

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
August 6, 2015**

Page | 1



**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
August 6, 2015**

CLOSED SESSION

To discuss Property, Personnel and Litigation

STUDY SESSION

Community Conversation: What's Next Park City Update

Ann Ober reports there were 167 community members at the June 15 "What's Next Park City" conversation at the Santy Auditorium. Over 70 participants were present at the follow-up conversations on June 23 and 27. Ober says this is the first time we've tried breaking the community up into smaller groups, which allowed the community to discuss, think the information over, and then come back for further discussion. We talked about Envision Utah and where we as a state wish to go in regards to growth. Feedback shows that in general Utahns like growth and they like the direction the state is going in regards to increasing the economy and population. Council member Beerman talked about a recent radio discussion with Robert Grow, which said that early results show Utahns are more pro-conservation, to which Ober states it is true Utahns are in favor of decreasing their footprint.

Ober says participants think growth is an excellent opportunity to make our community better and they suggested ways to make it better. Residents in each group said the focus should be on the community first and then on the resort second. They suggested putting planning controls in place to encourage more full-time residents. There was also a lot of discussion about how to make Main Street more of a community gathering spot. Other concerns from residents included environmental, climate change, affordable housing, and transit.

Phyllis Robinson reports that many questions were asked that residents wish to have more information on, such as: What is Park City's water plan for the next 25 years? There were many questions about traffic and transportation, such as: Can we make Main Street a pedestrian only thoroughfare? Will there be a Mountain Accord update specific to transportation? Can the city do another Slow Down Park City campaign? How do we discourage renting cars at SLC airport to travel to Park City? Does the PCSD MP address congestion? Would an expanded bus program for PCSD mitigate congestion? Can we add a reverse Park Meadows Loop? How are the parking plans set for various special events? There were also area-specific development questions, such as: What is the status of projects such as Lower Park Avenue and Bonanza Park?

Council member Matsumoto says that an individual suggested a big idea that would set Park City apart. Their idea was to not allow gas-propelled cars within city limits to show that the city is serious about pollution and congestion. Council member Beerman says that maybe our focus should then be to create a town where you don't need a car, implementing a plan to phase them out. Mayor Thomas states that if we are serious about approaching growth issues, we need to re-emphasize long-term planning, which all other ideas ultimately feed in to.

Robinson states that something they heard in all sessions was that these community discussions are a great idea and they would like to have more. She asks for suggestions on the best way to continue these conversations. Staff proposes ideas such as: having a guest editorial from Council as follow up to the community, developing a series of short videos on easy to answer issues, collaborating with Summit and Wasatch counties to broaden the conversation, holding quarterly conversations similar to what we did on the growth topic, and following up on the

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
August 6, 2015**

Page | 2

Robert Grow discussion relating to Park City's results from the Your Utah Your Voice survey. Staff also suggested focusing on the founding voices – listening to stories from those whose work formed our community and made it what it is today because people are not aware of the history of Park City. They suggested talking about affordable housing: what is it and why does it matter for our community.

Council member Henney says he likes the conversations with community members because they remind him of Town Hall meetings. Doing them on a regular schedule may allow us to get a broader cross-section of participants from around the community and more participants in general. He would like to hear how the community feels about the idea of more meetings and if they want more or not. Ober states the general consensus was the people do want more and would like the opportunity to be heard in a setting where leaders just come and listen. Council member Simpson states she felt community members liked the one-two format where they are given the information then are given the opportunity to talk about it at a later time. She suggests that maybe what residents would like is having written materials available before the meeting, then having the opportunity to meet and be heard without having to sit through a formal presentation. She feels this is a town that values face-to-face conversation and is excited about exploring ideas such as Founding Voices, especially since we have a big influx of new residents who don't understand what has gone in to making our community what it is. She suggests hearing from people from the non-profit sector to give residents an idea of why volunteering matters. Mayor Thomas would like to see mechanisms put in place in order to reach a broader cross section of the community since it seems we see the same community members over and over again. He states that what's important is what we do with the information we gather and that we need to raise the bar on planning.

Ober reports that Staff wants to hear from Council what they want Staff to do with all the information they've gathered. Council member Beerman states that our purpose has been to shine a light on problems and the next step is to further involve the public by telling them what is required of them if they desire certain outcomes. He says we also need aspirational ideas to educate the public on how growth will impact them personally. Bruce Erickson, planning director, states from a planning perspective, that we have about 10 years of public input but no set of filters to understand what people are really saying, so the challenge for the Planning Dept. is to filter the information and put it back on the public in the form of solutions without professional bias and without thinking we know more than previous generations. We should find a mechanism to filter input into actual tools we can work with, since more input doesn't necessarily mean better/more ideas. Council member Henney states we have vision, goals, and a general plan but not a cohesive, working plan and is not sure we yet have a baseline of understanding and may need more input. Erickson says we now need to step back and formulate a cohesive plan that incorporates all the pieces of input and ideas. Council member Simpson questions if we should continue to get a more robust sense of ideas from the community. Diane Foster, city manager, states we do have an actual general plan, but just because we have a plan doesn't mean we stop talking to the community and getting feedback.

WORK SESSION

Council Questions and Comments and Manager's Report

Council member Beerman states that Monday they formally signed Mountain Accord! Governor Herbert was there and it was nice to finally get that moving along. Wednesday night he attended the Grand Opening for Attatech, which has relocated to Prospector Square. It is a company made up of several guys from MIT who've developed a cutting edge snow probe for avalanche control. Congratulations Staff on a nice job at last night's Transportation Forum.

Council member Simpson reports that Chris Robinson, Summit County Council, had some nice words to say about all the hard work we have put in on Mountain Accord. She attended the Lodging Association meeting yesterday where Vicki Burella from the state tourism office and Nathan Rafferty from Ski Utah spoke. They reported tax revenue numbers from last year for state and local tourism revenues are breaking out at over \$1 million. Rafferty reported that apparently there is technology now that allows you to pay for lift rides and use them at any resort. She attended Fire Board meeting Tuesday night and reports they are doing another Fire Ops 101 on September 9th for anyone who may need the training.

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
August 6, 2015**

Page | 3

Council member Henney says turnout for the Transportation Open House was great and congratulates Alfred Knotts, Transportation Planning Manager, on a great job. He reports the incandescent string of lights at Bear Plaza bother him and he would love to see LED lights there instead. Foster states she will double check to see if they have been changed out. Henney compliments Matt Cassel, City Engineer, on his report on Deer Valley lighting and how we're putting in LEDs. Reports lots of idling is happening in Swede Alley by the liquor store and wonders if we can put signage there by the new plaza. Also states he loves the signage on Park Avenue saying we are a bike friendly community; he would like to see the signage extended to Heber Ave.

Council member Matsumoto attended the transportation forum last night. That is all as she has been out of town.

Council member Peek reports he was out of town visiting family.

Mayor Thomas reports that he had dinner with the Courchevel French student chaperones. He thanks them for parenting the kids while they are away from home, which is a big job. He attended the transportation forum as well, and states that it was very well presented and that there was an excellent turnout.

Partnership Opportunity with the Park City School District: Congestion Reduction Strategies for State Road 248

Mayor Thomas welcomed Park City School District representatives and thanked them for all their work on behalf of the kids. He states that he and his family moved to Park City in part because of the quality of schools and he is grateful his children could attend elementary through high school here.

Ann Ober; Alfred Knotts; Ember Conley, Superintendent; Julie Eihausen; and Nancy Garrison, Board Member, discussed the plans they're focusing on to address congestion issues. Ober states the master planning committee has presented their content to the school board, to which the board has made some amendments as of today. Ober states they will present two pieces: 1) a general overview of the plan, and 2) a discussion specific to transportation involving a partnership opportunity for Council.

Conley discusses the most up to date information, stating they met as a board yesterday where final recommendations were given from her and the master planning committee. She reports schools are at capacity and that finding adequate space is the critical need they are currently facing right now. She reports that the Board is on a fast, tight timeline to get their bond finalized with another meeting on the 11th where they will finalize numbers. There is another meeting on the 18th where the language will be finalized because August 20th is the deadline. No decisions were made last night per se, but the direction they're going is to expand Dozier and expand the high school to the west. In an emergency situation, in order to evacuate the student body, they need to have access on to Lucky John, and are looking at putting in a frontage road for better access in and out.

Knotts states that several ideas they discussed include: creation of a frontage road, access from Lucky John Drive, and the potential of creating a shared-used facility for parking. They plan on cooperating with the School District, as they have in the past, to create the best solutions. Knotts states that not addressing conflicts regarding access points would negate any potential improvements we recommend for an HOV or transit only lane. We can all agree at this point that the situation on State Road 248 is less than ideal, so we should support the School Board on whatever decisions they decide on regarding the road.

Ober defines our relationship with the School District by stating they are exempt from a large portion of our building code. The District has an option to work with us in the future, but in general there aren't many requirements we can place on the school district. We can, however, make requirements if the safety of students is involved. Request before the Council today is if Council is interested in working with the School Board in making these improvements, or does Council wish Staff to come back before them in a few months after fleshing out a more detailed plan.

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
August 6, 2015**

Page | 4

Thomas asks the Board, with regard to the broad values of this community and our sense of community, if they are sensitive to issues that could impact these values in a negative way. He asks the School Board about their plans to remove middle grades from the community and busing them out to the county. Conley states that Ecker Hill is a 6-7 grade school, which is where they will all go. The purpose behind the grade re-alignment was to group all students of similar grades in the same place. They totally revamped their kindergarten reading program as they're not reaching standards. And they decided to do all-day kindergarten to better accommodate all students. Just building another elementary just creates a bigger crunch in the higher schools, so they decided to move students from grades 5-8 to Ecker Hill. Thomas states our corridors are already stressed and is concerned about busing all the kids to Ecker, worried it will create incredible congestion. He asked about specific plans regarding access to Lucky John. States the main concern regarding access to Lucky John is getting students out in the event of an emergency. Thomas states turning Lucky John in to a major thoroughfare with buses, etc., concerns him because it is a heavy pedestrian road. Ober states the need to solve left-hand turns off 248 spurred the district's idea to revamp Lucky John.

Matsumoto states she wishes Staff to continue studying the issue as she doesn't know what the solution is yet for Lucky John. Henney asks Knotts what he needs, to work things out to address big issues such as congestion from the aspect of the greater community without compromising needs of the school board and still allowing them to meet their bond deadline. Knotts states he needs permission to go ahead with a cooperative agreement. Henney states we are partnering with the school board and asks how much control we need to maintain in order to meet our critical issues for the community. He is in favor of a cooperative agreement and in keeping Lucky John in the discussion. Simpson thanks the school board for their hard work with the grade re-alignment and wishes to express she is very much in favor of partnering with the school district to address these issues and is in favor of keeping Lucky John in the discussion to address safety issues. A school board member clarifies the frontage road issue just came up at their meeting yesterday and they have not had a chance to discuss it. They also clarify that they are only bussing one extra grade out to Ecker.

Council member Peek states he is on board for a cooperative agreement regarding the frontage road, the parking structure, and the Lucky John discussion. Regarding a frontage road, if UDOT is going to be involved we can explore other uses of the right of way that may eliminate demand with minimal impact to residential areas. Beerman thanks Nancy and Julie for their hard work. He asks if there's been any discussion on eliminating the number of vehicles accessing the school. Julie states that has not been discussed as of yet. Ober states that no, they have not had in-depth discussions on eliminating vehicles. Beerman also asks how much latitude Council would have to discuss frontage roads, ingress, egress, etc. once the Board finalizes their bond. Nancy states the board's focuses have been on improving Treasure Mountain and additions to the high school, so they haven't spent a lot of time looking at options for access involving Lucky John. Ober asks if the board is open to including certain language in their bond that will give the city and Staff time to work with them on coming up with solutions and deciding funding issues, etc. Knotts reiterates we need to have a cooperative agreement with the School Board to show the community the bond is a win-win for all. Simpson specifically asks the board to include language that would not preclude them from partnering with the city in the future in order to get the most use of structures, such as parking lots, to benefit both the school district and the community. Ober states a board member will be in on special events discussions in the future and that Jason Glidden will attend board meetings in the future. Thomas thanks the board for coming and encourages them to consider options to eliminate parking on campus. Foster asks if Council wants Staff to include in the study, strategies to present before the school board options for eliminating parking on campus. Simpson states that that discussion might be better to have next year. Peek states conversations have been had on reversing bus routes at certain times of the day. Beerman states we should talk about infrastructure options to reduce parking. Ober states that discussions can happen over the course of the next year, since it won't be a huge part of the bond. She suggests adding that topic to the next joint meeting. Council is in favor of a cooperative agreement. Nancy adds the board desires the city and community's input as soon as they have a plan in place.

Mayor Thomas suggests looking at how the school can cut back on parking rather than creating huge parking structures for all the students. Foster asks Council and the school board if they'd like to see a report from staff on

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
August 6, 2015**

Page | 5

specific ways the school could cut back on drivers. Simpson states she thinks that's a discussion they don't need to necessarily start right away, but it would be a good one to have next year. Ober states that the construction of a parking area wouldn't begin for another year, so they have some time to talk to the school district about transportation issues. Matsumoto states she's appreciative that Lucky John is on the discussion board, but that it's still being discussed and she doesn't want the school board to feel pressure about it. She wants the board to know that they have the final say about what goes on, on their campus. She wishes the schools in Park City were such that all students could walk to school, but she realizes that the school has made their decision to bus children based on educational, financial, and community reasons and she respects those decisions.

Mayor Thomas says they're in favor of an inter-local agreement of whatever kind and they support the continued discussions. They want to be advocates of good planning. Thomas is concerned about being a complete town going forward. He's a huge advocate of life safety factors, so he's not just concerned about what happens on 248, he wants to know what happens when you put a connection through to Lucky John—what does it look like? He wants to make sure that when moving forward they use the city's planning expertise and try to ultimately come up with any advice they can for the city. He knows they don't have any control of the school board and their decisions, but he thinks they can to work together graciously and openly to come up with the best solution.

Julie from the school board states that they do want to have input from the city, from the county, and from the community. Thomas wants to support Ann with all the team she needs—the planning department, the trails group, and everyone that can help and contribute to this opportunity. Foster wants the school board to know that more than just input—what they can take away from this is that they have a partner who's willing to participate financially in some form. The city doesn't know what that looks like yet, but they can consider it in a different light.

Public Hearing

No comments were heard

Adjournment into Lower Park Avenue Redevelopment Authority Quarterly Update

Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager, gave Council the quarterly update for Lower Park Avenue. States the critical message is the reminder that Staff will come back before Council on August 20th to ask for direction regarding the Library Field, a housing project on Woodside, the fire station, and the next steps regarding Miner's Hospital.

Henney says that in the report they talk about the Park Avenue 1450 and 1460 and he read that there was a certain preference for stand-alone housing. Henny asks Weidenhamer if that's been determined because he thought they were waiting to hear what the design team's recommendation was.

Rhoda says the process is that the council has directed Staff with a preference to single family homes; however, they will be bringing other options to the table.

REGULAR MEETING

- I. **ROLL CALL** - Mayor Jack Thomas called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6:10 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, August 6, 2015. Members in attendance were Jack Thomas, Andy Beerman, Dick Peek, Liza Simpson, Tim Henney and Cindy Matsumoto. Staff members present were Diane Foster, City Manager; Matt Dias, Assistant City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Karen Anderson, Deputy City Recorder; Ann Ober, Senior Policy Advisor; Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager; Bruce Erickson, Planning; Anya Grahn, Historic Preservation Planner; Jenny Diersen, Special Events Coordinator; Kirsten Whetstone, Senior Planner; Heinrich Deters, Trails Coordinator; Phyllis Robinson, Public Affairs Manager; Rhoda Stauffer, Housing Specialist.

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,

August 6, 2015

Page | 6

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

No comments were made.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Determination of Significance of 569 Park Avenue

Erickson says that the designation of the historic sites and national register of historic places are two of the most powerful tools we have in land use planning. Not only do we deal with local land use law and local designation of sites, we are reviewed by the state historic preservation office and the national parks service who administers the national registration of historic sites. Because of this the work of the historic preservation board is, in his opinions, considerably more complicated than even that of the planning commission. The protection of our historic designations, landmark, and significant sites requires precision of language and careful review before taking action. We thought we'd give you a little bit of context for your use. We reviewed all of our records as far back as our current system would allow, which is roughly 2006 and it looks like the last certificate of appropriateness for demolition of an historic designated structure was in 2006. Since then we've moved away from demolition and are now deconstructing and reconstructing buildings carefully using panelization or reconstruction. Not just purely demolition—drive them off the site and grind them away. So, while there have been demolitions, sorry, deconstructions of historic sites—listed ones—they have either been panelized or reconstructed using historic materials. If it's a landmark structure, it can be added back to the list of historic sites under our HSI designation. So, if they're reconstructed according to the national register guidelines, then we can add them back on the list. Since 2009 the historic preservation board has added 23 sites to the inventory. We've denied 5 to the significant site inventory and removed a total of 5 from 2009 to 2011, so we're up 23 and down 10. Each one of those denials or removals was reviewed individually by the historic preservation board with the advice of the staff and the consultants. As we've said, these historic designations are a powerful tool for preserving our heritage in our neighborhoods. But the tool is a laser, not a hammer, and we may need to rethink our more liberalized policies for new construction in the historic districts creating the drive to remove buildings that are historic, or in the case of 569, that strongly contribute to the sense of neighborhood. With that, I'm going to turn the time over to the experts, I'll be here to answer any questions.

Grahn says that just to give you a little background about where our criteria came from this all started in 2008 and I'm sure many of you remember when the process began, but we had put a moratorium on demolitions of any houses that had been built before 1962. And this gave us a chance to hire Preservation Solutions and Dina Blaes to come through and do an evaluation and do our survey, which led to the adaption of our historic site inventory in 2009. So, while she was doing this inventory, in 2010 they began reviewing the different nomination for the local district and new information would come up, so at that time she reviewed the 569 Park Avenue and she found it didn't comply with the criteria in the land management code that talks about the essential historical form. This criteria in the land management code was put in so that we weren't being capricious and so that we could treat everyone the same and have the same standards to fall by. In 2009 569 Park Avenue had been included in the HSI. When you walk past it it's very misleading and that's part of the reason our design guidelines stress the importance of not introducing architectural details that didn't previously exist and why they stress basing renovations on physical evidence and photographs rather than taste because that's how these bungalow elements came to be incorporated in the new roof form and the new shape of the building. Then in 2013 we hired Sierra to do an intensive level survey that is a lot more detailed than doing a reconnaissance level survey that Dina did. A reconnaissance survey is much like a windshield survey—you walk up and down the street and just look and decided if it looks historic or not. The intensive level survey goes further than that. It researches the property and its history in a lot greater detail. Grahn worked with the historical society and the museum to identify which building were on their list, but weren't necessarily on our inventory and this structure came up. We found that it had been removed in 2010 because it didn't meet the historical standards.

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
August 6, 2015**

Page | 7

Council member Henney states the windshield survey is what the community will look at and that this house now looks very similar to how it was in 1937. It adds to the historic character of the district. Grahn says if you want to keep houses like this on the list, then we need to redo the land management code. He asks if we can throw a moratorium on demolition until we figure out historic criteria as the structure adds to the character of the historic district and should be preserved. Erickson states they are willing to look at changing the code to preserve houses that aren't necessarily on the Historic list, but that add to the historic feeling of the city. Foster says it is the purview of the Council to change the code. Henney says that common sense and the code are at odds in this situation. A house is going to be demolished that adds to the historic look of the town and new structures that we don't know what they'll look like will be built. And he says it's not the same as contemporary infill. Council member Simpson states current code stems from decisions made to preserve the purity of appropriate preservation so as not to be arbitrary or capricious, but to preserve as many structures as possible. She says a lot of thought and work went in to the code to make sure it was a level playing field and people could understand the process. That's why there are two categories—landmark and significant—because some buildings are significant and we want to keep them, but they aren't necessarily landmark. Beerman says this home isn't cut and dry and the elements are there that make it something we would want to preserve. He like Erickson's idea that some homes are definitely Historic (with a big H) while others are historic (with a little h) and should be preserved even if they don't fit the description exactly. Erickson says they should do everything they can to protect that home other than listing it as a historic site. Council member Peek states additions that have been made to a structure through the years shouldn't disqualify it from being added to the list. Matsumoto states that later additions to the home should not keep it from being on the list; therefore, making it possible to demolish it. The original form is still there Erickson pointed out they have not seen an application for demolition and have had limited contact with the owner. Harrington cautioned Council on moratoriums that may interfere with pending legislation, but suggests looking at enforcing a pending ordinance instead. Simpson says a pending ordinance is what they need to do in this instance. She thinks any demolition in old town first needs to go to the Historic Preservation Board and she wants to look into creating a category that includes homes like this that may not be historically pristine, but that they want to preserve. Foster clarifies Council wants Staff to work on an LMC code change and a pending ordinance.

Public Hearing

Mayor Thomas opened the public hearing. John Browning, owner of 561 Park Avenue states he grew up in Utah but now lives in London and flew in to address this issue. He says that he and a neighbor used 569 as an example when remodeling their own homes because they considered it an historic home and now they find out that it's not. He states he doesn't understand why they, as residents, were not involved in preservation discussions and were surprised to find out that this structure can be demolished. He hopes the city will look at this house again and be more transparent about the decision process. Realizes the City must make decisions on what is historic, but reiterates that anyone looking at this structure can agree that it should be preserved. He encourages Council to find a way to preserve the home, whether it's through the pending ordinance or revisiting the reason it was taken off the listing.

Linda Cox, 575 Park Avenue resident, states her house now looks very different from how it did in 1937 but that the basic footprint and structure is the same and agrees there needs to be better notification to the public regarding de-listing of historic structures and/or potential demolitions. In a historic district it's important to preserve the few old miner homes that are there. She even welcomes a renovation of the house if it complies with the historic standards.

Mike Stoker, architect of 575 Park Avenue, states this issue is troubling because he has clients ask him what they can and cannot do to their homes to preserve them, and points out other homeowners had to jump through a lot of hoops to be in compliance. Feels 569 can be scaled back to its original look if that is an option and would hate to see two brand new homes built in its place. He thinks other angles

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
August 6, 2015**

Page | 8

besides just the front façade should be considered when looking at the historicity.

John Plunkett, a resident who has restored several homes in Old Town, states the current code is focused on the integrity of current homes but that the National Park Service does include a section on preserving neighborhood integrity. States he is perplexed as to why the Historic Board designated 569 as it did, so they engaged an outside expert whose opinion was that historic character would be diminished if this house were lost and that additions made to the structure do not diminish its character.

Andy Byrne, Old Town resident, has done lots of work to homes on Park Avenue and feels demolition of this home would be a slap in the face to residents of this neighborhood who have put so much time, money and energy into preserving their structures.

Justin Keyes pointed out that no demolition application has been made but a pre-application has, so the owner is taking steps to work to demolishing the home. He also states that this de-listing was not noticed properly and therefore the de-listing could technically be null and void.

John Staffschultz, living on 633 Woodside, states an owner of a structure on Woodside Avenue was able to have his home demolished the same day Council was voting on the demolition ruling. This happened in 2008 and the landscaping was just completed last week; therefore, the amount of impact cannot be overstated.

Mayor Thomas thanked everyone for their comments and closed the public hearing. Stated this is a very important issue to everyone on the Council. He's hopeful they can reach a solution that is satisfies everyone.

2015 Monthly Construction Update

No comments were made.

2015 Fourth of July Event Update

Council member Henney states he heard China Bridge filled up by 10:00 on the Fourth of July and asked if we charge for parking on the 4th. Jenny Diersen, Special Events, states no, we do not but we are contemplating doing so.

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

Jamie Wilcox, director of Youtheatre at the Egyptian Theatre, says thank you for allowing her group to have the use of Miner's Hospital this summer. States they are looking for a permanent home and would be interested in leasing Miner's Hospital if that is an option in the future.

Ruth Meintsain, 305 Woodside resident, spoke to funding for historic grants. She states there are 45 houses that did not receive grant money since funding ran out and feels the \$47,000 is not enough and hopes more can be added to the fund in the future. Foster says staff is currently working on this issue.

Tom Mills with Alpenglow Solar states a major concern from his point of view for the city is transportation. They have a pilot program for employees to drive electric cars to work and would be willing to give City employees all the equipment at cost to use cars that would be powered by solar panels. They would provide car charge stations at cost.

Alex Butwinski thanked Council member Beerman for the colossal amount of work he put in on the Mountain Accord issue and thought Beerman looked great on TV in his blue suit.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Consideration of Authorization of the City Manager to Enter Into a Personal Injury Litigation Settlement in the Amount of \$29,800.00, in a Form Approved by the City Attorney.

2. Consideration of Authorization of the City Manager to Enter Into a Construction Contract Change Order, No. 2, for the Deer Valley Drive Phase 2 Project with Beck Construction and Excavation in a form Approved by the City Attorney for Additional Services in an Amount Not to Exceed \$106,145.

**Council member Simpson moved to approve the consent agenda.
Council member Peek seconded
Approved Unanimously**

V. NEW BUSINESS

1. Consider Approving the Attached Ordinance Amending the Municipal Code covering Regulation and Fees Related to Type 2 Convention Sales Licenses to Specify when Special Meetings Can Occur and Matching Amendments in the Fee Schedule:

Increase the Fee for Late Business License Applications Requiring a Special Meeting.

Ordinance Change to Reflect an Emergency Special Meeting.

Finance and Building Recommend the Dates Shown in Exhibit A for Sundance.

Proposed Change to the Municipal Ordinance. 5-2016 Licensing Deadlines/Approvals.

Shelley Hatch, Finance, spoke to the amendments to the municipal code regarding emergency meetings for convention sale licensing that were addressed earlier this year.

Public Hearing

Mayor Thomas opened the public hearing. No comments were heard. Mayor Thomas closed the public hearing.

**Council member Beerman moved to approve the ordinance
Council member Henney seconded
Approved Unanimously**

2. Consideration of Naming of City Property in Honor of Bob Wells.

Heinrich Dieters, Sustainability; Bob Wheaton, Deer Valley; Patti Wells; and Scott Loomis, Mountainlands Community Trust, sought Council's authority to name Swede Alley Plaza in honor of Bob Wells. Dieters states Mr. Wells fits well within the naming criteria and that Staff will return with a resolution of what the commemoration will involve. Loomis thanked Council members Simpson and Henney for moving this forward and says Bob's contributions to this community and Mountainlands cannot be understated. Pattie Wells says Bob had a specific driving route she had to follow coming from Deer Valley and going down Main Street, past the Post Office and City Hall to get his mail. Wheaton states there are a tremendous amount of people who have contributed to what Park City is today, but he respectfully submits that we all fail in our contributions when compared to what Bob's has been.

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
August 6, 2015**

Page | 10

**Council member Simpson moved to approve consideration of
naming of city property in honor of Bob Wells
Council member Beerman seconded
Approved unanimously**

3. Land Management Code Amendments - Vertical Zoning

Public Hearing – Continued to a date uncertain

**Council member Simpson moved to continue the public hearing on
land management code amendments pertaining to
vertical zoning to a date uncertain
Council member Henney seconded
Approved Unanimously**

VI. ADJOURNMENT

**Council member Henney moved to adjourn
Council member Beerman seconded
Approved Unanimously**

CLOSED SESSION MEMORANDUM

The City Council met in a closed session at approximately 2:00 p.m. Members in attendance were Mayor Jack Thomas, Council members Andy Beerman, Dick Peek, Tim Henney, Liza Simpson and Cindy Matsumoto. Staff members present were: Diane Foster, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Matt Dias, Assistant City Manager; Lori Collet, Finance Manager; Tom Daley, Deputy City Attorney; Clint McAfee, Water Manager; Heinrich Dieters, Sustainability; Jason Glidden, Special Events Director and Bruce Ericksen, Interim Planning Manager. **Council member Beerman moved to close the meeting to discuss Property, Litigation and Personnel. Council member Henney seconded. Motion Carried.**

The meeting for which these minutes were prepared was noticed by posting at least 24 hours in advance and by delivery to the news media two days prior to the meeting.

Prepared by Katie Madsen.