PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH 84060

June 26, 2018

The Council of Park City, Summit County, Utah, met in open meeting on June 26, 2018, at 3:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

STUDY SESSION
Mid-Year Retreat Proposal:
Mayor Beerman stated that he met with each Council member individually to take a poll on items that should be focused on during the retreat. The top three items included a global discussion on housing including housing goals and high-level policy questions, economic diversity in the midst of a changing economy, and common sense government. The goal of the common sense government item would be to enhance the community's experience interacting with the City by looking at regulatory processes and other ways to reduce frustrations. The retreat would take place July 18, 2018 at 10:15 a.m. in the Community room of the Library.

Council Member Henney suggested revisiting a discussion regarding growth around borders and affordability that was discussed three or four years ago in a public forum. He referenced to a letter from a concerned citizen and stated it would be valuable to provide residents with additional information.

Mayor Beerman stated six to eight neighborhood discussions would be scheduled in August. The discussions would center around Treasure Hill and lend itself to a conversation regarding affordability. Mayor Beerman encouraged Council to organize a broader community discussion if desired. Council Member Henney stated it might be too much information to lump together. Mayor Beerman suggested they start with the Treasure Hill small discussions then branch out to a larger conversation in the fall. Council Member Henney agreed. Diane Foster, City Manager, stated the Citizen's Budget would be released August or September and was a great tool to help walk residents through these questions.

Summit County Presentation on Possible New Local Option Sales Tax for Transportation -Senate Bill 136:
Tom Fisher, Kim Carson, and Roger Armstrong of Summit County presented this item. Mr. Armstrong stated that at the end of the session, the State Legislature introduced Senate Bill 136 which was a comprehensive bill that covered a number of transportation and transit issues. Within the bill were two new opportunities for counties to levy

additional taxes. Two years ago, the County looked at two transportation sales taxes that required voter referendums. One option the County opted not to pursue at the time would have allowed them to propose a quarter percent sales tax. They chose not to implement it because it did not make sense if larger counties did not opt in. As it played out, the larger counties did not go forward with the tax which would have made Summit County one of the largest collection counties and would have pushed money to other jurisdictions. To make the tax more appealing this time, the Legislature said counties would not have to enact a referendum and if the tax was unilaterally imposed by June 30th 2018, 100% of the revenue would be given directly to the county until June 30th 2019. Summit County met with community members and other groups for input but the timing was especially difficult due to other bonds and funding requests.

If the large counties participated, the estimated revenue stream would be $3.6 million for the first year. The revenue would be split between municipalities for the second year and an estimated $2 million would come to Park City. There was a clear benefit, but the timing was challenging.

Ms. Carson asked Council if they were briefed on the information prior to the meeting. Council Member Joyce responded they were provided with an in-depth report.

Mr. Armstrong stated 4 cents per $100 or $4 of every $10,000 would be taxed. This would not apply to unprepared foods or gasoline. He estimated the personal impact would be lighter than other proposed taxes at $45 per year.

Mayor Beerman asked if the revenue would be equalized or reduced if they passed the tax after the June 30th deadline. Carson replied the full revenue would only be received until June 30, 2019. Mr. Fisher responded that if the tax was not implemented by June 30, 2018 the county would lose all revenue from that year. Armstrong said he recalled the statute stating that if it passed any time after June 30, 2018 counties would be able to keep the revenue from that time forward. For example, if the county enacted the tax on July 31, 2018, 11 months of revenue would be given to the county.

Council Member Worel asked if the tax would apply to online sales. Carson responded that yes, the tax should be included as a part of sales tax.

Council Member Worel asked if it was known if the larger counties were planning to implement the tax. Carson responded that Salt Lake County voted to implement it. She was unsure of Utah County as they were not as concerned about the deadline. The legislation stated that a portion of the larger county revenue would go to the Utah Transit Authority. Washington County was leaning towards implementing the tax but she was unsure of what their final decision would be.

Council Member Henney asked if the State Legislature's funding was shifting or if this was a new revenue stream and the State was attempting to put the brunt of enforcing a new tax on the Counties. Carson replied that there had been a variety of these quarter sales taxes available. Summit County did not put the fourth quarter forward because if it did not pass with other entities, the result would not be favorable for local residents. Voters of larger counties turned it down two years ago. Fisher stated the tax was lobbied for by the Utah Association of Counties and The Utah League of Cities and Towns. He thought the legislature wanted to provide the tool to local governments but not many took advantage of it through the process that was in place. He thought it was an incentive to get local funding to local governments. Carson added two large incentives included the option to receive 100% of the revenue the first year as well as not requiring a voter referendum. Armstrong stated most small towns struggled greatly with funding transportation and infrastructure funding for roads, so back when it was proposed a couple of years ago, he indicated the legislature saw the tax as a way to assist in that area. But when larger counties did not participate, the Legislature decided to sweeten the pot. It was also an election year so it could be a way to pass the pressure to the counties.

Carson stated another option that was discussed during the session was the possibility that if counties did not participate, the State might implement the tax in 2021/2022. This was not included in the bill, but in this case Counties would not have the ability to implement.

Council Member Henney asked for the County Council's feelings about not having the public vote. Carson replied they conducted outreach to individuals as well as groups because the public would not be giving official voter input. Most feedback had been positive. The tax rate would remain lower than other Utah counties.

Council Member Joyce stated he liked Summit County's approach of not approving the tax unless larger counties did as well. It seemed that other counties were not concerned about the June 30th deadline, and asked if Summit County would pass the tax without having a firm commitment from the large counties. Mr. Fisher recommended that if Summit County was inclined to pass it, they should do it now and then repeal it if the large counties did not participate. Repealing would require the same action from Council as it would to implement it.

Mayor Beerman asked if they had calculated what the revenue would look like after 2020 if not all of the large counties moved forward. Fisher responded that he did not have the specific numbers but they would be presenting that information to the County Council tomorrow night.

Council Member Ware Peek asked what opinions other cities had expressed. Fisher responded Coalville was not in favor. The Henefer mayor indicated they were supportive. The Oakley City Council was supportive as well as Kamas and Francis.

Mayor Beerman provided feedback that it was difficult to raise funding for transit and the tax was a good way to do that relatively pain free for citizens. He was uncomfortable with the timing as there were a lot of concerns about compounding taxes and fees. Council Member Henney agreed the benefits would be significant but the timing was concerning. Council Member Ware Peek stated the tax was something the Council could say no to as voter perception was important.

Council Member Joyce wanted to see more project-focused proposals instead of investments that required consistent funding. Council Member Worel stated as the focus on Social Equity increased, they should be mindful that a financial burden would be felt by some residents of Park City. Council Member Gerber added that in light of what the public had been asked to fund, this may be too much.

Joint Meeting with the Recreation Advisory Board RAB Visioning Staff Report:
Members of the Recreation Advisory Board (RAB) presented this item. RAB created a sub-committee to focus on preservation and protections of local park space and identified five spaces: Creekside, City Park, Rotary Park, Prospector, and the Municipal Golf Course. The board recommended "super-zoning" which would allow any future changes to require a voter referendum in an effort to keep the integrity and character of recreation spaces. The protections would also promote social equity and wellness. This would occur by utilizing Park City's existing Municipal codes and zoning requirements.

Council Member Ware Peek asked if there were changes to use of space, would those decisions be left to voters. Tate Shaw, Assistant Recreation Manager, responded any of those uses were still considered recreational so those decisions would be left to Council based on existing zoning. Any non-recreational changes would require voter input. Council Member Joyce stated certain situations may not be as black and white. For example if it was determined an additional MARC facility was needed and City Park was proposed as the site, this would be a recreational use but would fundamentally change the landscape. Shaw stated these questions had been investigated and would result in stress tests to determine if it was realistic to adopt this procedure and RAB would look to Council to approve the advisory board moving forward with research. It was indicated they would develop a master plan that included all sites and potential scenarios.

Council Member Joyce stated he liked the direction the board was heading. Council Member Worel agreed that she supported the board moving forward with their work but was disappointed that the National Park Service did not emphasize the mental health benefit of parks. Shaw replied that social equity was a key part of parks as the space was truly for everyone.

Council agreed the board should move forward with developing a preservation plan.

It was indicated that RAB would like to form a subcommittee to review current donation policies and potentially make change recommendations. Ideas included identifying predetermined locations that could be used for memorial benches and potentially charge a fee for these locations. Council Member Gerber asked if RAB had a list of wants from the community

Council Member Worel asked why they would charge the public for a bench. It was indicated that it would create legitimacy but would be part of future conversations to determine if charges should be in place. Shaw added charging a fee would help offset the cost of upkeep, similar to items within the cemetery. Mayor Beerman recommended RAB look into Mountain Trails and Summit Lands who had similar policies in place. Council agreed the board should move forward with developing a donation policy.

In efforts to research the possibility of building a splash pad in the City, RAB members visited Wardle Fields Regional Park in Bluffdale which housed a large splash pad, bouldering area, playgrounds and pickle ball courts. Splash pads were the leading planned aquatic facilities and were lower cost to own and operate than pools. Social equity was promoted as it was free access to water play. Council Member Joyce stated he supported the idea but wondered if it was the top Recreation priority at the moment according to the Recreation Master Plan. Ken Fisher, Recreation Manager, responded the top three priorities included aquatics, additional ice and additional indoor field space. A splash pad met the demand of aquatics outside of a Rec center. Council Member Joyce expressed concern about space and land limitations. Mayor Beerman recommended the RAB return with more specific information regarding space and scale.

RAB was investigating the possibility of providing free Wi-Fi in City Park. Wi-Fi was currently offered at MARC, Ice Arena and Library. It could be provided for $3,000. Mayor Beerman stated he received an email from a citizen who owned a Wi-Fi provider business and was interested in donating this service to the City. Council supported the option.

RAB would like to provide LED lights to the volleyball court on the north end of City Park. The Summer Sand Volleyball league had grown to include 22 teams. Half a dozen teams were turned away due to lack of lighting. Lighting the courts would provide the opportunity to test LED lights for the other facility use as well as expand the volleyball league to utilize the space in an increased capacity. Council Member Joyce asked why they were moving forward with the volleyball court if they were hesitant to bring LED lights to Quinn's Junction. It was indicated the court was smaller and would require fewer fixtures and maintenance. Mayor Beerman echoed they should light the City Park court the same time they plan to light Quinn's Junction. Council agreed.

WORK SESSION

Social Equity Discussion:

Kilo Zamora led the discussion and summarized three focus group meetings that took place in the past week. Everyone was enthusiastic to be at the table to create solutions together. The groups saw a role for the City to play and saw political capital that could be used. Questions posed to the groups included, Does it fit within your missions, Do you want to participate, Are we ready as a community, and Is there value to this process. The answers were overwhelmingly positive. Zamora indicated the next step was for the Council to decide the role of the City. All the data needed was in the reports from the meetings that were provided to Council.

Council Member Worel attended all three meetings and was encouraged by everyone's support and agreement that it should be collaboration between the community and City. She also emphasized the importance of including the underserved in the community in the conversations to gather their input.

Council Member Ware Peek stated it would be interesting to include individuals who were critical of the process to determine the root of their resistance. Council Member Joyce added it seemed that the group who was not ready to engage in Social Equity was not included in these conversations. Council Member Gerber replied they could not make people participate who did not want to, but perhaps their minds could be changed with the change of the community tide. Mayor Beerman replied that Council was currently in a vulnerable position where public talking points were not ready, which was why the first step had been reaching out to stakeholders who could help us articulate what Council was attempting to accomplish. Zamora commented that the individuals included in the meeting were credible leaders at the forefront of marginalized groups. These groups agreed that quality information should be distributed to the public as well as having a system to measure progress.

Zamora reminded Council that the process could inform an RFP or coordinator position. Council Member Worel mentioned only the City staff group indicated a need for a central information location.

Mayor Beerman asked Zamora how other communities formed an action plan. Zamora responded the City was currently engaging in best practices, but reaching a window where if the City did not act immediately by accessing the groups, apathy would begin. Now that engagement had begun, action items were paramount to avoid losing community trust. He recommended continuing to value the expertise at the table and beginning to structure deliverables. These deliverables could be modified.

Council Member Ware Peek asked how to reengage individuals who had participated but had not seen any action. Zamora answered that the turnaround time on sending notes back to those who participated was important as well as continuing to thank them for sharing their experiences.

Foster asked what ideas looked like deliverables. Zamora answered that changes could happen internally, such as cultural competency training. Another idea included forming a purpose statement with either a coordinator or RFP to identify gaps and ways to move forward.

Council Member Worel stated directors of nonprofits were involved in the conversations but asked how they could become engaged. Zamora answered the facilitators were the delegation as they knew how to access their populations and had valuable information.

Council Member Henney stated the identity of our community was a collage and we should pull from all parts of the collage as the work continued. Zamora agreed that the answers were inside the community and trust was required. Social Equity moved and evolved based on current events. Council Member Ware Peek said deliverables could involve experiences that carry an impact beyond the actionable item.

Mayor Beerman invited the public to share feedback.

Mary Christa Smith, Coordinator for the Mental Wellness Alliance said community assessments were helpful in her work to identify the gaps and priorities as well as measure outcomes. This data gathering process invited different perspectives into the conversation.

Juliana Duran explained the importance of having a communications system in place between all groups in the community For example, the ability to share event information in different languages would allow all communities to participate. It was important to identify how communities received information and include those channels in event promotion and meetings. Mayor Beerman asked what channels might be missing. Duran responded she would ask the other residents attending the meeting.

Joseph Durant stated he received information via KPCW, the Library, and Mexican supermarkets.

Leonel Inciarte stated it was important to include schools as students inform parents about important community events.

Ollie Wilder, Community Impact Director of the Park City Community Foundation, heard a call to action and a window of opportunity that the community was ready to jump into. There was an opportunity to create community around Social Equity. Wilder thought it would be helpful for the City to offer shape and resources to get the process moving and encouraged an RFP or internal position. Wilder also suggested turning political capital into social capital which would provide the opportunity for other groups to get on board. Park City Community Foundation would like to be involved and offer any assistance needed.

Council Member Joyce recalled that the Social Equity challenge was a lesson in how many ideas were in the community and perhaps Council could focus on tackling the most immediate ones. He also commented on the importance of gathering groups to form a more strategic plan. Council Member Gerber wanted to identify key priorities that would move the goal along on a larger level and agreed now would be a good time to look into an RFP. Mayor Beerman asked if all Council Members would like to investigate an RFP, to which the group confirmed. Foster clarified that the RFP would not specifically fund a staff position, but rather a function.

Francisco Astorga, Senior Planner, offered his services to any focus groups or nonprofits that would benefit from his input. He felt very lucky to have had opportunities in Park City and would like to give back to the community.

Mayor Beerman summarized the next steps to reconvene the focus groups to formulate a purpose statement by the delegation. Secondly, identify priorities and form a subgroup to determine which would be short term vs. long term actions. Mayor Beerman suggested also looking into an RFP and identifying a nonprofit to help the City facilitate. Mayor Beerman asked if Council would like to approve the RFP before it was released. Member Henney answered he would like to review it on July 12th. Foster added Holy Cross Ministry created a short 'day in the life of an immigrant in Park City' video which might be helpful to use in these conversations.

REGULAR MEETING - 6:00 p.m.

I) ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Status
Mayor Andy Beerman Council Member Becca Gerber Council Member Tim Henney Council Member Steve Joyce Council Member Lynn Ware Peek Council Member Nann Worel Diane Foster, City Manager Matt Dias, Assistant City Manager Mark Harrington, City Attorney Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder	**Present**
None	**Absent**

II) APPOINTMENTS

1. <u>Consideration to Appoint Brynn Bateman Louis and Reappoint Jess Griffiths and Jane Osterhaus to the Library Board for Three-Year Terms Beginning July 1, 2018:</u>

Adriane Juarez, Library Director, presented on behalf of the Library Board. The board held interviews for three open seats for the 2019 fiscal year. Two seats were available for renewal and two additional residents applied for three year terms. Council Member Ware Peek asked if the board now had nine members. Juarez confirmed. As liaison to the Library board, Council Member Worel commented they did a thorough job finding new applicants and the individual who was not selected was interested in serving on other boards.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Worel moved to appoint Brynn Bateman Louis and reappoint Jess Griffiths and Jane Osterhaus to the Library Board for three-year terms beginning July 1, 2018. Council Member Gerber seconded the motion.

RESULT:	**APPROVED**
AYES:	Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek, and Worel

III) COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

<u>Council Questions and Comments:</u>

Council Member Ware Peek attended the Your Barn Door is Open event at McPolin Farm on Saturday. She walked through Silly Market with Jenny Diersen and Tommy Youngblood of the City events team and Council Member Worel. Council Member Ware Peek encouraged everyone to listen to the Cada Domingo program on KPCW for wonderful Spanish programming.

Council Member Gerber also attended Your Barn Door is Open event.

Council Member Worel helped The Historic Society sell tickets to the Historic Home Tour Saturday morning and toured the eight houses that afternoon. It was a well-attended event that ended with a reception at Fletchers. She attended the Women's Walk and Wine event for the People's Health Clinic. The event was attended by a diverse group of 350 women. She also attended the City Social Equity focus groups as well as the Executive Committee meeting of the Mental Wellness Alliance Board.

Mayor Beerman thanked staff for short staff reports. He also thanked Council Member Worel for her extra work with the Social Equity focus groups. Last week, Mayor

Beerman met with Keri Putnam and Betsy Wallace of Sundance Institute and discussed the Arts & Culture District. There were no major announcements but the district was progressing nicely.

Staff Communications Reports:

1. Fourth of July Event Reminders:
Council Member Gerber asked if any reminders would be released for July 3rd. Jenny Diersen, Special Events Director, responded that reminders would be released on the radio and VMS boards. Council Member Worel asked if text alerts had a Spanish option. Mike McComb, Emergency Manager, replied it was an option that was in progress.

2. Stormwater Management Plan Update:

3. 2017 Annual Water Quality Consumer Confidence Report:
Council Member Joyce indicated there was an error in the Water Consumer Confidence Report that salt was the key component in chlorine when in actuality, chlorine was a component of salt. He would like the report to be technically accurate. Foster indicated she would notify Clint McAffee, Public Utilities Director, to make the change.

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

Mayor Beerman opened the meeting for those who wished to address the Council on items not on the agenda.

Mary Christa Smith moved into the Central Park Condos with her kids and expressed gratitude to Council for making affordable housing a critical priority. She was grateful to call Park City home.

Mayor Beerman closed the public input portion of the meeting.

V) CONSENT AGENDA

1. Request to Authorize the City Manager to Enter into a Professional Services Agreement in a Form Approved by the City Attorney with American Mailing Services for Daily Courier Services Not to Exceed $350,000

Council Member Gerber moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Council Member Worel seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek, and Worel

VI) NEW BUSINESS

1.Consideration to Approve Resolution 18-2018, a Resolution Acknowledging Hugh Daniels' Retirement from Park City Municipal Corporation and Recognizing His Many Contributions in Providing Emergency Management Services and Support to His Fellow Employees and the Park City Community
Brook Moss, Human Resources Manager, presented this item and asked for approval to recognize Hugh Daniels' contributions and retirement as Emergency Manager.
Mayor Beerman thanked Daniels for his service to the community for over 35 years. Daniels responded that he was honored and humbled by the resolution.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Ware Peek moved to approve Resolution 18-2018, a Resolution acknowledging Hugh Daniels' retirement from Park City Municipal Corporation and recognizing his many contributions in providing Emergency Management services and support to his fellow employees and the Park City community. Council Member Worel seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek, and Worel

2. Open Flame and Fireworks Ban Update with Presentation by Dan Benson, Brianhead Fire Chief:
Dave Thacker, Chief Building Official, presented this item. Mike McComb, Emergency Manager, introduced Dan Benson, Brianhead Fire Chief, who provided insight into how last year's Brianhead fire affected the community.

Council Member Ware Peek thanked Chief Benson for coming and asked for input on how to spread fire awareness. Benson answered that having a consistent message across all counties regarding fire restrictions would be very helpful.

3. Consideration to Continue an Ordinance Approving the Daly Delight Plat Amendment Located at 180 Daly Avenue and 182 Daly Avenue, Park City, Utah
Hannah Tyler, Planner, presented this item to continue approving the Daly Delight Plat Amendment to the July 12 meeting.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Gerber moved to continue an ordinance approving the Daly Delight Plat Amendment located at 180 Daly Avenue and 182 Daly Avenue, Park City, Utah, to July 12, 2018. Council Member Joyce seconded the motion.

RESULT: CONTINUED TO JULY 12, 2018
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek, and Worel

4. Consideration to Approve Resolution 16-2018, a Resolution Adopting Park City's Locally Preferred Alternative for State Route 224

Alfred Knotts presented this item. Knotts reviewed the preferred plan for State Route 224.

Council Member Worel asked why the center lane was wider than the other lanes on the visuals. Knotts responded it was a two way left turn lane and would allow increased clearance.

Council Member Ware Peek asked how north bound in traffic in Kimball Junction would turn left into the transit center. Knotts answered it was an operational detail that would require evaluation. Council Member Ware Peek asked for details on the current width of 224. Knotts answered 64 feet, plus the shoulder area which would be 80 total feet.

Council Member Ware Peek asked why the center two-way bus lane was more expensive than other options. Knotts replied it would require full reengineering of the road section and passenger facilities would need to be constructed.

Council Member Gerber voiced excitement over the project but favored a decrease in the width of the shoulder. Knotts replied UDOT had been very responsive in listening to public opinion.

Council Member Worel asked where breakdowns were supposed to go if the shoulder width was decreased. Knotts responded the bus lane was an option but it was an operational detail that would require evaluation.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Gerber moved to approve Resolution 16-2018, a resolution adopting Park City's Locally Preferred Alternative for State Route 224. Council Member Ware Peek seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek, and Worel

5. Consideration to Approve Resolution 17-2018, a Resolution Authorizing the Approval of Amendment No. 1 to the Metropolitan Narcotics Task Force Interlocal Agreement

Mark Harrington, City Attorney, presented this item. The City had participated in the agreement in years past but some jurisdictions were not included on the interlocal signature line. Council Member Worel asked why Park City was not included on the signature line in the agreement in the packet. Harrington responded this amendment would include Park City, and the City Council was ratifying an approval by the interlocal board which already added the City.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Joyce moved to approve Resolution 17-2018, a resolution authorizing the approval of Amendment No. 1 to the Metropolitan Narcotics Task Force Interlocal Agreement assuming Park City is added to the list of law enforcement agencies included. Council Member Gerber seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek, and Worel

6. Consideration to Re-Adopt Ordinance 2018-28, an Ordinance Amending (I) Title 5 GRAMA; (II) Title 3 Ethics; (III) Title 2 City Council; and (IV) Title 2 Disaster Response and Recovery Act

Mark Harrington, City Attorney, presented this item. There were no questions with regard to the proposed amendments.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Worel moved to re-adopt Ordinance 2018-28, an ordinance amending (I) Title 5 GRAMA; (II) Title 3 Ethics; (III) Title 2 City Council; and (IV) Title 2 Disaster Response and Recovery Act. Council Member Gerber seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek, and Worel

VII) ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Leah Langan, Deputy City Recorder

PARK CITY
1884

June 22, 2018
(*Date of Rescission*)

From: Park City Municipal Corporation Fire Code Official

Subject: REMOVAL OF RESTRICTION ON OPEN SOURCES OF IGNITION, OPEN FLAMES, AND/OR FIREWORKS

Reference: (a) PCMC Policy and Procedure for the Regulation of Open Sources of Ignition and Use of Firework (b) PCMC Fire Code Official Declaration of June 11, 2018

1. Per references (a) and (b), the standing ban on open sources of ignition and open flames, including fireworks, is hereby rescinded, effective immediately.

CBO/FLO 06-22-2018
(SIGNATURE OF FIRE CODE OR DESIGNATED OFFICIAL)

Dave Thalker CBO/FLO
Printed or Typed Name

PARK CITY 1884

June 22, 2018
(*Date of Declaration*)

From: Park City Municipal Corporation Fire Code Official

Subject: DECLARATION OF RESTRICTION ON OPEN SOURCES OF IGNITION, OPEN FLAMES, AND/OR FIREWORKS

Reference: (a) Park City Municipal Ordinance 2016-36 of July 21, 2016
(b) PCMC Policy and Procedure for the Regulation of Open Sources of Ignition & Use of Fireworks

1. Per references (a) and (b), a standing ban on open sources of ignition and open flames, including fireworks, is hereby declared. Exceptions to this ban include the following:

Not Applicable

2. With the exception of areas specifically listed below, this ban is effective immediately for all areas within City limits, until rescinded in writing. Specifically exempted areas include the following:

None

3. The following criteria were considered in making the determination to enact restrictions on the use of open sources of ignition and/or fireworks:

a. Great Basin Coordination Center Predictive Services Intelligence and Outlook reports *(Additional sheets may be attached as necessary). In all cases, overall trends are to be considered and listed, as opposed to relying solely on specific conditions present on a given date.*

Monthly/Seasonal Report:	Across the higher elevations the below normal precipitation produced a low snowpack, mostly 50-70% of normal. Drought conditions have been minimal for several years however very dry conditions have increased across Utah. Climate models continue showing a very dry year.
b. Dead and live fuel moist	Dead and live fuel moisture is normal to dry.
c. Temperatures:	Forecasts show above average temperatures with below average precipitation
d. Humidity:	Maximum humidity between 63-73% and a minimum of 18-28%
e. Dew Point:	Currently 37 degrees
f. Wind:	Varies

g. Local and regional weather forecasts, including warnings, watches and lightning probabilities:

The US Forrest Service indicates the current fire danger is moderate, and due to forecasted conditions will move to high in the near future. That coupled with forecasted above normal temperatures and below normal precipitation create fire ignition concerns.

h. Energy Release Component (ERC):

Currently 65. The ERC average increases to over 70 in mid to late July.

i. Other applicable information relied upon in enacting this ban:

Historic data shows an increase in dry conditions will sustain through the summer months increasing fire danger. Due to this information we will enact the open flame and fireworks ban.

CBO / FCO 06-22-2018

(SIGNATURE OF FIRE CODE OR DESIGNATED OFFICIAL)

DAVE J WALKER CBO/FCO

Printed or Typed Name

Park City Social Equity Focus Group Notes

Nonprofit Meeting Summary

Question 1: What is the interest of your nonprofit, in the social equity initiative? And on a scale of 1(low)-10 (high) how important is social equity to your organization?

- All nonprofits reported that social equity was of high importance to their organizations.
- Every nonprofit spoke about how social equity is woven into their work and mission.
  - Example 1. Peace House reported that: *its woven into our work, when we talk about gender based violence, we have to talk about addressing oppression, we are expanding our vision of Peace House to make a space that is safe for a more diverse community.*
  - Example 2. Education Foundation: *Its a huge priority, the Principals say schools are great place to identify needs for children, but find resources are challenging to obtain. So the Foundation is aways finding ways to provide more resources to students and they families. You can't be ready to learn if you don't have these needs meet.*
- Example 3. PC Toots: *We are more than a daycare we are early learning community, an assessment of child health, encouraging breastfeeding and training daycare providers.*

Question 2: If a delegation is formed to represent the broader community, what resources and support would be helpful from the city (space, human resources, etc)?

- Finding ways to connect with each each other and share insights.
- City needs to help facilitate the process, I feel like is in a situation to broker services
- We can feel disconnected and invisible, convening is helpful to keep us together.
- The city can help create political capitol around the topic, and help build social capitol by helping us connect to each other
- What will keep us at the table is to uncover the discomfort of the gaps in the community to serving families.
- We need to see measurable results.
- Having vision of building a process that we can share with sounding towns and cities.
- We need to share with the whole community the big picture, we are inviting them in, we accepting people where they are

- Collective impact methods would be helpful in this process and utilize population goals. (note- Dr. Pam Perlich UofU has done presentations on demographics)
- Effective tool to reach the latino community is door to door conversation. Grass roots.
- Seek out individuals and learn from them.
- How can we go door to door to the second home community? How do we get them involved??

Question Three 3: If a delegation is formed to represent the broader community, what resources and support would be helpful from the city? (Space, Human Resources, etc)

- Resources for grass root organizing
- On the the macro level there is a lack of diversity on all levels. We need to represent and promote at that level.
- There needs to be a consideration of the macro forces that can impact people from participating in this process.
- We need younger generations in the pipeline to government. For example internships.

Question 4: General comments

- We have a G\growing Filipino population
- Educators are overwhelmed
- The schools can be both a great place for these conversations and challenging place to start this work.
- We are all learning and this is a process
- Learn by doing not by just planing.

Internal City Employee Conversation

Question 1: What social equity services are missing or needs to be enhanced in the city or the community?

- There is a need for a resource hub. The hub would be a place where people can get quality information in multiple mediums (multiple languages, large print, etc).
- It would be valuable to have a sliding fee scale for recreation services.
- Rule 1: if you loose social equity it is gone,; rule 2: The rate of change in a community effects the ability do social equity.
- Strengthen our coordination across departments.
- Constantly clarifying the term social equity.
- Community: Shared ownership with the community.
- Trust Factor: Does the community feel a part of the process?
- We have to listen deeply to the community.

- This is a great way to explore what we are doing and what we need to do better.
- Small group and large group share out, its easy to drill down with a small team and then the large group is a share loop
- Every department should have a rep in the large group meeting
- Social equity needs to both benefit the community and the employees of the city.
- We need to really think through the purpose of the group and who needs to be here.

Mobility Matters
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

June 2018

PLEASE EMAIL YOUR THOUGHTS TO mobilityMatters@summitcounty.org

What is a 4^{th} and/or 5^{th} quarter?

The 4^{th} quarter is a 0.25% sales tax that can be used to either pay debt service or to fund regionally significant transportation facilities. After the first year, revenue from this option are subject to statewide redistribution to cities (0.10%), transit districts (0.10%), and counties (0.05%). The 5^{th} quarter is a 0.20% sales tax that can be used to fund transit capital purchase and service delivery. 100% of the revenues generated by this sales tax go directly to the County. There is no redistribution.

How are the taxes under consideration different from those that were passed in 2016?

They are actually very similar to the previously imposed taxes in that they are intended to be used for improvements to our transportation network. The Legislature has made these additional mechanisms available in hopes of filling a funding gap that remained, even with the previous taxes in place.

The difference this time around is that **part** of these taxes are redistributed statewide, which means that a portion of the revenues collected go directly to cities within a County. However, this also means that revenues from other counties across the state who impose the tax would come to Summit County.

What are you doing with the money from the 2016 taxes? Wasn't that enough?

County and cit[ies] staff began implementing projects as soon as the funds became available. The Electric Xpress, the Kimball Junction Circulator, and the Kamas Commuter are all funded through the previously imposed taxes, as are some of the electric bikes and the pedestrian tunnel near Park City High School. Also with this revenue, work has begun on the Jeremy Ranch interchange and the Ecker Park and Ride. The County is in the process of purchasing and improving the Kamas Park and Ride parcel. Both Kamas and Francis also received funding for road overlay projects.

In 2019 with these revenues, the County will construct the Bitner to Silver Creek Road extension, improve trails, expand transit, and begin the environmental phase of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on SR-224. Park City will begin its Bonanza Park Transit Center project along with SR-248 Corridor safety improvements. Coalville City will continue with the design process for reconstruction of Coalville Main Street.

Why are we in such a rush to do this?

Because we want to maintain local control of these funds rather than wait for the state to dictate how and where to spend the money. Additionally, if the County acts on the 4^{th} quarter before July 1 of this year, the County will keep 100% of the revenue generated until next July.

How much will this cost me and my family?

Visitors to Summit County pay around 50% of all sales tax and this tax is not applied on (unprepared) food from the grocery store. For locals, the taxes represent around $1-$3 per resident per month depending on spending habits.

Will this make Summit County less competitive as compared to other resort communities?

Even if the County Council were to implement both the 4^{th} and 5^{th} Quarters, Summit County would still be on the lower end of overall sales tax rates compared to other counties in Utah. Our tax rate would also remain lower than comparable communities in Colorado, such as Vail, Aspen, and Breckenridge.

What would the County Council spend the money on?

The revenues generated would significantly increase the amount of dollars that go to Kamas, Coalville, Francis, Henefer, Oakley, and Park City for road infrastructure improvements. Quite simply, it would mean more money for municipalities to address their own transportation priorities. The County would also have the ability to fund projects in Kimball Junction, on SR-224, and in Silver Creek sooner than previously planned.

Additionally, implementation of these taxes would place Summit County in an extremely favorable position when competing for federal, discretionary transit dollars (i.e. very large grants; in some cases, $80 million). The current presidential administration has directed U.S.D.O.T. to drastically increase the emphasis on both local and innovative funding shares/options when reviewing discretionary grant applications. Rural communities are also more favored. Unlike most others, Summit County can claim both attributes.

Can you use this money to fund other programs in the County like mental health or recycling?

Because of how these taxes were authorized by the Legislature, the funds can ***only*** be used on transportation and transit projects or to pay off debt from these projects.

I want to talk to the County Council about this!

The County Council wants to hear from you during the decision making process. To be a part of the conversation, before June 27, please contact any Council or staff member directly or send an email to mobilitymatters@summitcounty.org.