak afternoon hour period, just those two hours, you were almost at the average daily limit that you guys told us for a road, and that was just literally two hours. So that left the remaining 22 hours of the day to---I mean, traffic doesn't just drop off a cliff at, you know, 9:00 a.m. or something when the clock turns.

Matt Cassel: No. And, and that's, and I didn't---this didn't get out today?

Planner Astorga: No, it didn't, but I can bring it up.

Matt Cassel: There was a map that we put together that I think is trying to address that question, which is, I think the most representative counts for Lowell Avenue and Empire Avenue are the ones at the intersection of North Star and Lowell.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay.

Matt Cassel: Pretty much up near the bend. As we get down and move into the intersection of Silver King and Empire we changed the designation of the

APPROVED 9.27.17

street. Empire Avenue is actually a commercial street. It is designed to carry a capacity of 15,000 trips, versus Lowell Avenue and Empire, which are designed for a maximum of 2500. So that's one of the things I felt was kind of confusing is as people are looking at these intersections and looking at number of vehicles passing through the intersections, they weren't taking into account the different road sections that were tied into those intersections.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay. I understand what you're saying. I'm still a little confused because if you, if you simply get down to the area kind of down at the bottom of the hill near the Bamberger proposal, if, if that's exceeding capacity and you start running into problems where people can't pass and, you know, basically traffic backs up, then it kind of doesn't matter that it's free up the street from there. You've still got a street blocked and the street's only, you know, what is it a half mile long or something. It's probably not even that. So it's not like, oh, yeah, but it's clear up at the top where, where there are no cars right this minute.

Matt Cassel: And you're right. And one of the things we did right in that area, which is the Park City Mountain Building and the Marriott, is we actually, the road is about the same but we actually have sidewalks on both sides of the street. So, we're removing some of the friction to allow freer flow and allow more vehicles to me able to move there, through there safely. So we have---made changes in that little section because of the large number of trips generated by the Marriott.

Commissioner Joyce: So, so let me ask this because this---I, I, when I was reading through I wasn't quite sure. And by the way, the stuff's not up on the screen. I don't know if you're trying to show us anything. But, oh, there we go. One of the, one of the concerns that when we really talk about---even if you ignore the fact that traff-, you know, you may end up with trucks kind of going head to head trying to get up and down the hill, which I still haven't figured out how that's not going to happen since it's been happening for years there. We have two safety issues. One that we've heard about is, you know, fire trucks and emergency vehicles being able to get up Empire and Lowell. And the other is, there's a really unusual number of pedestrians on those streets because they're walking down. I mean, you've got an attraction, right down there at the end of the street that's in

APPROVED 9.27.17

walking distance. And so you go to any other street---you know, go up here to Norfolk or something like that, and it's not like there's all those people walking out there because there's a really interesting thing right down the street. But here we do. So you can, I mean, you just go there at 8, 9 o'clock in the morning and you see a flow of people from different, you know, houses and condos, and people who are parking there that probably shouldn't be anyway, walking down the street. There's a lot of pedestrian traffic. So, how do you guys, and this could be either of you here, or any of the three of you, how do you recommend that we take in those safety concerns. Because if you start getting to, we're not going to look at peak traffic, we're going to look at ADT or AADT, I've still got safety concerns for both the pedestrians and emergency access up those roads. How, how do we filter that into this discussion, because I really didn't see that addressed here.

Matt Cassel: It---well, we, we had a section, I think it was in [inaudible], we talked about the reason, our reasoning for sidewalks, or not for sidewalks. And, and it's an important question you're asking and it's, it's one of the basis of, of our decision-making in 2011 is where to put the pedestrians. And, and---

Commissioner Joyce: And just to be clear for the people who didn't read here, the answer is you put them in the street.

Matt Cassel: We put them in the street.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay. Just---

Matt Cassel: And, and so in, in a nut---really what we're looking at is number of trips per day. If it's within the confines, or within the counts for a local street, so it's less than 2000 trips a day, we want that side friction. We want the peds in the street, we want the bikes in the street. We want everything in the street mingling and slowing people down. Making it a neighborhood street, not a road. Now that works well in the summertime. In the winter then we start talking about let's put a different path for the pedestrians. Where do we put them? And we talk about it here, about putting a sidewalk. And at the end of the day that sidewalk's going to be buried in

APPROVED 9.27.17

snow. People are going to walk where we plow. And we, and we plow the street and that's where we're going to walk. We can put sidewalk in on the west side or on the east side, and we talk about that in the report. At the end of the day, if we don't plow those sidewalks people are going to walk in the street. And it's shown in one of the pictures that was shown a couple months ago, people walking down the middle of the street between the Marriott and 1301 Lowell, and there's sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Commissioner Joyce: I know, but back in 2009 when we went back and reviewed through there, where there was a lot of discussion about the different street profiles and stuff, there was also a lot of discussion and recommendation, I think from the Planning Department, that not only would there be sidewalks but the sidewalks would be plowed. And so I keep getting back to---I understand where you guys are going and I read through all that, but I, I keep just trying to picture in kind of a logical simplistic view, if you're still pushing snow over to the side of the road, and we're not going in there every morning and hauling it all off, which obviously we're not going to, and people are still parking on that road, which they're still going to unless we make a change and say no parking anywhere, at which point I, I don't know how those people park their houses any more. You've basically got snow storage and cars parked and you've driven people out into the street, and we're going to have two-way traffic on all these roads. And I just can't, I just can't do the little cross-section to make that work. I don't, I don't know what you're recommending that looks like.

Matt Cassel: The, one of the things, and it's not going to flow. I'll tell you that right now, it's going to be slow moving wherever they go because of the people in the street, and because the cars as they come head to head have to move over to pass each other. And that was the goal of what we were trying to accomplish. Slow everyone down.

On Empire Avenue, I wrote that up in here, also, it is---you know, one of the things the City needs to do a better job of is we need to manage the road. There are numerous signs that were taking down saying no parking that have become places where people park. People are supposed to be parking on the west side of the road, and many people park on the east side, which now is the road down and becomes the head to head conflict with two trucks.

APPROVED 9.27.17

One of the things, I think---and so by us managing that a little bit better of how people park we keep as much width open as possible. Now when people are parking on the street, not every foot of road is taken up by parking.

Commissioner Joyce: Right.

Matt Cassel: And so that's where the passing occurs. That's why---as, as people come head to head to each other one moves over into an area that's not parked up and they pass each other. That was our entire is to force people to slow down to nothing. To make them crawl through those places. To make them a street. To make them so that slower speeds reduce accidents, reduce the, the dollar value of accidents, reduce a lot of the stress.

Commissioner Phillips: It---I'm sorry, I just have to, does it also reduce the amount of an ambulance getting from one end of the road to the other?

Matt Cassel: One of my favorite sayings is, we create, we make wider streets so that we can quickly get emergency vehicles to respond to accidents caused by wider streets. So we can make them wider---

Commissioner Phillips: I'm not, I don't, I wouldn't say that that, that my biggest concern on that road is a high speed accident. My biggest concern, 'cause I'm right there with you. My biggest concern is that you know, and I understand and, you know, I understand that you don't design roads for the worst case scenario, but you have to have a plan for the worst case scenario. And so, you know, I'm just trying to picture the Cisco truck getting jackknifed down one side, and then the two wheel Uber driver spinning, he can't spin his wheels fast enough to get up the other road. It's all backed up and the kid next door eats a peanut and needs an Epipen, you know. And, and in, and in all of that we have purposely slowed everything down. And that's

APPROVED 9.27.17

my biggest fear. The traffic counts, the numbers, all of that, I mean, you guys are the professionals, but I'm worried about the kid that ate the peanut next door.

Commissioner Joyce: I'm worried about, as part of this CUP, the 11-story hotel on fire. And so, now you're talking about trying to bring up big fire trucks and lots of them in a hurry. I sympathize with the peanut guy, but I mean, as part of the CUP---

Commissioner Phillips: I have kids.

Commissioner Joyce: We actually have review criteria that says, you know, how does emergency access work. And I feel like we're exacerbating that problem.

Matt Cassel: Every step we took in 2011, the fire department was with us. And we made sure that what we were building was something that they could work with. Not something that was less than what they could work with, but something that we meet minimum fire standards. That was the most important thing for us is to make sure that emergency vehicles can make it through. At times right after a snow event, that is more difficult than it is on, than on July 15th. But, we had hand-in-hand the fire district with us as we went through and decided how these roads were going to look and how they were going to operate. That was the most important thing to us is to make sure they could get through.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay. I mean, quite frankly, just for all the discussion we have here, I understand where you're coming from, but I don't care about summer. I mean, to me there's five months of winter that are the problem in that particular area.

Matt Cassel: Right, right.

Commissioner Joyce: And that's, that's all that matters for this particular discussion.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Matt Cassel: Right, 'cause in the winter time it's a narrower road. You're absolutely right.

Commissioner Joyce: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

Planner Astorga: So, I think we discussed---Matt explained the, he evaluated the AADT with all the other, other acronyms aligned on three, and also even four. If we could just move, or do we have any more questions that we need to address on those?

Chair Strachan: I just have one more. What, if anything, has the applicant proposed to mitigate the impact on emergency vehicle access? Ski runs and Cabriolets can't go to that, right?

Matt Cassel: No.

Chair Strachan: So, what is the applicant proposing that's going to make it easier? To what degree I don't care. But easier at all. Well, actually I do care to what degree, but I just want to find out if it's more than zero.

Planner Astorga: I can't think of anything specifically to that, but would you be okay if we asked Gary Horton that question?

Chair Strachan: Absolutely. Yeah.

Planner Astorga: I don't know if he, if he wants to come up and answer it now or---

Chair Strachan: Why don't you chime in right now, Gary. Grab a mic.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Gary Horton: Sorry. I was taking notes so do you want to repeat the question and make sure I'm answering the correct question.

Chair Strachan: What does the applicant propose that will mitigate the impact visa-vie emergency vehicle access? What are you guys proposing that will make it easier for an ambulance or a fire truck to get up to Treasure?

Gary Horton: I'd have to talk with our team, but---

Pat Sweeney: I can answer that question. Do you want me to answer it?

Chair Strachan: Why don't you come up to the mic. Sure.

Pat Sweeney: Pat Sweeney, representing MPE, the applicant. Our position on this is that there is a solution, just like there's a solution for the rest of Old Town. John knows that, I know that. I've lived up there for 40 years. I don't know how long you've lived up there, John. The fire department/EMS system makes it happen, even under the worst circumstances. Regarding operation of the road, and, and I have a little bit of side expertise here, I was an emergency physician for 40 years. Treated over 100,000 patients. Worked at the Trauma One Center in Salt Lake. I, I have to agree with Matt. When they need, when the need to, when the need arises, the fire department will get up there and people will get out of the way. And I don't know if they're here tonight. I wish they were. They've said that before, and all those folks, that's how they think. I'm totally, I understand what it's like for a child to eat a peanut that they're allergic to, I understand that. I understand what a fire is like.

Regarding what we're going, we agreed a long time ago to a fire protection plan that had extraordinary measures regarding our project, so a lot of the equipment will be in [inaudible] and built into our project, including a command control system. So in certain circumstances, all the firemen have to do is get up there one way or another.

APPROVED 9.27.17

If, if there's a problem with what we're talking about here, it exists today. It existed last winter. And the, there is a solution if we work together on this. There's a decision to be made, and our position as applicant when it comes to the roads, we can give you all sorts of great ideas, and we have over the last 15 years. But it's, it's up to the City to make that decision and operate the roads for everybody. That's our position.

Chair Strachan: That's your position in full? Period.

Pat Sweeney: Adam, that's our position. We've been talking for 15 years. All 15 years of counts.

Chair Strachan: All right.

Pat Sweeney: And I'm not saying I'm done yet.

Gary Horton: The one that was done---sorry, I had to sit back and think. Generally, emergency services are considered already in place unless you're adding new roads or adding things, how are you going to accommodate them.

I think one of the mitigations that was done a long time ago was the donation of the property for the Empire/Lowell connection loop, so the emergency services can access those homes in that area from either direction. If one is block off, it provides the ability to come from the other direction. So, like any, most developments require two access points. That created that ability for that, what wouldn't have been without that loop connection.

Chair Strachan: All right. So you're citing the donation of the connector of Lowell and Empire?

Gary Horton: Correct.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair
Strachan: Anything further?

Gary
Horton: Not that I can think of.

Chair
Strachan: Okay. All right.

Commissioner
Thimm: So, I guess, you know, we have---this, this Commission has time after time talked about enforcement issues and that sort of thing, and various aspects of, of municipal codes. And, you know, the, the Staff report, particularly in this Item #2, points out the ignoring of no parking signs and the parking on sidewalks and that sort of thing as I guess part of the solution to the problem. What is going to happen differently to cause enforcement to actually happen where it hasn't happened before?

[Mr. Cassel and Mr. Knotts confer.]

Matt
Cassel: We're thinking out loud.

Commissioner
Thimm: That's the best way sometimes.

Matt
Cassel: We've got a project coming down, and because of the project, the road project that's coming up in a couple of years, we're starting discussions about expanding the permit program. By expanding the permit program, we expand the area that we can enforce. Some of the things that have happened in the past were on the sheer basis of the priority of parking exceeds the need for pedestrian sidewalks. And, and at the end of the day, that priority trumped.

So, you see, like I think I talked about it on Norfolk, where people are parking on sidewalks, Council had to make that decision of what to do. Either tear the sidewalk out; allow people to park in places they're not

APPROVED 9.27.17

supposed to park. And the decision was to allow them to park on the sidewalk because of the need of the neighborhood to have parking.

Commissioner Band: But is it the need of the neighborhood? I mean, I don't think that---when was the last time Old Town parking permits were enforced? A lot of those people parking on Lowell and Empire do not have permits in their car. And as I understand it, it's actually the City who's enforcing that, not the Police Department. Is that correct?

Alfred Knotts: That is correct. Outside of the permit area the Police Department does enforce. Within the permit area, the Parking Services does enforce.

Commissioner Band: Right.

Alfred Knotts: So as Matt mentioned, we are considering expanding that program not necessarily based on the project facilitating that, but more of the overall Old Town Parking Management Plan, recognizing that paid parking may have other consequences, but people spilling over and things that we have seen, even without paid parking and also without projects.

Commissioner Band: Right.

Alfred Knotts: To hinge that on this project, that's what we were discussing about, whether we wanted to say that, because it does require a lot of public outreach, other policy decisions by the Council. So we obviously didn't want to tie that necessarily right now to that type of a project. But that has been an ongoing issue and permit programs would potentially be considered down the road in advance of this project.

Commissioner Band: But we already have a permit program, right? It's just not being enforced?

APPROVED 9.27.17

Alfred Knotts: It's enforced but it does not extend to this area and it does not extend to 14th and 15th.

Commissioner Band: Okay.

Alfred Knotts: We, we were considering moving it all the way down to Deer Valley Drive, but again, that's just something that's been discussed, because right now where it ends, all it does is really push everything down to 14th, 15th, and those areas from the permit area right now.

Commissioner Band: So I used to live on Empire. I had a parking permit, all my tenants had parking permits. Did that change? Is that, I mean, you know, like, like I said, parking---in my opinion, and this is completely outside of the Treasure application, we should be enforcing parking permits in Old Town. People should not be parking unless they have a permit, unless they live there. And if not, they should get ticketed or towed. I mean, that's going to change a whole lot of the problems we've got there. It's not going to solve everything, but I think we should probably start with the low-hanging fruit.

Alfred Knott: Correct. And it has become more of a priority for the City. We actually hired additional parking enforcement people. And we've hired additional, or a new parking manager whose made this a priority also. So that is the low-hanging fruit it yes, let's not create another problem before we address the problem that currently exists. So we do, we do concur with that.

Chair Strachan: I mean, a lot of that's not really relevant to the CUP criteria, right? That's something the City has to do no matter what. The applicant can't claim the City's obligation to enforce its parking laws as a mitigating factor.

Alfred Knotts: No.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair
Strachan: And you guys aren't saying that. Right?

Matt
Cassel: We're not saying that, no.

Chair
Strachan: Okay.

Alfred
Knott: Correct. And that's kind of what I was dancing around about the larger Council policy issue that's tied more to the Transportation Demand Management Strategy and the Old Town Parking Strategies as well.

Chair
Strachan: Okay.

Commissioner
Thimm: So, so the concern that I have is, is if the transportation strategy in this area depends on road widths and that sort of thing, that, that make the presumption that parking laws are, are being obeyed and they're not, doesn't that strategy fall apart?

Alfred
Knotts: It's a part of the overall strategy is the management strategy, and then also shifting a lot of those modes and those trips. Two different modes. Shifting those trips off of those peak times, too. So it kind of goes back to what Commissioner Joyce said about those peak times where it may or may---or be close to potentially failing with or without the project.

So we looked, and some of the strategies you'll see in here that we've articulated, or tried to articulate a little bit better in the Staff report, is to shift those trips off of those peak times so they don't exceed those ADTs during that time. So when we look at deliveries we tried to articulate the best we could from what we have to work with at a Staff level, is to shift those off to peak times. To shift employee work times and schedules off of those peak times to not exacerbate what already currently exists as the background travel and the background ADT. Which background means existing, sorry.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Commissioner Thimm: So, in terms of enforcement, obviously the applicant doesn't have anything to do with enforcement, but shifting of trips off of peak times and that sort of thing is a clear indicator that the applicant does have control over, or can have control over it.

Alfred Knotts: That is, yes, that is our position. As these are the---the TDM strategies that are outlined put a lot of emphasis, meaning transportation demand management strategies, are put a lot of emphasis on by the applicant. We try to drill down on those because we do see that they do address the issue to a certain level, but without that specificity they may or may not be effective. So that's why we've tried to be very specific on what those strategies are.

And again, the enforcement issue comes back to a broader City management strategy, not necessarily directed specifically at the applicant or this project.

Planner Astorga: The, the applicant simply wrote on their position paper on page 203 that they support the City's policies regarding on-street parking on Lowell and Empire Avenues, and assist the City in parking enforcement efforts on the streets.

Chair Strachan: Treasure's going to assist?

Planner Astorga: I, I don't quite know. Again, this came in Thursday at noon. I don't know what that last section means. And it says the City's parking enforcement efforts on the streets.

Chair Strachan: What was that, Pat?

Pat Sweeney: I, I'd be happy to explain that to you if you'd like. If you'd like we can [inaudible].

APPROVED 9.27.17

Director Erickson: So just, just to keep it kind of going here. I think that our folks probably want to get through their presentation, and then I think we should have a coordinated rebuttal and conversation with the applicant, or whoever the applicant wants to represent them.

Chair Strachan: That's, I think, a good general strategy. I think there's going to be some exceptions to that. I mean, we're getting down here to the short strokes as I've said before, and what I want is some, you know, point/counterpoint responses, because if there's mitigating factors I want to hear them. And sometimes those get lost because 20 minutes goes by when somebody's not saying something responsive to a question.

Director Erickson: Right, right, so from, from a process standpoint, Mr. Chairman---

Chair Strachan: I will make sure the process is observed. And I will make sure the record is as clean as possible. And I think we're going to be pretty efficient. But we'll just have to kinda do it a little bit by the hip tonight.

Director Erickson: That, that will be fine. Just what Francisco's alluding to in his Staff report is this list of outstanding issues and responses coming back. So we're attempting to do this in writing as best we can. And you'll start to see the lists and the counterpoints to the list. And you'll start to see the applicant's response point by point in the meetings. So however you want to run it, Mr. Chairman. We're, we're here to serve.

Chair Strachan: Okay. We'll try it. If it gets away from me, John won't have to buy drinks. I'll buy them. All right, let's---sorry. Commissioner Suesser?

Commissioner Suesser: Yeah, I have a question just going back to that Section 3 that we were just discussing. The peak hour volumes that were collected by the applicant

APPROVED 9.27.17

and the analysis the City's done based on those numbers. Just want to clarify that we're talking about the numbers that they collected from President's weekend of this year. Those are the peak hour numbers that we're---that's you're basing your analysis on?

Matt Cassel: Correct.

Commissioner Suesser: And do you have some concerns about the fact that it was an unseasonably warm, you know, rainy weekend, and the fact that Epic locals were---it was blacked out for them. So you didn't have typical local traffic coming to the Resort on that weekend because they were blacked out. Have you factored those things in, because that's a concern of mine that we're basing a lot of this on those numbers from that weekend, and it might not be, it might not capture what's really going on during the winter months up there?

Alfred Knotts: Yeah, and I'll clarify this. So the peak hour really doesn't shift, hasn't shifted based on whether it was ten years ago or it was just recently. So those peak hour windows---

Commissioner Suesser: What about the volumes?

Alfred Knotts: Stayed. Yeah, the volumes have changed over those years, obviously. We have taken that into consideration. We didn't apply any type of reduction factor based on those conditions that occurred at the time. Any time you kind of do a traffic count to that level or any time you do any type of existing conditions or field assessment, there typically is a plus or minus of about 5%. And so I think you could take into account that those conditions may have been applied to that 5% range, but still feel comfortable that they're representative of that peak day and that peak time.

I think, and not to defend anybody or anything, but having gone through this in different instances constantly with different projects, you schedule this labor and this technology and deploy these mechanisms well in

APPROVED 9.27.17

advance of not knowing what exactly is going to occur that day. So those anomalies are not a typical to exist.

Commissioner Suesser: Okay.

Chair Strachan: All right, let's move on to the third point, Evaluation of the AADT calculations or within the range, the accuracy and good engineering. Or did we cover that in the last discussion and we're moving on to four?

Commissioner Suesser: That was discussed. So they covered it.

Chair Strachan: All right. Five then. It looks like four was covered as well.

Commissioner Suesser: Maybe we should discuss four a little bit.

Chair Strachan: Okay. Francisco, what's your, your input there?

Planner Astorga: Well, I think I'm going to defer to my transportation experts on that.

Matt Cassel: Number four?

Chair Strachan: Explain the measurement location of ADT at the intersections and the intersection reflects the total traffic on the street.

Alfred Knotts: It---well, when those are deployed they do identify specific intersections and then see what's bled off or siphoned off from the next intersection. So we see what the traffic volume is that went through that intersection and then saw what was carried through the entire corridor. So, if you're asking about the methodology and whether we feel comfortable with it,

APPROVED 9.27.17

yes. That, that is an acceptable practice and we do feel comfortable with those intersections in that deployment.

Commissioner Suesser: I think the point we were getting to in that number four was that it didn't, it captured only what was going on at the intersection, and not what was going on in between the project and Manor. You know, or what will be going on between the project and Manor Way, for instance, or the rest of---or to the intersection of Deer Valley Drive and Empire Avenue. It doesn't capture what's going on the road and it doesn't take into account the pedestrians or take into account the congestion on the streets, and the parking on the streets, and the winter conditions on the streets, and the fact that they're one way roads on those streets. That's what that was, I believe, getting at there. Evaluating what was going on at the intersection exclusively, which was something you pointed out in your memo. You said that the traffic analysis needs to include an evaluation of the roadway congestion, you know, in between the street, not just in the intersection.

Alfred Knotts: Yes, and it is typical that the level of service is measured at intersections, because those are the, the conflict points, I guess. But there are additional conflict points along the corridor. And I think as Matt mentioned, too, there's all those different factors that weigh into it, such as the pedestrian friction, the snow friction, the width of the street. And those aren't necessarily always a bad thing, as Matt mentioned. And also, is that they can cause calming factors on the street, also.

Commissioner Suesser: You know those roads are failing now as Pat Sweeney pointed out. The, the problem exists now on those road, and now are you going to increase the traffic and you're still going to keep those conditions the way they are. That's what you're proposing. Just push everyone into the street and that will snow the traffic down. That's---

Matt Cassel: Just for clarity, though, the streets are not failing. They have a lot of traffic on them and, and, and failure or how the streets operate is, is pretty subjective. It's different for everybody. And I know that our goals and what we were trying to accomplish are---can be different from a lot of

APPROVED 9.27.17

people, especially when something like Treasure is coming in, as to where and when failure occurs. We know that after a big storm event that most of our roads in Old Town, I'm not going to say are in failure mode because our maintenance dudes get out there and they clear snow and they open everything up. And that's important to us. But we know that they'll be times when the roads won't operate at peak condition. But we make sure that as we're going through and evaluating and coming up with these roads in the cross sections that the emergency fire district is involved, everyone is involved to make sure that there's a comfort level that when the time comes and needs to happen, emergency vehicles can get through. That they are, they are safe. That the speeds are slower than what they are on other wider streets. That's we're accomplishing our mission to slow people down.

Commissioner Joyce: I have a question, and I don't know whether this is going to be back to the applicant or to you guys, but actually I'm sorry, it goes all the way back to number one, here where it was just, are the surveys good. I just, there was one question that I asked you guys back in the, the August 9th meeting. There was a chart that had the actual counts in 2005, and then the actual counts in 2017. And in a number of cases they were anywhere from 3 to 5 times higher, even though there were no, you know, major projects like a Bamberger or anything like that that came along.

And so I guess I'll, I'll start with Park City. When you guys said, yeah, these things are good, did you look at that. Do you have an explanation that you're comfortable with? Because one of the things we're doing is we're projecting out to 2037 and looking at the volumes there. And those volumes are just little tiny increments over what we have projected for 2017 with Lowell added. How in the world did we get actual counts that went up? And if you're looking, it's page 91 of the package from, from August 9th. But I mean, it was huge jumps in actual counts. Why is it that we're comfortable that we're suddenly going to start adding big projects in there and have little tiny things over 20 years, when we had so much increase over 12 with no big projects. Anyone?

Planner Astorga: We, we don't have an answer. This is why we're having this somewhat of a work session format, so we can make sure that we've caught everything or indicated that we're not---didn't catch everything. So we'll, we'll note that and get back to you.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Commissioner
Joyce: So if you would. That was, that, that's a real important one to me because that---the effect it had on me is---looking at the 2037 projects and going they're way off. And I could be wrong, but if I look from 2005 to 2017 and see five times the traffic volume, and then I look out another 20 years and see a 20% increase, I have to say no way. So although you guys came forward and said, you know, we accept their traffic studies, I don't yet. And I still haven't heard a good answer to that.

Commissioner
Suesser: Right. And I, I want to point out that in their traffic study that was submitted, they, they drew conclusions on future traffic volumes relying on data based on anticipated regional population growth, rather than looking at data based on localized increases around the Resort area. So just a general population growth in Summit County was used as their data point rather than what was going on, what's going on in Old Town or what's going on in the City, within the City limits. [Inaudible.]

Commissioner
Joyce: Yeah, the thing that I threw out was that when you look at Vail's own projections for the part of the Canyon spa that their working on, that I know is unrelated here. But Vail says we're increasing skier days 5% every year for the next five years. And that just blows through the 20 year projections for the kind of localized regional numbers. And so, again, I just want to get back to how do you account for all that, because boy it seems to be in direct conflict to the 2037 projections.

Chair
Strachan: All right. Any more questions on four? All right, let's go down to five. The traffic split on Lowell and Empire Avenue at construction delivery and daily traffic. Times, I'm assuming should, should have been in, in there.

Commissioner
Joyce: Nope.

Chair
Strachan: Nothing?

Commissioner

APPROVED 9.27.17

Joyce: Nope.

Chair Strachan: My only question is the third bullet point down says daily traffic generated by Treasure Hill may use both streets for access with adequate mitigation as proposed. Any new mitigation that's being proposed that we haven't already seen, that you guys are aware of? No? All right.

So we're talking then, and correct if I'm wrong, but we're talking then about reduced construction times in terms of the number---when the dump trucks can go up and down Lowell and Empire. Talking about on-site storage of excavated materials. And we're talking about having staff, construction staff coming in on shuttles.

Alfred Knotts: Right. Correct.

Commissioner Band: Or carpooling. I think it said carpools.

Matt Cassel: Or use of the Cabriolet.

Chair Strachan: Or use the Cabriolet. Okay. All right, let's go to six. Nothing?

Commissioner Joyce: No. The only thing, the only thing that I got out of this was, you know, you basically get the, the failure at the Deer Valley. You know, it exacerbates the failure at the Deer Valley intersection with 224 by adding additional traffic. But that's certainly not limited to this CUP. It's just one contributor.

Chair Strachan: All right. Now seven is kind of the, the whopper. I think the best thing to do here is let's ask Alfred and Matt. You know, of all the traffic mitigation measures that you've seen proposed by the applicant, do you think that they are reasonable? Do you think that they're going to be effective?

Alfred

APPROVED 9.27.17

Knotts: Yes. I think they are appropriate and reasonable. They are identified in several of our plans as adequate mitigation measures and strategies. As we look at the community-wide, we look at our reasonable strategy that we've laid out in our plans. We look at TDM as being a major strategy in achieving our transportation goals. Same with transit. And also active transportation and other alternative mode of transportation. And then trying to put the least, or a less amount of emphasis on heavy capital projects. So when we look at the regional scale, we try to drill down and put those and practice those principles and those strategies at a project level. And I think that we tried to do our best to put what those actual strategies are and how we're going to mitigate, or measure that effectiveness also.

So the strategies themselves with a heavy emphasis on transportation demand management, transit service and access, and even the Cabriolet in itself are very consistent with the regional transportation policies and goals, also. So I think they're reasonable and appropriate for this type of a project and a project of this scale that we've seen it in other communities.

Again, I go back to the fact that measurement and evaluation of the effectiveness of these measures is going to be very critical. And that's something that the City cannot lose sight of as the project should move forward.

Commissioner Joyce: Can, can I ask for clarification? I think Adam, I'll stick words in your mouth here. I think what he asked is are the applicant's mitigations appropriate and acceptable. And there's some things that I see in your words here where they've proposed something---I'll pick one. You know, employees during peak season will be shuttled to the site. And your proposals or the Staff's proposals are, no, that's all year long. So it sounds like a difference between kind of the topic of mitigation and then the details of actually---or the extent, call it that. So which were you addressing?

Alfred Knotts: We think that they require a significant amount more of specificity. And if they're going to be effective on a daily basis, not just on a seasonal basis, they need to be applied as we have recommended or how we've laid out. Certain things are laid out that the seasonality of employees will show up during the winter period. Well, we have significant problems during peak

APPROVED 9.27.17

summer times, peak weekends, peak events. So we would like to see those applied as standard operating procedures for the project itself.

So, in the sense that the measure itself we see as being an effective measure if applied and implemented as we've laid out. It needs that level of specificity. It also needs to be laid out in a manner that we know it will be funded. That it will be managed by the applicant or, and/or the operator. And it will be monitored by the applicant and/or the operator to determine if it is effective.

So I guess I would reframe that and, and answer the questions as you've, you've laid it out. Is it adequate? We think it's adequate if we implement it in the way that we have laid it out.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay, thank you.

Alfred Knotts: And, and certain things that we also sough specificity on. Building the Cabriolet is great, but unless it operates with the certain parameters, it's not going to be effective to the level that maybe the applicant has assumed. So back to those assumptions and other strategies such as parking and other things that they can do. One other thing that we laid out, too, was, or sought specificity on was that the applicant would implement a shuttle from the airport. Well, if they don't---if I'm not going to shuttle back to the airport that's not going to be a very effective mitigation measure and it's not going to be much of an incentive for the customer to use that. So just an example of us trying to drill down on what that really means and how we can determine whether it's effective.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay, thank. Sorry, just---

Chair Strachan: No, I agree.

Commissioner Joyce: Wasn't sure we had the right answer to the right question.

Chair

APPROVED 9.27.17

Strachan: Nope. That's right. And I mean, it sounds to me like what you're proposing is that the mitigation may be feasible, it just has to be conditioned properly.

Alfred Knotts: Correct.

Chair Strachan: All right.

Planner Astorga: And, and on this list---we're on Item 7. The, the first bullet point, we find that it's not directly mitigating the impacts of this current conditional use permit. What the applicant listed here is simply the parameters of the Master Plan. One, one quick example is the, the dedication of the road, of the, the switchback. That was dedicated in 1987, actually. Deeded to the City in 1987 in preparation for it, but it, it, it's not a direct, it's not directly mitigating a cause of the project. Does that make sense?

So, and, and the position paper does a lot of that in what they've, in what they outline as accomplished mitigated. A lot of those were different phases of the Master Plan. Again, they're not directly mitigating the impacts of, of this project.

The rest of the bullet points on page 165 and 166, we are saying that we agree with the, with the applicant just like we just discussed, but we need additional specificity and evaluation to follow up on. And then the very last bullet point, we do not agree on the one-way traffic on the loop that, that they would want to create. And I'll let Matt expand on that one. But the ones in between, just like I said, we agree that they're appropriate. We just need to follow up.

Chair Strachan: Well, some are, some aren't. I mean, for instance, one of them is Treasure Hill will have a dedicated employee housing on-site.

Planner Astorga: You're right.

Chair Strachan: That's an MPD requirement. It's not a mitigator.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Planner Astorga: No, I, I missed that one.

Chair Strachan: Yeah. So the one-way loop. Matt?

Matt Cassel: We've not been supportive of a one-way loop. I, I think on paper it sounds good. It's an idea. It makes a wider road. But at the end of the day trying to implement it, trying to get the Marriott, guest of the Marriott having to drive all the way up Treasure and back visa-versa, VMTs, vehicle miles traveled goes up. It doesn't accomplish a lot. It opens the road up. Speeds go up. It really doesn't accomplish anything other than getting from point A to point B quickly, and that's not our goal.

Chair Strachan: Gary, do you disagree with that?

Gary Horton: I'll approach it during my presentation.

Chair Strachan: Okay. All right.

Gary Horton: [Inaudible.]

Chair Strachan: Well, yeah. He'll present it later is what that boils down to. All right. Further questions on 7?

Commissioner Thimm: So I just---quick question Francisco or Bruce. These mitigation measures, at least the ones that are appropriate, are those going to be part of conditions of approval eventually?

Director Erickson: They are, they are potential conditions of approval that we're evaluating for their effectiveness and their specificity. And what we're trying to do is drive them forward early in the process so the Planning Commission can

APPROVED 9.27.17

review the strategy in whole rather than debating the wordsmith at the final conditions of how that decision gets made. And you'll see that on a number of the issues coming forward where we're proposing potentially qualifying conditions.

Chair Strachan: And one of the things that I'm going to be looking for, as will all the other Commissioners, I'm sure, is hard data on what impacts are being mitigated, for instance, by the Cabriolet and intermediate---construction of beginner and intermediate ski runs. How many vehicle miles are being reduced because of those mitigators, and how are you quantifying that? How do you know?

Same with employees not living on-site during the winter. I mean, if we, even as conditioned, what's your estimation of the number of vehicles that will be reduced, and how did you get to that number?

Alfred Knotts: What we've looked at is, for mitigation measures like that to be determined to be effective, and we've looked at other projects and resort areas of similar scope and scale to apply that. But even those projects have had a heavy emphasis, again, on the mitigation monitoring. It's very similar to any type of origin destination survey. We go out and ask, you know, how did you arrive to the Mountain? Did you use the Cabriolet? Yes, no. If the Cabriolet was not built, how would you access the Mountain? I would have driven. I wouldn't have made the trip. I would have used transit. So, those types of surveys are very typical, and again, it goes back to the origin and destination survey of any travel or demand survey. So those types of surveys would need to be completed and reported back to the City to determine that effectiveness. And then potentially other measures be implemented should they not be effective. Do people know that the shuttle even exists from the airport? It could be as simple as that. If the people don't know the shuttle exists, are they even going to use it. If it's not operating 365 days a year are they going to use it. So again, it comes down to a lot of the outreach and management of that strategy, not just implementing it. When we talked about the fact about whether just building the Cabriolet is mitigation in itself. It's not if it's not operated or managed in a way that actually mitigates the impact also. So, that's the specificity that we would like to see to determine if the project or that measure in itself is effective.

APPROVED 9.27.17

So again with the ski run, is the ski run open on opening day. Does it have snowmaking on a low snow year. Is it accessible. Well, those are big questions. If not, everybody's still going to have to walk down to access the Payday area, Legacy Lodge, and those areas if we don't know that there's the adequate resources to keep that type of facility open.

Director Erickson: So just a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman. The Staff is aligning potential mitigations with impacts that have been identified in the 15 criteria. I don't believe we're quantifying the actual VMT, vehicle miles traveled. Actually quantifying those numbers, I believe that's part of the applicant's job, but am I misunderstanding what you're asking?

Commissioner Joyce: Everything we've done so far has been in trips versus vehicle miles traveled. Were you looking for something different?

Chair Strachan: No, trips is fine. I mean, basically what I want to make sure of is that there's a nexus between the mitigation and the impacts. Otherwise you can't---

Director Erickson: Right. And I, I agree. And I think our current strategy is, if both parties are getting close to agreement that the ADT is reasonable, then the mitigation strategies need to be in place to ensure that we're not ever going to exceed that average, that predicted amount. I think that---and if there's additional mitigations that the predicted amount is too high, then, then we need to make sure our mitigation strategies reduce below the predicted amount. So, we're getting to agreement on the predicted amounts; whether those are accurate or not. And we need to mitigate so we don't exceed or reduce.

Chair Strachan: Yeah. I, I agree with you, we're not going to be able to get exactness.

Director Erickson: Right.

Chair Strachan: But we need to be getting as close as we can.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Director Erickson: Right.

Chair Strachan: All right. All right, still on 7. Anything? All right, let's move on to 8. Are the TDM---

Commissioner Thimm: Oh, did we fully address the one-way issue.

Chair Strachan: Well, I think we've heard Mr. Cassel and Mr. Knotts position on that. Gary Horton, the applicant's traffic analysis, is going to save that answer until a later time.

Matt Cassel: Just to, just be clear, Staff does not support one-way.

Chair Strachan: All right. 8 - Are TDM methods proposed adequate and how the effectiveness---how should the effectiveness be measured. I think that's kind of along the lines of what we were just discussing. Do we have--- and, and it looks like what it boils down to is that we need more specifics and we don't have them. Is that fair to say? All right. And those specifics need to come from the applicant. Correct?

Director Erickson: Correct.

Chair Strachan: All right. The Staff has no intention of coming up with those numbers, right?

Alfred Knotts: No. We just tried to depose the question of how we would evaluate the mitigation measure. I think it's explicitly called out what the effect is speaking to, the construction of the Cabriolet. We support these mitigation measures or what's proposed by the applicant, but they need to demonstrate how the operate and what the certain parameters are for it to

APPROVED 9.27.17

be effective. That's not mitigation. Just upon itself for just the construction of a, of a measure.

Chair
Strachan: Got it. Okay.

Planner
Astorga: And, and the same applies to the one right below the Cabriolet. The beginner and intermediate ski runs. And, and just jumping down on employees not living on-site in obviously winter season, we want to change that to 365 days, not just the winter season. So it's more of a yes, it's a good mitigation strategy, but we need to beef it up for lack of a better term. And the same applies for the shuttle service to the airport, not just in the winter but we find that it should be provided year-round.

Chair
Strachan: Got it. Okay.

Commissioner
Suesser: Are we clear on where the applicant stands on these proposed conditions? Is the applicant agreeable to these or are they resisting these changes to their, to, to the mitigation measures?

Planner
Astorga: I think we'll hear more from them during their presentation. And so unless you guys have any other questions on this section 8.

Commissioner
Joyce: Yeah, just kind of tied back to what Adam was just asking, I just want to make sure. There---in the August package we went through a lot of detail, actually on, you know, the Cabriolet was going to reduce trips by, you know, 20%. And I, I'll get the numbers wrong. I'm not looking at them.

Chair
Strachan: [Inaudible.]

Commissioner
Joyce: Yeah, so, but I mean every step along the way had some percentage of reduction. And I know, obviously, that's kind of a grab at a number given that you don't have specificity of the actual things like hours of running and days of the year and things like that. It's hard to really justify 20%

APPROVED 9.27.17

versus 30% if you don't have that detail. But are you guys happy with, I guess two things. One is that technique of using that percentage reduction of, of trips as, as a way to quantify the impact on, on the traffic. And the other question is, do you think that once you get to your recommendations for mitigation that you could actually feel comfortable saying, yes, 20% is right or 30% is right or 40% is right. I mean, do we have an end game that, that at least from Staff's perspective we can actually get to something that we all nod our heads yes?

Alfred Knotts: There are certain percentages identified in our Transportation Demand Management Plan that are endorsed by the air quality management districts within the State of California because they do have and are federally mandated, they have TDM programs. There's really not a ton of background information, but that's really the only industry standards what to apply to. And so there is percentages of reduction to apply to paid parking or to free transit. And they're in the range of 5% to 10%. So across the board those could be applied.

And then one of the recommendations was too, is that they would employ and/or designate a transportation demand manager. And while we would assume that all of these measures would be under that purview of that transportation demand manager, and report back and evaluate and monitor those types of mitigation measures where we can determine whether they've been effective or not.

Commissioner Joyce: So I guess what I would ask is that---I mean, obviously, we're not going to instantly become traffic experts up here. For these mitigation things that they have assigned, and again, this was mostly back in the August package where they went through and did trip reductions based on, you know, on-site commercial support and the ski runs and all those kinds of things. When we get to the next step I would love to see those things kind of in a clear-cut fashion that are like all on one or two pages. And I would like to see between the Staff, Park City Staff and the applicant, either you've got two answers, and I'd like to see both answers. Or no we have an answer and we both agree to it. Because I'd like to at least be able to identify things. If the thing is the Cabriolet is 30%, and you think that's great and they think that's great, fine. I'm not going to be the one who sits back and tells you you're both wrong because you know a lot better than I do. But if you think it's 10% and they think it's 60%, then that gives me

APPROVED 9.27.17

something to focus on. And I really don't have that right now. Unless the answer is you agree with all their percentages, at which point I can go back and pull them out of the package, and we've seen those.

But, I mean, there was a lot of trip reduction and parking reduction both in there that, that fit into the traffic models and all their numbers were driven out of that. And so when you guys say back in Bullet 1 or, you know, Point One, we agree with their models, I don't know if that included the mitigation or just the basic what we monitored and measured.

Planner Astorga: Right. And, and let me clarify something for you. And I, I am not the transportation guy so please correct me if I'm wrong here. They start with 30%, then---for the Cabriolet for example. We reduced it down to 10%. I think what we're saying is we're comfortable with that percentage as being the starting point, but we need to come back and evaluate that number and then, and then adjust from that point. Is that correct?

Matt Cassel: I want, I want to say it a little bit differently. When we come back and look at that number, one of the important things we need to have is the post-monitoring program. And that's where all these TDM measures are coming about. And so what our goal is, is if they're saying that the Cabriolet will reduce trips by 10%, that post-monitoring program, however it's managed, however it's monitored, needs to verify that they are achieving that 10% reduction. So we---I think [inaudible].

Commissioner Joyce: So, so here, here's my challenge. And I, I thought I understood that piece of it, but here's the problem. I don't want to approve a project where the number is 40%, and when we monitor it and find out it's 10%, now what? It's built. You know, those cars are all up there and we're not all of a sudden going to go up and shut down, you know, a 200 room hotel because there's too many cars coming out of the entrance. And so I, I like the idea of monitoring. I like the idea of feeding this into the whole City-wide TDM. I like where you guys are headed. I need to make a decision of do we approve this conditional use permit. And yes, I like the idea that there's a monitoring program. I want to know that you guys are pretty comfortable with the numbers to start with, and it's not like, here's a

APPROVED 9.27.17

good starting point. It's like, no, I want a, I want, I want your agreement. I want you guys to either agree with them or both stand up and disagree and say we think it's ten, we think it's 40. And I can at least go from there. And the more you guys can come to agreement, beautiful, that makes our life easier.

But we need to get it right. I mean we, we can't do all of this as post construction adjustment kind of thing. It's got to be pretty close to start with.

Commissioner Band: So these monitoring programs. I know it's, it's typical and you've seen them done before. Who typically pays for that and who---I mean, I would assume the City is the one who is ordering it. Are we paying for it?

Alfred Knotts: The applicant will be responsible for the majority of the monitoring. We typically---what you typically would do is put together a mitigation monitoring reporting program. And that would identify the responsible party and that would be made a condition, potentially a condition of approval. And that way it can be built into the project. So, say that the applicant didn't propose a Cabriolet, well, as a condition of approval, the, the construction of the Cabriolet is now a condition of approval, and that is put on the applicant so that they can budget it into the project. They can know how to operate it. They know where it's going to be. So it is a shared responsibility. Some of the things that I would foresee that the City Staff will be responsible for would be collecting some of the data on the street conditions, because that may not be solely the responsibility of the applicant. It also goes back to the discussion we had with the parking enforcement and things like that too.

So it is, I guess the answer is it's a shared responsibility but it should be identified who is responsible and when that mitigation measure and reporting of it is required as well.

Commissioner Band: Okay. So is there any second or third party confirmation on the data that we're getting from---the hypothetical data we're getting from the project once it's been monitored for what they're responsible for. Are we just solely going off of, yes, we served 250 people yesterday on the Gondola.

APPROVED 9.27.17

On average we are having x-number of people parking in the parking garage.

Alfred Knotts: It would be based on what the projected usage was, or whatever that estimate was, and then what the difference is or the delta of that and how--what the proposed, I guess adaptive measure would be all. So here's how we propose to achieve or to get to that difference that we're not getting to right now.

Commissioner Band: Okay.

Chair Strachan: This monitoring program, is, is a new concept as far as I can recall. Totally new. As of tonight's meeting this, I think, is probably the first time I've heard it. So, we're going to want some pretty specific contours to that. I mean, apparently these things happen all the time in other projects, so maybe an example or two taken from other projects, and then tailored to fit this one is, is where we can start. But, we need to start looking at that [inaudible] because this is the first I've heard of it.

Director Erickson: I, I think where we're going with this, Mr. Chairman, is we've got a series of monitoring programs out there. The difficulty of the Planning Commission has had with them in the past is that they don't get enforced very much. So for example, we're supposed to be looking at Deer Crest traffic on a regular basis. We're supposed to be monitoring the employee generation at Montage, and the 25% reduction in parking at Montage. We're supposed to be monitoring the, the affordable housing requirements in all three of our large-scale MPDs. So we've got a series of monitoring programs going forward. I think where the Staff is changing course a little bit is to beef up the enforcement side in accordance with the Planning Commission and City Council direction.

Chair Strachan: Well, and I think what Alfred was just saying is that's a cost that is borne by the applicant and not by the City. And in the examples you just gave that's a City borne cost.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Director Erickson: Right. So just to not get too far off track, but Deer Valley is required to monitor water quality in storm water ponds. They pay for those monitoring programs. They deliver the results to our team and Wasatch County. So we're used to dealing with this. But I think the cost-sharing issue at this larger scale is something that we're going to have to take a hard look at.

Chair Strachan: Yeah. I would agree with that. All right. Francisco, that covers your eight points.

Planner Astorga: That covers the eight points. So the next phase is saying, is there anything that was not listed in 1-8 that we missed; that we need to look at. That we need to come back to you.

Commissioner Thimm: Maybe it was, but I, I didn't see it specifically addressed, and that the, you know, the third party report. The, the LSC document. And in particular there were, there were a couple of things mentioned in there. One of them indicated that trips---the trip reductions document appear to be incorrectly applied. I don't know what that means in terms of quantity. I don't know if we looked at that in terms of the way the, the LSC report breaks those numbers down versus the way the Triton report breaks those numbers down. Did we look at that as part of our finding that we agree to everything in the report?

Alfred Knotts: Yes. And I believe what that was referring to is the classification under the Institute of Traffic Engineers Manual. What type of hotel. I think it was classified as more of a general kind of, I'll just use the---

Planner Astorga: Specialty.

Alfred Knotts: Yeah, well a specialty hotel, yes. So it, it probably underestimated the trips so it was inconsequential to the findings. But they did want to point that out that, that, applying that rate for that type of facility was not

APPROVED 9.27.17

consistent or did not think that it was consistent with what should have been applied.

Commissioner Thimm: And is that the 65% versus 100% factor?

Planner Astorga: No.

Commissioner Thimm: Okay, because that's also mentioned in the LSC report.

Planner Astorga: Yeah, the, the 65%, that was the occupancy rate, not the different---

Commissioner Thimm: Correct.

Planner Astorga: Ratios provided as far as that transportation demand. Sorry, I'm not using the correct term here. So, for your first thought, let's, let us double check to make sure that it's not, that it's not a substantial effect on the trans-, on the transportation study. And I don't quite recall where we're at on the occupancy issue, which is 85%. And Gary, that's where you've got it at right?

Commissioner Thimm: Was it 85%? Sorry. Maybe that was it. I'm---

Gary Horton: LSC's comments were on the May draft traffic study. We have not seen revised or new comments from LSC since the other study was submitted. So all those comments, or many of those, were addressed between the draft and the new version.

Commissioner Thimm: So in the new version, what percentage of hotel occupancy is presumed?

Gary Horton: 85%.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Commissioner Thimm: Not a 100%?

Gary Horton: No.

Planner Astorga: And, and Gary correct me. The reason why you went with 85 is because the ITE Manual indicates that specific standard, 85. Is that correct?

Gary Horton: Two-fold. Yeah, two-fold. ITE went that way and also a similar study just done at the Canyons over this last winters. They gathered hotel occupancy rates during February, a very busy, very good ski season, and they found those same rates. So that's why we felt it was accurate for the, for the area and what's being proposed.

Commissioner Thimm: Okay.

Commissioner Joyce: You asked if there was anything beyond the eight points on there. Everything you have on here, at least from a direct standpoint, is kind of focused on traffic. There are some of the mitigations in there that have impacts on parking that when you start talking about off-site and that kind of thing. But it seems to be steered towards traffic. Are we going to see anything more specific about parking or---because I've still got concerns back about, about some of the parking numbers?

Planner Astorga: Yeah, that, that's part of the third discussion that we're going to have tonight, which is anything not, not regarding transportation.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay.

Planner Astorga: So, so this first is just---

Commissioner

APPROVED 9.27.17

Joyce: I tend to just lump them together and I know that's a bad thing, but they just fit hand in hand with so many of the mitigations. Okay, thank you.

Chair Strachan: All right, moving on then, I think you wanted to discuss, Francisco, whether we agree with Staff that the refinements identified in 17.2 are not in direct response to specific comments made by the Planning Commission.

Planner Astorga: And actually, before we get to that segment phase.

Chair Strachan: All right.

Planner Astorga: I want to wrap up more transportation. If you could go to your packet, page 167. You've seen this list, however, we have refined it and updated the, the list where we divide it between construction impacts and temporary impacts. And we want to just survey the Commission to see if there's anything out here that jumps out that you have any clarifying question or comment regarding, again, this refined and updated list of construction and temporary---construction and temporary impacts, as well as permanent impacts, before we move on to 17.2,

Commissioner Joyce: Um, yeah, so. I don't know.

Planner Astorga: So we're looking at pages 167 through 171, I guess. 172, 172.

Commissioner Joyce: So, so there were a couple of places, and I'm going to kind of jump ahead and include as part of this discussion, the feedback from the applicant that you guys just got on Friday. But I just want to kind of steer this perhaps in a way that gets us to a reasonable answer, which is, I heard from the application, or read from the applicant, we don't think some of these proposal of like year-round restrictions and things where, where they have

APPROVED 9.27.17

proposed peak season kinds of things are, are reasonable. It's, it's mitigating beyond the impact that we have.

I'm going to kind of throw this back to both of you guys. To the applicant, when you guys use things like during the peak season we'll tell some of our employees to park somewhere else and come in and shuttle in. And that's like the description, give or take a few words. That to me is meaningless. That could be one guy doesn't show up for work and parks out at the park and ride, and you've met that one day. You've got to come back with something that you guys think is realistic, that's quantifiable. If you want us to even consider what you guys are proposing, the soft fluffy things that you have in there are meaningless to me because I can't begin to evaluate their effectiveness of, of mitigation when I don't know. Are you talking three days of peak season, are you talking four months of peak season? Are you talking all of winter but not the shoulder seasons? What are you doing about the summer? You guys need to get back. And the things that we've seen from you so far are so vague.

I'll go back to you guys, now, to Staff. I think if you're going to stand up and say that, hey, a 21 or whatever it is foot wide road is adequate for traffic, and yeah, it's a little awkward getting up and down, then I have a harder time requiring that they shut down a good chunk of their construction during the entire winter. If the answer is no, you guys said the road was okay and it's okay for trucks, then you need to be able to come back and provide some more detail about why you think it's reasonable to shut things down for six months at a time, when you just said the roads are all right. And it's either got to be about the road can't handle it, which we just spent 30 minutes talking about why you said the road can handle it, or it's too much traffic, but I haven't heard that yet. There's some different things. You also talk about excavation, but if they're not doing off-site excavation then any kind of excavation limitations needs to be something more about soil and stability and things like that; not about traffic. Because if they're not hauling it off, it doesn't matter.

So, I'll go back to both groups here and go neither one of you have really justified in my mind a lot of what I would call either the soft fluffiness coming from the applicant, or the, the pretty hard end of all employees all the time. And, and---but we do have examples of that. I mean, when you look at things like the St. Regis. They park all the people down at the bottom and they run them up to the top. And there are very few

APPROVED 9.27.17

exceptions to that. And they did the same thing for construction and they did the same thing for construction for the Montage.

So, I'm looking to both groups to not just throw out these kind of mitigations. I want you guys to explain to me why you got the right one. And again I haven't heard it from either side, yet. And it's, there's probably some answer in the middle for some of these that we haven't seen yet.

Chair Strachan: All right. My only comment on---any more comments on these, the construction and temporary impacts updated list?

Commissioner Thimm: The, the only comment I have, it's on page 169, it talks about construction activities related to concrete pumping, major excavation, etc., will be prohibited from November 15th to April 15th. So, is this, this is something that the applicant has agreed to and, and is fully on board with?

Chair Strachan: I don't think so.

Commissioner Thimm: Or are these conditions that are going to be implemented as conditions of approval? Or what, what do these mean?

Director Erickson: At this point, what these mean, these are potentially qualified conditions that the Planning Commission needs to review with information from both the applicant and the, and the Staff, consistent with Commissioner Joyce's commentary. And if the applicant says no to it, then we're going to have to figure out a different agreeable condition one way or another to mitigate heavy construction during heavy snow periods. So they are, they are not proposed conditions one way or another. They are potentially qualified conditions that need discussion or rejection on the part of the Planning Commission.

Chair Strachan: Yeah, and it, you know my comment along those lines is let's call them what they are, you know. They shouldn't be called QS2-1B. Let's call

APPROVED 9.27.17

them potential conditions, because I don't think that's fair to either the applicant or the public to have to go through this and discern what those are. If those are conditions of approval that are being proposed to us for our consideration, then they ought to be labeled as such. And they might be wrong. We might reject them. But there's no point in my view to hiding them or, or misrepresenting what they may become at some point in the future when we get down the road closer toward a decision. Call them what they are.

Director Erickson: What they are at this point is an attempt to measure the ability to mitigate any of the impacts in the 15 criteria.

Chair Strachan: Well. You know, I mean.

Director Erickson: Other than that, that' fine. If that's what the Commission wants, we can adjust it.

Chair Strachan: QS T-1c says all contractors shall deliver and store appropriate materials and trade tools on the site so as to facilitate shuttle access and utilization of the site for and by workers. You know, to me that sounds like a proposed condition. So I think it just behooves us, especially for the public, to look through these packets and be able to give us public input on, hey, condition #14 is not going to work for x and y reasons.

Director Erickson: We agree.

Chair Strachan: All right. Okay. Anything else on the list.

Commissioner Joyce: At what point do you want to get to real detail? I mean, 'cause I, I see some of these and I just don't think we're quite at the, we're quite ready. We're still at the 50,000-foot level. But I see things like QS 2-Th, or T- 2h, contractor should be required to log time and quantity of all materials delivered to or hauled, off hauled from site. All trucks shall be easily identifiable to the public and City Inspectors by unique number and

APPROVED 9.27.17

signage. I don't know what you're trying to mitigate there, but I can't, I couldn't guess. I, I tried getting really creative and I have no idea. And there's, there's a number of those that I look at that I kind of---and you've heard my one about the white noise backup thing that says, you either do it for all the construction in the City and make it an LMC Code change, which I'm good with, but that's a different path and not tied to this CUP. But I can't imagine why it's okay for the construction going on at John's, next to John's house and the trucks are going beep, beep, beep, and the trucks over here have to do whatever a white noise. I can't replicate that.

But once we get into the details of these things. I don't know if you're ready to start going through them one at a time or---it doesn't feel like it.

Chair Strachan: I don't think we're there yet.

Commissioner Joyce: But we have to.

Chair Strachan: Yeah.

Commissioner Joyce: At some point soon.

Chair Strachan: I think that's the direction we're moving in, but I don't think, you know, we are saying in any way, shape or form that, you know, QS T-2h is all good. Because we haven't told you, Francisco, that you're way off base, you shouldn't just assume that we're okay with that. I mean, we're not at the point yet where we're walking through these step by step, sentence by sentence and determining which ones are going to stick, if any, and which aren't.

Commissioner Joyce: I guess that's what I was looking for more than anything, is that everybody in the room is kind of on the same page. I mean, I've got dozens of questions about specifics of each one, that if we were sitting here crafting conditions of approval for a final vote, I would go through all that. But, I won't.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair Strachan: Yeah. Some are close, others are not. All right. Does that give you what you need, Francisco?

Planner Astorga: Yeah. I---for this part. So I don't know if it would be wise to now jump onto---since we've been, since we were discussing transportation, to let Gary Horton do his presentation before we switch and go into 17.2 and the revision.

Chair Strachan: Yeah, I think that's wise.

Planner Astorga: Me too.

Chair Strachan: Yeah.

Commissioner Thimm: Stay on topic.

Chair Strachan: All right.

Gary Horton: Okay, thank you.

Shawn Ferrin: Can I just make one, one comment about what I'm, to make sure I'm hearing you correctly. With respect to the Staff report, and these potential conditions, we haven't seen them either. We got this on Friday. We have not had an opportunity to talk with Staff about it, but what I hear from you is that you want us to have that dialogue with Staff, and if we can come up with one that Staff and the applicant agrees on we can present it to you. And if we can't, we come up with ones that are our two opinions about it and bring it to you for discussion. But we haven't, we haven't looked at these. We haven't vetted them with all the experts that we're using. So I, I wanted you to be aware of that. And I wanted to make sure I was hearing you correctly with what you would like us to bring back to you on those.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair Strachan: I think you're hearing us correctly. Okay.

Planner Astorga: And, and just---

Shawn Ferrin: Great. Yeah, and that's what we're, we're hoping to do with Staff is to start having a dialogue about those, look at what's the impact, what are the mitigators assigned, what are the pieces we're putting together to try to evaluate those mitigations.

Chair Strachan: Okay, thank you.

Shawn Ferrin: And, and this section of the Staff report was taken from the Staff report that we published last month, and we just refined and edited and updated here and there. So they've had, you know, over a month to start thinking about them.

Chair Strachan: Well, let's not get into that. Let's just keep---

Planner Astorga: I, I, no, but I just didn't want to---

Chair Strachan: I understand there's going to be some back and forth about who got what when and, you know, stuff coming late and whatever, but that doesn't move the ball. Let's, let's move the ball.

Planner Astorga: Fair enough.

Chair

APPROVED 9.27.17

Strachan: I understand where you're coming from, Francisco, but there's going to be darts on both sides on that issue.

Gary Horton: I will try and make this a little bit quicker than I originally planned.

Chair Strachan: Thank you.

Gary Horton: Some of it you covered with Staff so I think it's going to be taking some of that information. And I'm going to try and answer some of the questions that I heard, so I actually appreciate the, the step and the process we went through. So, as I go along, though, please feel free to interrupt and ask a question if you feel like I am not clear.

I have also typed at the bottom of this, and I'm not going to read every one. I typed every question that I heard last time I was here. I've provided what I think is a response. I'm not going to go through every one, but if, once again, if you feel like those comments were not captured, I would love to hear that and I'll try and address them at a future time. Or via email or something.

So, Francisco, yeah, I've got it up on mine as well. So, these are the five items I'm going to try and address tonight. First off, next, next slide. So, existing conditions. And I'm going to present---this is going to be presented a little different than it flows in the traffic study. And you'll see where that comes in. I'm going to really go through existing conditions, future conditions, and future with the project, and the analysis associated in that time frame so that hopefully it captures what I think each element brings.

It shows here the traffic counts that were gathered on the originally report, and then actual counts in 2005, and the counts we gathered in 2017. So after our draft report there was a conversation that that was, that the President's Day Weekend this year happened to not be a peak or a typical President's Day Weekend. I think it was the comment from Commissioner Suesser. So what we did, Francisco, next slide, please, is there is a permanent counter located out on SR224. It gathers daily traffic volumes going up and down the road. What we did is gathered all that date in December, January, February, and March. And you can see the

APPROVED 9.27.17

red dot. There was our, it ended up being February 18th, which was Saturday of President's Day weekend. That was the 43rd percentile day. Not a typical President's Day weekend. So what we did is figured out what was the 85th percentile volume. I don't know what day it was off the top of my head. But what was the 85th percentile volume, and factored ours up compared to what we found on SR224 on February 18th, to what that volume would have been. And then we transfigured all those volumes throughout. Next slide, Francisco. Throughout all the intersections. So on the left is the day we counted in the volumes, on the right are the factored, increased factored to what is an 85th percentile, which is a typical busy ski day in Park City and Summit County.

I also believe last time there was---as a couple of Commissioners had pointed out, there was one of these numbers in here that was, had not be factored up. That has been corrected. So I appreciate that.

Let's see. Next, Francisco. So what we've done is then analyzed that information. And what you see is the levels of service and delay at each of the intersections based on existing conditions with that increase in traffic. As you can also see, Empire Avenue and Silver King currently experiences delays beyond acceptable levels. And Lowell and Silver King. You'll find out as we move along, Lowell and Silver King is a direct effect because of the backup from Empire and Silver King. And I'll get into it in the future, but understand that's why that failure is happening.

Next slide. So what we did, then, to try and forecast or to forecast 2037 or 20-year assumption---or traffic volumes. We used two methodologies. One. Summit County is currently completing the traffic model for the region, and that includes all the County. There are two items that typically go into that for the traffic related portions. One is population growth and one is VMTs or Vehicle Miles Traveled. Population growth is what we applied in this because the vehicle miles traveled, or the VMTs is still being evaluated in that study. There's some concerns, and part of that is both the County and the City anticipate that the current patterns of travel are going to change in the future. And at least that's the hope, that as transit takes board, and other things take hold, that there's potential---there will be less vehicle miles traveled than there has been in the past. And that's why---that's still being evaluated, so I couldn't apply that number. So we included a population growth with the understanding that vehicle miles traveled does not equate directly to population. But it's the method we had at the time.

APPROVED 9.27.17

If we applied vehicle miles traveled, understand when I move forward into these future slides, the impacts to the intersections would have been, even been greater, and the net impact by Treasure would have even been less. Okay? If you say there's a 1,000 at a future intersection because of population, but when you factor other things in and it's 1500, and Treasure brings in potentially 100 let's say, you know, at 1000 it's at 10%, at 1500 it's a lesser amount. So, I was trying to be conservative of what the impacts of Treasure would reflect on the intersections.

The other thing I did to verify or second---to do a second check on future numbers at the intersections was looked at the anticipated development for Bamberger, along with Park City Mountain Resort. Did a trip generation, and there was more---Bamberger is well-known. Park City Mountain Resort I had to look through the agreements in the, that are on, on file with the County. I had to read through what's entitled. And assumed that they would also do a similar type of mixed-use development. I had to assume that it wouldn't all be housing or it wouldn't all be just hotels. There'd be a variety of things. I, I really don't know for sure exactly what's going to be there so I took, you know, the common when you're doing development on something like this. I applied that and created trips from both those projects, potential projects, and applied them to the intersections. Those numbers landed within the future growth rate that was assumed just based on population. So I felt it gave a reasonable forecast of the future.

Next slide. So the next slide is the volumes from---once again I used the factor volumes on 28 and the 12.8 increase, and applied those to the future volumes. And that's just a table of total volumes at the intersection.

Next slide, please, Francisco. So this one is a representation of the analysis of those intersections, once again, without Treasure. This is a future forecast if Treasure comes on board or not. Park Avenue/Deer Valley starts to fail. Empire/Silver King was already failing so it gets worse. And Lowell and Silver King fails. So, typically at this point you look, how can we start to---what mitigation or what, what's available to make them improve the traffic operations [inaudible].

So, next slide, please, Francisco. So Park Avenue/Deer Valley. This first slide is going to focus on that. With the improvements that we added to the intersection it gets a Level of Service C in the morning, a Level of

APPROVED 9.27.17

Service E in the p.m. Once again, that is not a level of service that is ideal. And I can explain a little bit more. But let me explain the improvements we made first. A free right-turn movement from SR224 on to Empire. Right now, if you're taking a right turn there you have to come to the signalized intersection. You have to stop and you have to wait until there's gaps in the traffic. A free right turn means where you channel it and there's an island. So I can just pull off and I can pull right and around. That's with that free right. So I'm no longer constrained by the signalized intersection. And additional southbound left turn lane, so there are dual lefts from Park Avenue on to dual, on to Deer Valley. This intersection receives both Deer Valley and Park City Mountain Resort. So right now it's a single left-turn lane going that way. It would be a dual left-turn lane. The other item is coming back from the Deer Valley side. A channelized, similar like what we did on the other one, is a right-turn from westbound on to SR224 so that they get that free movement to get going on SR224. With those improvements in the morning we can get a Level of Service C and in the evening a Level of Service E. Once again, that is without Treasure. That is the future of 2037 as best we can forecast today.

To get better than a Level of Service E at that intersection in the future, you---it would require triple lefts. Meaning coming from Park City Mountain Resort, three left turns on to SR224. However, SR224 doesn't have the cap capacity for three lefts. So you're not just talking for there, you're talking chasing that all the way down and all the way down to the interstate. So, that's why it comes back to it's a Level of Service E. It's not every day of the year. It is during peak times of the year. And it's been a planned philosophy of the County and I think as well as the City. They're not going to build their way out of congestion. The hope is, and I think Alfred was mentioning this earlier, is these will drive a change in behavior patterns. People will decide not to leave during the p.m. peak. They'll stick around. They'll leave before the p.m. peak. They'll, you know, find amenities that keep them around or alter their driving patterns. Grab on transit, you know, elements like that. So, I wanted to be clear that Level of Service can be reached higher, but once again, I mean, this is just the future without Treasure.

The next slide, please. So Empire Avenue and Silver King, with the installation of a traffic signal or roundabout, it gets to a Level of Service A in the morning, and a C in the p.m. peak. Lowell Avenue and Silver King with improvements at Empire and Silver King go to a Level of Service D in

APPROVED 9.27.17

the morning and B in the evening just because the backup starts to go away. So you don't have to make any physical geometric improvements to see that.

So that's future. Now I'm going to jump on with Treasure. So next slide, please. Trip generation. I think we've talked about this quite a bit. There are four elements. Hotel. We applied a resort hotel. Employee housing dedicated to Treasure Hill so we did not have trips accounted for during the peak hour. Does that mean employees are never going to leave the site? No. But it is anticipated as probably the conditions that we're working together is that there would be a shift that would make sure that the employee shifts don't coincide with the a.m. or p.m. peak. Fairly common. It's not unheard of. So---plus the fact that they're on-site, it's anticipated they're not going to hop in their car to drive from the hotel to the commercial on-site. And they wouldn't leave the site anyway, even if they did.

Condominium townhomes, we just used the ITE standard across the Nation, so it's wherever you would gather from anywhere. And then Commercial space, we used 17,470 and we used Specialty Retail and a quality restaurant. That goes back to one of the LSC comments that, is that really what's going to be applied there. Based on what's used in the area, that's typical. Specialty retail for those people who would go stay at the site and be there. Similar, a quality restaurant. That's what we found, you know, other developments and other hotels in the area. So, that is what we applied and it's a best forecast of what we anticipate.

Next slide. These are the numbers applying those land uses. Jump to the next one, Francisco. So, trip reduction. We talked about this already, but Resort Hotel, we assumed an 85% occupancy. The next one is internal capture rate. Change from the draft to the, to the next one is a 22% internal capture rate, and that is based on an ITE worksheet methodology that calculates that number. The third one is ski runs or trails in the summer. From Park City Chamber of Commerce, there is information that gave the average, when visitors come, the average length of stay. Also the number of days they skied. So we took that and divided by it. That number was roughly 88%. So we took---that's the number of people that will ski on any given day from the tourists that come here. We assumed that only half of them, which I think is conservation, even though they are staying at the base of a resort, only half will ski there. The other half will choose to go to Deer Valley, go to the Cottonwoods, go

APPROVED 9.27.17

somewhere else. So that's why there was only a, a 43% reduction, because we assumed someone may still decide to go somewhere else. And then the Cabriolet, we used a 10% reduction. With that, these are the revised trip generation, or the, yeah, trip generation numbers.

Next slide, Francisco. And so this is the traffic analysis with the same improvements that would be anticipated with or without Treasure. So once again, this shows those improvements I talked about a few slides back. If you look at it, you receive the same level of service with Treasure as you do without. That just tells you a lot of it's the background and what's already there today.

Chair Strachan: And those, those numbers assume the trip reduction---

Gary Horton: They do.

Chair Strachan: Amounts you just gave in the previous slide?

Gary Horton: They do. Yep.

Chair Strachan: So if those are off, these are off?

Gary Horton: Correct.

Chair Strachan: Of if they're on, then these are on.

Gary Horton: Right.

Chair Strachan: All right.

Commissioner

APPROVED 9.27.17

Thimm: So, so what triggers the improvements.

Gary Horton: There's only so much---I'll go to the Deer Valley/Park Avenue. Signalized intersections only have so much time available, green time, we call it, for each movement. And as volumes increase, that competing green time creates that delay. So, the level of service is just a function of the average delay. If you look with Treasure, in the morning your average delay per vehicle is 29 seconds. So, and that calculates everybody that comes into that intersection or every vehicle. In the evening, at an E it's a 75.7. And so that's how you refer back to the level of service.

Commissioner Joyce: One thing I've never quite understood, and maybe it's the difference between a stop sign and what you can do at a signal. But, I mean, if you look at the traffic patterns in the morning going---I mean the Park Avenue/Deer Valley intersection. You know, the bulk of people aren't---it's not lot an even intersection. There aren't many people coming down Park Avenue and making a left to go up to Park, to Park City to ski. I mean, you look at it, it's a whole lot of people coming up 224, a handful of people coming down Deer Valley Drive, and they're going across to go ski at Park City. And so when you see an average, I've never quite understood, because all the rest of them have westbound/eastbound. I can look at individual turns. This, this kind of ignores that and kind of lumps it into a 29 second average. But that's---

Gary Horton: It does.

Commissioner Joyce: You know, if the answer is the people on 224 are backed up all the way past Kearns because they've got a four-minute wait, then that's interesting to know, even though the average is 29 second. Somehow---those numbers don't work but you get the point. How, why is it different? Why don't we see the details?

Gary Horton: So that, that information is in the appendix. I didn't bring it with me today.

Commissioner

APPROVED 9.27.17

Joyce: Okay.

Gary Horton: It does tell you what the delay is per leg. And it actually breaks it down further. It tells you per turning movement of each leg. So on the northbound you could say the left experience this amount of delay. Those who are going through experience this amount of delay. Those turning right experience this amount of delay. That's part of the way we evaluate what improvements should be included in an intersection. So when we looked at those, the, the Park Avenue/Deer Valley, the right turns trying to get up into the Park City Mountain Resort was experiencing a lot of delay. That was having influence of the overall delay of the intersection, so that's why that free right turn was proposed.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay.

Gary Horton: Similar, the dual left turns going to Deer Valley. We found out that was a major delay. When you start to take that out and you try and get to the point where it's pretty well even, because if one is excessive, it does have an impact on the overall intersection.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay, thank you.

Gary Horton: Yeah. Next slide. So, mitigation, if you'd like to call it that. Treasure has agreed to pay their portion of the improvements that are necessary at the Park Avenue/Deer Valley intersection, along with Empire/Silver King. So this is different than the numbers that Staff has come up with. I'll tell you that right now. I'm not sure---we'll work together and I'm sure we'll find out whether we agree, or it may be a point where we just disagree. But I used two calculations. One was the change in volume. You'll see in the morning at this intersection there's 105 cars; in the p.m. 152 cars. That percent increase you can see. That equates to an average of volume of 3.15. Delay change actually in the morning---sorry, this is a future 2037 without the project, and future 2037 with the project. That's what I'm comparing, just to be clear. Delay change in the, in the morning, or in the, in the morning is zero with or without Treasure. In the evening it's 6.8, which is a 4.49. So a total average is 3.82. That's at Park Avenue/Deer

APPROVED 9.27.17

Valley. Francisco, next slide. And similar equation for the Empire/Silver King, is 8.7. I'm not going to---if you'd like I can run through the numbers again, but most engineers bore people with numbers, so I'll skip that.

Next slide. So in conclusion, two intersections require improvements with or without Treasure. It's a future need whether Treasure comes on, on board. And Treasure is willing to pay their portion of those improvements.

Next slide. So that's the end of the traffic analysis. I'm going to go to street capacity. I, I think, based on conversations and comments I've heard, I, I have not had, heard or received any responsive comments that there's concerns of street capacity from April to November. The street capacity concern is only December to March.

Chair Strachan: I don't know that I'd assume that going forward.

Gary Horton: Okay. All right. Fair enough. Only comments I've heard is during winter, but, okay. I'll---

Chair Strachan: I think as your projections are going to require you---as, as you look at the growth rates throughout Summit County I think the growth is going to continue to occur 365 days a year, so it doesn't seem logical to exclude the summertime months from those calculations.

Gary Horton: Okay. Let me---

Chair Strachan: The project will exist during the summer months.

Gary Horton: Correct. Let me, let me rephrase that. No comment---I haven't received any comments about concerns. The analysis and the intersection operations are of, are not meeting acceptable levels of service April through November, except for the ones that I've identified. The concerns about operations has been primarily focused December to March.

Chair

APPROVED 9.27.17

Strachan: I think based on the comments you may have heard thus far, that might be true. That doesn't mean we don't have concerns with them. I mean, I think we're drinking from the fire hose, getting a lot of information here, and we haven't had time to distill it all. It's very likely we will come back to you and say, now let's talk about the summer months and, and some of the, you know, the basis for your calculations there.

Gary Horton: Okay.

Chair Strachan: But, I mean, just because we haven't brought it up, you know, in this meeting or prior meetings doesn't mean it doesn't exist.

Gary Horton: Okay. All right. I'm going to run through some basics. Street capacity. One of the things that you need to understand. There is, the engineering standards are very, I won't say big. There's a lot of ways to interpret it. You get 100 traffic engineers up here and you'd probably get 100 different answers on street capacity, especially for the type of streets we're looking at. Most street capacity is evaluated on a freeway or measures like that because they want to know how many cars. There's the through-put and free flow conditions and stuff like that. What we've talked about before, many of the times, many traffic studies that focus on areas like that, the constraints are at intersection, because that's where you stop. I drive from A to B, then I stop. When I get through there I drive to the next point. Typically, it's not reflected in the roadway.

So, just from a general standpoint, if you---and once again this is---there's 1800 vehicles per hour that can be handled on a two-lane road. That's at a Level of Service D. That's a number that you can use. I'm not saying that's what anybody wants to put on any specific street, and that's specific to a Level of Service D. Fewer cars you get a higher level of service. More cars that level of service drops.

One of the things I want to point out, and it's been talked about tonight, capacity versus speed. Some of the, I think the objection or the point of what's being planned out there is to reduce speeds. Capacity will be in direct conflict with speeds. So capacity is about moving cars. If you talk to UDOT, what do they do? They move people from A to B. So when you

APPROVED 9.27.17

ask how they fix their problems, they widen them and they make them improved. But then the enforced speed is not their issue.

So numerous impacts that, that have capacity. Francisco, if you wouldn't mind, the next slide I'm just going to list them all out. So when you start analyzing; street capacity; pedestrian accommodations and uses, number of vehicles, number of access points, shoulder widths if you have them, speed limit, horizontal clearance, divertible obstructions on the side of the street, intersection spacing. Next slide. Types of vehicles on the road. Quantity and duration of snow events. How streets are plowed and maintained after snow events. Where and how individuals elect to park. You know, and specific to here, how, how parking regulations are enforced. And, you know, service delivery needs. Do I put my garbage truck out in the road? Do I put my garbage can out there? Do I put my mail out there? All those have impacts on street capacity. And that's why I say, if you ask---

Commissioner Phillips: You forgot one.

Gary Horton: I'm sure I---

Commissioner Phillips: How many people are walking down the road.

Gary Horton: Actually, it's the very first one. I said pedestrian accommodations and usage.

Commissioner Phillips: Oh, okay, sorry.

Gary Horton: No, you're good, you're good. And there's probably more, but that's why I say, it's an ever fluctuating condition. You know, if you ask me to analyze it today, the number of cars parked there on the next day will be different. The number of people walking down the road. That's why if you ask 100 different traffic engineers you'll get a 100 different answers. And it depends on which viewpoint you're wanting to look from oftentimes.

APPROVED 9.27.17

So what---a few things I've come up with for you to consider. Options to maintain capacity with the new roadway cross section. The width of the asphalt available, it's just how that is assigned. From, once again, and this goes back to that previous slide, it appears that when the summer width is available people feel like operations are acceptable, at least today. If that's the case, then adding sidewalks behind the road gutter provides a location for pedestrians to walk. It allows for cars in that capacity to be maintained. Create pockets of snow storage. It may not be able to be allowed up and down the street but if you create pockets so that snow storage doesn't have to be completely hauled off the site it creates an opportunity to maintain capacity. Add parking areas as well. So if you have that competing interest of sidewalks and parking area, you may need to have some areas of both. Enforcing parking standards.

And then the last one is considering a one-way option. This is what I want to mention from before from Commissioner Strachan's questions about am I recommending one way. I'm recommending one-way as a potential safety option. There is a certain amount of travel width, as you were asking about emergency vehicles that need to get from A to B. Will one-way require more vehicle travel miles? Yes. There is definitely out of direction travel. But it's a question of is safety a high enough priority that it should come into play when winter or snow is just not able to be maintained, and the width is not available. That's why that analysis was brought is, is it even feasible. I mean, if I say one-way but it all fails at all the intersections, maybe it doesn't solve the problem. So that's why we ran the analysis. It's an option to maintain street capacity.

Francisco, would you go to the next slide? So once again, this is an analysis of the one-way condition with Treasure, and once again, the improvement at Park Avenue and Deer Valley. And it shows that you still receive an acceptable level of service and it's a viable option.

Next one, please. So, pedestrian accommodations. Bottom line, it's about improving safety for pedestrians. Install signs and painted crosswalks throughout. There's two locations for stair improvements that were recommended, and the applicant has said they would be willing to construct and still thinks it's a viable solution. And then from an applicant standpoint, typically I would not recommend pedestrians to be the traffic calming device or the friction measure for trying to reduce speeds. I generally would suggest that's done through parking and other elements. I would always recommend safe accommodations for pedestrians. So, it

APPROVED 9.27.17

would still be recommended that sidewalks along Lowell and Empire Avenue be available.

Next slide. Parking summary. So I have not gone over this in detail. Once again, I'll try and keep it short. Fourth edition of the parking generation was used. Similar to the ITE trip generation, they have numbers based on data they've gathered for different land uses. So, we have a resort hotel. They didn't have any data for parking for resort hotel, so we used a hotel, it's called urban hotel. It's the closest land use we could apply. Employee housing. Once again, we used a land use of 221 which is a low to mid-rise apartment, condominium or townhomes. They had residential condominium townhomes, suburban and urban. And I'll get into that because that's one of the big numbers that Commissioner Joyce brought up last time. And then commercial land use. They had a shopping center. They don't have retail. They didn't have good numbers on retail, so that was as close as we could apply. And then they did have on quality restaurant.

Next slide. So I put a little asterisk by that 88, because I think that was brought up last time my Commissioner Joyce. So there is a range of parking, I you look. It's 88 for urban. They found during the weekend parking generation for a condominium and townhome there's 88 for urban. And for suburban ones there's 156. So it's a huge discrepancy. I went with the lower number. And when I, when I ran all the numbers they seemed to---somewhat equal. I could have put 156 so that the weekend showed a lot more. I went with urban because it seemed to fit total parking.

Commissioner Joyce: So, so that, that is a concern of mine is just, you know, picking the lower number when, when the question is do we have adequate parking. But I'm still stumped on one. And, and this is---you, you've got a hotel that has 30,000 square feet of commercial in it or more, support commercial, depending on plan 17 or 17.2, it's changed a bit. But ballpark, you have 30,000 square feet of commercial and 200 rooms. And I look at the parking and I get 182. And I take 17,000 square feet of commercial and I get 184. So for two-thirds of the commercial space, and 200 hotel rooms that are at 85% occupancy, I have minus 2 cars. So, so explain to me how I take 200 hotel rooms and 10,000 square feet of commercial space and park it with negative two people. Negative, negative two cars, I'm sorry.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Gary Horton: I'll go back and look at it more. Once again, I applied the knowledge that I got out of there. I don't disagree with your comments. I understand what you're saying. And I'll---

Commissioner Joyce: So, and just to get, just so you bring me back the right answer. So, so just so everybody's in sync here, the hotel we've got includes 30,000 square feet of support commercial, and 200 rooms. And we're saying that that has less parking required than 20,000 square feet of commercial. And, and we've---you can go back to the Master Plan. Whether it's support commercial or commercial it's all supposed to be serving the hotel, so it should be similar. Now, throw in the townhouses. If you take the higher end of the townhouses, now you've got another 150. So when you start looking at kind of ballpark, even if I said 100 townhouses was the same as 200 hotel rooms, which 'm not sure I would buy that either, now we're, we're way off, because now all of a sudden, you know, now we're really blown away. So part of it may be that the hotel numbers that we're looking at don't deal with the fact that there's 30,000 square feet of commercial.

And by the way, there's another, oh gosh, it's been so long since we've looked at this, 15, 19,000 square feet of, of meeting space. And you've heard me complain that no matter what you guys promise us for meeting space, outsiders from---not just hotel people will come to meetings at the hotel. So, that takes more parking. So when I look at this, I'm, my first guess is your hotel number is off by two or three hundred. And it probably isn't, but I could actually justify pretty damn well with, with the space that you've got sitting in that hotel. So, just, just to queue this one up just for both Staff and you guys, parking is completely broken to me right now.

Gary Horton: Okay.

Commissioner Joyce: And it may just be a matter of getting the right numbers in place and convincing us that they're in fact the right numbers. But at least with what

APPROVED 9.27.17

you've shown us, it, it's just, it's way off. I don't---we're not even close to, to these numbers being right. So, please fix that one before we get to a point of having to apply it, because that's just. And, and there's another piece in here that I asked that you guys haven't answered. And I don't mean---you, you asked for questions on the way and it's just appropriate here.

Gary Horton: Yeah.

Commissioner Joyce: One of the questions that we talk about is mitigation of employees parking off-site or on-site, and whether it's off-site is it off-site all year round or peak season. And we were going through those discussions. If the answer is during the shoulder season the employees are parking on-site, then my question was, what is a reasonable expectation of the number of employees---I'll call it the daytime shift, which is probably the busiest time. So you've got, you know, you've got 50,000 square feet of commercial, you've got meeting space, you've got 200 hotel rooms, you've got townhouses. Somebody please give me some idea of what it means for us when we say employees park off-site, employees park on-site. 'Cause if the answer, and I know this isn't right, if the answer is there are only 30 employees it's not that big a deal in here. If the answer is its 300 employees, and you've only got 450 spaces, we've got a completely different problem we have to go through. And again, my default until you guys can give me something better to work with, is it's a big number and they need to be gone all year round around. So if you, if you want something different, different than that from me personally, I can't speak for anybody else, bring me, bring me some realistic numbers. And again, I would love it if you guys would provide the numbers and our own Staff would look and go, yeah, that's pretty accurate. Give or take 10% that's accurate. If we can get agreement then, then that's great for me. Thank you.

Gary Horton: Okay. Just for clarification. The ITE Trip Generation Manual is coming out for the 10th Edition later this year. They're still in the 4th Edition for parking. For whatever reason, parking doesn't generate as much interest. So even half the land uses they have no parking data for. So for whatever reason it's just a little harder to evaluate.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Commissioner Joyce: So one of the things that, that I'll throw out is, and it doesn't help with the, the particular issues of how much parking do you need. But certainly from an employee standpoint, one of the things we looked at when we were looking at mass and scale and that kind of stuff was, I think it was Appendix Q in our monstrosity of data here, that was the comparison of the St. Regis, the Montage, and when we were looking at---W? Okay, Appendix W, was, was the comparison of the, the big hotels of how much, how much space they have allocated for different things. And, but I know they have some very stringent restrictions about where employees can and can't park and that kind of thing. But certainly from an employee count, if the answer is there's no magic ITE standard, if, if you came back and said, hey, you know, the 800 or 900,000 square foot Montage has, you know, an estimated 217 employees, then that would give me something solid to work with, because I think what you guys are building is fairly comparable. So it doesn't have to be an ITE standard, but I, I---there's too many other things around here that we ought to be able to get something fairly reasonable.

Gary Horton: Francisco, do you want to jump to the next slide? Yeah, I'm going to---once again, based on those comments I'm going to come back with something different. Or not different, but at least more information.

Next slide. The last. Temporary construction. And I think there will be more conversation. This was just more focused on from the traffic study. I wanted to be clear it was anticipated they'll enter from Lowell, exit on Empire. Employees access to the site will be limited. It's anticipated the product delivery limitations from December to March would be different than potentially April to November. And I say summer just as a simple, simple phrase. I understand it still snows in April. I live here. Snow plow when necessary to accommodate deliveries.

And we say parking outside of the area. We mention Richardson Flats probably as an example. There's other places. There's going to be a new Ecker park and ride lot or potentially other locations. Some of that is dependent upon the contractor. Where my employees come from will depend on where I'm going to try and shuttle them from. I'm not going to tell them they've got to drive past the Ecker park and ride lot to come park at Richardson or vice-versa if they're coming from Heber or stuff like that. So some of that is dependent upon the contractor and the employee of

APPROVED 9.27.17

where they live and where they're coming from. So, and also, sometimes that will need to be fluid because the park and ride lot that maybe they had planned---what's available today may be different in five years or ten years, depending on when it's constructed and everything like that. So, understand we're---I think we'll try to come up with more information, but that's a little bit challenging because of what's available and what the future looks like.

Next slide. And I promise you I'm not going to read through all these, but these are all the questions I had last time and my response to them. So, there's three slides. I'm not going to read all of them to you. I don't know if, if you would like to look through it and see if your question was answered. Have Francisco pop to the next slide. I just wanted to make sure I captured them and I tried to respond.

Commissioner Joyce: I do have one question that this triggered. You---back one slide. You had a thing that said the operational street capacity depends on the paved surface area. The cross section that you showed just as a picture when you had that, had a, kind of a wider street than what we've actually got to work with for Lowell. So when you said 1800 was the, you know, capacity of a two-way street, what was the assumption of how big a, a road that was?

Gary Horton: That would be more along the lines of a freeway where you have a 12' travel lane in each direction. And all those items that I mentioned, there's no parking, there's no pedestrian conflicts, there's no access points. I mean, that whole list of items are very minimal. So that's kind of your, you can really hit a lot of capacity if you get rid of everything on the street.

Commissioner Joyce: So, so let me offer it to you just in the grand scheme of things. If we looked at that 1800 number and then we looked at peak hours. And, and, you know, if we said 1800 is capacity if it's built like a two-lane highway, but we've only got 150 so we're good. But the answer is, no, we've got people walking in the street and we've got narrow streets and we've got snow storage and all that kind of stuff. And our peak on some of these roads is still up around like 1,000 at, at peak hours, especially in the afternoon. And that really worries me still. And, you know, I've heard our own Staff tell me I shouldn't be worried about it, but, but I'm still worried

APPROVED 9.27.17

about it. I mean, we're starting to push something at, at 1,000 cars per, per hour through Lowell and Empire through some of those intersections. And if you get, even as you get closer to 224 it actually starts getting up to like 1300, 1500 cars per hour, and we're still not on a nice highway yet. We're at least off of little, little Lowell and little Empire, but I'm, I'm still not there. So, I'm not sure where to do with that. And I may just have to finally give up and just go with our Staff's opinion on this one. But it---I, I just don't see how this works. I mean, 900 cars. When you start doing the math on that, I mean, that's a car every four seconds going through Empire. And I mean, if you've ever been there when they start backing up, you can just imagine throwing in another one every four seconds. It would take all of about, you know, a minute and a half or something before it was absolute total chaos. And, and yet that's the traffic volume we're talking about. That's the numbers that we have here and the projections for peak hours. And I just, I don't get it.

Chair Strachan: I would---you're planning on submitting these questions and answers to Francisco, right?

Gary Horton: I apologize. I'm actually---so the, the summary of our report, the conclusions and recommendations didn't change, but because of a table that was commented on, I'm going to resubmit that report with a few of those corrections, and, and then be done with it.

Chair Strachan: But just in terms of these questions.

Gary Horton: They, yeah, he already has them.

Chair Strachan: Okay. Great.

Gary Horton: I, yeah, I gave him a PDF list.

Chair Strachan: Yeah, I want that for the future.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Planner Astorga: Any, any other questions, or I think that concludes the, the transportation portion of what I wanted to cover. So we're done with one. Two more to go. Obviously, we're not going to take as long on the, the next two, and obviously we still have to have a public hearing. I see the time out sign being flashed upfront.

Chair Strachan: Yeah. You know, we've just got two more quick things. But I've got some questions about traffic based on that presentation. I think probably the other Commissioners do as well, right? Or not.

Commissioner Joyce: I was asking all mine, so---

Commissioner Thimm: I outlined a lot of mine already.

Chair Strachan: Okay. Yeah, you know, we've been at it for the better part of 2-1/2 hours. Why don't we take a little break. We'll come back and we'll finish the rest of the, the two issues and then take public comment. All right.

Break

Chair Strachan: All right. Let's call the meeting back to order. I think what we'll do here is finish up with this traffic issue, move quickly into 17.2, finish your last question, Francisco, and then do public comments. We should be quickly on to public comments. I appreciate everybody waiting around. I know this takes a long time.

I only have one questions about the, the one-way option and the sidewalk options. You contended that those are more safety issues rather than mitigation issues. Is that, is that right?

Let's, let's separate them, too. Let's just talk about the one-way first.

Gary

APPROVED 9.27.17

Horton: One way is a---I would say it's safety and capacity. If the street width, if, if it's functioning as a one-way, which, you know, many times you see all these pictures, then at some point you've got to realize cars heading in opposite direction driving in a one-way scenario is not a safe condition. So it's---by making it one-way it actually enhances capacity, because then I'm not having to wait for you to pull into the driveway or me to pull into the driveway, and then I can go by and vice-versa.

Chair Strachan: Right.

Gary Horton: So it's capacity, but it is also safety. When, when you don't have the appropriate travel way, then it really needs to be considered whether it should be one-way. And that goes back to, you know, parking enforcements and everything else. So.

Chair Strachan: And, and along those lines, the dump trucks and the construction traffic should be on a one-way loop. Right?

Gary Horton: Correct. That's why it's going [inaudible].

Chair Strachan: So if for whatever reason we do not elect to do a one-way loop, doesn't that increase the danger to the pedestrians? I mean, you've got to do a one-way loop for construction traffic, as you just said. But if we do that, we're sort of putting ourselves in between and rock and hard place because, you know, either we do it or we don't. And I looks like Staff's recommending that we don't, which increases the danger to the pedestrians. So which side do you come down on? More danger to pedestrians or less danger to pedestrians but poor vehicle traffic flow.

Gary Horton: I guess I'm not equating those two together. If I'm accommodating---so let me attack the pedestrian accommodations. That's a safety element that pedestrians should not be in the same path as vehicles. They should be in a separate path.

Chair

APPROVED 9.27.17

Strachan: Granted. Yeah. What I'm asking is, if you don't pick the one-way loop, you have traffic going both directions, as Staff has recommended.

Gary Horton: Okay.

Chair Strachan: That increases the danger to the pedestrians, right?

Gary Horton: Not if you accommodate pedestrians outside of the travel way. That's what I'm saying.

Chair Strachan: Okay. So and then the only way to do that is with sidewalks?

Gary Horton: You don't have to make a sidewalk. It could be a gravel shoulder. I mean, you have to make pedestrian accommodations. Generally, they're sidewalk or asphalt. But it doesn't have to be a hard surface.

Chair Strachan: Okay, and there's no other option besides that?

Gary Horton: Oh, there's plenty of---I mean, you could---

Chair Strachan: What are the other ones?

Gary Horton: Build a grade separated from, from all the way around there. I mean, you could put a tunnel.

Chair Strachan: Well, what about---let's talk reasonably.

Gary Horton: You said any other so I'm---

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair
Strachan: Yeah, yeah, well. It's getting late, Gary.

Gary
Horton: Understood. When you're trying---I felt like you were trying to back me into a corner is what I'm saying. All right, if you're trying to say a range of opportunities, there's---

Chair
Strachan: What are the other reasonable options?

Gary
Horton: Not---yeah, it would be behind the curb and gutter, or even further separated from the curb and gutter. But no, outside the curb and gutter, outside the travel way for pedestrians.

Chair
Strachan: That puts us in a tough position, I think. I mean, if the Staff's recommending we don't put in sidewalks and we don't do a one-way option, and both of those things are necessary safety measures in your mind.

Gary
Horton: I think they're safety measures right now in my mind. I don't think Treasure is the creation of that. That's the point I'm making. Engineering standards and national standards do generally---I, I have not found something that has pedestrians walking within the roadway. Not that it can't happen.

Chair
Strachan: I would agree with that.

Gary
Horton: But that's, you know, when you design a road and you're accommodating both pedestrians and vehicles, they're generally separated.

Chair
Strachan: Well, I agree with that. All right. Anything else?

APPROVED 9.27.17

Commissioner Suesser: Another, another difference between what you're recommending and what the Staff's recommending is that construction traffic under your recommendation comes up Lowell and goes down Empire. Is that correct? It says enter from Lowell, exit on Empire. So it leaves the project and it goes---construction traffic goes down Empire? That's the first one.

Gary Horton: Right. That is what I recall from the conditions of the Master Plan.

Pat Sweeney: Pat Sweeney. I mean, briefly we could go either way. It makes sense since the section on Lowell is being beefed up for the purpose of load. That the loaded vehicles go up Lowell. And the unloaded vehicles go down Empire.

Planner Astorga: What, what the Master Plan indicates is that access to the property, the property would be Lowell and Empire. I don't believe it's specifically specified for construction traffic. And, yes, as Pat just mentioned, there was a clause in there that in the future, if the City Engineer's Office or Public Works Department was going to rebuild the road, we would, the applicant would be able to participate in thickening that layer of asphalt. Now, currently, the applicant has chosen to participate in Lowell, but he did not participate on Empire. So the consequence as outlined in the Master Plan says that if the applicant requests to also use Empire, he would have to rebuild the road.

Commissioner Suesser: And Staff's not recommending that, though. Staff's recommending that Lowell be used for construction traffic exclusively, correct?

Planner Astorga: Yeah. And I, I think that maybe we haven't had this specific discussion with the applicant, but that was always assumed further participation in the road thickness.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Commissioner Suesser: And so it has nothing to do with traffic flow and pedestrian safety to use Lowell exclusively.

Planner Astorga: I'll let Matt and Alfred answer that portion of your inquiry.

Matt Cassel: It's assumed just because Lowell was built to handle the construction that all the construction traffic would be on Lowell. And it's not about capacity. It's about the road standing up to the pounding it would take from the construction.

Commissioner Suesser: But Lowell, Lowell is being beefed up by the applicant, but they haven't chosen to fortify Empire? I'm not, I'm not following why Lowell has---

Planner Astorga: That is correct. And, and I believe that the answer is that Empire was built right in the middle of the official, official negotiation between the applicant and the City. Empire was rebuilt three years ago, Matt? Four years ago.

Chair Strachan: Well, and do we have any studies or findings that Empire can or can't accommodate the, the loads?

Matt Cassel: From a technical term it cannot. It would have to be beefed up to handle additional construction traffic. It's a local street.

Commissioner Suesser: And the applicant is required to do that under the MPD?

Planner Astorga: Under the MPD I believe it says that if the applicant chooses not to participate in thickness of the road at the time of usual City reconstruction, the applicant would be obligated to rebuild the road.

Chair Strachan: Well, that's an additional impact to the residents of Empire that---

APPROVED 9.27.17

Planner Astorga: Yeah. And, and I'm sorry to interrupt, but we have not had an opportunity from Staff to, with the applicant to discuss construction on Empire. So I just want to make sure that the Commission understands that.

Chair Strachan: Yeah, I, I understand that. I think we all do. That's a big problem for you guys. Just saying. All right. Let's move on. We'll tackle 17.2. Your question is, does---sorry, I didn't mean to move on too fast. Are we done with the traffic discussion? I think we are. Okay.

17.2. Does the Planning Commission agree with Staff that the refinements identified in 17.2 are not in direct response to specific comments made by the Planning Commission? I don't know. Where do people come down on this. Where do the other Commissioners come down? Commissioner Thimm, what about you?

Commissioner Thimm: In, in looking at it there were, some of the issues were spoken to. Cliffscapes were spoken to, some of the building footprint areas were spoken to. There really wasn't enough information to get through and understand, yes, this is in direct response to our, our commentary. I didn't really see, in looking at the massing or the elevations that were provided, I didn't see such things as addressing commentary about stepping up and, and honoring the topography rather than just hogging it out, that sort of thing. And so I think that there's more needed. And there are some steps in the right direction, but I would tend to agree with Staff's commentary.

Commissioner Suesser: I do as well. I have nothing further to add.

Chair Strachan: Commissioner Joyce?

Commissioner Joyce: I, I wouldn't go so far as to say, say that. I think I would take Commissioner Thimm's thing a little further. The thing is, it didn't, the, the

APPROVED 9.27.17

things that changed, unfortunately, didn't like mark something completely off my list. It was progress in the right direction. I mean, a good example of this is the reduction in support commercial from 33,000 down to 21,000. I think that's a good thing, but my problem is I don't believe---I believe that all they were allocated was the 19,000 or 17,000 square feet of actual commercial that was specified in the plan. And as we talked about, gosh it's been almost a year ago, there's a clause in there as part of the Master Plan agreement that says, you know, this is the maximum amount and, and it shall not exceed this. And so I'm still stuck on, no, you get meeting space, you get resort accessory, but you don't get support commercial. It was very clear about that to me. And so I see the reduction as being a move in the right direction but not there.

Same kind of thing with moving the, the cliffscape back. I believe we have basically a building area that was pretty clearly outlined on the map, and the area outside of that was, was converted to open space. They brought the buildings back, they brought the cliffscapes back, and got closer to being inside the building area, but it's not. And so I still have problems that there's, there's permanent cliffscape structures going into areas outside the building plat, and in restricted open space area.

So, you know, there's a couple of things like that that I think we're moving in the right direction. Same kind of thing with excavation. We were looking at close to a million cubic yards of excavation. Now we're looking at what, 860 or something like that. That's moving the right way. It's still, you know, a behemoth compared to anything Park City's ever seen. And I still think we have lots and lots and lots of steep cliffscape and excavation questions that moved the right way, we just---it's still a huge issue to me.

So I wouldn't go so far as to agree with the statement that says they weren't in direct response to specific comments made. But I would try to, I would word that a little differently that said they didn't eliminate---I don't think it eliminated any of my concerns. I think it kind of got rid of, you know, 30 or 40% of a concern, and the concern is still there.

Commissioner Band: I agree with that. Have nothing further to add.

Chair Strachan: Commissioner Phillips?

APPROVED 9.27.17

Commissioner Phillips: Ditto.

Chair Strachan: All right. Yeah, I'm on the same page as the other Commissioners.

Planner Astorga: The, the applicant did prepare a presentation. They updated the model that we saw, I think two months ago now, to reflect 17.2. So they have asked for a presentation to show us that.

Chair Strachan: Okay. Who's ready to go?

Planner Astorga: As they do that, I have one slide to show you, which is the most significant concern with this application. We printed the comparison sheets that the applicant provided. And if I could get to it real quick. This one right here. It is extremely hard to follow on the computer because of the redline that you could barely see. But this is Building 4B. This is the hotel. It is the biggest building. As you can see, the red line represents where the building was, and now anything above the red line represents where the building is currently being proposed. So I just wanted you to pay---

Chair Strachan: Under 17.2.

Planner Astorga: Under 17.2. This is page 191 of your packets. All the other ones were about the same with the exception of the elimination of some buildings that they got rid of. But just like you pop a balloon---you push in a balloon here, it's going to pop out over, over there.

Chair Strachan: Yep. All right.

Planner

APPROVED 9.27.17

Astorga: And this, and this building took the most of the increase in shifting. Not increase in density but shifting square footage from the elimination here to elimination over there. This is the most significant that that popped out. This is the only exhibit I wanted to show you.

Chair Strachan: Thank you. All right. While the applicant's getting set up, why don't we tackle your last question, which is should Staff present in chronological order to us our list of questions. And the response is there too.

Director Erickson: Do you need additional explanation of that or is, is the---

Commissioner Phillips: I think it's pretty straightforward, right?

Director Erickson: Text pretty clear? And I'll take this one, but basically Francisco has taken the last couple weeks to go through every one of the Minutes of our last 14 meetings, put together a list of issues and things that had not been addressed, and now we're relating them back to the 15 MPD criteria and the 8 criteria---15 CUP criteria and the criteria inside the MPD, aligning with the impacts. And so we're recommending that you review them, not chronologically, even though we will reference back to when you talked to them. We recommend that you review them according to the 15 Criteria and the MPD.

Chair Strachan: I think that makes sense. Does that make sense to everybody else?

All Commissioners: Yes.

Commissioner Joyce: I agree.

Commissioner Thimm: I agree.

Director Erickson: Good, thank you. We're done.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair Strachan: And then just in relation back to the question presented in the Staff report regarding 17.2, I was unaware the applicant had a presentation tonight to give. So I withdraw my earlier comment. I may reassert it after the presentation is made, but I don't make any decisions about whether 17.2 is adequate or not without having seen this presentation. And I don't think the other Commissioners have either.

Steve Perkins: Good evening. I'm Steven Perkins. I'm representing the applicant. I'd like to do two things tonight. First is to present to the Commission and the public the recently completed video animations and renderings of Treasure 17.2, including a series of still shots, which depict the differences between the 17.1 images that were previously presented to the Commission, and the new 17.2 refinements.

And secondly, I would like to briefly re-summarize the goals of underlying the site planning and architectural refinements of 17.2 that were presented to the Commission last month by David Eldredge. And then in the interest of time let's just go ahead and start the animations.

The first animation is going to show the approach to the project from the golf course and the Resort Center. As we're watching the animations I want to remind everyone that they are from a birds-eye view, and do not represent how the project will appear from a car or pedestrian standpoint.

The second animation shows the approach from Deer Valley. And lastly, this animation shows the approach from Upper Main Street and Old Town.

In addition, we're going to show you a couple of short selected animations that include wintertime simulations as well.

Lastly, we're going to show the stills of 17.2 wiped in from the 11 required viewpoints requested by Staff for CUP review. These are from the Park City Mountain Resort was previous, the golf course. From the Peaks Hotel. From the City Park. From the 9th Street turnaround. From the Aerie. From the Town Lift deck. From Heber and Main. The Deer Valley Roundabout. The Marsac Building. And the 5th Street lots. We can

APPROVED 9.27.17

revisit these animations again if desired during the Commissioner's questions.

The next sequence of animated stills will show the comparison between the existing condition, the 17.1 Refinement shown at earlier hearings, and lastly, the 17.2 version all from the same vantage point.

The first three stills were from selected vantage points. The last nine are from, again from the same vantage points that were selected by the Staff for CUP review.

Commissioner Suesser: I think these have to be much slower for us to get anything out of the comparisons.

Director Erickson: Steve, you're going to submit these things for review?

Steve Perkins: Absolutely.

Director Erickson: And, and let the Commission take some time to review the situation. You don't have to guess tonight. Francisco, if I might ask a question. Have you looked at these yet?

Planner Astorga: We have received the, the model. It was hyperlinked to the Staff report. We have received the---

Director Erickson: I guess the question is, have you, have you checked to see if these are zoomable, excuse me zoomable in electronic form?

Planner Astorga: Yeah. These exhibits are all listed on page 161. There are hyperlinks to it, except for the one, the video that he had, that Pat had. Nothing there. Then 17.1, 17.2. Obviously, I don't have those in video form. I have it in photograph form. And those were part of the packet. But no, I don't have them both together in the video where you could---

APPROVED 9.27.17

Director Erickson: If the Commissioners want to look at them in more detail, could you zoom into them in still?

Planner Astorga: Yes.

Director Erickson: Okay.

Planner Astorga: Yes, we could do that.

Director Erickson: So you'll be able to do that when you see the hyperlinks.

Pat Sweeney: Also, also, Bruce, we provided stills, individual stills of all the individual viewpoints, the selected ones and the required ones. So you can really zoom in on those.

Director Erickson: Okay.

Planner Astorga: Yeah. Those are the ones that we have hyperlinked on the Staff report.

Chair Strachan: Great.

Pat Sweeney: And you can, you, you know, you can play with it on any computer. Slow it with your finger. Make it go real slow, etc.

Steve Perkins: As, as already been noted in your package tonight is a link to the drawings that David Eldredge presented to the Commission at the last meeting. These drawings contain very specific details that show the 17.2

APPROVED 9.27.17

Refinements and their comparison to the 2009 drawings. David's here tonight and can answer questions about that comparison if so desired.

I'd like to quickly touch on the overriding goals that drove the site planning and architectural refinements for 17.2, and the specific actions that we took to achieve them. We developed these goals taken from comments and suggestions that we received from Planning Commission or Staff and public over the course of the previous meetings. And we verified it by re-reading the Minutes of those meetings as well as our own notes.

Very simply, the goals of 17.2 Refinement are as follows: Goal #1, reduce the amount of excavation. The actions taken in order to do that include eliminating two Area 5 buildings; Building 5B and 5D. Shortening and moving Building 4B to the east, and reducing the size of the central amenities space. Raising the grade at the back of Buildings 1B and 1C. Reducing below grade accessory and circulation space. And keeping Lowell Avenue at existing grade, as opposed to the 5' lower of the 2009 drawings.

The net effect of those actions is to reduce excavation from 960 cubic yards to 812 cubic yards. And that is a more accurate estimation from Rob McMahon, our Civil Engineer, which the previous estimate did not include the changes at the 1 Buildings. And so now he's been able to incorporate all those changes, so we feel this is a pretty accurate number. That is 148,000 cubic yard difference or about 16%.

The bar chart here shows then that reduction of excavation from each of the plans. 2009, on the left, 17.1 in the middle, and 17.2 at the right side.

Commissioner Joyce: Can I ask a quick question? At one point we had a lot of discussion about the expansion factor of when you pull out, you know, whatever. You pull out a million cubic yards or whatever, what the expansion is when you break it up and haul it up the hill and that kind of thing. And we heard numbers of 30% and 50%. And one of the things we asked was for the applicant and Staff to see if, again, if they could find an agreed to number that for our planning purposes we can use. Has that happened yet or?

Pat Sweeney: We haven't agreed with the Staff. But we, we have an, an opinion from Applied Geotechnical Engineering Consultant, Jim Norquist, that it would

APPROVED 9.27.17

be in the range of 25%. We're doing some soils tests right now that will allow us, allow him to render perhaps a more accurate opinion on that. And we can discuss that with Staff.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to know if that was a done thing, and I just want to make sure we didn't lose it. Thank you.

Steve Perkins: As the excavation was reduced the building footprints eliminated and moved, and the grades behind certain buildings changed. We were able to also achieve Goal #2, which is to significant reduce site disturbance. The---according to David's calculations, the new area of site disturbance has been reduced by approximately 78,000 square feet, or 1.8 acres.

Thirdly, in addition, we have been able to lessen the height and visual impact of the cliffscapes. As noted on the chart there, the, the top of the cliffscape behind Building 4B has been reduced by approximately 16 feet. The top of the cliffscape behind Building 1B has been reduced approximately 37 feet. And the top of the cliffscape behind Building 5C has been reduced approximately 48 feet.

If you look at David's drawings, there's also details at bottom of slope and that top of slope number, if you want to see what the actual dimension of the cliffscape is in its certain locations.

While these goals are more site related and---we have also established interrelated goals that deal more with building, buildings and use. These additional goals include Goal #4, to reduce the amount of support commercial. Next slide Pat. And that we have done, which has already been mentioned in the discussion, by 12,000 square feet or approximately 36% of the, of the support commercial.

Also, to improve the parking layout and circulation, that has been by a combination of double-loaded bays and also changing a lot of the one-way roadways that we had into two-way streets.

As a result of those changes I've noted above, and others noted below, we were able to achieve Goal #6, an improvement in overall building

APPROVED 9.27.17

efficiency and a significant reduction in the percentage of back of house relative to gross square footage. That reduction includes accessory space of 37,000 square feet or 27% of the accessory space, reduction of circulation space of 17,000 square feet or 10% of that amount. And a total square footage reduction of all uses of 68,000 square feet or 7% of the gross building area. That then results in a reduced back of house---a back of house relationship to the gross square footage of 36%, compared with other similar projects as was done in the aforementioned Exhibit W. And so we've done those project comparisons using the same kind of approach that Exhibit W used. You can see the Montage, the St. Regis, Treasure 2009, and Treasure 1712 in the charts, and then of course---17.2 in the charts. And also, you can see the bar charts below with the corresponding colors for those percentages. I think the most important line to look at is the back of house line, the orange line at the top. You can see the Montage has a back of house area of about 43.8%. The St. Regis has a back of house of about 47.1%. Treasure 2009 was about 40%. And Treasure 17.2 is at now 36.2% in terms of amount of back of house.

So in conclusion, contrary to language in the Staff report, we feel that the 17.2 Refinements are substantial and relevant, and are in, are in response to comments from the Planning Commission, Staff and public. I want everyone to note, however, that the numbers and percentages still are approximate, and that the more detailed numbers are available in the 17.2 to 2009 comparisons in your packet, and the 17.2 drawings package that was submitted to Staff last month.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Chair Strachan: Thank you. All right. Anything to say about that, Francisco?

Planner Astorga: No. Everything is still the same from Staff's perspective.

Chair Strachan: Yeah. Yeah, I think everything's still the same from my perspective as well. You know, it changes my opinion a little bit about whether this was done in response to our comments. Whether it goes far enough or not I think is a different issue. But decreasing the excavation certainly is something that we've brought up, and to the extent you guys have done

APPROVED 9.27.17

that, that was in response to our comments. Again, whether it goes far enough is a debate we'll have later.

All right. Anything further?

Commissioner Joyce: Let me just throw out again. I just want to keep---make sure we don't lose track of some of the things. One of the things that was brought up last month as well was because you made changes in the retaining walls, the good news is the retaining walls are shorter than they were and they've kinda gotten pulled back in closer to the building footprint. But a part of that was being made a lot steeper. And so there was some work done---gosh back in 2009 or maybe even back in the 2003 kind of thing where there was a description of what retaining walls were going to look like and how they were going to be tiered and everything. And now it seems like that's a less like---a lot less likely to be accurate because it's just that steep now. So at some point I don't want to lose track that I don't think the design of the retaining walls that we have had access to is accurate anymore. And we'll need to see that.

Steve Perkins: I don't know if that's true, Steve, because those retaining walls that are shown on the written and pictorial that was done in 2009 include not only retaining walls that might be adjacent to the cliffscape areas, or in addition to cliffscapes, but also walls that would be at the front of the project where we have the, for instance, the lifts. And so, I think we were throwing out a whole range of options for those walls for you guys to consider.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay.

Steve Perkins: And we've selected several of those to use in those areas.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay. I guess the big one, the big concern for us from both an excavation standpoint and then an appearance standpoint is, you know, its, it's certainly important, it's not to negate the smaller walls that are kind of down by Old Town because that's part of a transition. But when you have still, you know, 100 foot walls back behind, one of the things that was pictured in those was that you had tiers, and actually had some things

APPROVED 9.27.17

pointed out as fairly substantial plantings and things like that in there. And I think you guys are up to like 4:1 was what we were told for---

Steve Perkins: We do. But I think if you look at David's grading plans, we still are trying to create small terraces and other pockets for that kind of planting to occur.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay, I, I'd like to see that at some point because it's hard for me to imagine on a wall that steep that we can have much other than, you know, a little shrubbery here and there, or something like that. But if we can, that's, that's cool. I'd like to see that. 'Cause I went back through it after our last meeting and it didn't seem to apply anymore.

Steve Perkins: And I think if you---believe it or not if you look at, if you go to look at David's drawings and then also look at what we've done with the videos, you'll see that we've tried to take those pods and that's where we've placed trees in the videos.

Commissioner Joyce: Okay. I'll pay attention to that when we go through it. Thank you.

Chair Strachan: All right. Nothing further? Francisco, applicant, we're all done?

Director Erickson: I have, I have just two more from the Planning Commission in keeping with Commissioner Joyce's comments. We had also brought forward issues about making sure that the construction impacts of the conveyor system were accurately represented on the side of the mountain. Making sure that the placement of fill was accurately represented, and the over excavation for the cliffscapes was accurately represented in the drawings. So what you're looking at is 2017 vegetation overlaid with the 20-whatever ski runs, but none of the impacts of the construction going to lift towers and the conveyor system. So we asked about that information previously. We need to see it again.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair
Strachan: Good points.

Commissioner
Joyce: And, and I think there's a whole series of things that we haven't discussed about where exactly this dirt goes. I mean, we kind of got the, we're going to mow down 16 acres of tree in the higher area of the open space and pile the dirt there, but I haven't seen---I mean, I had questions about whether that was even allowed based on the conservation easement, and I haven't heard back on that. But even the details of what exactly does that look like and how do we retain that much soil. Because I mean, over 16 acres, even if you stacked it up straight on the sides it's 45' deep. And obviously you can't stack it straight. And you guys have depicted it in the pictures as being a, a mound. And I just don't understand how we take a, what's probably a 60' high mound of dirt on the side of a steep slope and get it to stay there and revegetate successfully without erosion issues and things. And that, that may be something that you guys can bring us a plan on. But, but we certainly haven't had the opportunity to look at that yet.

Chair
Strachan: All right.

Commissioner
Thimm: One, one, one comment. Sorry.

Chair
Strachan: I really want to get to public comment here. These guys have been more than patient.

Commissioner
Thimm: Yeah. So a comparison to the 2009 plan I think is good. I don't want us to lose sight of going back and looking at 17.2 in comparison to the original approved Master Plan. I think that is actually the model that we need to be looking at.

Chair
Strachan: Good point. Yep. All right. Let's open the public comment on Treasure Hill CUP. I appreciate everyone's extreme patience.

<u>Public Comment</u>

APPROVED 9.27.17

Nikki DeForge: I almost feel given for having comments giving the lateness of the hour. Thanks for bearing with us. I'm Nikki DeForge here speaking on behalf of THINC, a non-profit group of hundreds of Park City residents and businesses. We appreciate this opportunity to share our concerns with you.

Starting with road capacity. Commissioner Joyce poised a question at last month's meeting that remains unanswered. He said how can the modeling possibly predict that the roads impacted by the Treasure Hill development will function well in the future, when the evidence shows that the roads are not functioning well now. And stated another way, I think you could ask the question, how can the Commission possibly rely on the modeling and traffic reports predicting no future capacity issues with the Treasure Hill project if the actual evidence demonstrates serious problems even now. We've all seen the videos and the photographs showing actual road conditions on Lowell and Empire. We've heard the testimony from the local residents about what it is actually like to live and drive on these roads. And having seen and heard that evidence of the real world traffic conditions, the Commission cannot possible conclude that these roads adequately function now, much less that they will adequately function in the future with the sharp increase in traffic projected from Treasure Hill. It can't---the Commission cannot be required to focus blindly on these speculative prognostications while ignoring the actual evidence in the record of the real world boots on the ground issues with these roads.

And even in the most recent submission, the applicant makes no attempt to answer Commissioner Joyce's question. It doesn't pretend that the current road conditions along Lowell and Empire are acceptable. Instead, it makes two alternative arguments. First, it essentially says pay no attention to what the road conditions actually are like. The studies say it will all be fine when we add all of this traffic on there. But really, the past modeling and studies, including the 2015 InterPlan study that, that was mentioned earlier suffer from the same flaws as the applicant's current study. They are based on idealized road conditions and cross sections that do not actually exist on these roads. The studies assume that the Old Town roads around Treasure Hill actually function year-round as they appear on paper, again, in these cross section illustrations. In other words, that they have pristine road conditions with a handful of cars, a few pedestrians walking on clear sidewalks passed nicely spaced driveways

APPROVED 9.27.17

and on flat terrain. But that is not remotely how these roads actually function, and particularly not in the wintertime, as we've seen.

Therefore, as noted by the LSC Transportation Study in its recent review, the traffic analysis needs to include an evaluation of roadway congestion along Lowell Avenue and Empire Avenue between the site and Manor Way, reflecting real world winter traffic conditions. Snow, both on the roadway and piled, grades and the high density of residential driveways all combine to reduce the capacity of these roadways. The Avenue Consultants report likewise cautions that during winter conditions when the roadway width is reduced to one lane and vehicles must regularly yield to oncoming traffic or even backup to make way for another vehicle, the roadway capacity may reasonably be assumed to drop to as little as one-tenth of the ideal values, which would be only 60 to 120 vehicles per hour. And yet we're talking about a thousand vehicles per hour, potentially.

None of this, none of these issues are addressed in any of the applicant's studies or even, frankly, in the earlier studies that were commissioned by the City. Again, those were all based on idealized conditions that are not present here even remotely. The LSC study further notes that if such winter conditions result in one-way operation on the roads, which the evidence in the record shows it does, then this impact on capacity is not reflected in the [inaudible] and methodology used in the applicant's 2017 report. Although LSC notes that capacity under such restricted conditions as exist on these roads can be modeled using a simulation software package, the applicant has made no attempt to model that data. And, in fact, as noted by LSC, the applicant has made no attempt to address actual capacity in its report at all under wintertime conditions or otherwise. Instead, the applicant persists in relying on inherently flawed traffic studies that make projections based on inaccurate idealized conditions that are not applicable here.

Second, the applicant attempts to essentially wash its hands of any responsibility for road capacity by shifting all the blame to the City for lack of road capacity due to its recent narrowing of Lowell by 3' this summer. Of course, this argument overlooks the fact that the capacity constraints evidence in the videos and the photographs were from last winter, well before these roads were narrowed. And although the narrower width of the road will certainly have an impact on pedestrians and parking and safety, the fact remains that there is no way that under winter conditions two cars can pass on either of these roads, regardless of whether they are

APPROVED 9.27.17

25' wide or 22' wide. And that is particularly true with respect to the 300 heavy construction trucks per day that are projected to pass along Lowell Avenue.

And as the Planning Staff, LSC and Avenue Consultants all point out in their reports, capacity is less the function of width than of quality of life, traffic noise, and safety concerns. According to LSC, the latter definition is typically the definition used by jurisdictions to define the appropriate roadway capacity, not the number of vehicles that you can conceivably cram down a road. Although the applicant now complains that this definition of capacity is too subjective, the City has imposed objective criteria for measuring this in its 2011 traffic master plan, based on its knowledge of the true condition of these roads, and not some idealized assumption. It has established a threshold of 2500 daily vehicle trips on Old Town roads such as Empire and Lowell in order to maintain quality of life for residents, and safety, and ensure adequate functionality. And yet again, we're talking about 1,000 vehicles per hour coming down these roads. So the Planning Staff is absolutely correct in requiring the applicant to provide the actual daily volumes along these roads in order to determine whether the 2500 threshold will be exceeded. And frankly, the City should require these volumes to be measured both at the upper and lower portions of Lowell and Empire to ensure accuracy.

The difficulty is that the applicant did not measure this in its President's Day study. It only measured peak traffic volumes. But even based on the peak traffic volumes that have been provided by the applicant, both LSC and Avenues Consultants projected that the average daily volumes are either already exceeded on Lowell and Empire, or would be significantly exceeded with the Treasure Hill project. For example, Avenue Consultants projects that Treasure Hill would add about 2600 new daily vehicles trips to these neighboring roads. Now if all of that additional traffic were funneled exclusively on to one street, like Empire or Lowell, which---and, and Empire is where the GPS coordinates currently will direct the traffic, then the increased traffic alone as a result of this project will exceed the total threshold of 2500 daily trips allowed for these roads. Even if those 2600 new trips were equally split between Lowell and Empire, as assumed by the applicant, both roads would exceed the threshold established in the 2011 traffic plan. So if projected traffic with this project will exceed road thresholds by 35% to 55%, then the City can't possibly conclude that the capacity on these roads is adequate under its 2011 traffic plan.

APPROVED 9.27.17

And even if the decision to narrow Lowell was ill-advised or was based on incorrect modeling or whatever, the City must still evaluate the CUP criteria for this project based on the actual current road conditions today, and the future impact from Treasure on the conditions of the road as they existing today, and not based on what conditions might have been had the City done something different, of if the City were to do something different. Just because conditions now are bad does not mean that the applicant can make them far worse with impunity and without mitigation. They must account for that. The applicant must demonstrate that it can mitigate the impact of its development on the traffic and road capacity in light of the current conditions on the ground without sacrificing public safety and quality of life for the residents. This project will push these intentionally slow roads, as the City has described them, to gridlock. And that is not acceptable under the CUP criteria.

The reality here is that the winter conditions exist for five to six months of the year in these neighborhoods. They are not exceptional events or outliers that the applicant need not mitigate. But the mitigation proposed by the applicant and recommended by the Staff will not effectively mitigate these impacts.

Just a couple of examples. There's a proposal to mitigate traffic impacts by funneling all the construction traffic on to Lowell. And we've had an explanation as to why that is. Yet, the applicant's entire traffic study is premised on projected traffic numbers being equally split between Lowell and Empire. So right there, if that's a mitigation requirement, then the traffic studies are, are flawed by, you know, considerably and have to be looked at again. And keep in mind that even then the applicant's study was conducted when Lowell was 3' wider than it is now.

Another example is the potential mitigation option of adding there more feet of asphalt on the east side of Lowell during construction to try to address the issues that will arise from the 300 heavy construction trucks attempting to pass each other along Lowell every day each way. And that's 600 trips by the way. Now adding the asphalt would only get Lowell back to what it was last winter when the videos and photographs were taken showing gridlock on the roads. Again, how do you get two-way construction traffic, neighborhood traffic, garbage trucks, emergency vehicles, snow plows and pedestrians using these roads at the same time, and say that this is safe and this provide sufficient quality of life for these

APPROVED 9.27.17

neighbors. These roads were not designed or built for construction, traffic like this, and there is nothing that can be done to mitigate that without drastically harming the quality of life of the residents in violation of the CUP requirements.

Again, regardless of what the engineering numbers purport to show, the real issue, as Commissioner Joyce pointed in the last meeting, is how the roads actually function in real life, and the impact on, on quality of life of the residents.

A brief comment about the one-way road option. I, I direct you to our comments from last month where we extensively addressed this issue and pointed out numerous problems with this approach, including the fact that this would actually increase the traffic along Lowell and Empire by directing all of the traffic that is currently below Manor, such as at Park City Resort, all the way up and around the loop. There are numerous other problems that again are addressed in detail in those other letters and comments. And I won't go into those in detail tonight.

External trips. The applicant's MPD mandated that the development not be designed to attract commercial traffic from off-site. And the latest summaries, the applicant does not bother to argue that it satisfies this condition of the MPD, and it does not, as set forth in detail in our comments last month. The parking requirements, traffic projections and commercial square footage all aptly demonstrate the project is specifically designed to draw, and will in fact draw, significant external commercial traffic, and that violates the MPD. Now instead of arguing that the project is not designed to draw external traffic, which is really the issue, the applicant now suggests that it need not satisfy this MPD requirement at all so long as the resulting traffic impact is minimal or can be mitigated. Again, that is not remotely the issue. The applicant is improperly conflating the MPD approval requirements with the CUP requirements, and there is no connection. As a threshold matter, the development must comply with the MPD conditions before we ever get to the issue of the CUP criteria. Because it doesn't comply, it doesn't matter what impacts the applicant thinks it can mitigate, or how minimal it thinks those impacts might be. And in reality, the prohibit on external trips in the MPD is not simply a traffic issue. In the MPD it explains that the condition was imposed in large measure out of concern for existing businesses in Old Town. The City did not want Treasure Hill to put all of the commercial business---to pull, excuse me, all of the commercial business away from

APPROVED 9.27.17

Old Town and create a ghost town there. Because prohibition on off-site commercial is not simply a traffic issue, it cannot be mitigated through traffic controls alone, even if it weren't a threshold MPD requirement, which it is. Because this no external trips issue is an MPD requirement and not a CUP issue, the applicant cannot resolve the issue even by agreeing to the proposed mitigation measures that have been suggested in the recent Staff report.

Assuming that the applicant could demonstrate that the project was not designed from the outset to draw off-site traffic to the site, which it cannot, these measures would be imposed so that the applicant does not later attempt to drive traffic to the site after CUP approval. Again, these mitigation proposals do not relieve the applicant from demonstrating in the first place that it's project meets the MPD conditions with respect to internal---external trips.

With respect to parking, in addition to Commissioner Joyce's comments earlier, which we fully concur with, we'll add one more; and that is that the applicant argues that its parking plans for the project comply with MPD requirement, but they don't. According to Table 14 of the Triton study, that applicant's parking plans, and I think we saw that here tonight, include 178 weekday parking space, and 184 weekend parking spaces for off-site commercial traffic. This represents 36-37% of the total parking needed for the project. Because the MPD mandated no off-site commercial traffic, the applicant's parking plans requiring substantial parking for such traffic do not comply with the Master Planned Development.

As for the Refinement 17.2, we completely agree with the comments earlier that none of this, none of this results in, in bring the project into compliance with any of the MPD criteria that the previous plans violated. That includes the violation of the support commercial restrictions mentioned, encroachments outside of the building area boundary and into open space, excavation issues and drawing off-site commercial visitors. Nor does it effectively mitigate the numerous impacts of the project under the CUP criteria, such as mass and scale, compatibility, preservation of existing slope, and so forth. Based on these new plans, the project is simply a little less egregiously in violation of the Master Planned Development and the development CUP criteria.

APPROVED 9.27.17

We appreciate the opportunity to share these, these concerns with you, and we encourage the Commission to, to turn down this CUP application. Thank you.

Chair Strachan: Thanks. Let me, let me ask you. Is it THINC's intention to provide comments on any proposed conditions by Staff and/or provide its own proposed conditions at any point?

Nikki DeForge: I'm sorry could you---I didn't hear the first part of that question.

Chair Strachan: Yeah, is it THINC's intention to comment on the proposed conditions like those we discussed tonight at any point, and/or supply proposed conditions of its own.

Nikki DeForge: I don't know that we are planning to supply proposed conditions of our own. We certainly will comment on the conditions as, as they become a little more concrete. There is so much information coming, particularly at the last moment, that it's impossible to address all of those issues in our comments without taking up all of the time. But yes, we would like to do that as we move forward.

Chair Strachan: Okay. I was just wondering where you guys kind of were planning on going?

Nikki DeForge: Yeah. I, I think that, again, the position of THINC is that this project as proposed is a violation of the MPD, and so whatever criteria we impose might mitigate some impacts but in the long run it doesn't matter. It, it's simply---

Chair Strachan: No, no conditions at all could ever satisfy the CUP requirements.

Nikki

APPROVED 9.27.17

DeForge: As long as it's in violation of the Master Planned Development approval, no, because that's the threshold issue. If we, if we can't reach that, then we don't even need to get to the CUP criteria

Chair Strachan: Understood.

Nikki DeForge: Thank you.

Michael Kelly: Hello. I'm Michael Kelly. I've been to a number of these meetings. I'm a resident of Park City. I bought property here in 2002, 2003, built in 2005. I own a house on Lowell Avenue at the intersection of North Star. I won't repeat the various comments that my previous speaker has made because they're all relevant in my mind. I would note that unlike some of my neighbors I'm not totally opposed to a concept of their being a development at Treasure, but it needs to be reasonable in size. I'm from San Francisco so I understand density and issues and can deal with those kinds of thing. But my concern is simply that this way out of line with what's possible and what should be done, and considering what's happened in Park City over the last few years.

But my real concern is the fact that construction process is going to make life and quality of life miserable for everybody between Park Avenue and the Resort for however many years it goes on. Right now we're in the middle of redoing Lowell. This is the second summer we've been in the middle of redoing Lowell. The first one was a bust because contracts didn't work out with regard to the sewer and the water. So for a second summer Lowell is totally torn up and basically unusable by many of the residents. The construction is going to result in the road being narrowed by 3', which you obviously know about. But that's going to have a huge impact on things.

It, it's also possible, and I wonder if the Staff has looked at this issue, is the development going to require that Lowell totally be reconstructed again to deal with new sewer and new water because of the increased amount of usage by Treasure. I don't think this particular system has been designed needing that capacity. So I suspect that not only will be have to go through the construction process, Lowell's going to have to be redone totally all over again. We'll go through the same thing once again.

APPROVED 9.27.17

In particular, I'm concerned about the intersection between North Star and Lowell. There is a right-of-way and the City and Treasure can probably do whatever they want to do, but the point is that's a very steep drive, it's very difficult to access as is. One-way would make it almost impossible to come up and turn in that way. It's very steep and it would be very difficult. And I assume the only one-way rationale is to go from a north to the south. You wouldn't conceive going the other way because then you'd have all the traffic at the intersection of Empire and Lowell and, and the little road that comes up from Park Avenue. So that would make it very difficult. There, there is not currently 3' to provide for the extra 3' of construction. If the road is narrowed 3' then you've got the extra 3', but that makes it no better than it is right now. It just changes what you do with the road.

So the construction this summer, the City's done a reasonable job. Granted, it's done a reasonable job in trying to mitigate, but my guess is they had all kinds of requirements that they were supposed to do. They've done some, they haven't done others. And this is the City's own development. So what you've got to expect is that whatever mitigation they promised, whatever mitigation you imposed, it's only going to work 50% of the time. And they're not going to do it the way they're supposed to. You're going to have incredible glitches, incredible problems, and so you're going to have a real issue with regard to whatever they promise. Whatever is proposed to be done it's not going to happen the way it's supposed to. I mean, you just don't get in and out of places like this with that limited access. The City was not designed to have a million square foot development at the end of two roads that barely support the number of people that use them now.

So, you know, it's hard for me to imagine how anybody in that neighborhood is going to have a decent quality of life for the next umpteen number of years that this takes to construct, and the fact that it will always take more time and the mitigation won't work the way it's promised. Thank you.

Chair Strachan: Thank you.

Mary Whitesides: I had a, a visual presentation that doesn't work on his computer. Dang it.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Planner Astorga: MAC versus PC.

Mary Whitesides: 'Cause it was a big part of it. Anyway, I keep getting these emails from PCMC about how proud they are that net zero Park City is their goal. And on---

Director Erickson: Would, would you just back up and put your name on the record for us, please?

Mary Whitesides: Oh, I wrote it down so I thought you heard me write it.

Director Erickson: No, no, Mary's got to hear it, too. Sorry.

Mary Whitesides: Okay. Mary Whitesides, 812 Crescent Tram, or 812 Empire, depending whether you're in front of my house or in back of my house. So I get a double whammy. So Park City Net Zero wrote a big 11-page explanation of how they want to achieve net zero footprint. And I'm just going to number them here. They went into detail. You can see it on the website. They have an energy plan that is set for 100% renewable by 2022. So I called Rocky Mountain Power this afternoon and the energy that is now supplied to Park City is 30% wind and 70% coal. And, of course, we know the emissions that coal create.

They're also going around giving presentations to different organizations on---called Climate Reality Project, to raise the awareness of net zero. They've, they've added electrified buses and electrified bikes. So when you plug these in, and it's mostly generated by coal, you're getting emissions anyway. But their hope is to put in solar solution soon. They also have water management strategies on there, and they have a tree planting project with the idea of zero carbon goals.

APPROVED 9.27.17

So, with the, with the Treasure Hill construction project, net zero goals for Park City becomes a joke, both on a construction level and after it's completed. If you look at construction itself, it's one of the biggest energy guzzlers of any project in the United States. It's also one of the biggest pollution emitters.

And that's where I was going to show you the construction that's been going on around my house. The amount of trucks that turn and go down Crescent Tram. The amount of noise, the amount of carbon emissions from a diesel truck, the amount of dust that comes up into the air, and the two people coming up from 8th and coming down from Empire that have to either back up or what do they do. Some of them don't even know. So here's construction pollution.

There's water pollution. And the sources of that pollution is diesel, oil, paint solvents, cleaners, cement, and harmful chemicals. When you clear the land it produces erosion that leads to silt bearing water runoff. There's surface water runoff that carries pollutants from this site. They can poison waterways. Pollutants that soak into ground water is a source for human drinking water.

There's air and dust pollution. This generates dust from concrete, cement, wood, stone, silica, travel, soil loading and unloading, wind and erosion. Dust carries long distances and can't all be controlled by water it down. Some dust is classified as PM10, which is matter less than 10 microns in diameter, which is invisible to the naked eye and travels long distances.

Diesel, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides and carbon dioxides all create dust pollution. There's noxious vapors from oils, glues, thinners, paints, treated woods, plastics, cleaners. They all create dust pollution.

In addition, there's noise pollution. Source for noise are vehicles, heavy equipment and machinery, people shouting, radios turned up high is annoying and distracting and can cause hearing loss, high blood pressure, sleep deprivation, and extreme stress.

There are also co2 emissions. Exhaustion from diesel equipment, preparation, grading, excavation, construction and on-site structures. There's exhaust from water trucks to control dust emission. There's

APPROVED 9.27.17

exhaust from welding machines, electric generators, air compressors and water pumps. There's exhaust from pickup trucks used to transport workers and materials. There's exhaust from trucks delivering concrete, fuel and supplies. There's exhaust from workers who commute to the site.

As far as energy consumption there's energy used for transportation, land clearance, electric consumption, fuel consumption by trucks and machinery. Even the materials that are produced to build these developments emit---require energy. Construction waste management requires energy. Delivery of materials and machinery.

This does not address the completed project, which I'm not going to go into, but I read just this afternoon. Buildings account for 32% of co2 emission in the US. The issue for Treasure Hill is being decided by cold hard facts and codes, and yet it is a quality of life issue for our neighborhood. The developers can safely propose this project while they are insulated in their own lives by nature and quietude. I don't know how many on the Commission are located in our neighborhood. If there are none it's hard to see how they can relate emotionally to these issues. So the decision rests on cold hard facts and codes, and not the impact on human beings and their neighborhood quality of life. None of this fits into the net zero goals of Park City.

And also, I wonder what happened to common sense and actual experience. I think that should play into it. And enter on Lowell and exist on Empire. Are they going to put a sign saying do not turn down Crescent Tram, because they do and they did? And my presentation would have shown you that. That's all I have. Thank you.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair Strachan: Once you get that video presentation working, Mary, you can submit it to Francisco and we can access it on line if you'd like.

Mary Whitesides: I would to do that. Yes.

Chair Strachan: All right.

John Stafsholt: Hi, I'm John Stafsholt, 633 Woodside. I'd like to give kudos to this Planning Commission, because in the 20+ years of dealing with Treasure that we've done, all the previous Planning Commissions have come back and complained about size, mass and scale. It's too big. Size, mass and scale. It's too big. And they always come back bigger. This is the first time ever I've seen them come back smaller. Even if it's a little bit it's just a change in direction that I want to give you kudos for.

So I'll just limit this to some notes I took tonight around traffic that's tonight's subject. We heard the City talk about streets versus roads, and the philosophy of streets. And I believe almost a quote, that streets are for people to access roads from their homes. So the key point I'm thinking about is homes; not hotels. Hotels are not allowed uses in Old Town. They weren't planned for in Old Town. They're not allowed. And streets are for homes and residents, and they're not designed for hotels.

In 2005, previous traffic study had some Ds and I believe at least one, maybe two Fs for intersection grades in their charts. And that was over ten years ago. I would say the, the Park City Police understand that. If you're in the winter ski season, between 3:00 and 7:00 p.m. for four hours a day during the ski season, not just Saturday and Sunday. During those hours the Park City Police have marked black and white vehicles with their lights spinning really loud. No sound, but I mean, the lights make a big blue and green, whatever it is color. Blue and red color everywhere at at least four intersections for four hours a day. I mean, that is what they're staffed for. Those intersections are Empire and Park, Kearns and Park, Deer Valley Drive and Bonanza, Kearns and Bonanza. And during peak times, there's police at more than four intersections that they feel are failed. I've talked to the police about this. They are sometimes at other places such as 14th and Park where people come down from Park City, and the Deer Valley Roundabout and Heber Ave. So that wouldn't be necessary if those locations weren't failing already. And that's a cost to the City and the taxpayers now.

As far as the current presentation, you heard Mary, she lives on Crescent Tram. I noticed that in 2037 with the Treasure Hill development, the intersection of Crescent Tramway and Empire is rated as an A. Well, with that rating of an A, I think you have to question all of the assumptions that were made in that study, because there is no way Crescent Tramway is

APPROVED 9.27.17

an A today. Forget about when Treasure's built, because that's the fastest way down.

The applicant mitigations that we've talked about, maybe not all of them tonight, but we've talked about over the years, they're almost all actually impacts when we're talking about traffic. If we talked about one-way roads, what if you live at the bottom of Lowell. You gotta drive up Lowell and go around Empire to go home, or vice-versa the other way. Or to leave. I mean, to go. They tried doing that on Woodside, upper Woodside to make it one-way up. The amount of time it took me to go from my house up Woodside down Park back to where I started was a little bit less than the time it took me to drive to the Canyons from my house. I went by 13 different construction sites and it certainly wasn't more safe for me. One-way roads are not a mitigation. They're an impact.

Widening roads, we talked about in the past at least 12' of widening roads taking people's front yards and driveways. That's not a mitigation. That's an impact. Moving all parking possibly to the uphill side or the downhill side. That's not a mitigation. That's an impact. Increased enforcement for the City for parking, for snow removal. Those are costs. They are impacts and they're not mitigations at all.

All construction traffic on Lowell has to go on Lowell. It has to be a two-way street because of the MPD requirement that the street road base has to be increased by 6", and I forget how much more asphalt on top. So, if all traffic doesn't go on Lowell we do the one-way answer, or we do the other recommendation of going up Lowell and down Empire. That means the developers have to redo the road on Empire all the way down to Manor Way. That's an MPD requirement. That's a major, major neighborhood impact, and that is not a mitigation at all.

Manor and Lowell. Anybody who skis Park City knows that when the Resort's here, this is Lowell coming here, all the instructors, all the patrollers, all the hosts are out of this building. They get their, their uniforms, they get their skis and boots and they all walk across. Okay? So with all the hundreds of instructors, etc. picking up all their stuff and walking across that intersection, I just can't imagine dump trucks and semis coming up Lowell and Manor Way in the winter. It just, it kind of defies description to me. Plus, we're going to have the Bamberger parcel potentially being built in that same exact space.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Okay. Slightly off traffic. Cabriolet. We talk about that as a main, one of the main proposed mitigations. I might have missed it somewhere down the line, but I, I've never heard who actually is going to run the Cabriolet. Is it Vail? If it's Vail, how much are they going to charge each construction worker to ride the Cabriolet to work and to ride it back down. Because if they're not charging anything, I don't see why Vail would keep it open. You know, there's a profit motive there. There's no hours around the Cabriolet, and it's not that great for our neighborhood, anyway. It's mostly there to enable construction and to talk about mitigation. It's certainly not a ski benefit.

The other thing I would say, just to touch on briefly. A 100% on-site excavation storage on-site, that's impossible. I think we all know that. There's also a lot of contaminated soil that can't stay there. The applicant's own estimate in the past for Treasure was almost 20x, 20 times the amount of excavation at the Montage. It's down now from those numbers. I think it's about 16 times, I did it on the back of my paper here. When all those trucks went down Marsac during the Montage building, I know many residents who moved out. They tried to rent, their renters would leave. They left. They sold their houses, moved out of Old Town. A lot of them moved out of Park City. This is going to be much worse for everyone on Lowell, everyone on Empire, everyone Crescent, everyone on Woodside. You know, what 400 maybe families. People are greatly impacted by this, maybe move, maybe leave. It's just not right. Thank you.

Chair Strachan: Thank you.

Kyra Parkhurst: I'm Kyra Parkhurst. And I think you all. I feel bad that at this late hour we have to still be listening to the opposition side. And we're all exhausted, but this is really important.

The one traffic slide showed the street capacity slide and things that we should do to make this work. It was like add sidewalks. Well, is Matt still here? Matt's still here. Matt, I think---Matt did a good job like eight, ten years ago. There was a real problem in Old Town. The speeders were horrendous. The police department would be up there. People---they would let us use speeding, you know, things to track it. Speeding, as the

APPROVED 9.27.17

town developed, became horrible. Not only with people living there but construction and taxis and transportation. And when Matt---they first did Norfolk and they were like, okay, let's put a sidewalk in. Well, that didn't work. Everybody parked on the sidewalks. Everybody walked in the streets. So when it came time---and I think Lowell is not the only street that has been narrowed. Every street in Old Town as it's been improved, I believe, has been narrowed. So it's not just Lowell and they're not just picking on Treasure. So, Matt, I think the whole City Commission, we had a walking tour of Empire trying to figure out what we could do, because the sidewalks didn't work. But the speeding was so bad and we didn't want---and Matt and the whole group came and we walked up the street. And after the end of the day it was very evident that a sidewalk was not possible. The homes on the downhill side, some of them, their driveways are literally bridges that go in because the land dips so much. And so they couldn't do it on that side. The uphill side---or the, or the degree into a driveway would make it prohibitive for a truck to get into their, an SUV to get into their driveway anymore. The uphill side had the same issues. The driveways were so short that cars would be sticking out into the sidewalks and into the street. So it was pretty evident that sidewalks weren't going to work. So that's not an option. I know it's a great option sitting there with your regional maps and how to correct the situation, but the reality is when you walk up and down the street it physically cannot be done.

Then the other option was, do an immediate right turn lane. So have you talked to Cole's? Are they going to sell you part of their property to, you know, make a right-turn lane? I don't know where else the road---you're add another lane. And then these immediate right turn lanes are then going to funnel right back down into a single lane on Empire. So all that does is make the funnel a little wider and narrower, and narrower, and narrower. It doesn't really solve it at the very end where everybody's trying to go. So that's my thing on traffic.

I guess I'm, I'm just going to do a couple of things. As far as noise, the other day a guy was driving up the road with his diesel with a full load of stone trying to get up the street. I heard him barreling even before he got to my house. I got in my car. I followed him. And I said come on, like how fast were you going. And he whipped off his headphones. He said my truck is noisy, it makes a lot of noise, that's why I wear these, 'cause it'll drive me crazy. And he said and I've got a full load and it's the only way I can get up this road is if I give it some gas. He said, so live with it,

APPROVED 9.27.17

lady. So, that was one truck. So I'm not quite sure how we're going to handle all the others. Maybe headphones can be given to everyone in Old Town.

What happens if the excavation is done on the retaining walls and we find that such during excavation that they can't be terraced. Do we just sit and go, oh, well, no terracing, no flowers, no nothing? That's okay. Again, and we do want to answer all those conditional things. What guarantees on all those and what penalties would there be if all these conditional things are not met? You know, it's really easy to put it down that hours are only going to be for a certain time. Is there going to be a flagman down there when 30 trucks of concrete are backed up due to snow or traffic, and all of a sudden the hour where they can't deliver, they're going to say, sorry, gotta go back. You know, this isn't going to happen. The, the conditions are not going to happen.

The workforce housing. No one has ever said. Where does workforce housing and employees have to live on premise. Where does it start and stop? Is it seasonal workers? Is it the manager of the restaurant? Is it the manager of the hotel, is it the accountant, is it the vice-president of operations, you know, the executives, or the secretarial staff? Is everyone supposed to live on premise? And then the numbers that we've been using that throws another whole other curve into that. And then does it include the employees of the retail space and the restaurants? They aren't living---

Cabriolet, next subject. How fast and how quick are they going to be able to get employees up there? If you've got 300 employees and they're all standing in line and they're going three or four at a time in a little Cabriolet, are they already on the clock? Is the developer going to get pissed off and go forget it, I'm not paying these people to be doing that? And then they say the Cabriolet is going to be one of the first things built. So will the Cabriolet handle the----and will, will it be structurally still stable during the blasting of the excavation, or will that affect the stability of the Cabriolet and then the Cabriolet can't be used.

One thing, we went through the slides really quick. How much higher are the buildings? Those slides went through so quickly, and it's just, here's a red line. How much higher are they? I know we cut down total square foot size, but how much higher are they?

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair Strachan: I think it depends on the building, right?

Kyra Parkhurst: That one that you showed us, Francisco, in the very beginning. You said in particular the red line is here.

Planner Astorga: Yeah, well, you would like me to answer that? I mean.

Chair Strachan: Yeah, I mean, he can answer as to that one building but I think---

Kyra Parkhurst: Oh, that's just that one. I just wondered.

Chair Strachan: I think I saw at least three stories in sections and then two in others. So I think it varies within the stories.

Kyra Parkhurst: Okay. All right. It's hard. It was hard.

Chair Strachan: Which presumably are ten feet.

Kyra Parkhurst: I couldn't even see the red line so it was hard to see. And then, let's see. I think that's about it. I think it's just that these streets were set up in a mining, as a mining town. They were set up so, so long ago. And they, they are, there probably is not another model anywhere that can be used because it doesn't exist. And it was never made to be, you know, built up as it is at this present day, and then all of a sudden say, well, let's plop down a million square foot because I want to do it, and this I think will work. You know, the Montage. Again, the Montage. You can't keep comparing it to the Montage and the St. Regis. They are up there in the middle of nowhere; not in the middle of a residential area with great access roads. And the roads just don't---no matter what you do, you can't change the area surrounding the proposed development. Thank you.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Chair
Strachan: Thank you. All right. Anyone else from the public wishing to comment? All right. Seeing no one we'll close the public hearing.

End of Public Comment

Chair
Strachan: Francisco, anything to close up on or?

Planner
Francisco: No, I think we, we received the, the direction from you already as we went through each item. So I don't have anything else to add.

Chair
Strachan: Great. All right. Then what we'll do is, unless there's any further comments, entertain a motion to continue.

Commissioner
Joyce: Are we just continuing, are we just continuing this out to the first meeting in October, whatever that is? October?

Chair
Strachan: It should be October 3rd?

Planner
Astorga: 11th. October 11th.

Chair
Strachan: Oh, way off.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to CONTINUE the Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit to October 11, 2017. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Park City Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

APPROVED 9.27.17

Approved by Planning Commission: _____

APPROVED 9.27.17