PARK CITY COUNCIL AND COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
650 ROUND VALLEY DRIVE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH 84060

June 28, 2022

The Park City and Summit County Councils of Summit County, Utah, met in open meeting on June 28, 2022, at 9:00 a.m.

JOINT PARK CITY AND SUMMIT COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

I. ROLL CALL

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

Summit County Council Attendee Name	Status
Chair Chris Robinson Vice Chair Roger Armstrong Council Member Doug Clyde Council Member Malena Stevens Council Member Glenn Wright Tom Fisher, County Manager Margaret Olson, County Attorney	**Present**
None	**Absent**

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Entity Workforce/Affordable Housing:
Jason Glidden, Park City Housing Development Manager, reviewed the success each entity had in affordable housing development over the past few years. He indicated it

was becoming more difficult to develop these projects because of rising construction costs and less availability of land.

Park City performed a needs assessment and it needed 800-1,000 affordable units over and above current projects within the next five years. These numbers were needed to maintain 15% of the workforce within the City limits. The market demand was much higher than these projected numbers. Summit County needed 297 new units per year. Jeff Jones, Summit County Economic Development and Housing Director, noted that number was based on population growth and it did not include units within Park City limits.

Glidden reviewed programs that helped with affordability, including a lite deed restriction program, which paid individuals to put a deed restriction on their property and required the unit to be owner-occupied or a long-term rental. A buy down program was in place in which a property was bought at market rate and sold or rented at an affordable rate with a deed restriction. Park City was in a public/private partnership to develop a mixed income development at the Homestake Lot. He also noted a private mixed-use development was going in next to the film studio. The County had the Canyon Village and Silver Creek affordable projects. He hoped the City and County could work together to figure out how to develop more affordable projects.

Glidden asked three policy questions for the group to discuss: To what level is affordable housing a priority? Together, who should we be developing housing for? Should the City/County jointly facilitate a workforce housing plan that supports the ongoing function of our local governments?

Tom Fisher, County Manager, stated he and Matt Dias, Park City Manager, discussed working on housing each workforce independently. There had been analyses done on where the workforce lived. Over the entire organizations, a good amount of employees resided locally, but in looking at the subsets of the organization, the numbers looked quite different.

Chair Robinson asked for more information on the lite deed restriction program and the public/private partnership on the Homestake Lot. Glidden indicated the lite deed restrictions were on the property forever. It didn’t limit the amount of rent charged, but it required renters to be long-term. The City paid owners for putting the deed restriction on the property and it was negotiable. An advisory committee would review the offer and they could accept, reject or make a counteroffer. This program was done in Vail, Colorado, and they typically paid owners 17%-20% of the property value. For the public/private partnership, the City leased the developer the land. The developer was also applying for federal grants, which would reduce the cost, and the average Area Median Income (AMI) percentage for the units would be 60%. Council Member Armstrong noted that the City would not be able to restrict applicants based on where they worked and lived. Glidden indicated there was a waterfall provision to prioritize applicants based on certain factors as long an nobody was excluded.

Council Member Rubell asked if there was a leading practice in how far away first responder employees should live from their work. It was indicated public safety was short staffed and they would hire qualified employees no matter where they lived. But optimally, it would be best if they lived close so the response time was shortened. Council Member Doilney asked if employees moved to the area after being hired. It was indicated employees wanted to relocate but were generally unable due to the high costs. Council Member Gerber thought first responder housing was a critical priority, but stated it was a priority for everyone. She hesitated prioritizing one job over another. Some questions not being asked was who was not safely housed now, whose needs were not being met and could not be met through additional services, such as commuting money. She thought the conversation was missing on whose voices weren't being heard and who was being displaced. She felt these discussions unintentionally discriminated against some workers in the community. Council Member Rubell disagreed and asked what the community would do in the event of a wildfire or active shooter if first responders were not close enough to respond. Housing for these employees was serving community needs and looking out for the safety of the community. He thought that was a different discussion. Council Member Gerber asserted it would not be good to have all first responders in town when other workforce commuted into town and lived 10 people to a home. Council Member Rubell indicated only three firefighters lived in town, and that was not sufficient.

Council Member Wright noted dual income families didn't qualify for affordable housing. They needed to discuss expanding housing in general in the County, both affordable and moderate-income housing. Council Member Stevens stated looking at equity in the workforce should be discussed. She hoped to get to a place where all workers had housing, but asked what group they should start with. She thought deciding where to start would be helpful. Council Member Gerber stated all areas of the workforce were in short supply in the County and they were all needed. She suggested maximizing areas where they could find qualified individuals and bring them into the community. Mayor Worel agreed affordable housing was a huge problem and asked how the City and County could work together to make incremental progress. Council Member Toly thought the councils could do things that wouldn't take too long to complete. She asked if there were programs that could be looked at, like Lease to Locals, that could use the existing housing stock. She favored forming a regional housing group.

Council Member Armstrong stated government entities were not responsible for housing people. The City and County were doing their best, but companies needed to provide affordable housing as well. He was interested in housing critical workers such as first responders, teachers, public service, and health care workers. This was a regional discussion. In order to make this work, redevelopment was necessary. Council Member Gerber requested a presentation on how Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) funding could be used in the communities. Council Member Armstrong asked if deed restrictions were adequate because the County's were not sufficient. He cautioned about the type of deed restrictions being attached to properties. He indicated nightly rentals needed to be addressed.

Council Member Doilney supported having a regional housing authority for better communication between the entities. He thought housing was a critical priority and critical employees should be prioritized. Council Member Stevens agreed and supported targeting critical personnel. She indicated the big issues would not be addressed if government didn't have the personnel. Council Member Gerber asked to define critical employees, and noted part of an elected official's job was to serve the undervalued in the community. She didn't want it to be discriminatory. Other Council members felt it had to be discriminatory and housing was being built for government employees. Other employers needed to pay a living wage or provide housing. Chair Robinson thought an agreement could be achieved so staff could work together on concrete goals. Council Member Armstrong suggested staff look for opportunities to acquire housing and indicated safe housing should be another priority. Council Member Stevens cautioned focusing so much on one area that other areas were neglected.

Glidden summarized there was consensus that the housing issue was critical. The majority of the Councils favored targeting housing for essential personnel with attention to what was essential. There was support for working together regionally. Council Member Dickey stated a housing authority was a collective authority that was a tool to manage housing. It would be beneficial to have joint housing development. Council Member Gerber asked if a housing authority could be a taxing entity. Glidden stated they had the authority to bond, but needed a revenue source to pay for the bond. There was discussion on various tax entities that would produce viable revenue. Council Member Clyde stated the only transfer tax was Empire Pass. It was noted that Founder's Place also had a transfer tax. Council Member Rubell suggested getting aggressive on private development applications, beyond inclusionary housing, to negotiate with developers for additional affordable units.

Jones asked staff to consider the following: outline a housing authority's roles and responsibilities and how it would be structured; give a better definition of LIHTC and ask someone from Utah Housing Corporation to present to the Councils; and help get a more specific definition of essential workforce. From the pandemic, the federal government defined an essential employee, and they could start with that definition and work from there. Pat Putt, Summit County Community Development Director, stated the City and County were in this together. Staff would come back and explain the structure of a housing authority. He thought the critical employee priority should be examined further before building something. In collaborating, we needed to go through all the steps. At the next discussion, we should look at potential locations and the characteristics of what the locations looked like with regard to connections to mobility, services, and recreation. This could be done together. The City and County needed to be bold and courageous. Chair Robinson didn't think everyone from both councils needed to do this, but a subcommittee could be created and he would leave it to the City and County managers to come up with the subcommittee.

<u>Park City Remote Parking Update:</u>

Matt Dias, Park City Manager, presented this item and reviewed the joint City and County process to evaluate properties for potential park and rides. The County took the lead on SR 224 and the City was looking for a park and ride location on SR 248. The City Council paused the Quinn's Junction project to discuss it further with the County, due to congestion concerns. He indicated the project now was delayed for at least a year. The City Council requested a temporary solution by implementing Transit service from Richardson Flat, and he noted there were several drawbacks at that location. Council Member Armstrong asked if the City would bear the cost of shuttles or if the resorts would share the costs. Dias stated the resorts desired the service and he thought they would be willing to pay for it. A question was asked how traffic would look coming in and out of that area. Matt Neeley, Transportation Director, indicated staff would monitor that and the resorts were considering a reservation system with Richardson Flat as an overflow parking option. A question was asked if UDOT would help make the Richardson Flat lot more accessible. Dias stated this was a temporary solution, but UDOT wanted park and rides in the region and they would enhance their service as demand increased. A question was asked if Richardson Flat would match up with Park City Transit and High Valley Transit (HVT) for transit service. Dias stated if this became a permanent facility, it would be public for all transit use. A question was asked if they should expand the study to Highway 40 and SR 248.

Chair Robinson stated some of the project funding was from the County and asked how that came about. There was also discussion of the realignment of Highway 40 and SR 248 and he asked about the County studies on the environmental impacts. Julia Collins, Transportation Manager, stated $3.8 million in funding was received from UDOT. Park City was providing $405,000 for Phase One and then $1.8 million was from a transit sales tax grant through the Council of Governments (COG) for Phase Two, which would fund end of line facilities. Park City would also fund $1 million in transportation money for the match. Chair Robinson stated he looked at shifting the road but it would be difficult because of wetlands, private property, sewer lines, etc. Derrick Radke, Summit County Public Works Director, indicated the existing right of way could be moved 200 feet without entering the wetlands. Chair Robinson stated there would be effects on the County, such as assuming the County would do a project that they didn't want to do. Radke stated realigning the road was always in the master plan, whether the park and ride was there or not. Chair Robinson stated another element to help the County form an opinion was to understand the impact of the park and ride on future enhancements to the interchange and the entrance of Old Highway 40 to SR 248. He hoped to learn how the park and ride would fit into the bigger picture of improving Quinn's Junction. John Robertson, Park City Engineer, stated those discussions were already taking place. Chair Robinson stated if the park and ride didn't harm the interchange it was fine, but if it had to be ripped up in the future that would be bad. He requested a master plan for the area. Council Member Toly asked what additional land was needed beyond the 200 feet and the rail trail, to which Radke stated another 100 feet of property was needed.

Council Member Armstrong didn't know if this was the best alternative for Quinn's Junction for being the least impactful with the best benefit. Council Member Dickey stated the City didn't want to build something that made the interchange worse. Chair Robinson asked to know what the County's commitment needed to be with the movement of the intersection, i.e., if it was a priority, what it would cost, and when it would be done. He appreciated that the City Council paused the project. Council Member Doilney stated everyone was worried about how much time they spent trying to get in and out of Park City. He thought there could be spillover into the County with congestion and asked if the County had talked about it. Chair Robinson stated they hadn't thought much about it. There was a lot of development in Silver Creek Village and the County was in the same situation with congestion. He suggested getting UDOT involved to see what creative ideas they had for the frontage road. Council Member Doilney thought it was good to work with the County on issues like parking, traffic, and transportation, so that both entities were aligned. He was concerned about congestion this winter. Council Member Armstrong asked Fisher to give consideration to parking issues because the bus barn completion date was delayed, which affected parking spaces at the Ecker Hill park and ride. Stevens asked what the City's timeline was so the County could have an answer. Dias stated more collaboration with staff would help, and at the next quarterly meeting this could be discussed further. The bid could go out in the winter. Collins noted in the meantime, funding could be rescinded since it wasn't used by the deadline.

Discussion Regarding Watershed Protection and Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) Grant Possibilities: Jessica Kirby, Summit County Public Lands Manager, and Heinrich Deters, Park City Trails and Open Space Manager, presented this item. Kirby reviewed what the County did regarding fuel mitigation efforts. She was looking to get a large FEMA grant. The first deadline was in August with the final deadline in January, 2023. Staff submitted a notice of intent and it was looking good. The grant would be for $50 million. There would be a 70/30 split, which meant a $15 million match would be required from entities in Summit County over three years. The funding could also be spent over three years. The match could be in-kind donations from the City and County or private individuals, with the hope that it would be structured as a cost share program from the grant to participants.

Kirby explained there were three categories for grant use. The defensible space component and home hardening piece would give a $10,000 grant to a homeowner, of which they would pay $3,000 for a new roof and/or defensible space work. The watershed protection piece would use the funding for the head water project in Weber. The third piece would be capacity building to increase homeowner inspections for wildfire mitigation. This would bring project management and staff to the program so they could manage the funds over the three years and facilitate a biomass facility that could be in the County to offset carbon and deal with the slash that came out of the projects.

Kirby asked that the councils give letters of support that would be submitted with the grant application. Staff needed some City Council members to meet about dispersing the funds. Mayor Worel stated she would give them two names. Council Member Toly asked how it worked with the Community Wildfire Risk Assessment (CWRA). Deters stated staff would use the CWRA to look at wildfire danger and the associated environmental impacts, whether those would be watershed, wildlife, or cultural aspects. The assessment would help narrow down the priorities for dispersing the funds. Kirby stated they wanted this to be a long-term solution and not for homeowners just looking for handouts to improve their landscaping.

Council Member Stevens asked how many letters of support were needed. Kirby was looking for five to ten letters, but stated the more letters the better. She thought the resorts and other businesses could give letters of support as well. Fisher asked how much money would go to each category. He thought hardening buildings would be the last thing to get done and people would resist. Deters stated the Fire District put a lot of effort into the building hardening message in Park City. He thought they had a good chance of receiving the grant and he looked for the Councils' approval to continue to move forward. Kirby reviewed the other grants she had received for the watershed. Council Member Toly asked if there were contractors available to do the work, to which it was affirmed they had contacts. Fisher suggested talking about suppression techniques in future discussions.

Council Member Stevens asked if the water districts were supportive and if they were willing to add to the match. Kirby noted she had conversations with some of the water districts and they were involved and saw the value with these efforts. Mountain Regional committed to some funding, but they looked to staff to get significant federal funding on combatting these issues. It was noted that the County received a $1 million earmark from Congressman Moore in the appropriations bill and they were waiting to see how that played out.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

____
Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder