PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
AUGUST 18, 2021

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair John Phillips, John Kenworthy, Sarah Hall, Bill Johnson, Christin Van Dine

Excused: Laura Suesser and Doug Thimm

EX OFFICIO: Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; John Roberts, City Engineer; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

---

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

The following written determination was read:

> On May 19, 2021, the Chair issued a written determination that because of the public health emergency, conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may attend in person. This determination is based on the ongoing risks and infection rates statewide and in Summit County. For these reasons, this meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location. Planning Commission members will connect electronically.
>
> Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but will not be read aloud. For more information on attending virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org.

APPROVED 09.08.2021

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from July 21, 2021. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meetings from July 28, 2021.

MOTION: Commissioner Van Dine moved to approve the meeting minutes from July 21, 2021. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion.

VOTE: Sarah Hall-Aye, Bill Johnson-Aye, Christin Van Dine-Aye, John Kenworthy-Abstained, Chair John Phillips-Aye. The motion passed unanimously with one abstention.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to approve the meeting minutes from July 28, 2021. Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No hands were raised on Zoom and no eComments were submitted.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no Staff or Board disclosures.

5. CONTINUATIONS

6. CONSENT AGENDA

7. WORK SESSION

A. Park City Mountain Resort Base Parking Lots - MPD Modification Work Session - Replace Expired Exhibit D of the DA, the 1998 PCMR Base Area Master Plan Study Concept Master Plan, With a New Master Plan, Known as the Park City Base Area Lot Redevelopment Master Plan Study. The Commission Will Discuss Transportation, Draft Findings of Fact, Draft Conditions of Approval, and Other Issues Raised in the Staff Report. 1 Park City Page 2 PL-20-04475.

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth, presented the staff report and stated that the request is to amend the 1998 Development Agreement ("DA") and replace the expired

APPROVED 09.08.2021

Exhibit D with a new Base Area Master Plan Study. The next meeting for the project was scheduled to take place on September 15, 2021.

Summit County Regional Transportation Planning Director, Caroline Rodriguez, stated that she also serves as the Executive Director of High Valley Transit, which will be her sole position beginning in 2022. She was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Kenworthy commented that several months ago, the packet included a Park City and Summit County Regional Park and Ride Map that supported mitigating substantial amounts of parking requirements at the resort base in Park City. Ms. Rodriguez was familiar with the map presented. She was asked to describe the public/private relationship that exists on Ecker Hill. Ms. Rodriguez explained that Ecker Hill includes approximately 450 spaces, 100 of which are reserved for Canyons Village Management Association ("CVMA") employees. Currently, they are not gated so any member of the public can park there. At any time, CVMA could choose to gate off the west side of the lot and have key cards made for their employees only. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the remaining 350 spaces are open to the general public, although this year, most of the spaces will be occupied by a temporary bus depot and operations for High Valley Transit.

Ms. Rodriquez explained that the CVMA was applied to amend a Development Agreement they had with the County. As part of the approval, they gave a large portion of capital funding to construct the Park and Ride lot. In addition to that infusion of capital, they pay about $80,000 per year in operations and maintenance for the 100 parking spaces. As a result, they can install key card parking gates at any time. Commissioner Kenworthy asked if there was a similar arrangement for the use of Quinn's Junction. Ms. Rodriguez was not aware of one. She understood that the template came from County Attorney, Dave Thomas, but it went through the Community Development Department as well.

Commissioner Kenworthy next inquired about the Clinedahl (sp?)Park and Ride and asked if it will ever get built out. Ms. Rodriguez stated that currently there is no plan for anything on that property. It would not be accurate to label it a Park and Ride or even a future Park and Ride at this point. With regard to the Kimball Junction Transit Center Park and Ride, the parking will remain and there will still be at least 40 spaces. They consider it a hub rather than a Park and Ride because from the transportation team's perspective, if people drive into Kimball Junction, they have failed because they have gone through the pinch points. The existing spaces, however, will remain open to the public going forward.

APPROVED 09.08.2021

APPROVED 09.08.2021

With the planning taking place with Dakota Pacific and the transformation, Commissioner Kenworthy asked if a Park and Ride is anticipated. Ms. Rodriguez stated that it is not. It was confirmed that Jeremy Ranch has been completed with just over 80 spaces. It was estimated that there are 470 Park and Ride spaces. In response to a question raised by Commissioner Kenworthy, Ms. Rodriguez stated that there is no destination or original data for transit riders. However, Park City, through its partnership with Vail, was tracking that through its Ride On app.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked Ms. Rodriguez to address the County takeover on July 1 and how that will work. Ms. Rodriguez stated that the cooperation will remain largely the same. High Valley Transit provides a very high level of service with a route that runs from Jeremy Ranch to Deer Valley. It runs every 15 minutes, is scheduled, and the transfers are timed to the greatest extent possible. They try to mirror the times that existed previously. There are several stops between Jeremy Ranch and Park City Mountain because of the way it is structured. On the County portion, most of the stops that were on the route before will remain. As a result, it acts as a local service between Jeremy Ranch, Pinebrook, and Kimball Junction. There are also stops on SR-224. It runs more express into the Park City Mountain Base.

Commissioner Kenworthy pointed out that Park City Municipal's jurisdiction ends at the White Barn. He inquired about passes and how to capture people outside of Kimball Junction before they reach those pinch points. Ms. Rodriguez stated that additional funding is needed, which could come from a municipality or a private interest. Park City could also choose to annex into the High Valley Transit District, which would give them a spot on the Governing Board where they could have voting rights and a say in how the service is structured and where resources are deployed. Ms. Rodriguez stated that they are providing operating and capital funding to the system with an agreement in place to receive a certain level of services. Commissioner Kenworthy stated that the intent is to reduce Average Vehicle Occupancy ("AVO") as we count on bus ridership to do this. Going forward, Ms. Rodriguez stated that no other Park and Ride lots are planned for transit on the County-end.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the potential for an exclusive bus lane from SR-224. Ms. Rodriguez stated that it is on the horizon. They are going through the environmental process currently and expect to be finished in less than one year with a categorical exclusion. They will be moving forward concurrently with project development when they get toward the end of the environmental process. They applied for a large Federal Grant and are pursuing the Invest in America Act for the Bus Rapid Transit. They hope to begin construction by 2023 with one lane in each direction that is exclusive for buses. Commissioner Kenworthy asked if the plan is for the County to go beyond the

White Barn. Ms. Rodriguez stated that they intend to go all the way to the Old Town Transit Center, although the dedicated lanes will likely only run to the A-Fresh Market.

Commissioner Kenworthy next addressed Highway 248 and commented on the Park and Ride area there with 80 spaces. Ms. Rodriguez explained that it is an unimproved lot. The County previously planned to improve it and add amenities but it currently functions as a paved lot. It can accommodate 70 to 80 cars. In addition, Francis City has opened up their City Hall parking lot, which adds 15 additional spaces to transit because the transit route was extended to that point. She noted that there is not much demand for it. Most of the current riders either walk or get dropped off there.

SR-248 was next addressed. Ms. Rodriguez stated that it involves Park City Transit Service since it is within the City limits, with the exception of the Kamas route. The High Valley route includes three runs in the morning and three in the evening. It is a commuter service and there are stops at the Francis Town Clerk, the Kamas Park and Ride, Deer Mountain, the Learning Center, the Cemetery, A-Fresh Market, and the Old Town Transit Center. In the County, there are no satellite parking lots planned on SR-248. To put a stop at the top of Browns Canyon would require participation in the Transit District from Wasatch County. They were working with them, but funding was needed.

Commissioner Kenworthy next addressed Highways 248 and 224. In 2010, a memorandum was sent to Don Fisher when he was the County Manager regarding the intercept of parking discussions. Between 2010 and 2015, daily vehicle trips on SR-224 and SR-248 increased by an average of 10.5% including 9% on SR-224 and 12% on SR-248. The Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") predicted a large transportation increase. In terms of future roadway capacity, Ms. Rodriguez stated that she has been involved in all of the studies on SR-224 that UDOT has done and recognized that traffic will increase regardless of what they do.

Commissioner Van Dine asked if the County intends to have the High Valley Micro Transit go into the resort center or utilize them to just get closer to the resort this winter. Ms. Rodriguez stated that they have no intention of using micro-transit to go to the Park City side. Park City is not in the County's transit district boundary and micro transit is not intended to be a taxi service but rather a piece of a larger transit puzzle. From the public side, their micro and ADA paratransit vehicles are the same.

The County's district boundary encompasses all of the Park City School District boundary as well as some of Silver Creek, excluding Park City Municipal. Technically, the boundary is exactly where Park City Municipal begins between White Pine Canyon Road and the White Barn. Their fixed route will go to Park City Mountain Resort because they operate in the public roadway and Park City is not trying to prevent transit. The fixed route

APPROVED 09.08.2021

includes a minimum of four buses per hour from SR-224. That does not include Park City Transit buses. More were anticipated from High Valley in the future. She expected the frequency to double or triple during peak periods on the SR-224 side. If they were to implement a Wasatch County or Heber route, it might run every 15 minutes as well during peak periods. Over the next five years, as both base areas come online and the demand is there for transit, Park City will work with the County to serve the demand as best it can.

City Engineer, John Roberts, stated that with respect to Quinn's Junction, they plan to go out to bid this winter and expect 465 stalls to be constructed. Richardson Flat currently has 630 stalls and there have been no plans to expand it. His understanding was that some stalls have been set aside for Upper Deer Valley. Ultimately, nearly 1,100 stalls will be ready for use by day ski users and others by the end of summer 2022.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the exclusive use by one resort, Park City Municipal or Deer Valley, on either of those lots. Planner Ananth stated that the applicant is proposing to use Richardson Flats on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays for employees only and will run their own shuttles. At Quinn's Junction, no exclusivity was proposed. In all, there will be nearly 800 stalls available for day ski users in addition to what the County has offered. The strategy is that when Quinn's Junction begins to fill up, they will shift people to the Richardson Flats lot.

Commissioner Kenworthy commented on the spaces that are leased from the high school. He stated that it is a one-year contract. He asked if the Commission needs to mitigate the potential end of the contract. Planner Ananth stated that that is the purpose of Richardson Flats. The legal issues of what can and cannot be done on Richardson Flats would be addressed later on in the meeting.

Commissioner Johnson commented that the applicant has gotten very creative with the bus slots proposed and they had a mockup of Richardson Flat. He asked if there is a size difference between the Park City and High Valley Transit buses. Ms. Rodriguez stated that currently, they are very similar. Presently, Park City Transit's largest bus is 35 feet. Most of the High Valley Transit buses are 35 feet long but they do have 40-foot buses coming. An MCI coach bus is slightly larger than that and can be seen on the PC/SLC Connect route. She expected that the 40-foot buses will eventually go to Park City Mountain Resort.

Planner Ananth commented that the Transportation Plan, in her opinion, does not have enough stalls and has not been fully developed.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the goal is to increase ridership. The intent is not to add more parking but to capture users where they originate. Commissioner Kenworthy stated that

APPROVED 09.08.2021

in Wasatch County there are a significant number of daily riders that come to the Park City Mountain Resort from Heber Valley. He asked about the status of Wasatch County in terms of regional support. Ms. Rodriguez explained that they have a joint Council Meeting to discuss the issue on October 5, 2021,, as well as the action plan for 2021-2022 and how Wasatch County could be incorporated into the transit district. She felt that the addition of micro under High Valley Transit has demonstrated that the technology has enabled first and last-mile solutions and makes it easier to serve regional origins.

Robert Schmidt from PEG Development asked about the utilization rate of the stalls at Ecker Hill. Ms. Rodriguez stated that typically during the winter peak, they are at 80 to 90 percent capacity. He asked how the parking supply affects transit. Ms. Rodriguez had no information in that regard.

A question was raised regarding how the Old Town Transit Center has been doing since the incorporation of High Valley Transit and the City moving through the area. Ms. Rodriguez stated that there have been challenges. They have not been due to the volume of buses, but the lack of training on the part of some of the drivers. There have, however, been no major incidences. Kim Fjeldsted, Transit Manager for Park City, reported that the transit system is going well overall. The area is tight and there is a learning curve involved in coordinating with High Valley Transit. Timing issues were discussed. Ms. Fjeldsted stated that the data shows that during the 4:00 p.m. hour, 18 people on average exit the bus. They can move a considerable amount of people in a very short time frame.

Strategies employed at the drop-off zones were described as well as the unique strategies to accommodate that. The applicant has worked to determine what they need to provide shuttles and have been providing the space in their existing parking lot for years. The applicant has worked to provide the same linear square footage equivalent. In addition to that area, should there be more drop-offs, the applicant was proposing to use garage space for those types of uses. The area is flexible and after speaking with the resort operator, found that there is sufficient space to accommodate the shuttles.

Commissioner Kenworthy commented that in the morning hours, 42% of those parking in Snow Park come from the Wasatch Front and Salt Lake City using SR-224. With 470 spaces, no future planned spaces, and 42% being verified by Deer Valley, he did not see how what is proposed would work just by using that one verified number. He asked for an explanation of how the numbers work.

Ms. Rodriguez verified that CVMA did not receive additional density for their contribution to the Park and Ride and stated that their density was actually reduced in the process. She was relatively certain that they paid $3 million for the 100 spaces but agreed to

APPROVED 09.08.2021

provide the exact number in the future. Commissioner Kenworthy asked for a copy of the contract and Ms. Rodriguez agreed to provide it.

Ms. Rodriguez commented that to address the issue, there will have to be dedicated bus lanes. The intent was for fewer cars to drive into Summit County. She did not think it was unreasonable that the same deal could be made with existing Utah Transit Authority ("UTA") Park and Rides or parking locations in the valley. They could be collected and taken up I-80, which has few capacity issues, onto a dedicated bus lane. Even in mixed-flow traffic, with the right technology and vehicle, the bus would still travel faster than the vehicle next to it. Commissioner Kenworthy commented that the guiding principle for the development is to improve the guest experience of arriving and leaving the resort center. He believed that is something that can be achieved for both locals and visitors but this plan falls way short at the current time.

Kordel Braley, Senior Traffic Engineer with AECOM, stated that they have not yet reviewed what Fehr & Peers has submitted. He pointed out, however, that Google Maps currently shows that traveling from Salt Lake City to Downtown Park City is a 39-minute drive using SR-244 and a 40-minute drive using SR-248. The two routes are surprisingly even in terms of travel time, but he did not think it was outside the realm of possibility for people to know that Quinn's Junction and Richardson Flat have a lot of parking. The question was whether the 42% comes from the Kimball's Junction area or the Salt Lake Valley. If a lot is coming from the Salt Lake Valley, Quinn's Junction and Richardson Flat are still very viable Park and Ride locations, if needed.

Commissioner Kenworthy's interpretation was that the 42% was the drive from the Salt Lake Valley. To include Kimball Junction and Jeremy Ranch is an additional 34% of the visitors that come every morning. That now equates to 76% of the drive to market that comes from SR-224. Mr. Braley had not reviewed that but assumed that most people come up SR-224 because they assume that is the fastest way to get to Park City. If people are educated on the parking situation and realize that most of the parking is at Quinn's Junction, it will be a viable option. He offered to provide his opinion further once he looks at the data. It was suggested that his analysis include the interchange at US-40.

Chair Phillips stated that the bus system and how passengers arrive is the goal. Currently, 42% of people are driving their cars, which is not the preferred method. The intent was for them to be on a bus. Providing more parking at the end destination works against the goal of getting them on the bus. Making the bus option faster and cheaper was the goal. For that reason, his concern was making sure that they are reducing the impacts on the entire community. Creating parking at the end destination works against that goal.

APPROVED 09.08.2021

Ms. Rodriguez was asked to address the facilities proposed at the Park and Ride locations. She stated that with a parking lot such as Richardson Flat, a shelter makes no difference and is all about security and keeping employees safe at a remote lot. In a broad sense, amenities at a Park and Ride make very little difference. What is important is the speed at which a bus comes since the passengers do not want to get out of their vehicles and wait at a shelter. They want to know when the bus is coming and when is the best time to exit their vehicles and get onto the bus.

Chair Phillips commented on the Canyons Village Base and the contribution given. He felt that a contribution from this applicant would go a long way in ensuring that funds are in place if a deck does need to be put in. Ms. Rodriguez stated that Patrick Putt or Tiffanie Robinson from Community Development would be happy to prepare relevant staff reports that hit the highlights of that agreement. Commissioner Kenworthy asked to see that agreement. Ms. Rodriguez took note of his interest.

Commissioner Kenworthy was interested in getting information about where the traffic comes from and stated that it is critical to the bus schedule. It was noted that the resorts generally have that information. The benefits of the information were described. He explained that they need to have bus schedules that will incentivize people to get on the bus and come to the resorts. As other projects come in, they need to look at those individually and accommodate them. Appreciation was expressed to the professionals who were present to answer questions and share valuable information.

Chair Phillips reported that information was received from AECOM. He noted that two key Commission Members had not participated in tonight's discussion. Some of the issues may be better to address when the other Commissioners are present. Planner Ananth noted that representatives from AECOM were available to answer questions. Many of their suggestions dealt with managing effective conditions of approval.

Mr. Braley reported that the memorandum prepared by AECOM was prepared specifically in response to the Commission's previous discussion. AECOM put together a table in the memo titled, "Applicant (PEG) Outstanding Items" with items that either need to be resolved at a future date or highlighted. Mr. Braley noted that it was not a comprehensive list of everything that had been recommended since a lot of the recommendations had been taken care of by working collaboratively with the City and the applicant. He explained that the memo is a pared-down list of items that need to be conditioned or considered.

Mr. Braley explained that there was nothing in the memo that had not been brought up before. AECOM tried to emphasize some things that may have been forgotten or that

APPROVED 09.08.2021

have not been emphasized recently. He discussed the importance of the footprint. AECOM has spent a lot of time with staff and the applicant to make sure that the transit facility can handle the bus maneuvers, that there will be room for amenities, that there will be room for site path trails, and that the exclusive transit lanes can be accommodated. Once the footprint is set, it is difficult to change. As a result, a lot of the effort had been focused there.

The 20% mode shift through implementation of a Travel Demand Management ("TDM") Plan was something the Commissioners brought up previously. It is important and the best way to make sure the mode shift happens is through an extensive TDM. A lot of suggestions have been provided through redlines. Mr. Braley noted that the applicant had, in principle, agreed to the redline suggestions. The AECOM memo outlined some of those suggestions. Mr. Braley felt it would be important to focus on the annual or bi-annual follow-up in order to identify key performance indicators and refine the plan as it goes.

Chair Phillips explained that what was in front of the Commission was a starting point. He expected there to be debate, modifications, additions, and subtractions in the future. Chair Phillips pointed out that Planner Ananth had put a lot of work into getting something to the Planning Commission that they can start to work with. He reiterated the fact that two Planning Commission Members were not present at the meeting and noted that it was important to work through the material as a Commission. Chair Phillips did not believe there would be much time for public comment at the current meeting. However, there will be ample time for public comment at the next meeting. In addition, it may be better for the full Commission to hear public comments for themselves.

Planner Ananth explained that her strategy moving forward was to start with the document, "Draft Findings of Fact: PEG's Park City Base Area Lot Redevelopment Master Plan Study," and focus on areas where the applicant is looking for exceptions. She suggested starting with Findings of Fact #29 and work through the Setbacks, Height, and Parking sections. Commissioner Kenworthy wondered if the Commission would look through Findings of Fact #1 through #28 at another time. Planner Ananth explained that they would look at those items as time allows. She felt it was best to prioritize the Setbacks, Off-Street Parking, and Building Height sections first. Planner Ananth asked the Commissioners to read through the Findings of Fact listed in the Setbacks section and determine whether there were areas they were not comfortable with or wanted to be rephrased.

Chair Phillips discussed Findings of Fact #32, which stated the following:

APPROVED 09 08 2021

- The applicant withdrew setback exceptions originally requested for Parcels C, D, and E and currently requests limited reductions in the perimeter Setbacks to 20-feet for the north, east and west facades of Parcel B only, consistent with the 20-feet setback for the Recreation Commercial (RC) District.

Chair Phillips wondered if that language needed to be included or if it could specify that the applicant was only requesting a setback exception for Parcel B. Planner Ananth explained that either language would be acceptable. Staff could ask City Attorney, Mark Harrington, what his preference might be. She personally thought it might be beneficial to show on the record that the Planning Commission had requested changes and the applicant agreed to make those changes.

Findings of Fact #36 was discussed. Planner Ananth noted that it spelled out the exact exceptions on the east, north, and west facades of Parcel B. The exceptions are necessary to provide the desired architectural interest and variation. She explained that the setback reduction was requested for floors 2, 3, and 4 on the east, north, and west facades. There was discussion regarding the townhouse bump-outs. Planner Ananth commented that she would accept emails and suggestions over the next month related to the Findings of Fact. In addition, she would send out the document to various staff members in the City to receive further input. She believed the Commission was fairly comfortable with the Findings of Fact that were listed in the Setbacks section.

The Off-Street Parking section was discussed. Planner Ananth noted that it began with Findings of Fact #40. The section was broken up into three different subsections: General, Day Skier Parking, and Commercial and Residential Parking. She reported that the General parking portion discussed the parking analysis submitted by the applicant. The applicant is proposing 1,721 parking stalls at the Base Area with 1,200 reserved for day skier parking and the remaining 521 reserved for the hotel and condominium development.

Commissioner Kenworthy commented that he would not be comfortable with anything in the Off-Street Parking section until he is provided with the information he requested earlier in the meeting. He wanted to have data about where visitors are coming from. As mentioned earlier, the AVO is based on getting people onto buses. He was far from convinced that the plan for the AVO was possible. Commissioner Kenworthy felt that a 20% mode shift and an AVO number of three will be difficult to achieve. He reiterated the type of information he hoped to receive from AECOM and the applicant and once again stressed the importance of buses.

Mr. Schmidt noted that they could revisit the AVO discussion. However, he reminded the Commission that the 20% mode shift is not just buses. Other mode splits occur there as

APPROVED 09.08.2021

well. Mr. Schmidt noted that there are certain things that they do not know because the project will take approximately eight years to build. What is going to happen over that time period will likely change and adjust in the future. That is why flexibility was built into the TDM and Parking Management Plan ("PMP").

Commissioner Kenworthy believed they were supposed to hit the 20% mode shift five years from the time the parking is completed. Mr. Schmidt commented that this was one of the conditions he was uncertain about. He did not think it was practical because there will still be construction on other areas of the project. Mr. Schmidt explained that he would be more comfortable stating that the 20% mode shift will occur five years after completion of the project. He wondered if there were conditions that would make Commissioner Kenworthy more comfortable. Commissioner Kenworthy stated that there were many conditions that would make him more comfortable, but the applicant, the Planning Commission, and the City need to be on the same page in terms of expectations. Once everyone is on the same page, those conditions can be formulated.

Further discussions were had about the 20% mode shift. Planner Ananth explained that the language stated that this will take place after occupancy of the Parcel B garage. The project may not be fully completed at that time. Mr. Schmidt reported that the project will not be fully completed by that point. From a logistics standpoint, it will be difficult to meet the 20% mode shift, since there will still be a lot of moving parts and pieces taking place on the site. He did not want to commit to something that would be difficult to achieve operationally. Instead, he would rather commit to something that would work.

Planner Ananth explained her thought process with the 20% mode shift recommendation. The idea was that the transit station and all of the public infrastructure related to transit will be ready along with Building B. As a result, she felt that five years is an appropriate timeframe to start changing behaviors and reach the 20% goal. Based on that perspective, Mr. Schmidt believed they could work with a condition that was along those lines.

The Day Skier Parking subsection was discussed. Planner Ananth reported that the 1,200 existing day skier parking stalls were being replaced with 1,200 structured day skier stalls, and therefore, there was no material loss. In addition, the subsection discussed the parking study, PMP, signage, and paid parking was outlined. Findings of Fact #50 mentioned reaching the target AVOs as necessary over a five-year period, beginning with the occupancy of the garage on Parcel B. She noted that it might be more effective to change that to the occupancy of the transit station. Commissioner Van Dine agreed. Planner Ananth made a note to change that language.

APPROVED 09.08.2021

Commissioner Hall asked about data tracking. Planner Ananth explained that the applicant will have to have to do a lot of data tracking in the future related to parking utilization rates. The City will be responsible for tracking transit rates. She noted that there will be interim data that the City will receive and the bi-annual meetings will also take place. Those meetings will take place as soon as the building permit for Building B is issued. Chair Phillips commented that there could be a condition that before the permit for the last building was issued, all of the goals that were outlined must be achieved. Right now, the Planning Commission was concerned about assurances related to the 20% mode shift.

Commissioner Kenworthy expressed concern related to the accuracy of the data that was being used. He did not believe the data has been fleshed out fully. Mr. Schmidt noted that they were relying on the City to increase bus service. In order to hit the AVO goals, the City will need to do certain things on their end, such as increase bus service. When those conversations took place with the City, the issue would be discussed further.

Commissioner Hall noted that the 20% mode shift and the timeline were important issues. She felt there needed to be consequences if the 20% did not happen. Commissioner Van Dine agreed and explained that one of her biggest questions had to do with the consequences. She wondered what would happen if the goals were not achieved.

Mr. Schmidt clarified his earlier comments. His concern was that there may be things in the TDM plan that require all of the improvements to be in place. He was not suggesting that they not do anything until the entire project is complete. Rather, he was comfortable stating that they would do everything they could as soon as the bus station was complete. He did not want the 20% to be a sticking point. Planner Ananth commented that City Staff and PEG could work together over the next month to determine the exact language. That could then be brought back to the Planning Commission in September 2021.

Commissioner Kenworthy wondered what would happen if they were hitting the mode shift, the Park and Ride lots were full, the City was providing the full bus service and the buses were full. Mr. Schmidt explained that if all of those things were happening, everything would be functioning the way it was intended to. However, if overflow parking was happening in neighborhoods, that would be an issue. If a problem occurred, they would step in and provide a solution. He reported that there are ways to expand Quinn's Junction, but if the system functions the way it was envisioned, there should not be people parking in neighborhoods or gridlock traffic scenarios. Commissioner Kenworthy commented that buses are the key to the system. He did not see the projected number of buses being satisfactory. Mr. Schmidt noted that this will be a collaboration with the City.

APPROVED 09.08.2021

The Commercial and Residential Parking subsection was discussed. Planner Ananth reported that 521 stalls are available for residential and commercial uses. The subsection also outlined shared parking agreements and summarized the capture ratio of the commercial space. The latter meant that most of the users in the commercial space will already be there parked as skiers and will not need additional parking stalls as a result.

Commissioner Hall was not convinced that a waiver for the commercial parking stalls was warranted. Planner Ananth wanted to get a better sense of this concern. Commissioner Kenworthy noted that everything was contingent upon the 20% reduction in vehicles accessing the site over a five-year period. The roads are already at capacity and they are seeing the limitations related to available solutions. Commissioner Kenworthy stated the document still needs work. He hoped it would eventually provide a better understanding for the City, applicant, and community and ensure that everyone is on the same page. It will take a lot more work to get there and everyone needs to have their roles clearly defined.

Mr. Braley was concerned that on one hand, they wanted a 20% reduction in vehicles accessing the site over a five-year period, but at the same time, Commissioners were saying that they want to provide more parking on the site. Those are two competing initiatives. One way to promote transit use is to not provide too much parking.

Commissioner Hall discussed Findings of Fact #60, which related to the Canyons side of the Resort and the 95% capture ratio. She did not feel the 500 parking stall exemption made sense based on that data as the Park City Mountain Resort Base was very different from the Canyons Base. A lot of people stay in Park City who are not necessarily skiing. Mr. Schmidt explained that PEG did its best to provide expert analysis and AECOM has agreed with the analysis. Planner Ananth asked whether it was possible to provide more information related to the capture ratio, for instance, capture ratio data from other resorts. Discussions were had about similar resorts that may be able to provide more relevant capture data. Possible examples were Aspen, Breckinridge, and Keystone. Mr. Schmidt noted that they could look again, but this data was not published on a national database.

Chair Phillips shared thoughts related to transportation and parking. He explained that the roads cannot handle any additional growth. If additional parking was put in, the bus system would not work. Commissioner Hall agreed that the bus infrastructure needs to be improved upon so vehicles can be removed from the road. However, the commercial and residential visitors were not necessarily visiting during peak hours. Chair Phillips commented that the best option is transit, otherwise, the quality of life in Park City will drastically reduce. He expressed his support for the application. While there was still room for it to be modified, any necessary modifications could be done through conditions

APPROVED 09.08.2021

that ensure all parties follow through with the agreements made. Chair Phillips stressed the importance of moving things forward.

Commissioner Kenworthy respectfully disagreed with Chair Phillips. He believed that the people of Park City wanted a bold solution. This application was limited by the jurisdiction they have on the plan. For instance, they could not hold Wasatch County, Salt Lake County, or Summit County responsible. The solution depends on jurisdictions from all around Park City, which includes counties that have not cooperated with the transit plan previously. He suggested looking at other communities to see what they have done.

Chair Phillips made note of the General Plan. Commissioner Kenworthy commented that the General Plan looks at the mixed modal options that are available, but a lot had changed since the application first came in and since PEG made an agreement with Vail. For instance, the fact that the County has taken over the transportation as of July 1, 2021. He felt it was important that this project was a win for the locals, guests, resort operator, and developer. Commissioner Kenworthy reiterated his earlier comment that further data was needed. Planner Ananth noted that City Staff and the applicant will look to divide responsibilities more clearly and provide additional information on the capture ratio data.

The Building Height section was discussed. Planner Ananth explained that it discussed that the zone height allows for structures up to 35-feet and the Planning Commission may consider an increase in building height based upon a site-specific analysis. Findings of Fact #78 specifically outline the maximum allowed heights that the applicant is seeking. Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the height on Parcel A. Planner Ananth reported that it was 115 feet tall and an exception had been granted for the height. At that time, the City Council granted the exception under the MPD. Mr. Schmidt clarified that the height exception was granted as part of the MPD and that was for Parcel A through Parcel E. All of those parcels received height exceptions under the 1998 Development Agreement.

Commissioner Hall disagreed with the statement made in Findings of Fact #72, which included the following language:

- The Planning Commission finds that buildings have been positioned to minimize visual impacts on adjacent structures. Potential problems on neighboring properties caused by shadows, loss of solar access, and loss of air circulation have been mitigated through building placement and setbacks and are not more impactful than those approved under the 1998 Development Agreement and 1997 Approvals.

APPROVED 09.08.2021

She did not believe the properties were less impactful. Commissioner Van Dine and Commissioner Johnson agreed. Mr. Schmidt asked for clarification on that statement. The building heights were similar if not less than the heights approved in 1998. The massing had been moved, specifically on Empire Avenue, by putting the townhouses along Empire Avenue for Parcel B. They had demonstrated clearly that what was proposed did not exceed what was approved previously. Commissioner Hall did not think it was a necessary statement to include in the Findings of Fact. She was still conflicted about the heights. Planner Ananth suggested removing the second half of the sentence from the language.

Commissioner Van Dine made note of Findings of Fact #56, which related to limiting ticket sales. Attorney Harrington believed the Planning Commission had the ability to do that if it relates to specific mitigation. If the Planning Commission feels they need more detail or a specific agreement from Vail, they have the authority to do so as long as it is tied to a standard of performance in the existing Development Agreement. Commissioner Van Dine hoped they had the ability to enforce Vail limit ticket sales if necessary. Mr. Schmidt felt it was important to address parking issues with parking solutions rather than limit ticket sales. He did not believe the latter would be effective. Commissioner Kenworthy pointed out that the only solutions that have been proposed, such as adding additional parking at Quinn's Junction and Richardson Flats, may not even be possible.

Mr. Schmidt noted that the ski capacity was not increasing. He was confused by some of the concerns shared by Commissioners as they relate to parking. The project was adding new buildings as well as parking to support those buildings. Mr. Schmidt stated that the skiing operations were not changing. If the 20% goal is not met, certain solutions can be implemented, such as building more parking stalls. Commissioner Hall explained some of the concerns shared by Commissioners. She noted that if there was limited space for bus turnarounds and shuttle drop-offs or not enough parking stalls, there would not be a way to change that after the fact. The Planning Commission wanted to make sure everything was done correctly. Mr. Schmidt pointed out that they needed to find a way to move forward.

Chair Phillips asked the Planning Commission Members how they would like to proceed for the remainder of the meeting. He suggested moving onto the conditions instead of looking at the rest of the Draft Findings of Fact document. Commissioner Kenworthy wondered whether they would hear from the public during the current meeting as he would like to hear what members of the public had to say about the discussion. It was determined that the public would be allowed to speak at a future meeting when all of the Planning Commission Members were present. Commissioner Van Dine agreed with the suggestion made by Chair Phillips to move onto the conditions associated with the topics discussed.

APPROVED 09.08.2021

APPROVED 09.08.2021

Commissioner Hall explained that she would prefer to continue looking through the Draft Findings of Fact document. If they looked at the Conditions of Approval document, it would likely need to be revisited once all of the Commissioners were present. That might duplicate the efforts of the Commission. Chair Phillips and Commissioner Van Dine agreed with the statement made by Commissioner Hall. The Planning Commission decided to move forward with the Draft Findings of Fact document.

Planner Ananth noted that the Background Information section established that there was a 1998 Development Agreement and Conditional Use Permits ("CUP") were required for each Parcel. Chair Phillips made note of Findings of Fact #5:

- The 1998 Development Agreement allowed for a permitted density of up to 491.78 Unit Equivalents and is subject to the volumetrics of the PCMR Concept Master Plan, which represented maximums that could be achieved on any Parcel A-E.

He wondered if there was a Finding of Fact that represented the newly requested density, which was less than that number. Planner Ananth reported that Finding of Fact #28 establishes the density. However, it was a bit of a placeholder because things are still being finalized in terms of exact square footages.

Planner Ananth outlined the General Information section. This establishes the application being submitted and documents all of the Planning Commission Meetings related to the project. It also outlined all of the exceptions that the applicant is seeking in Findings of Fact #18. Planner Ananth discussed the fact that the Resort Support Commercial and Accessory Use exceeds what the Development Agreement allows. It is slightly over the 10% allowance, because of the hotel amenities, such as a restaurant, spa, gym, and meeting spaces. She and the applicant had discussed how to get that into compliance. They were debating whether the applicant should ask to exceed the 10% allowed in the Development Agreement or find a way to comply.

Mr. Schmidt wondered if the Commission would support exceeding the 10% allowed in the Development Agreement. He suggested increasing the number to 15%. Commissioner Hall and Commissioner Van Dine noted that they did not have a problem with the increase. Discussions were had about previous amendments. Commissioner Hall did not have an issue stating that the applicant is seeking exceptions from the amount allowed in the Development Agreement but felt there should be further definitions included.

The Zoning section was overviewed. Planner Ananth explained that this section was factual and fairly straightforward. There were no Commissioner comments related to the section. The Density section was discussed next. It was noted that density for MPDs is based on the Unit Equivalent Formula. There was an explanation about how it was calculated in the 1998 Development Agreement. A final table related to the exact square footage needed to be added to the section when it was received. Planner Ananth outlined Finding of Fact #28. She explained that the General Plan for the neighborhood mentioned that in order to get the site built out, the Planning Commission will likely need to look at allowing for some exceptions. Commissioner Kenworthy suggested adding language that related to the General Plan. Planner Ananth took note of the suggestion.

The Open Space section was discussed. Planner Ananth reported that it has to do with the application meeting the minimum requirement of 60% open space. The Site Planning section was overviewed next. Chair Phillips noted that there had been a lot of discussions related to Findings of Fact #85. Commissioner Hall felt that the details should be in the Conditions of Approval rather than the Draft Findings of Fact document.

Commissioner Kenworthy was not sure that he agreed with Findings of Fact #86:

- The plan includes adequate areas for snow removal and snow storage that are accommodated by the Landscaping Plan…

Planner Ananth explained that City Engineering and Public Works will specifically review the CUP plans as they come in. Commissioner Kenworthy suggested language to state: the snow storage areas will be further detailed during the CUP process. Commissioner Hall had a similar concern related to Findings of Fact #87. She asked about Finding of Fact #88, which had to do with the recycling program. Planner Ananth noted that one of the requirements is that each building must have a specific recycling area so the tenants in that building can recycle. The language could be updated to state that it will be reviewed during the CUP process as well. Chair Phillips felt it was important that anything that will be finalized during the CUP process clearly states that.

Discussions were had about the recycling program. Mr. Schmidt explained that in the sustainability portion of the project that was presented in November 2020, the recycling program was discussed. There will be a recycling program for all of the tenants and users of the buildings, which complies with the Sustainability Guidelines. A food waste program was discussed in November 2020 as well. Mr. Schmidt pointed out that this was a suggestion but not a specific condition that had been agreed to. It would be evaluated to see if it makes sense for Parcel C, which is the hotel development. He was comfortable with the Findings of Fact that related to trash and recycling. Attorney Harrington reported that the sustainability team and Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken had previously spent time redlining and updating the originally proposed conditions.

APPROVED 09 08 2021

Commissioner Hall felt that Findings of Fact #89 to #91 seemed like generic statements. She would like to see further detail related to the CUP process added. For instance, what will be decided and discussed later. Commissioner Van Dine believed Finding of Fact #84 also needed to be addressed in the CUP process. Mr. Schmidt wondered whether some of the findings were required under the MPD. Attorney for PEG, Robert McConnell confirmed this and noted that additional details could be added as needed. However, some of the Findings of Fact were replicating to a certain degree, some of the language in the Code. He suggested possible language that could state:

- Engineering Staff needs to look at the plan at a Master Plan level and determine that snow removal and snow storage are accommodated, subject to further refinement as part of the CUP process.

The Landscape and Lighting section as well as the Sensitive Lands Compliance section were overviewed. There were no Commissioner comments related to those sections. Planner Ananth also reviewed the Employee/Affordable Housing section and stated that the Housing Authority has conditions and findings associated with their approval. That information will either be moved into the document or referenced within the document.

The General Plan Review section was discussed. Chair Phillips made note of Findings of Fact #103 (f). The item related to decreasing resort impacts on surrounding residential communities. Chair Phillips believed there had been discussions about possible staffing to help address those concerns. Mr. Schmidt commented that Planner Ananth had added a condition around either staffing or paying for code enforcement. He had some concerns with that and there would be an alternative proposal for the Commission to consider.

Commissioner Hall asked about Finding of Fact #111. Planner Hall reported that the applicant has proposed a median so that cars exiting the resort at Parking Lot E on Silver King Drive are not able to make a left onto Three Kings Drive. Planner Ananth explained that this would force those exiting to take a right so they could not cut through the residential neighborhood.

Commissioner Kenworthy discussed Findings of Fact #108, which related to an employee TDM. He believed that employees were not allowed to park on-site and wondered how many employees there were. Planner Ananth reported that there were between 200 and 300 employees, with 200 on most weekdays and 300 on weekends. Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the number of hotel employees and felt that there would be many more employees than the 200 to 300 mentioned. Mr. Schmidt explained that the number of employees parking at the site was different than the total number of employees. There is employee housing that houses some of those employees and some employees take the bus or other modes of transportation.

APPROVED 09.08.2021

APPROVED 09.08.2021

Commissioner Kenworthy commented that he could not support Finding of Fact #108 until he saw a report related to the numbers. Planner Ananth stated the Housing Mitigation Plan takes into account the number of projected employees. That information could be shared with the Commission at a future meeting. She noted that it is also important to remember that the employees work different shifts. Some employees may be given a pass to park in the day skier parking area when it is available at night.

The Sustainability section was overviewed. Planner Ananth reported that the findings were reviewed in Fall 2020 as well as the conditions associated with sustainability. Commissioner Hall wondered whether the applicant would commit to net-zero and/or zero waste like Vail. Planner Ananth noted that Vail had zero waste for food and not zero waste in general. Findings of Fact #118 stated the following:

- The Sustainability Guidelines provide for the installation of rooftop photovoltaic arrays, as well as the potential for other on-site renewable energy generation methods, such as micro-anaerobic digester for food waste, intended to supply not less than 8% of the project's energy demands (including 100% of the energy demand for the project's structured parking facilities), and the design and preparation of additional roof areas that will be "PV ready" so that additional panels can be installed in the future.

Planner Ananth offered to send out the Sustainability Guidelines to Planning Commission Members for further review. She overviewed the Section 15-6-6 Findings portion of the document. These are required findings that the Commission has to make in order to grant an MPD. It was the last section of the Findings of Fact document. Commissioner Kenworthy did not agree with Findings of Fact #123 and had issues with Findings of Fact #126 and #128. Commissioner Van Dine agreed with the concerns related to #128.

Mr. Schmidt asked for more information about why there were concerns. Commissioner Kenworthy did not believe it promotes neighborhood compatibility. What it does is fall within the compatibility of the 1998 Development Agreement. Commissioner Johnson noted that the 1998 Development Agreement could be referenced in the language. Mr. McConnell noted that the items in Section 15-6-6- Findings portion of the document are Code-specific requirements.

Chair Phillips felt it had been a productive Planning Commission Meeting. The concerns expressed by Commissioners would be revisited during the next discussion. He assumed there would be additional information at that time as well. Chair Phillips believed the next meeting would include a review of the Draft Findings of Fact document with the updated changes and additional information. The Planning Commission could also review the conditions and allow time for public comment to take place. The next PEG-specific Planning Commission Meeting was scheduled for September 15, 2021.

8. REGULAR AGENDA

There were no further items.

9. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Hall moved to adjourn. There was no second.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: ______________________________________

APPROVED 09.08.2021