



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
July 21, 2021**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair John Phillips, Sarah Hall, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm, Bill Johnson, Christin Van Dine

EX OFFICIO: Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; Rebecca Ward, Senior City Planner; Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Brendan Conboy, Senior City Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at approximately 5:45 p.m. All Commissioners were present except for Commissioner John Kenworthy, who was excused.

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.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

- A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting from May 19, 2021. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from June 16, 2021. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from June 23, 2021.**

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to approve the meeting minutes from May 19, 2021. Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to approve the meeting minutes from June 16, 2021. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to approve the meeting minutes from June 23, 2021. Commissioner Doug Thimm 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

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken, reported that there were no staff disclosures but mentioned that they would discuss the public meeting format for the next meeting on July 28, 2021.

Chair Phillips stated that currently there are no plans to hold the upcoming meeting in person and the Commission would continue to hold meetings virtually.

Commissioner Suesser disclosed that during a social event on July 2, 2021, she was introduced to Clyde Bush, who relayed concerns regarding the traffic studies for this project. She reported that she suggested that he attend the Planning Commission Meetings or provide public comment to the Planning Department. It was noted that Mr. Bush submitted comments for tonight's meeting.

Chair Phillips disclosed that he attended the same function and several members of the public indicated that they wanted to speak to him about the traffic studies. He similarly encouraged these individuals to attend and/or provide public comment. Chair Phillips reiterated that the process must be addressed in an open discussion in the public forum.

Chair Phillips mentioned that he would like to see the direct links on the agenda in the packet itself rather than just in the notice.

5. CONTINUATIONS

There were no continuations.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

There was no consent agenda for consideration.

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, parking, site circulation, construction phasing, and mitigation, in Accordance with the MPD, and Applicable LMC and General Plan Criteria. Other topics may include but are not limited to potential Conditions of Approval. PL-20-04475.**

Chair Phillips suggested that initially, it might be helpful to discuss what they perceive as the path moving forward on this project. He suggested that at the next meeting the Commission start looking at the language for the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact. He acknowledged that they may not be able to address all issues but would like to begin the discussions and get to the point of a vote.

It was suggested that the Commission provide the Planning Department with their input and thoughts so that staff can begin drafting the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact. Chair Phillips stressed the importance of finalizing the discussions on transportation, which includes input from the County.

Commissioner Thimm commented that it would be helpful for the Commission to receive a first draft of the Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact for review. He stated that

they have prepared a record through these proceedings over the last year and a number of items they have discussed with the applicant could be included in a draft document. He expressed support for the suggestion of receiving the draft document now for review and discussion.

Chair Phillips agreed with Commissioner Sarah Hall's suggestion of returning to this discussion after tonight's presentations.

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth, confirmed that she was ready to begin preparing a working draft of Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval with the understanding that they would discuss the documents very specifically in a work session or public hearing.

Robert Schmidt from PEG Development, stated on behalf of the applicant, that they are willing to move forward to a discussion of Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval. He remarked that the initial discussions would be best served in a work session with a public hearing to follow. Chair Phillips agreed with having the initial discussions on the first draft occur during a work session.

Planner Ananth stated that her goal would be that the draft would be included in the Staff Report and available the Friday before the meeting.

Planner Ananth proceeded with the presentation and PEG's request to replace the 1998 Development Agreement with a New Master Plan Development ("MPD"). She confirmed that the next meeting on the project will take place on August 18, 2021. She turned the time over to Mr. Schmidt to update the Commission on what had been completed since the last meeting.

Mr. Schmidt referenced the Q&A document contained in the Staff Report that addressed the Commission's questions. Planner Ananth also addressed the Commission's questions in her Staff Report. He expressed his hope for an open dialogue to address the questions and achieve clarity for all sides so that they may move toward the next step of discussing Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Schmidt stated that PEG's consultants will address the Average Vehicle Occupancy ("AVO") and how it plays into the 20% mode split. They would also address the shared parking analysis, particularly in Parcel C and the hotel, as well as strategies to manage to park. They would also discuss traffic loading on Empire Avenue, as well as construction mitigation, snow storage, and other issues that have been raised.

PEG's consultant, Pete Williams, stated that they expect the AVO to increase as a result of paid parking. He commented that from the standpoint of operations and capacity at the resort, nothing is changing. This project would result in the same number of parking spaces as currently exists. Capacity and visitation levels were also expected to remain unchanged.

Mr. Williams noted the prior discussions surrounding the impact of ride-share on the AVO and explained that ride-share is accounted for in their analysis and grouped in with other types of drop-offs and shuttles. Therefore, if ride-share were to increase and transit were to decrease, that would be captured within the analysis.

He noted that due to the increase in lodging as part of this project, a slight surplus in parking spaces would be created, which would provide the opportunity for utilization for drop-offs. Mr. Williams explained that the AVO numbers will vary throughout the season. For example, mid-week mornings will see low AVO numbers whereas peak holiday days would see high AVOs. AVOs typically vary between 1.8 and the low 3.0 range. Higher visitation generally results in a higher AVO. He commented that paid parking has proven to be a significant factor in increasing the AVO.

Mr. Schmidt asked Mr. Williams to explain how the plan improves the parking situation, given that the area currently experiences parking issues. Mr. Williams stated that slope-side lodging creates the best scenario in terms of getting people onto the mountain in the morning. The people utilizing slope-side lodging are already at the mountain and therefore not using parking or transit daily.

Mr. Williams continued by stating that with the addition of lodging, their analysis concluded that there are a sufficient number of units for the resort, which frees up parking and other methods of accessing the area.

Commissioner Thimm asked how they differentiate the ski-in/ski-out benefits of slope-side lodging and the base skiers who currently go to the resort weekly. He expressed his opinion that the slope-side skiers would add to the base skiers that already access the mountain. Mr. Williams explained that they could determine the number of day-skiers, but the real impact is on those who are currently lodging in areas outside the resort, effectively making them day-skiers. Their analysis assumed a reduction in people lodging further away from the resort and having to transit into the resort. Chair Phillips pointed out that there are other uses in the development that contribute to the traffic. Mr. Schmidt commented that this discussion involves the ski operations only and noted that there are surface stalls that already exist for the ski operations.

Commissioner Bill Johnson asked the applicant to address the adequacy of drop-offs for ride-share and hotel shuttles and noted that micro-transit is not accounted for in these numbers. He commented that micro-transit will likely go to the four to six spots where the shuttles will be directed. He expressed concern that the numbers are extremely low based on his experience in the area. Commissioner Johnson commented that a majority of drop-offs and pick-ups occur at the location where all of the programs begin. The Parcel B spots are located farther from the program hub, and he could not envision people walking that distance with seven-year-olds and all of their gear. He further commented that based on his experience, the ski racing programs alone involve over 100 children and 70% of the parents are dropping their children off. This does not account for the other programs offered at the mountain.

Mr. Schmidt pointed out that there is a surplus of 126 stalls, which will fluctuate depending on peak versus non-peak days. It is not contemplated that there would be any empty stalls on a peak day. Mr. Schmidt added that currently, employees both at the resort and existing base area businesses were likely using the surplus stalls.

He highlighted where 20 stalls could be located in the parking structure at Parcel B to allow easy access for drop-offs and getting children into the elevators. The Parking Management Plan ("PMP") states that they could transition some of these stalls to Parcel E in the future or they could simply add 20 stalls to Parcel E in the future. They are assuming that the Transportation Demand Management Plan ("TDM") will be effective and achieve a mode split, resulting in more stalls becoming available.

Mr. Schmidt stated that from a management standpoint, the plan addresses the concerns raised by Commissioner Johnson. They implemented the 30-minute free parking for drop-off and pick-up, as well as 15-minute free parking in the day-skier stalls. He noted that the 15-minute free parking should provide a lot of capacity for pick-ups and drop-offs.

Commissioner Johnson added that the hotel shuttles would not be going into the Parcel B parking lot and questioned whether the locations in Parcel C would be adequate for those shuttles. Mr. Schmidt reported that in their discussions with Vail, the existing shuttle drop-off is located on the south end of Parcel B and runs east/west. The capacity is approximately 140 feet. Their plan has approximately the same shuttle capacity as exists in the current configuration. He reported that they were conservative in their calculations by showing six shuttles in that location. From a parking management standpoint, Vail is comfortable that the plan would be sufficient. While they will have to manage the plan somewhat when it goes online, he stated that they believe the drop-offs are appropriately sized.

Commissioner Thimm asked Mr. Schmidt if he would be open to the idea of a Condition of Approval that provides that as each new parcel is developed, the parking would be reassessed based on what has occurred in real-time. Mr. Schmidt stated that they are committed to making sure that as they go through each phase that the parking is adequately sized but it would be difficult to determine the adequacy on a phase-by-phase basis because they would be in a state of disruption during the construction of each phase. He commented that they would likely not have an accurate baseline to calculate from as the project progresses.

Commissioner Thimm suggested that they have real-time counts each year even as the project develops. Mr. Schmidt stated that might be true but had issues with agreeing to Commissioner Thimm's suggestion without further consideration and discussion. He recalled prior discussions on this topic but expressed hesitation to agreeing to a Condition of Approval as suggested. He commented that the real intent is to try and obtain a mode split and reduce traffic. Commissioner Thimm suggested that the Condition of Approval calling for a re-assessment could include the option of reducing the number of stalls.

Commissioner Johnson added that it would be important to address these issues when they speak with the County about transportation. He stated that micro-transit is something that would likely be utilized more in the future and expressed his struggle believing that the above-ground drop-offs would be sufficient for hotels, shuttles, micro-transit, and rideshare.

Mr. Schmidt clarified that their intent was that rideshare drop-offs would not be included in the shuttle drop-offs. Rather, they would have the option of utilizing the 15-minute free parking, the 30-minute free parking, or the parallel parking drop-off between Parcels C and E. The shuttle area was intended specifically for hotel shuttles.

Commissioner Suesser asked about amenities at the shuttle drop-off locations, such as benches and racks. Mr. Schmidt stated that they have not specifically shown those amenities, but they have reduced their setback request in that area to pick up additional space. He stated he would ask a team member to assess the issue.

The assumption about the impact of the paid parking on the AVO was raised along with an inquiry as to whether the plan was actually achieving the 20% modal split. It was noted by Commissioner Suesser that they are still trying to determine how much remote parking would be available in the County for those who will be using the anticipated 35 buses an hour coming into the resort to drop off skiers. She expressed concern that the AVO is based on a remote parking plan that is not yet in place.

Mr. Schmidt stated that the parking reduction that they requested relates to the new uses and not the day-skier parking. It was noted that PEG asked for a reduction of 431 stalls in Parcels C, D, and E, and there are 440 day-skier parking stalls in Parcel E. Commissioner Suesser stated that based on the minimum parking requirements found in the Land Management Code ("LMC"), they would have insufficient day-skier parking stalls.

Mr. Schmidt reported that they have a sufficient number of day-skier parking stalls. They proposed a 1,200-replacement strategy for the existing stalls which means that the day-skier parking stalls do not change and they end up with excess stalls. He stated that they performed the shared parking analysis to ensure that they do not overbuild parking and end up with vacant lots and increased traffic.

He agreed that there is no science involved in the projected changes, including achieving the mode split. They need the City to participate, and while some of the pieces are not yet in place, he stated that they could be agents for change by building the appropriate infrastructure. As the City's infrastructure changes, the development would be prepared for those changes.

Mr. Schmidt introduced Ryan Hales and Josh Gibbons from Hales Engineering to present a review of the shared parking analysis. Mr. Gibbons expressed his appreciation to the Commission for their questions and concerns. He pointed out that the LMC is an important tool and sets forth important requirements as a starting point for a single-use site. The proposed development involves a mixed-use site within a resort community, and there are certain applications they have analyzed which are more realistic.

Mr. Hales added that when they did the shared parking analysis, they looked at the project as a whole. They also looked at the individual parcels, with Parcels B, D, and E being self-parked. Parcel C is not proposed to be self-parked except for early in the morning or late at night. He identified strategies, including valet parking, which would add approximately 49 stalls in Parcel C.

Mr. Hales also noted that there are parking stalls in Parcels B and E that could be cross utilized, which would result in more than adequate parking. He stated that they believe that the demand for parking would be lower than the supply. As the demand is spread out over the different stalls, the site is more than adequately parked, even during peak times.

It was expressed that they have used "transit first" to strike a balance between getting transit to the site, while at the same time having adequate parking.

Mr. Gibbons highlighted some of the modifications based on the mixed-use resort community. They analyzed the time-of-day parking demand by looking at each land use and applying national data to identify the demand for each hour of the day. This analysis was applied to each land use to determine how parking could be shared.

They also used local data from the Canyons Resort area and determined that the 85th percentile parking rate on a peak day was .99. They, therefore, applied one stall per unit for the plan. Mr. Gibbons stated that they adjusted the analysis by not providing parking for employee housing. He noted that the rate of .99 referenced “per occupied unit,” so they applied an occupied percentage of 85% for the condominium and hotel units. They anticipate that all of the commercial uses planned for the site will be for people who have already accessed the site. Because they are already parked on-site for one use, would not need another stall for a different use.

Mr. Schmidt addressed the management of valet parking and stated that a valet might park a car non-traditionally. Both levels of parking were analyzed, and there were approximately 49 stalls easily picked up with a valet parking plan. He relayed that their experience with valet parking indicated that they could certainly meet the parking demand in a non-traditional manner. Mr. Schmidt expressed his understanding that the LMC does not address valet parking but does address tandem parking for residential uses. Additionally, the shared parking analysis shows excess stalls in Parcels D and E that a valet could use should they be needed.

Commissioner Suesser commented that there will be approximately 1,200 employees that will not be parked according to the applicant’s plan. Mr. Schmidt disagreed with that conclusion and noted that on a typical day, there will be approximately 100 Vail employees on-site, in addition to an unknown number of employees from other businesses. Many employees use Park City/Salt Lake Connect, Park City Ride On, carpools, vanpools, and other transit options that are spelled out in the PMP. Mr. Schmidt also referenced the strategies outlined in their PMP and TDM for PEG’s new employees.

It was noted by Commissioner Suesser that the spaces in the Quinn’s Lot are non-exclusive for resort employees and the Richardson Flat employee parking could not be expanded in the future. Even if the available employee parking gets divided amongst the resort and other uses, she stated that the employee parking falls short. Commissioner Suesser was pleased to hear that Vail was committed to continuing their employee vanpool to Heber.

Mr. Schmidt stated that a certain number of the new employees generated by the project will have access to employee housing. The rest will use transit, carpools, vanpools, and private vehicles. The analysis showed that they would need approximately 200 stalls during the weekday at Quinn's, and then transition to Richardson Flat on the weekends. He reiterated that they want public transit to be successful and they believe this plan takes cars off the road and encourages their employees to use transit.

He acknowledged that the stalls in the Quinn's Lot and Richardson Flat are not exclusive to employees and if adjustments need to be made, they will make them as they go along. It is in everyone's interest to ensure that these employees can get to work. He noted that Richardson Flat has 650 stalls that are currently under-utilized, and this project will not overwhelm that parking lot.

Chair Phillips stated that employee housing is one of his primary remaining concerns. He acknowledged the comments that Vail would ensure that they have transportation for their employees but expressed concern about the other businesses at the resort that are not represented in this forum.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they would do everything they could to help everyone at the base in terms of transportation but reiterated that the parking lots at the base area are privately owned and there is no current parking obligation to existing businesses at the base. That being said, Mr. Schmidt stated that what is good for the applicant and the resorts would be good for the other base area owners and their intent is to include those owners in their plans for shuttling and encouraging off-site parking.

He continued by stating that if there is a need for senior-level employees to have parking, they could work out an agreement to address that need. He commented that after 5:00 p.m., there will be a lot of available stalls, so there is an opportunity to work out parking for those employees who will be working in the evenings when a shuttle might not be ideal.

Chair Phillips asked if there will be an opportunity for the owners of some of the other base businesses to contribute financially to provide parking for their employees within the site. Mr. Schmidt stated based on their analysis, there are potentially 100 to 200 extra stalls available, and they want them to be effectively used. The idea was raised that some stalls could be allocated at no cost to other base businesses on non-peak days.

Mr. Schmidt mentioned the potential of an employee parking coalition that could involve other base business owners in addition to the coalition between PEG and Vail as mentioned in the plan.

Commissioner Thimm reported that the parking analysis and plan for Buildings B, D, and E make sense to him. He stated that Building C, however, seems fundamentally under-parked for a 249 key hotel and commercial offerings. He noted that Mr. Williams acknowledged that part of the strategy to achieve the 20% modified modal split is to assume people using the hotel will park their rental cars at the hotel and ski-in/ski-out. Commissioner Thimm stressed that the vehicles of hotel guests need to be accounted for in the plan. He calculated that the parking analysis should account for approximately 186 cars for the hotel only and the plan for Parcel C appears to be insufficient. He requested an explanation of the requested parking reductions.

Commissioner Suesser added that the minimum requirement under the LMC is 520 stalls and PEG proposes to park 185 vehicles. Commissioner Thimm reiterated his significant concern over the severe reduction in parking proposed by PEG. Mr. Gibbons shared the parking analysis spreadsheet for Parcel C. He stated that there are 249 rooms, plus 13 condominiums, meeting space, and commercial space. Under the LMC, the required parking will be 520 stalls. He reported that based on the data, the reductions that were applied specifically to this parcel were one stall per occupied unit. They applied a rate of 15% unoccupied to arrive at the occupancy rate of 85%.

A question was raised regarding whether they should plan for Christmas week and President's week to ensure adequate parking during those peak weeks. Mr. Gibbons stated that the data they collected was collected during those peak times. They concluded that even during peak times there is not full occupancy. Mr. Schmidt commented that even if there is 100% occupancy during peak times, not everyone brings a vehicle. Based on his experience with other hotels, if the hotel is within 45 minutes to one hour from a major airport, approximately half of the guests use ride-share, so they are not using stalls. He expressed that one unit per stall with a 15% reduction is conservative.

Commissioner Thimm calculated that between the hotel and the condominiums, 196 stalls will be required, but only 185 stalls are proposed. Mr. Schmidt referenced the table that shows peak demand numbers of 223 for the hotel and commented that peak demand for the hotel occurs at 10:00 p.m. The analysis took into account the shared parking with the meeting space, which has no demand at 10:00 p.m., and the commercial space, which only requires four stalls at 10:00 p.m.

Mr. Gibbons added that the analysis demonstrates the benefit of mixed-use sites, where residential units have less parking demand during the day, opening it up for commercial or meeting space. Mr. Schmidt acknowledged the peak under park number of 48 but explained that because the hotel would be valet parked, they can conservatively pick up 49 stalls. He stated that for Parcel C, they believe the plan allows for them to park the demand and cover the number of stalls using valet parking.

Mr. Schmidt added that eight of the stalls for the peak demand are coming from the commercial use at 9:00 p.m. From a shared use perspective, they could theoretically use the day-skier stalls at 9:00 p.m. for commercial uses. Commissioner Thimm disagreed and stated that there are no day-skier stalls in Building C. It was noted that the day-skier stalls are located next door in Building E.

Commissioner Thimm raised the issue of the potential for change of ownership of the separate buildings in the future and whether a deed restriction could be included in the Conditions of Approval to ensure that the parking as set forth in the plan does not change. He also requested that the statistics take into account the valet parking and the shared parking from other lots.

Mr. Schmidt agreed that a Shared Parking Agreement would be necessary and be integral to the project. With regard to the resident guests, Commissioner Thimm requested proof that the valet will result in more stalls. As they consider approval of the application, they need to know that the parking solution is viable and will not impact the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Schmidt pointed out that there will be excess stalls on Parcels D and E during Parcel C's peak time. They envision that Parcels D and E will be managed under the hotel umbrella and combining with valet parking would allow them to park far in excess of the number of vehicles that need to be parked across Parcels C, D, and E. Commissioner Thimm was interested in seeing the statistics that support this conclusion that could become part of the approval documents.

Mr. Schmidt commented that by adding the valet scenario to the proposed 185 stalls, the valet parking entirely eliminates the deficit on Parcel C. The diagram at Level P-2 shows the additional stalls achieved by valet parking. Chair Phillips suggested shading the added stalls a different color. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that 49 valet-parked cars were shown on the diagrams and further confirmed that valet parking will be available around the clock.

Commissioner Suesser pointed out that even with the additional 49 stalls achieved with valet parking, they are still far below what would be required under the LMC. She

stated that the Code sets forth the minimum parking requirements and she finds it difficult to vary from the Code to such a significant degree. She expressed concern that it is under-parked even with the additional stalls. Mr. Schmidt noted that the LMC includes a provision that allows the analysis of a shared parking calculation to be used to support a shared parking reduction from the specific requirements for each use. This ensures appropriately sized parking structures.

Chair Phillips agreed with Mr. Schmidt's comments regarding the shared parking provisions of the Code and stated that the Commission still needs to make sure the plan works.

Commissioner Suesser sought clarification of the peak times for the hotel. Mr. Schmidt explained that the check-out/check-in times account for the lower demand, but most guests are in the hotel at 10:00 p.m. He listed a multitude of reasons why hotel guests with cars might not be at the resort during the day.

Commissioner Hall asked if the analysis considered whether people who check out of the hotel in the morning keep their cars parked for the duration of the day. Mr. Schmidt acknowledged that scenario but reiterated that the parking analysis shows excess stalls during the day. The challenge occurs at the peak time of 10:00 p.m. Mr. Gibbons added that the time-of-day land use analysis they performed accounts for this scenario.

Mr. Schmidt confirmed that there is parking under the plaza between Parcels C and E. It was noted that during a prior application for this project by a different developer, the City was willing to invest funds into a transportation center. Chair Phillips asked if there would be room for the City's involvement in improving this project, and specifically referenced micro-transit.

Mr. Gibbons next addressed some of the questions previously raised about traffic impacts on Empire Avenue and stated that the project would add some traffic to Empire Avenue. Ingress to the project will occur at either Lowell Avenue or Empire Avenue, while the primary egress would occur via Empire Avenue. He clarified that the figure of 800 vehicles per hour is a "per lane" capacity. Currently, there are approximately 1,100 vehicles on Empire Avenue during the P.M. peak hour. With the proposed configuration and coordination of traffic signals in the project area, he stated that traffic will flow better than it does currently.

Mr. Gibbons presented the traffic data to the Commission, which included the vehicles per hour that currently use Empire Avenue. The 2040 base condition, which is based on the Summit County Travel Demand Model, equates to a growth of 1% per year. He explained that the projected traffic shows an increase to 1,700 vehicles per hour on

Empire Avenue, which is a 12% increase. However, with the 20% mode shift, they will get to 1,400 vehicles per hour. Mr. Gibbons acknowledged that there would be added traffic but compared to the base, the increase is not significant. They believe that with the addition of the signals, traffic will flow much better than it does currently, especially as transit is added.

Commissioner Van Dine's concern was not necessarily the slight increase in traffic but the impact on the residents and pedestrian traffic. Any increase in traffic along Empire Avenue was not ideal. Mr. Schmidt commented that the General Plan calls for traffic to be directed to Lowell and Empire Avenues as part of the resort's Traffic Circulation Plan. Empire Avenue is an integral access road to the resort area and the homes with frontage there are arguably part of the resort area.

Mr. Schmidt continued by stating that the efforts they have made to prioritize "transit first" and create dedicated bus lanes would shift some traffic to Empire Avenue; however, they have mitigated it so that the increase is modest and managed with signals that will improve the situation even over current conditions.

Commissioner Suesser noted that the 1998 MPD provided for 1,300 day-skier parking stalls under Lots C and E. PEG's proposal adds an additional 320 stalls in Lot B over what currently exists. She commented that the intent of the project is to spread out the parking, yet the proposal does not put any day-skier parking under Lots D or C, and Empire will bear the brunt of this. She also expressed concern over the circulation plan that effectively calls for Empire Avenue to a dead-end, forcing vehicles into the residential neighborhood. General-purpose vehicles on Shadow Ridge that cannot turn right onto Lowell Avenue will be required to continue straight and turn around at the NAC, and then come back down and turn left onto Empire Avenue.

Mr. Schmidt acknowledged that the circulation plan presents a unique challenge and recalled that their initial plan was to create a one-way circulation loop. Commissioner Suesser suggested that flexibility be built into the circulation plan to address changes that could arise. It was noted by Mr. Schmidt that the plan will be an improvement to what exists currently and a fantastic circulation plan in the long term. He acknowledged the challenges but stated that with time and signage, people will learn the best way to circulate around the project.

He stressed that the plan is the result of an exhaustive process that generated 10 different scenarios. Commissioner Suesser commented that they are sacrificing a lot for the dedicated bus lanes and questioned what will be gained by preserving the dedicated bus lanes. Mr. Schmidt stated that in the long term, the dedicated bus lanes will provide the ability to have a dedicated transit system. He disagreed with the notion

that it sacrifices the functionality of general-purpose vehicles. While it might not be as smooth as a one-way circulation loop, a one-way loop will direct even more traffic to Empire Avenue.

The discussion turned to pedestrian access and circulation. Mr. Schmidt stated that one of the changes made since the last meeting was to increase the width of the sidewalk along the south side of Parcel C from 5 feet to 12 feet up to the slope side. They also included a pathway around the pedestrian plaza on the west side. He noted that the plan always included pedestrian access from the plaza to Silver King. Although the sidewalks highlighted in yellow are lightly used and are not primary pathways, PEG would be comfortable increasing the width of these sidewalks to 6 feet generally, and to eight feet where it fits.

Commissioner Suesser commented that the pedestrian walkway coming off of Silver King will need to accommodate people getting off the bus and stated that five feet is too narrow. She proposed a width of 10 feet because it will also include bike access in the summer. Many people walk to the resort from Three Kings, and the pedestrian access should accommodate that use.

She also expressed concern about the qualifier in the proposal that these widths are "subject to right-of-way rights." She would like to know whether they have the room to increase the widths of these sidewalks. Mr. Schmidt agreed with the suggestion to widen the sidewalk on Parcel E but based on their analysis of 50 pedestrians per hour using the stairs, a six or eight-foot sidewalk should be sufficient. If the Commission wanted an eight-foot sidewalk in that location, he would agree to that. He further stated that the right-of-way language only applies to sidewalks that front properties that PEG does not own or control.

In response to an inquiry regarding bus service around the berm at the corner of Silver King, Mr. Schmidt stated he would defer to staff regarding bus operations for Thaynes Canyon. He added that a bus could access the resort from Three Kings Drive but could not return onto Three Kings from Lowell Avenue due to the dedicated bus lanes. Commissioner Suesser commented that bus service is being lost through Thaynes Canyon and they still should accommodate the bus service on Empire Avenue.

Planner Ananth confirmed that the Transit Department is looking at this issue and stated that there are a couple of routes that will likely be routed to Silver King after dropping off at the existing base area. She added that there is also one other route that will likely use Empire Avenue to maintain existing services that are well utilized.

Commissioner Thimm echoed the comments of Commissioner Suesser regarding wider sidewalks and asked the applicant to explain the pedestrian plaza path on the west side of Building C. Mr. Schmidt stated that in the winter the path will be snow-covered as it is part of the slope. In the summer, it will be a dirt or gravel pathway. Commissioner Thimm requested more specifics on the width and the materials proposed for the pathway. He wanted the pathway to be a defined space for the public to use.

In response to an inquiry regarding the Clinic, Mr. Schmidt stated that the plan calls for it to be permanently located in Parcel E. Access to the Clinic from the slope-side would be at grade, and access from the street would be through the portico on Silver King. Commissioner Johnson remarked that access to the Clinic would be another good reason to widen the pathway in that area. Mr. Schmidt explained that ski patrol will essentially cross the plaza to access the Clinic.

Chair Phillips addressed the intensity of the use of the plaza and asked if the spaces on the lower-level plaza were intended to be active and utilized by the public. Mr. Schmidt explained that the commercial uses in Parcels C and E front the plaza and will be storefronts open to the public. Chair Phillips wanted to ensure that the plaza uses remain active and open to the public. It was confirmed that the plaza is part of the Open Space Plan and is designated for public use.

The discussion turned to bike parking. Mr. Schmidt reported they are required to provide 52 sheltered bike-parking stalls. He stated that there will be 15 sheltered stalls in Parcel B, 19 sheltered stalls in Parcel C, 10 sheltered stalls in Parcel E, and 10 sheltered stalls in Parcel D. He added that during the summer, they will add bike parking on the plaza next to the mountain and potentially may add a bike valet. He identified the multi-use paths that show access around the resort and access to the mountain along the south side of Parcel C. Users can also walk their bikes through the plaza. He stated that there is great circulation for bikes around and through the site.

The bike drop-off area is located in front of the new plaza, and after dropping off their bikes, visitors can either park in Parcel B, or circulate around and park in Parcel E. In response to an inquiry, Mr. Schmidt explained that if someone were to park in Parcel E with their bike, they could exit the parking structure by using the ramp or the elevator.

In response to an inquiry, Planner Ananth stated that e-bike parking would be part of the Summit E-Bike Program. Commissioner Suesser suggested reconsidering the e-bike parking location at the corner of Shadow Ridge and Lowell Avenue.

Mr. Schmidt next addressed snow storage and stated that there are landscaped areas on the plans that will accommodate snow storage. Both public and private snow

removal on-site will require collaboration between the resort and the City. He stated that they are willing to work with the City with regard to additional services if needed, and financial contributions as necessary for additional services for the public snow removal.

Planner Ananth confirmed that the City Engineer has reviewed the Snow Storage Plan at a high level with the Public Works Department, and they did not see any issues. She added that the City will continue to offer the level of service that they currently offer to the resort. If the snow removal load increases, the resort will likely become responsible for some of that. City Engineer, John Robertson, confirmed the foregoing and stated that while there will be challenges, there were areas where snow could be stored until such time as it could be removed from the site. He also confirmed that Vail and PEG expressed their willingness to pay for any additional City services over what they currently provide to the resort.

Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the snow storage locations will not obstruct any pedestrian pathways. Engineer Robertson added that City personnel are very good at keeping snow out of areas that would block pedestrians or traffic, and Public Works has committed to moving the snow to appropriate locations until they are able to return to haul it off-site. Mr. Schmidt added that Public Works would remove snow from the public streets and the property owners would remove snow from the sidewalks pursuant to a property owners' association agreement. Vail would not be part of the property owners' association unless they own property within the project.

Chair Phillips raised the issue of maintaining the unique character of the resort and Park City. Mr. Schmidt stated that they recognize the nature of the resort and the community and want to maintain the character to the extent possible. Chair Phillips referenced the Main Street chain store limit, and while Mr. Schmidt could not commit to a condition on limiting chain stores, he reiterated PEG's intent to maintain the feel of Park City in the resort.

Commissioner Suesser expressed concern with keeping the plaza active. He noted that PEG is proposing the plaza as a benefit to the community yet there is no bus stop and less day-skier parking at the plaza. The 1998 proposal envisioned Buildings C and E as a skier-services area that could activate the plaza and questioned how the proposed layout achieves that. Mr. Schmidt opined that their plan lines the plaza with uses such as restaurants, seating areas, ski beach, and outdoor music that will serve that purpose.

Mr. Schmidt next addressed the Construction Phasing and Mitigation plan. The plan was prepared in conjunction with the general contractor and HKS, and the general provisions have not changed. He outlined the various sections of the plan.

Mr. Schmidt invited the Commission to identify any questions not yet addressed from the Q&A. Commissioner Suesser inquired about the loading dock in Building B and how the trash and recycling will be accessed. Mr. Schmidt referenced the diagram and stated that this is not a loading dock, per se, but it does serve the trash and residential uses for the condominium that fronts Lowell Avenue. He added that this area is relatively lightly used in terms of residential use. He expressed his belief that the dumpster will get rolled out and picked up outside the building.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Suesser regarding ventilation in the enclosed parking area, Mr. Schmidt explained that enclosed parking garages require ventilation, and it is typically located in a corner with a vent either leading up or into a well. The specific ventilation plan will be defined in the building design process. He added that the garage is internally ramped with a single inbound lane and outbound lane at each of the three access points.

Commissioner Johnson referenced the tall van accommodations in Building E and asked how many spaces will be allocated for those vehicles. Mr. Schmidt stated that there is one level in the parking lot that is oversized that can accommodate tall vehicles, however, they have not prepared a specific breakdown of the number of stalls. Commissioner Johnson would like information on the capacity for those vehicles and stressed the importance of these accommodations, given the usage in both summer and winter.

Chair Phillips reminded the Commissioners that if there is any further information needed it should be requested so that it could be provided by the applicant at upcoming meetings.

Commissioner Suesser requested that the applicant provide a diagram for the parking on each floor in Building B. Chair Phillips echoed this request and commented that as they move forward, they need to be able to rely on the most up-to-date illustrations for the overall MPD. He suggested that isometric 3D views of the buildings be provided, recognizing that they might be changed during the Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") process.

Commissioner Thimm stated that most of his comments and concerns were addressed, although not necessarily closed with regard to some of the traffic and circulation points and parking issues as discussed. He referenced an elevation view of the northeast end of Building B and expressed concerns with building massing and height since it is the main entrance to the resort.

Commissioner Suesser expressed concern with vehicles exiting Building D and turning right onto Empire Avenue. Mr. Schmidt stated that the access point in Parcel D serves 45 parking stalls. Their analysis concluded that the occasional vehicle that leaves during a peak hour and cannot make a left turn will have to make a right turn onto Empire. Their option would be to either go down to 14th Street to Park Avenue to turn around at the NAC or pull into the parking structure on Parcel B and turn around. He stressed that it is a low volume number. While it admittedly is not a perfect solution, there are options.

Mr. Schmidt showed the site plan overlayed onto an aerial that depicts a representation of the location of the NAC building next to the existing Resort Center. They have worked with NAC on access and utilities and with Resort Center to address easements and access for NAC. He stated that there will be a fire turnaround at the NAC, which would also provide a location for a vehicle to turn around.

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Schmidt stated his expectation that the NAC will be under construction well before the completion of Parcel B. He expected that the NAC will have their access as PEG begins construction on Parcel C. Chair Phillips requested a list of the different CUPs that will be presented.

Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the turnaround at the NAC is being designed as a full hammerhead turnaround sufficient for fire vehicles. He stated that the access for the NAC involves PEG, Vail, and The Lodges. Chair Phillips commented that from a CUP standpoint, he wants to ensure that the access road is completed with Parcel C at the latest. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that at the latest, that road will be included in the CUP for Parcel C. It was confirmed that the turnaround would be necessary even without the NAC building since it will provide fire access for PEG's project and the existing building.

Mr. Schmidt presented an updated rendering of Building D to the Commission and highlighted some of the changes made based on comments from prior meetings. He stated that it will be a four-story building at one end. As the immediate neighbors are all multi-story buildings, this building will fit in with the other structures in the area. He commented that they made some dramatic changes to the end of Building D.

Commissioner Thimm remarked that it seems to be a lot of mass on that corner, which is the main entrance to the resort. He would have liked to see that mass softened and was not completely comfortable with the design. Commissioner Hall echoed the comments of Commissioner Thimm. Mr. Schmidt responded that they attempted to soften the plaza and retail to provide a sense of arrival at the entrance. Overall, they made a lot of adjustments throughout the project with regard to building heights and

respectfully requested that this rendering be embraced. Mr. Schmidt stated that they feel good with the way it came out and they do not want to go back and shift density.

Mr. Schmidt confirmed that a helipad is required for medical emergencies at the resort. The location must allow for clearance from the buildings and open space. The Clinic as well as Park City emergency responders will review the location of the helipad. He noted that they have held high-level discussions regarding the logistics and there will be refinements required for operations. A comment was made that the proposed location is not logical, as they would want the closest place to ski access for the quickest loading. Mr. Schmidt reiterated that the location is still up for discussion with operations.

Commissioner Suesser explained that her request for updated diagrams for the parking at Building B was to evaluate the changes in the setbacks. Chair Phillips reiterated the need for updated documents for the Commission to review as this moves forward.

Mr. Schmidt suggested further discussion on the steps moving forward. Chair Phillips reiterated his earlier comments that taking steps to move forward is proper at this point. Robert McConnell, PEG's legal counsel, agreed with the earlier discussion about next steps so that they might move towards a discussion of Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval.

Chair Phillips confirmed with the Commissioners that they agree with the path forward as discussed. They can begin the process at the next meeting. Planner Ananth would begin her work on the language.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

Sean Railton reported that he and his wife own commercial property on Shadow Ridge. He could not see how this project can move forward without Vail owning their parking. Without that ownership, they would have plausible deniability in the event something goes wrong. He further stated that Vail should come to the table with information regarding new lifts, which could change the traffic flow for pedestrians going from the parking areas to the plaza. He commented that people will not come out of a four-star hotel to take First Time up the mountain.

Mr. Railton stated that the corner of Shadow Ridge and Empire Avenue needs to have pedestrian crossings on all four corners. He noted that if there is no crossing from Shadow Ridge to the NAC and Building C, people will cross there anyway and create a dangerous situation. He commented on Chair Phillips' statements that the commercial areas should be sales tax-generating, which will benefit Park City. They should not be clubs or real estate offices. He mentioned a news article that stated that construction

will not begin until 2023, which will provide two opportunities to see how paid parking will work. He commented that when the roads are constructed in 2022-2023, they could have a dry run to see how well this road system will work. He commented that everything is speculative now and the existing roads cannot handle more vehicles.

Mr. Railton preferred to see less parking underground and lower buildings because the roads cannot handle cars coming into the parking area as it currently exists. The fewer cars coming into the Resort Center in the morning, the fewer that will be leaving in the evening.

Nicole Deforge stated there have tried to verify much of the information presented by the applicant and often find that it is not accurate. She expressed hope that staff was taking notes of everything that is said and figuring out what is correct and what is not. She referenced a statement that the General Plan directs traffic for this project to Empire Avenue. She read from a section of the General Plan that stated that future development at the Resort Center, combined with development along Lowell Avenue will create increased demand on nearby roads. Traffic calming measures to deter visitors from utilizing roads in residential neighborhoods should be implemented prior to construction and Three Kings Drive and Empire Avenue should limit through traffic.

Ms. Deforge stated that the circulation plan for Empire Avenue will not function. AECON acknowledged that currently, Empire Avenue is 300 vehicles per hour over capacity and already "impedes access for adjacent residents." She further stated that in looking at the applicant's numbers, there will be a 50% increase in traffic on Empire Avenue, which will only be reduced if the 20% modal split were achieved. She commented that the applicant already stated that they could not meet the pre-requisites to achieve the modal split with their AVO number. She referenced AECON's report that an AVO of 3.0 is needed to achieve the 20% modal split. The applicant stated that they expect an AVO of 2.3 to 2.75.

Ms. Deforge stated that even if the applicant achieves the AVO they need and they achieve the modal split, she could not see how that actually helps Empire Avenue because all of the buses are directed to Lowell Avenue. The issue on Empire Avenue is not the bus traffic but the day-skier parking traffic. Every vehicle going to and from Parcel B has to use Empire Avenue, including those vehicles heading to the parking lot, the shuttles, and ride-share. Hundreds of parking stalls are being removed from Parcel E and being moved to Parcel B. This doubles the day-skier parking in Parcel B, which, in turn, doubles the traffic on Empire Avenue to get to that parking. She offered that Empire Avenue would see at least 1,700 vehicles per hour, which is twice its capacity and 50% higher than current traffic.

Ms. Deforge commented that in addition to the foregoing, there are also seven new private driveways on Empire Avenue directly across from the residential homes that would add to the problem.

Ms. Deforge disputed the applicant's claim that this is a complex project and the circulation plan presents the best option. Significant concerns were raised regarding the applicant's prior circulation plans and their response was that this circulation plan would function best with what they want to build at the project. She suggested that if the circulation plan had been designed as part of the overall plan, they might have a very different circulation system and more options. She described this as a self-inflicted problem since the applicant chose to take parking out of Parcel E and move it to Parcel B. She stated that the Commission does not have to accept this nightmare circulation plan that the applicant created.

She noted that with regard to the applicant's inability to reach the AVO of 3.0 in order to reach the 20% modal split, they were told by the applicant that AVO is not really that important. That directly contradicts not only the applicant's own experts but the City's experts. She added that it is not logical to take the position that day-skier parking and demand would not increase as a result of this project. It ignores the fact that day-skier parking is already inadequate and the skier demand will continue to increase with population growth, irrespective of ski resort upgrades. She stressed that the AVO is important and should not be forgotten.

She agreed with all of the statements made regarding the parking at the hotel and noted that it is already over-parked. She addressed the applicant's solution of valet parking and stated that LMC Section 15(3)(i) states that tandem-parking designs are permitted only for single-family dwellings, accessory apartments, and duplex dwellings. Therefore, the LMC will not allow the applicant to have tandem parking.

Ms. Deforge agreed with the statements made by the Commissioners regarding peak time parking for the hotel. She stated that the applicant should use other ski resorts as comparables. She added that the data itself does not make sense, since peak hours for the hotel of 7:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. ignores the fact that the hotel guests will still be there overnight and in the morning. To the extent that the plan calls for shared parking with day-skier uses, the day-skiers will be arriving in the morning. If the spaces are occupied by hotel guests, there will be no parking.

She pointed out that the applicant stated that hotel guests will go to other resorts during the day, yet guests at other hotels will be coming to this resort as day-skiers. She questioned the 7:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. peak time for the hotel when the applicant assumed that hotel guests would arrive at the hotel and stay, thereby not contributing to

the traffic. To say that there is only demand for hotel parking during those peak times did not make sense.

Ms. Deforge remarked that with regard to above-ground parking, there is a disconnect between the 80,000 square feet calculated by the developer and the 100,000 square feet calculated by staff. She commented that the applicant does not want the short-term stalls counted against their parking numbers because they are used for drop-offs during peak hours but noted that the peak hours are when they need the parking spaces. To the extent that the applicant is going to achieve the mode split, they would need more shuttles and more capacity and there is no flexibility in the plan.

Ms. Deforge stated that if the helipad is going to be put on open space, that location could not be counted as open space under the LMC. She reiterated that they do not know what the applicant is designating as open space and whether it really qualifies under the LMC. Enforcement was still an issue. Bi-annual meetings and parking management strategies have not been spelled out, especially with respect to Empire Avenue. She stated that they still need details on setbacks for every level and every façade.

Lisa Paul agreed with the Commissioners' concerns and the prior public comments. She referenced the parking garage on Parcel D and noted that it is too close to the light and will slow traffic to allow for people to turn right into the garage. She questioned how pedestrians are supposed to navigate the entrance/exit to the Parcel D garage. She stated that the street is too busy, and the access point is too close to have a parking garage in that location. Forty-five cars is a lot of cars that would also shine lights into the building across the street.

The applicant's claim that Building D is only four stories is misleading and she referenced the obstructed view of the mountains from Powder Point, which is a five-story building. Ms. Paul suggested that the applicant visit the neighborhoods to observe the resort traffic that comes into the neighborhood. She noted that based on her review of PEG's website, they have never developed the base of a ski resort. Their development at Jackson is 12 miles from the ski resort. PEG has a property in Ketchum that is two miles away. When the neighbors complained about the heights of the buildings, PEG reduced them so they did not block views. She commented that PEG has not built anything to this level or had to deal with these traffic issues.

Ms. Paul reported that the Traffic Plan should be put in place to see what works. PEG should build around what the public wants and what works. She does not agree with working around the design that PEG wants to construct.

Tana Toly pointed out that the General Plan specifies that there is a significant decrease in ridership when a person lives within one-quarter mile of a bus stop. She would like to know how many residents actually live further than one-quarter of a mile from a bus stop and how many short-term rentals in town are further than one-quarter mile from a bus stop.

With regard to PEG's statement that the plan actually helps increase parking by having overnight visitors stay at the resort, she stated that in reality the project is adding to the bed-base in Park City and increasing the number of skiers by an average of 700. The plan does not reduce vehicles and just adds more people to the town.

Ms. Toly commented that continuing to compare transportation and parking to the Canyon's Resort is not a valid predictor of how this base development would function. She encouraged PEG and the City to reach out to the Park City Lodging Association to understand the average number of cars of winter guests in the existing accommodations. The statement that Summit County is only projecting 1% growth in this area shocked her. In one area alone, 20,000 homes were being constructed in the next five years, and all of those people are going to want to ski.

With regard to resort traffic in the Empire neighborhood, Ms. Toly stated that unless someone is checking residential passes every day, there would not be the occasional rogue car that finds its way into the neighborhood. There will be hundreds of vehicles that will circle and slide their way down 8th Street onto Main Street.

Deb Renfro agreed with the comments made about the site plan and commented that it is built out to the "n-th" degree, and there is no area available for expansion. She noted that from the beginning there has been talk of the need for a bus stop at the north end of the resort, and with this layout, there is no room for a bus stop in that location. She commented that there is no designated drop-off for rideshare or micro-transit, nor is there any area available for increased pedestrian or cyclist improvements. The shuttle drop-off is seriously lacking. Ms. Renfro referenced her email that included statistics she collected that nine snow country limousine shuttles arrived in a 45-minute period and they were all the large 28 passenger coaches. The six-shuttle drop-off area would not be sufficient to accommodate those limousines and other vehicles.

Ms. Renfro stated that the loading dock remains a big concern since any truck that accesses it must cross the multi-use path to enter and exit. She agreed with the concerns raised regarding the proposed location of the helipad; she expressed her understanding that if someone was injured on the mountain, they could not be sledded across the plaza and would have to be put in an ambulance to be transported to the

helicopter for loading. This would present a serious problem for traffic, which would have to be halted anytime the helicopter is used.

She noted that Empire Avenue was shut down earlier in the day for paving and the majority of the City buses were able to make the turn at the turnaround, however, the High Valley Transit buses were required to make 3-point turns. She encouraged someone to look at the difference in bus sizing and how they would deal with High Valley Transit in this plan.

Ms. Renfro expressed concern with how many vehicles can fit in the hotel entrance area, as there is no temporary parking to accommodate off-loading. Too many vehicles in that location could block the multi-use pathway off of Lowell Avenue. She reported that currently, a significant number of the shuttles use 14th Street. They know that if they have to go through the Deer Valley/Park Avenue intersection at a peak time, they would be delayed several minutes.

She asked how drop-offs work for vehicles with bikes on the back and questioned whether they create a safety issue for those people unloading their bikes with the general-purpose traffic lane next to them.

She referenced a recent meeting where a Council Member expressed disappointment that the community was listening to the hypotheticals about the soils repository and not paying attention to the facts. She suggested that the developer is asking them to look at the hypotheticals and assumptions rather than providing facts. As a member of the community, she strongly urged the Commission to require facts and compliance with the LMC. She stressed the importance of having up-to-date illustrations to accurately reflect what the project would look like. She added that the landscape plan does not provide clear sightlines upon exit from any of the garages.

Douglas Lee commented that many of the neighbors have substantive concerns about the project. He stated that one of the biggest challenges is that the project was designed as a "PEG-first" project, not a "transit first" project. By assuming that all of the day parking had to be maintained and relocating 60% of it to Parcel B, PEG made a fatal mistake. The bulk of the day parking was moved to the furthest point of the site rather than taking traffic off-site as it comes into the resort area. He highlighted statements made by PEG that he found to be misleading. In the March submission, PEG stated that an AVO of 3.1 was needed to achieve a 4% reduction in trips. Now, they say that an AVO of 2.7 results in a 4% reduction in trips. He requested that PEG show the math and stated that the Commission, staff, and the public deserve better.

He also referenced the rendering showing a fake mountain photo-shopped in behind Building D. He recalled Ms. Renfro's rendering from a few months prior that showed photo-shopped mountains behind Buildings D and E. He stated that this is unacceptable in a project of this scale and importance. The Building C Shared Parking Analysis is completely inadequate. He wanted to know all of the assumptions, comparable resorts they used, and why. He stated that the resorts referenced are not comparable. He referenced Hales Engineering's reliance on national industry-standard data for other uses. The standards might make no sense for Park City and for this project. He wanted to see why this data makes sense. He expressed his hope that future sessions will be as productive as possible, and that PEG be held to a higher standard.

Melissa Band stated that her children have been going to the Park City youth programs for a long time and dropping children off for these programs is quite an endeavor. She stated that Vail has done a great job to date but she stated that she pulls into the lowest turn and there are three areas to park, unload and walk to the corral to sign in with the teacher. This area is about 20% of the lower parking lot in front of the First Time lift. Based on her experience, she did not see how the PEG drawings will work unless Vail intends to get rid of the locals programs entirely.

There were no further public comments. Chair Phillips closed public comment.

Chair Phillips wanted to know when the location of the helipad will be finalized since it will have both visual and circulation impacts. He also wanted to hear from AECON regarding their earlier recommendations and assurance from them that their concerns were addressed.

Commissioner Suesser stated that as proposed in the 1998 MPD, Building C was contemplated to have a skier services learning center on the main floor, and 101 condominium units above. It also had day-skier drop-off and parking. While the Mountainside Marriott was included, an additional four-star hotel on Parcel C was not contemplated. She stated that this is a significant change of use for Parcel C and not part of their initial analysis. She stated that a four-star hotel with a restaurant drives more traffic to the base resort than a skier-services facility with 101 condominiums above it. According to the Hales Report, Parcel C will generate 3,400 vehicle daily trips to the hotel.

Commissioner Suesser reported that AECON stated that a four-star hotel will generate approximately 50% more trips than the use contemplated in the 1998 MPD. She stated that this is something that needs to be considered since the change in use is something that the Commission would be approving. They are trying to reduce vehicle trips to the

resort, yet the change in use is actually drawing traffic that was not necessarily anticipated for this site in 1998. She also expressed her frustration that a stand-alone traffic study was not conducted on this site. PEG and Hales Engineering relied on the traffic study completed for Treasure Hill and other sites and combined that data with data from the Canyons to arrive at the numbers being presented. Commissioner Suesser stated that the Canyons is not an analogous resort because it is more self-contained.

The site is very different from the Canyons. It is close to Main Street and PEG has presented ideas for visitors to access the rest of Park City. She also referenced the resort base at Solitude, where there is no town to access.

Chair Phillips looked forward to continuing the discussions on the transportation issues next month and further comments will be reserved if necessary. Commissioner Suesser noted that the Commission has not yet had the opportunity to hear from the County about the Regional Transit Plan, nor the City about the Local Transit Plan.

Commissioner Johnson requested a more in-depth analysis of the adequacy of the hotel shuttles and the drop-offs.

Planner Ananth was asked about the information presented earlier about the High Valley buses. She stated that she would obtain that information for the next meeting. In response to an inquiry, Director Milliken confirmed that at the next meeting, a representative from the County's Transportation Team would be present and, provide an overview of projects and initiatives in the works and in the vision for transportation. She confirmed that the Richardson Flat and Quinn's Junction lots will be included in those discussions.

8. REGULAR AGENDA

9. ADJOURN

Commissioner Thimm moved to ADJOURN.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission:
