



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
June 16, 2021**

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

EX OFFICIO: Jessica Nelson, Planning Analyst; Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; John Robertson, City Engineer; Alex Roy, Senior Transportation Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

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

The following written determination was read:

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. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no staff or board communications or disclosures.

4. 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 Planning Commission Will Conduct a Work Session, With a Focus on the Applicant’s Transportation and Circulation Plan, in Accordance with the MPD, and Applicable LMC and General Plan Criteria. PL-20-04475**

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth, presented the request to replace the PEG request to amend the 1998 Development Agreement (“DA”) and to replace the expired Exhibit D with a new Master Plan Study. Planning Director Gretchen Milliken, City Engineer John Robertson, and Senior Transportation Planner Alex Roy joined her. The City’s Transportation Engineer Consultants from AECOM, Laynee Jones and Kordel Braley, also joined her. The applicant Robert Schmidt was also present, along with Hales Engineering and Kristin Williams.

Planner Ananth reviewed the framework for the City’s review. Engineer Robertson and Planner Roy were introduced to provide the Commission an update on the City’s transportation improvement plans and regional park-n-ride facilities. She stated that AECOM would provide a brief presentation after which time the applicant would provide an update on their Transportation and Site Circulation Plans.

The next meeting was to take place on July 21, 2021, and will address whether the Commission is ready for staff to move forward with Findings of Facts and Conditions for the project, or whether there are other items that need further review.

Planner Ananth advised the Commission that since the last meeting, the applicant has submitted an updated Transportation Analysis Memorandum that addressed many of AECOM’s comments. The revised Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan and Parking Management Plan (PMP) were submitted that incorporate the redlines made by the City and AECOM. The revised document was attached as Exhibit D to the Staff Report. Planner Ananth also advised that the applicant submitted a Parking Response Memorandum as well as a letter of support of PEG’s application from Vail Resorts.

She noted that the City’s two priorities for site circulation are a site plan that prioritizes the City’s “transit first” philosophy, as well as the City’s modal hierarchy that gives priority to buses, pedestrians, and cyclists. The other priority is adherence to a transportation mode shift in order to improve circulation and reduce congestion at the base area.

They also looked at the General Plan objectives for the base area neighborhood as well as the Transportation Master Plan criteria. The applicant, the City, and AECOM have agreed that the circulation scenario, identified as scenario 2b presented to the Commission during the January and March meetings, is the best circulation plan for the resort base area. It meets the City’s transportation priorities, reduces travel time on site, and provides a transit center with six to seven bus bays. Additionally, two-way traffic flow is maintained on Empire Avenue.

Planner Ananth reported that the applicant has committed to a mode shift to reduce the number of vehicles accessing the site. This means fewer passenger vehicles and more transit ridership

and pedestrians. The revised TDM and PMP commits to achieving this goal within five (5) years from completion of Building B.

She reported that the City met with the applicant at Richardson Flat, the site of the proposed transit center where buses and shuttles were made available. She reported that as a result of that meeting, a few changes to the site plan were made, but for the most part, they agreed that this plan would work. The plan for the transit center includes seven (7) bus bays. They have removed the bus shelters, split the staircase, and provided more sidewalk area. They shifted the transit building so that the flow works for both buses and pedestrians. She noted that this plan is not in the meeting packet, since it was revised following the recent on-site meeting.

In response to an inquiry, Planner Ananth stated that the graphic depicts the wheel paths for the buses making the turn from each of the different bus bays and demonstrates that the buses can effectively clear parked buses that might be in those bays.

Planner Ananth highlighted the plans depicting the dimensions of the pedestrian walking areas. She noted that the applicant is looking at potentially adding a canopy to provide some covered area while people wait for buses. She also pointed out a proposed warming building with public restrooms. She noted that the narrowest pedestrian area on the site is 12 feet wide. The pedestrian facilities have similar dimensions at Building B.

Chair Phillips commented that he would expect more foot traffic in the narrower area of the sidewalk and inquired whether they could shift some of the dimensions to accommodate the expected additional foot traffic.

The discussion turned to the crossing between the bus locations and the shuttle location. Commissioner Suesser asked about the proposed improvements to the sidewalk on the resort side. Planner Ananth relayed that the City and the applicant have discussed having a continuous sidewalk to the extent possible, and then utilize colored paving to demark the sidewalk area. The sidewalk between the pedestrian crossing and the driveway narrows to a width of ten feet.

In response to an inquiry regarding movement of the shuttles, Planner Ananth stated that the shuttle will likely be required to wait for any shuttles in front to pull out before they could move forward. Commissioner Suesser expressed concern regarding potential congestion in this area.

Planner Ananth also noted that the applicant provided revised traffic circulation plans and clarified that the plan attached to the Staff Report should have only included one page. The first page of the attachment showed that the transportation-related infrastructure and the intersections would be part of Phase 1 of construction. The transit center, the bus lanes, the lights, and the intersections would be completed when Building B is ready for occupancy.

A Commissioner addressed the bus turning area and the impact on the charging stations. Planner Ananth confirmed that there are two charging stations adjacent to Building B and they have discussed potentially moving one of the charging stations across the street. She further stated that the City wants to place the charging stations in locations where they make the most sense, but they want the option to be able to charge buses included in the current plan. She commented that it makes sense to have charging stations in this location for routes that terminate at this transit center. When the City decides how to allocate transit, that will help to determine the charging station needs and/or locations in this area.

Planner Ananth next presented the relevant findings that the Planning Commission should be considering during the applicant's presentation. These come from the MPD provisions in the Code. The required findings were as follows:

- Does the Planning Commission find that adequate internal vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation are provided?
- Does the Planning Commission find that pedestrian and bicycle circulation is separated from vehicular circulation and provides safe travel time within the boundaries of the Master Plan Development and safe travel to adjoining public sidewalks, trails, and right-of-way?
- Does the Planning Commission find that the site plan for the MPD includes transportation amenities, including drop-off areas and bus stops, if applicable?
- Does the Planning Commission find that service and delivery access, and loading/unloading areas, are included in the site plan and are separate from pedestrian areas?
- Does the Planning Commission find that the site plan promotes the use of non-vehicular forms of transportation through design and by providing trail connections as well as dedicated transit lanes?
- Does the Planning Commission find that the site plan addresses and mitigates traffic?

Planner Ananth added that the Planning Commission should consider whether it is ready to direct the Planning Department to prepare draft Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval for this project, or whether there are other issues the Commission would like to discuss at the next meeting.

Chair Phillips commented that he expects that they will get to a point where the Planning Commission would be expected to provide an indication of how staff should be directed to act, as well as a meeting to discuss the details of the language to be implemented. Commissioner Thimm commented that there is still a significant amount of discussion and comment on the issue of transportation and parking before they are ready to make those types of commitments.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated he would not be able to commit to anything without a County transportation official weighing in since every park-n-ride lot on this plan is in the County. He wants to know how the County, the City, and the resort would work together. Planner Ananth advised that she has had discussions with Caroline Rodriguez who runs the County Transit system, and they are fully aware of this project.

Chair Phillips stressed that he is looking for a path forward on this project. He commented that the Commission should begin to focus on giving staff and the applicant an indication of what topics need to be discussed further so that they have direction and can prepare the language for the formal vote by the Commission.

City Engineer, John Robertson discussed four upcoming capital transportation projects that the City is undertaking to support the overall goal of the City to improve transit. He began by discussing the Quinn's Junction Park and Ride. This site is within the County and the City has an agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") for control over that property.

He stated that they have participated in several meetings with the County, and they are fully aware of the project. The City is currently working with utility companies to move out three fiber-optic lines and the plans are nearly complete. The project is fully funded and he anticipates that construction would begin in the spring of 2022, with a completion date in late summer 2022.

Engineer Robertson also reported that the County is looking to undertake some improvements to Old Highway 40, which would likely not occur until Phase 2 of the Park and Ride project. A recommendation for additional funding for these improvements has been sent to the County Council.

He expressed that the Quinn's Junction Park and Ride project would help support the City's overall transit improvements and be a good complement to the PEG project.

In response to an inquiry, Engineer Robertson confirmed that the City's transportation department controls all of the bus scheduling in and out of the park-and-ride lot. This project would cost just over \$2.5 million and is completely funded. The City's contribution of TST funds is approximately 20% of the overall project cost.

Engineer Robertson next addressed a project in which the City is replacing two bus shelters on Park Avenue. These shelters are two of the busiest transit stops in the County. The project involves improving the shelters as well as enlarging them for additional capacity. He stated that they have been working through some plan issues with UDOT and they expect to send this project out to bid in the next couple of weeks, with a projected start in spring 2022. He commented that contractors are very busy and they are experiencing difficulties in getting bids. Engineer Robertson reported that there are two UDOT projects currently ongoing. One is a large maintenance project in which UDOT has already contracted with Granite Construction for improvements to curb ramps, re-surfacing, re-striping, and installation of a bus lane.

The second UDOT project involves the installation of a traffic signal at Richardson Flat and State Route 248. They expect the installation to be completed by October 2021. Engineer Robertson stated that they view this project as a great way to improve access to the Richardson Flat Park and Ride.

Commissioner Kenworthy sought clarification that the scope of the first UDOT project only involves resurfacing and re-striping the existing asphalt. Engineer Robertson confirmed this understanding and stated that UDOT is not proposing any modifications to the intersections along the State Route 248 corridor at this time, with the exception of installing a signal at the intersection at Richardson Flat. In response to an inquiry, Engineer Robertson stated that there would be approximately 470 parking stalls at Quinn's Junction. At Richardson Flat, he estimated there would be over 600 new parking stalls.

Commissioner Kenworthy questioned where the entrance to the parking lot at Quinn's Junction will be located, commenting that it is difficult to enter that as one exits the freeway. Engineer Robertson stated that the entrance will be on the frontage road along the line of Old Highway 40. As part of their traffic analysis, they looked at the queue lengths that would develop and concluded that it would not be an issue for a number of years. He added that they have discussed this with the County and they are looking to move that intersection further east. He stated that they anticipate that when they undertake the Phase 2 improvements at Quinn's

Junction, the County would undertake these improvements at the same time to improve the queue length.

Engineer Robertson confirmed that the entrance to the Quinn's Junction Park and Ride lot will be off of Old Highway 40, which is the frontage road.

With respect to the connection between this Park and Ride with the Rail Trail, Engineer Robertson stated that the Rail Trail currently goes up to and crosses State Route 248. With the Phase 2 realignment of the intersection at State Route 248 and Old Highway 40, they view that connection would be a little cleaner and closer.

Engineer Robertson confirmed that the dedicated bus lane would not extend from the high school to the applicant's loop because there is no room to add a separate bus lane in this location. He noted that the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route along State Route 224 should reduce the time that the bus would have to use general travel lanes in that area.

Senior Transportation Planner, Alex Roy, explained the development of long-range transportation plans for the City. He presented to the Commission approximately 20 projects involving various sources that coalesce around moving the transportation network and advancing the car-optional lifestyle that is one of the pillars of Park City's 2020 Vision.

He noted that of the 20 projects presented, the major ones include the BRT project, improved park, and ride facilities, and improved bus shelters. As part of their ongoing work, they are looking at a new long-range Transportation Plan. He noted that they currently have 90 projects that the Transportation Committee is evaluating. They will be sharing the project list with the Commission in the near future.

As part of their long-range transportation planning, they look at what best aligns with the community goals, what is feasible, potential funding sources, and cost-to-benefit ratio. In addition to the long-range transit plan, they also have a short-range transit plan. As part of the evaluation of short-range goals, they look at things such as micro-transit in areas that do not justify a fixed route.

The City also looks at the Active Transportation Master Plan that would build on some of the long-range transportation ideas and projects and provide a high-level look at cost, right-of-way impacts, goals, and prioritizing non-vehicular modes of transportation. Planner Roy highlighted that with all of these plans, they are working with critical community stakeholders, including the resorts.

Commissioner Suesser asked about the Empire Avenue and Multi-modal Connections project. She noted that as part of the base resort redevelopment, improvements to the Empire Avenue and Park Avenue intersection were contemplated in 1997 and 1998. Planner Roy stated that in working with PEG Development and AECOM, they looked at a number of alternatives as to how to best utilize that roadway and right-of-way. Engineer Robertson added that it is well known that this is probably the busiest and most challenging intersection in Park City. What makes it more challenging is that this is a location where the BRT will go through. He does not have any details currently on what specifically they are looking at to address this intersection but stated that AECOM has been working with the City to arrive at a solution.

Planner Ananth highlighted two of the projects for the Commission. The Empire Avenue and Multi-Modal Connections project seeks to provide transit priority and enhanced connectivity for bikes and pedestrians. Improvements could include transit lanes, pathways, and other improvements outside the base area development. She added that the applicant would be prioritizing transit through that intersection with the installation of a signal and a crossing on Empire Avenue for pedestrians who are accessing the resort.

The second project highlighted by Planner Ananth was the Empire Avenue/Park Avenue/SRT24 intersection discussed by Engineer Robertson. AECOM is currently looking at design ideas to prioritize transit through that intersection. Engineer Robertson added that they are looking at approximately 6 different intersection alternatives for this location, and each alternate will be subject to a rigorous travel time/travel delay analysis over the next few months.

Planner Ananth noted that the City is evaluating express bus lanes between the intersection of Empire Avenue and 14th to the intersection of Park Avenue and State Route 224. The applicant's bus lanes pick up at the Empire Avenue intersection identified in project #3. Commissioner Suesser requested clarification of the location of the intersection in project #3. Planner Ananth confirmed that the intersection involved in that project is Empire and Silver King. It was clarified that this is part of the PEG Development project and is being capitalized by them.

Planner Roy stated that Richardson Flat and Quinn's Junction are two park-and-rides where the City is most involved in scheduling buses to and from. The County is taking over the regional routes, so they will be more involved in locations such as Kimball Junction and Ecker Hill. As they get through the planning of different route services, they will likely be utilizing Richardson Flat and Quinn's Junction the most for transit. In the future, there will likely be more integration as far as who can operate into those lots. Currently, the City will continue operating the white line, so there will be some interaction with the Kimball Junction Park and Ride as well.

Commissioner Kenworthy expressed his understanding that all of the park-and-ride lots would be non-exclusive. Planner Roy stated that currently, there is some hesitation about integrating City operations into a regional park-and-ride, however, they could evaluate whether the City could run a bus from a regional park-and-ride to the resort. He stated further that there is an opportunity for shuttle service operated by the resorts from the regional transit stops. Commissioner Kenworthy would like to see integration of the various services to serve the community. He wants to make sure that they have permission from the proper jurisdictions to continue to advance on these services, which would help with the success of the City's "transit-first" goal.

Planner Ananth introduced Kordel Braley from AECOM. Mr. Braley reported that in reviewing the applicant's most recent submittal, they had a list of approximately 16 remaining issues. They have met with the City and the applicant and believe each of these issues has either been addressed or could be deferred to the design phase.

He stated that they agreed that scenario 2b would be the best option, given the constraints and the expected operations. As far as the transit center design, they continued to have several concerns, but many of these concerns were resolved during the on-site meeting with the assistance of the bus operators. He presented the latest design for the transit center.

Mr. Braley addressed the question raised earlier about the dimension of the sidewalk on the east side. He explained that the electric charging infrastructure extends 5 – 6 feet into the

sidewalk, so the actual clear zone for pedestrians would be approximately 15 feet wide. They would be reluctant to move the width any further to the east.

Travel demand management is a key to the success of this Transportation Plan. The analysis performed by the applicant and verified by AECOM was that an approximate 20% reduction in traffic is needed to help transit work in the area. Mr. Braley stated that they expect further ongoing revisions would be made for each conditional use permit as this project progresses. For that reason, the TDM is expected to be a living document and they encourage all involved to re-evaluate it frequently.

Mr. Braley commented that there are safety concerns related to vehicle and traffic circulation on 14th and 15th Streets, including steep grades and residential land use. There are constraints at the Empire Avenue intersections and it would also put additional traffic pressure on Park Avenue. AECOM concluded that it makes sense to keep the pedestrian and bike routes in and out of other parts of Park City, but does not recommend using them for planned vehicular routes.

With respect to concern about cut-through traffic to the north, they recommended an investigation into traffic calming measures and/or variable message signs on the State Highway that would remind drivers of the correct way to get to the resort. Mr. Braley stated that they recommend Shared Parking Agreements between the various uses at the base to minimize parking issues in residential neighborhoods.

Commissioner Suesser asked if any attention was given to cut-through traffic in the neighborhoods to the south of the resort, particularly in light of the anticipated shuttle traffic. Mr. Braley stated that there has not been a lot of discussion about the areas to the south, but they could investigate that further.

It was noted by Chair Phillips that the Shared Parking Agreements are being relied upon in making this proposal work and expressed concern about how they can make sure that these shared agreements actually happen. Planner Ananth explained that the shared agreements are between the various parking lots that are being constructed by PEG as well as the uses that are being built. Shared parking would be a condition of approval for these uses. The sharing agreements will only be required for lots and uses developed by PEG and would be a condition of the MPD that would be reiterated during the conditional use permit process.

With regard to County involvement in the lots for resort use, Planner Ananth stated that the City has not approached the County regarding use of their lots for resort use. She noted that the County already services and encourages parking at the Ecker lot, which will continue through the County transit service. The City will service Quinn's Junction and the applicant will likely service Richardson Flat for its employees. Planner Ananth confirmed that Richardson Flat would primarily be used for PEG employees for the foreseeable future. If Quinn's becomes full, they could then move overflow ski parking to Richardson Flat.

Commissioner Suesser revisited the issue of reliance on Shared Parking Agreements to discourage parking in surrounding neighborhoods and expressed that the recommendation of Shared Parking Agreements seems insufficient. She inquired about the potential for resorts setting aside funds for parking enforcement in the residential neighborhoods, or installation of signage. Planner Ananth stated that there already is signage and many of the neighborhood

Homeowners' Associations (HOA's) have their own lots. Enforcement of parking in the private lots falls on the HOA's, while enforcement of City street parking falls on the City.

Mr. Braley stated that AECOM continues to work with both the City and the applicant to refine intersection layouts. He noted that Scenario 2b includes exclusive transit lanes in and around the site, which they believe is a good addition to this project. He concluded by stating that they are happy with the progress and the applicant's willingness to receive the comments by the team.

Chair Phillips addressed the issue of sidewalk width at the charging stations. Mr. Braley stated that their goal is to have a minimum width of 12 feet around the entire transit station, beyond any other structures such as benches or bike racks. Chair Phillips commented that during prior discussions, there were comments that the charging stations might not be installed, which would increase the sidewalk width by five feet on the wrong side of the road. He would like to really focus on whether the charging stations need to be in this location, and if they do not, evaluate whether it makes sense to add the extra five feet to the heavier traffic side. He does not want to plan for charging stations if it is ultimately not necessary.

Chair Phillips raised the issue of handling the snow storage and snow removal and commented that this has not been discussed during this process.

A Commissioner asked if AECOM looked at the pedestrian crossings and flow at the intersection of Shadow Ridge Drive and Lowell Avenue to access the lower base. Mr. Braley stated that this intersection would be signalized, and they are assuming that the crosswalks will have plenty of capacity. He noted that the crossing across Lowell Avenue on the south side of the intersection would be a narrow crossing, yet the only vehicles traveling in and out of there would be buses. He expressed no concerns with pedestrian movement in that crossing. The plan calls for minimum 12-foot wide sidewalks in each of these locations, so there should be plenty of capacity. He agreed that some pedestrians would head to the transit center, and some would head to the north towards Building C and the lower base. He reminded that the entire intersection would be signalized, so all movements would be protected.

Commissioner Thimm recalled a prior request for the precedence of where the traffic signalization proposed for this intersection occurs and has worked successfully. Mr. Braley reported that there are many locations where bus movements are protected with bus phasing. He stated that in the southbound direction at this location, there would be a left arrow signal for bus movement only.

It was pointed out by Engineer Robertson that the BRT Line in Utah County along the entire length of University Avenue has center-running bus lanes with left-turn lanes on the outside of the bus lanes. There is bus signalization for transit and left-turn arrows for vehicular traffic. University Parkway in Orem has the same configuration. Engineer Robertson specifically highlighted University Avenue and 200 North in Provo as representative of signalization similar to what is proposed in this plan. He presented to the Commission a map depicting this intersection. Commissioner Thimm noted that the differentiation of signal type is significant.

The applicant, Robert Schmidt, expressed his appreciation to City Staff and AECOM for working collaboratively on moving this forward with solutions that work. He presented to the Commission a view of the previous turnaround at Richardson Flat, and the aerial drone footage of the work they did at the recent onsite meeting. He noted that the on-site meeting gave them

a good feel for size and spacing, as well as the relationship of the buses at the transit center. He noted that they wanted the onsite meeting to answer questions around whether the buses could circulate around each other without conflict and whether they could get within three feet of the curb in a winter condition and still drop their ADA ramps. The drone footage shown to the Commission demonstrates that those questions were answered positively.

They also evaluated whether the buses could get within 6 to 18 inches of the curb line. Some of the approach lines needed to be slightly adjusted by a couple of feet, however, generally they found that there is adequate room for the buses to make the necessary turning movements, avoid conflicts and provide a safe experience. He showed the Commission the scenario showing that buses were successfully able to get into Bay 6, which is parallel with Building B and one of the charging locations.

Mr. Schmidt stated that during the onsite meeting, they discovered that the saw tooth configuration on the east side of the transit center was neither necessary nor desired. Staff felt that that side was more appropriate for the charging stations. There was enough flexibility and maneuverability to stack it in a parallel configuration for charging. Another issue they looked at was whether a bus could depart from Bay 5 and get past the other buses if they were stacked up waiting for a charger. In the field, they were able to demonstrate that there is sufficient room to do that.

Mr. Schmidt showed the Commission a successful test in the field of a three-foot separation between buses in Bays 6 and 7. They also determined that Bay 7 was too far north, so they made a field modification to accommodate the charging by designing a flatter approach into the bay. They made similar modifications in Bays 2, 3, and 4.

Commissioner Suesser questioned whether the careful maneuvering of the buses, as depicted in the drone footage, would actually slow down the buses getting into and out of the transit center. Mr. Schmidt commented that this design is standard for a transit center. The drivers felt comfortable making these maneuvers and expressed that this proposed transit center was very similar to others. Mr. Schmidt showed a successful test for a bus exiting Bay 6 and making a U-turn without conflict.

He explained that they also utilized shuttles to test maneuverability on site. Drone footage of shuttle maneuverability was shown to the Commission. Mr. Schmidt stated that the old plan contained conflicts for shuttle turns, so they flattened out the approach. They also learned that a shuttle driver would only get to about ten feet behind another shuttle, allowing for the front shuttle to be offloading gear from the back.

Mr. Schmidt presented the revisions based on the information obtained from the onsite visit. He also reported that based on discussions with the resorts, they typically see four to six shuttles at any one time, so they feel that there is adequate space to accommodate the expected shuttle traffic. Overall, they were confident that there is more than sufficient room for the shuttles and the buses to maneuver in the transit center. An area for emergency access was identified on the graphic and described to the Commission.

Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the estimate of four to six shuttles at a given time was based on feedback from the resort. A question was raised regarding whether micro-transit could impact this drop-off if it is implemented in this area. Mr. Schmidt stated that if and when micro-transit is implemented, this design provides plenty of options to accommodate it. There is adequate

space in the bus turnaround to add a micro spot at one of the far ends, or it could be accommodated in the shuttle area or within the parking structure depending on the size of the vans. He commented that micro-transit has not been a design consideration presented to them.

Mr. Schmidt addressed the issue of snow storage and stated that there are some areas at the ends, as well as an unused area at the end of the island. They originally programmed the charging equipment to go into that area, but there is plenty of space to install the electrical equipment next to the building, which leaves space at the end of the island for snow storage. They are confident that they can adequately accommodate snow storage.

Snow storage on the Lowell Avenue side was identified in the graphic. Mr. Schmidt identified large landscape setbacks that could be utilized as well. In response to concerns raised about the impact of snow storage on pedestrian movement, Mr. Schmidt stated they would keep snow storage outside of pedestrian areas. He next addressed the crossing and improvements to the sidewalks, as identified by Commissioner Suesser. All of the sidewalks around the transit center, including the stairs, ADA ramp up to the ice rink, and the existing access into the upper resort area, would be re-built. The new sidewalk will be approximately twice the width it is today.

Chair Phillips asked about the reasoning behind the variance in width of the sidewalk and expressed concern about pinch points on the heavier trafficked side. Mr. Schmidt stated there are adjustments they could likely work into the true design. Commissioner Suesser commented that it would be helpful to have the 20-foot wide sidewalk on the development side because it would hopefully encourage pedestrians coming out of the garage to go up to the pedestrian crossing, rather than crossing Lowell Avenue at the light. Mr. Schmidt explained that their analysis showed that 15-foot wide sidewalks are more than sufficient to accommodate pedestrian traffic, especially with the protected crossing at Shadow Ridge Road and a dedicated crossing on Lowell Avenue.

Mr. Schmidt next addressed overall traffic flow and showed the Commission the Geometric Plan. There might be some minor refinements to be made at the intersection of Empire Avenue and Silver King Road, and at the intersection of Silver King Road and Lowell Avenue. The plan includes dedicated bus lanes to the intersection of Shadow Ridge Drive, in and around the transit center, and then out onto Lowell Avenue. He identified the drop-off area along Lowell Avenue, and as mentioned in the TDM they would also have temporary or short-term parking within the parking structures to accommodate drop-offs should there be any issues with capacity. They have looked at providing the drop-off zones close to the pedestrian exits from the parking structure.

Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the short-term parking areas will primarily be located in Building B in the first phase. They would be spread out into the day skier parking in Building E when that structure is completed. He also mentioned that the Parking Management Plan calls for 15 minutes of free parking across the board. Mr. Schmidt stated that the traffic coming in on Silver King Road and Lowell Avenue would not be utilizing the dedicated bus lane. In Section B, there are three lanes of traffic, two of which are dedicated to buses.

The Commission was presented with simulations showing the traffic flow during morning and evening peak times. The simulation depicts vehicle movements pulling in and out of the drop-off area, pulling in and out of the hotel driveway, and navigating the intersections. Mr. Schmidt commented that the simulations also show pedestrian crossings and vehicle movement. He

highlighted that the bus stops are within the dedicated bus lanes, and, therefore, do not impact traffic flow.

In response to an inquiry from a Commissioner, Mr. Schmidt stated that they would have variable message boards advising incoming traffic of available parking. On Parcel E, there is one access point to parking, while at Parcel B there are three access points. They have modeled the plan on the concept that depending on the location and number of available parking stalls, the traffic will flow in a certain way. It was confirmed that delivery trucks will not utilize the drop-off zone.

Mr. Schmidt noted that the simulation shows more traffic on Empire Avenue during the morning peak, which is reflected in the traffic study. Commissioner Suesser asked if they considered signage for skier drop-off zones. Mr. Schmidt responded that way finding would be part of the overall signage package at the resort. There would also be signage for the National Ability Center ("NAC"), the existing resort center, and upper base/lower base retailers.

Chair Phillips stated that signage will be critical, especially for first-time visitors, and asked how signage will be handled between now and project completion.

Commissioner Thimm asked if any sort of modeling was used to arrive at the number and location of drop-off/pick-up locations. He noted that there is a drop-off area near the beginner's chair lifts, and several stow lanes all along what is now Building C. Mr. Schmidt stated that they have consulted with the resort, and the reason that they added the free 30-minute parking within the parking structures was to alleviate any concerns that there were not enough drop-off locations between Buildings C and E. They will watch that as part of the Parking Management Plan during their twice-yearly reviews with the City. If they need to add additional free parking spots in the structure that could be accommodated.

Commissioner Suesser stated that currently, many drop-offs occur at the lower end of the base and she is concerned that the eight spots in front of the plaza are not a good substitute for the number of drop-offs that occur at the side of the hill. She recalled the 1998 Plan that had skier services at Building C, including drop-offs and parking. While the change of use in Building C was acceptable, the loss of skier services and day skier parking and access is a big loss of great access to the lower base. This plan directs a majority of visitors to the upper part of the base despite the fact that most skiers, especially beginners, go to the lower part of the resort.

Mr. Schmidt commented that the proposed drop-off is twice as good as what was proposed in 1998. They are proposing the day skier parking and day skier drop-off in Building E with virtually the same access to the mountain. He also pointed out that the Transit Center as it exists today does not work, and they are proposing a drastic improvement over the 1998 Plan that addresses the needs of "transit first" and the goals of achieving mode splits. He also noted that the 1998 Plan did not detail pedestrian movement around the site, as opposed to the level of planning they put in thus far has surpassed the original expectation of the 1998 Plan in terms of pedestrian access, bicycle access, vehicle flow, and "transit first."

Chair Phillips asked if the short-term parking within the structures will be sufficient to accommodate increased vehicle heights. Mr. Schmidt stated that as part of the preliminary grading plans, they have some room in Building E to accommodate higher vehicles, whereas, in other locations, they do not have the same ability without increasing the height of the building. They have been working hard to keep building heights where they currently exist. He noted that

most modern parking structures must be able to accommodate a minimum of 8'2" for the ADA stalls only. Most parking structures provide between 7'6" and 8'2" clearance. In order to accommodate a Sprinter van, several feet would need to be added.

Commissioner Kenworthy addressed the Average Vehicle Occupancy ("AVO") calculations. He asked for a calculation of the AVO if someone takes an Uber to and from the resort. He noted that the City's goal is to get cars off of City streets and surmised that using ride-share actually increases it. He calculated the AVO at 1.5 with three people in a ride-share vehicle. With a single rider, the ride share AVO is .5 and increases traffic.

It was noted by Ryan Hales from Hales Engineering, that AVO counts the driver as well, so when a ride-share drops someone off, the driver remains in the vehicle for the AVO calculation. The idea is that when people pull into the parking lot, there are opportunities within the Parking Management Plan to provide parking stalls for vehicles with higher occupancy. Additionally, the paid parking rate will fluctuate as the demand increases. They would make adjustments as necessary to increase ridership and maximize the parking ability to increase the AVO for those who are parking.

Commissioner Kenworthy commented that he would expect more traffic on the street with increased app-based ride share use unless there is some sort of mobility program. Mr. Hales agreed that this is something that they will need to adjust as they go and reminded the Commission that the PMP was designed to be flexible and adjusted as needed. After the first season, they will receive good data to help them make necessary adjustments for the next season. Mr. Hales stated that the overall plan is a good starting point. They would want to move from an AVO of 2.3 to 2.7 on an average day and to an AVO of 3.1 on a peak day to meet the City's goals.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Kenworthy regarding access for snowboarders on a peak weekend day, it was noted by Mr. Schmidt that the day skiers create traffic for the day only. Commissioner Kenworthy focused on increased trip generation with ride share. Mr. Schmidt opined that the surmised increase is based on an assumption that is not valid and the small minority would not impact the overall function of the system. Mr. Hales reiterated that they have a plan that will need adjustments as they go. For every single passenger that arrives by ride-share, there are multiple passengers who arrive on shuttles or buses. The work that will be done in the coordination meetings would focus on finding balance to hone in on the best possible solution.

It was noted by Commissioner Kenworthy that the guiding principle is to have this development improve the guest experience for those arriving and leaving the resort. Commissioner Suesser added that many have commented about the current number of cars dropping off and wanted information on what the plan calls for with regards to the drop-offs in Lot C. She stated that PEG has not provided adequate drop-offs given current conditions.

Commissioner Van Dine added that some of the drop-off locations would be moved to Building E. Commissioner Suesser noted that while the additional locations would be helpful, the current drop-off conditions are not even close to accommodating current conditions.

Mr. Hales acknowledged that it does become a little chaotic in those drop-off areas, and what this plan is trying to do is consolidate them and organize them better to reduce the chaos. By putting drop-off zones in the parking structures, they are dispersing them. Mr. Schmidt

referenced the Addendum to the TDM where drop-offs in short-term parking structures are specifically mentioned. Virtually every parking stall on the project is free for 15 minutes, in addition to the stalls dedicated for drop-off. He echoed the comments by Mr. Hales that the Parking Management Plan is a living document that has been designed to be adjusted as needed. Mr. Schmidt stressed that neither PEG nor the resort wants to get this wrong. The resort has contributed to this plan and is very comfortable with it.

Commissioner Thimm noted that the proposal contains a 39% reduction in Parcel B and a 77-stall reduction in Parcel E. Mr. Schmidt stated that these reductions come out of the number of stalls they are proposing but noted that the parking analysis conducted by Hales Engineering shows 196 excess stalls. He stated that the key is to work the TDM to achieve the mode splits in conjunction with the City's improvements in transit service.

Mr. Schmidt next addressed the pedestrian improvements. He explained that there is pedestrian access on 15th Street as well as on 14th Street. They will provide an extension for pedestrian access from 14th Street to Park Avenue. He noted that this is subject to an available right-of-way, but they are committed to making this change.

In addition, they would be installing a sidewalk along Manor Way that will connect to the existing sidewalks to provide pedestrian connectivity to Park Avenue and ultimately to Old Town. He also stated that they would extend the sidewalk along Lowell Avenue to connect to the intersection. There are some utilities that they will work around to make this connection.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they are connecting pedestrian access to the City's existing multi-use trail at the intersection of Silver King Drive and Empire Avenue. He commented that their proposal addresses the improvements to the sidewalks, and reminded the Commission that there are also open space plazas, opened pedestrian connectivity on Parcel B, and significant amounts of open space on Parcels C, E and across Parcel D. They expect pedestrian connectivity to be world-class.

Commissioner Suesser expressed appreciation for the addition of the sidewalk on Manor Drive, as well as on Empire Avenue to the 13th Street stairs. She asked why the new sidewalk around Building C is only five feet wide, given the anticipated number of pedestrians crossing in that location. Mr. Schmidt responded that they assumed that most of the people who make that crossing would continue down towards the plaza.

Commissioner Van Dine questioned this assumption. Commissioner Suesser also expressed that this assumption was not valid given what occurs now and given the 1998 Plan that contemplated this area to be a ski-way. Mr. Schmidt stated that they would look at that further but stated that the intent was to encourage pedestrians to go down to the plaza.

It was also suggested by Commissioner Suesser that mountain bikers would likely use this narrower access way, which further supports the need for it to be 12 feet, rather than five feet wide. Mr. Schmidt commented that they feel that the mountain bikers would use the roadway rather than this pedestrian sidewalk to access the mountain. Chair Phillips agreed that the applicant should revisit increasing the pathway from 5 feet to 12 feet because it presents a more direct route to the snow. Mr. Schmidt stated that they would accept that as a condition, obviating the need to return to the Commission on this point.

Mr. Schmidt addressed the comment in the staff report regarding pedestrian conflicts with the loading dock at Building C. He stated that several months ago, they adjusted the arrivals at the loading dock by eliminating backing movements by trucks in the loading dock.

The TDM and PMP have involved a lot of collaborative work to assemble. Mr. Schmidt expressed that these plans are extensive and cover many strategies and scenarios. They expect that this document would change, adjust and update as they go through the Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") process and operations. He added that there are very few resorts in the country with 10.5 acres at the base, so there is not much in the way of precedent. They have done their best to come up with the best plan, with the ability to adjust as operations proceed.

Mr. Schmidt stated that both City staff and AECOM are comfortable with the TDM and PMP moving forward at this point. He submitted that this plan is far superior to the 1998 Development Plan in a number of aspects. He highlighted the proposed transit center, dedicated bus lanes, mode splits, increased AVOs, and the ability to manage the TDM over time. Additionally, the PMP addresses parking mitigation efforts in the neighborhoods. He noted that this project is less dense than the 1998 Plan, and they are complying with sustainability guidelines, preserving and improving view corridors, and providing substantial open space. He noted that this project doubles the number of beds over the 1998 Agreement and complies with the current affordable housing resolution. By doing this, they are enhancing the quality of life, creating a sense of community, and reducing traffic.

In addition, they have not changed the 1,200 day-skier lot, instead using shared parking for the new uses. The PMP provides strategies for today and in the future. They have enhanced pedestrian transit, as well as bicycle access and facilities, and substantially improved bus bays. Mr. Schmidt expressed hope that the Commission will recognize the level of work that has gone into this plan, and that it is a good project for the base area. It will be an enhancement to Park City and its status as a world-class destination ski town and resort. They would like to move to the next stage of obtaining a conditional use permit that would allow them to get into more details and design.

Chair Phillips called for a short break before allowing public comments.

Chair Phillips asked Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken, to address questions that came in during the presentation.

Director Milliken relayed a question about the assumed drop-off time of three or four minutes and the impact on the required number of drop-off spaces in front of the hotel. A similar question asked about the number of drop-offs/pick-ups for every child, and whether the parking spots allow enough time to collect a child from the slopes, including walking time.

Josh Gibbons from Hales Engineering, stated that if the assumed time for drop-off/pick-ups were to increase, then the drop-off period would increase which is why they recommended that extra space be provided in the parking garages. They have also recommended that on peak days an employee would be present to direct vehicles to the drop-off/pick-up spots in the garage. They would also direct people via wayfinding signage.

In response to a question specific to the drop-off and pick-up of ski teams, Mr. Schmidt stated that such a scenario is accommodated for in the short-term parking or in the drop-off zones. As they adjust the PMP over time, they would make sure that these drop-offs are handled

appropriately. Director Milliken relayed another question about building heights and whether they have to be increased to accommodate the higher parking structure clearances, or alternately, whether the parking structure could be built underground to maintain building heights. Mr. Schmidt stated that theoretically, the parking structure could go deeper, but there are design complications with that that he could not address at this time.

The next question relayed by Director Milliken addressed vehicle exits from Building D since the model showed left-turning vehicles hitting other vehicles. Mr. Schmidt cautioned that what is seen graphically on the model is not reality. Mr. Hales explained how the software works and stated that the dimensions do not always connect with what they are trying to accomplish. The 3D graphic is a simulation only, so when vehicles conflict it is because the size of the vehicles created by the software does not exactly match. Mr. Gibbons added that they optimized the simulation for 3D visualization and made slight changes in the features that may have resulted in some of that conflict.

Mr. Gibbons added that during peak times when there would be higher volume going north on Empire Avenue, the entrance might naturally restrict itself to a right-in/right-out. They have not suggested a median to physically restrict a left turn. During off-peak times, left turns would be easily accomplished.

Director Milliken read a question regarding whether the bus circulation plan allowed buses to turn west onto Silver King Drive when leaving the resort, such as the blue bus line route that was eliminated during COVID-19 transit cuts. Mr. Hales responded that they have not precluded any movements through that location, but they could look at that further if requested. It was noted that the way the plan is drawn, they have channelized the buses to go right onto eastbound Silver King Drive and out of the site.

Engineer Robertson stated that he would confirm with the Transit Department whether they would maintain the blue line.

Director Milliken relayed a question about the surface of the yellow dotted line in front of the resort on the ski-slope side. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that would not be an improved concrete sidewalk in that location, but rather a gravel, summer-type surface.

A further question was raised regarding how bikers would get to the trails since there are no multi-use trails designated to go to the mountain. Mr. Schmidt referred to the pedestrian and bicycling access plan that shows that mountain bikes can access the mountain by riding up the extension of Shadow Ridge Drive to the NAC Building. Access to trails would be as they exist today. Bikes could also be walked across the plazas. He stated that access would be improved as a result of the amenities they are adding at the base.

Director Milliken relayed a question seeking clarification as to why digging deeper underground for parking is complicated. Mr. Schmidt stated that this issue gets into a technical design question and added that the issue of parking garage height centered primarily on micro-transit that would involve a collaborative process with the City.

A question was raised about potential users of the day lockers. Mr. Schmidt stated that they expect transit riders to use the day lockers. They are providing them as a convenience, and a way to incentivize and encourage people to use the buses. They also anticipate that there would be seasonal lockers as well that people can use to store skis and boots.

The last question in the Q&A pertained to the entrance to parking in Parcel B off of Shadow Ridge Drive. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that there would be a single acceptance lane into Parcel B for access from both directions.

Director Milliken reported that all of the questions had been addressed and noted that several comments included in the Q&A would be attached to the next report.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

Debra Hickey stated that she has followed this matter and does not see much change in the proposal. She believes it is a very tight fit to accommodate large numbers of people. The estimate of 35 buses expected to travel up and down Lowell Avenue during peak times results in 70 simultaneous trips. Ms. Hickey questioned the environmental effects of that bus traffic on the Silver King and Shadow Ridge condominiums. She had not heard anything from the City that all of these buses would be electric, but notwithstanding, it seems like an enormous amount of bus traffic dedicated to those lanes.

Ms. Hickey noted that presently there are only two lanes on that road, and she questioned whether PEG would be taking land from the hotel parcel or somehow making additional space to accommodate the third lane. She noted that Mr. Hales repeatedly stated that this plan would develop and change as time goes by, but she expressed that with the tightness of this plan, she does not see much room for changes.

There is no dedicated bus lane from the high school into the resort area, so she does not see that as an improvement in travel time. Asking people to ride buses in traffic is not a good idea. She offered that more HOAs and hotels will all develop their own shuttle, which will increase shuttle drop-offs. She does not see any additional room for increased shuttles in the area. The four or five spots at the upper transit area are not enough for the number of people who want to visit the mountain. She would like to know if they would be expanding the size of Lowell Avenue for three lanes and whether there would be a transportation study on how that will affect the neighborhood.

Nicole Deforge spoke on behalf of the coalition of neighborhoods, businesses, and homeowners. She echoed the questions and concerns raised by the Commissioners. She stated that their first concern is the general lack of mitigation for the impact on the neighborhood. Land Management Code ("LMC") Section 15-6-6 requires the developer to mitigate the impact of the development on the surrounding neighborhoods. AECOM notes in their report that congestion on Empire Avenue, particularly during the P.M. peak, impedes access for adjacent residents despite the City's General Plan objective to decrease destination resort impacts on surrounding residential communities. Ms. Deforge stated that no reasonable mitigation efforts have been proposed.

The mode-split depends on many assumptions that cannot be documented by evidence at this point. If the mode-split is not achieved, there could be as many as 13 intersections in the neighborhood with failing levels of service. Even under the best of scenarios, the east B access at Empire Avenue would still receive a failing grade. She stated that Empire Avenue is of particular concern after watching the animation presented during this meeting. The changes that were purportedly made to accommodate the homeowners access to their neighborhoods

has resulted in a situation where all of the access to the Parcel B parking will come through Empire Avenue.

Ms. Deforge highlighted the comments of Commissioner Van Dine that people would not access the parking through Lowell Avenue when they can access it through Empire Avenue. Lowell Avenue would become primarily a bus transit roadway with some drop off locations. She urged the Commission to review the animation again to see the amount of traffic on Empire Avenue. Ms. Deforge stressed that this small residential street would become the major access for everything other than bus transit. Ms. Deforge offered that a way to mitigate these impacts would be to prohibit left turns from Shadow Ridge Drive into the parking garage, and perhaps the same off of Empire Avenue. She stressed that Empire Avenue is the one residential street in the area that already has a failing grade. This plan would make it worse.

In furtherance of Commissioner Kenworthy's comments regarding Uber traffic, Ms. Deforge expressed concerns over the responses provided. With regards to the comments that an Uber driver would be looking for a return fare during the peak hours, she questioned who would be leaving or arriving at the ski resort at those times.

She also expressed concerns over the response by Hales Engineering regarding the AVO for ride-shares. She stated that if the AVO takes into account the driver, the numbers would be skewed because the ride-share driver should not be counted. This would artificially increase the AVO and impact the other assumptions and result in bad modal splits, and worse circulation and traffic congestion. Ms. Deforge discounted the claim that the plan could be adjusted, stating that once the project is built, there would be no flexibility to increase parking, change the transit center, or increase drop-off zones. She added that the presence of the hotel would be an Uber magnet, and that increased traffic is not accounted for in this plan.

Ms. Deforge touched on the City's claim that they have the right to limit ticket sales if this plan does not work. They cannot have such a limitation in this development agreement unless Vail is a party to the agreement. Restrictions on PEG and its successors could be run with the land, but they could not enforce any ticket sale restriction on Vail unless they are a party to the agreement. PEG has conceded this point and asked for that condition to be removed. Everyone agreed that this plan is based on many assumptions that cannot be documented, so they need a more concrete way to implement and enforce the plan.

Ms. Deforge addressed the concerns of City staff and AECOM over the location of the loading dock in Building C. Staff suggested that the only viable alternative would be to put this dock in Building E, but they do not explain whether that has actually been considered as an alternative. Ms. Deforge also mentioned the possible alternative of locating the loading dock on the Shadow Ridge extension on the south end of Building C. If the loading dock is going to stay where it is, they would like to see a condition of approval limiting the hours of delivery so that there are no deliveries during peak hours. With regard to the size of the drop-off in front of the hotel, Ms. Deforge questioned the claim that it could be expanded if it is found to be insufficient. Every space shifted into the parking lot reduces available day-skier parking. She noted that PEG-provided shuttles are not mentioned in the TDM, PMP, or the current Staff Report. There is also no mention of a 24/7 shuttle to the airport, which would be required by the General Plan. The Planning Commission has repeatedly observed that the proposed shuttle drop-off area adjacent to the transit center is inadequate given the existing drop-off area is already at capacity. Reduced parking, more expensive parking, and offsite parking would lead to more shuttles. This needs to be revisited since once it is in place it cannot be expanded.

Ms. Deforge highlighted the staff comment that the Construction Phasing Mitigation Plan needs more detail, including neighborhood mitigation strategies for both general traffic and construction traffic. At a minimum, these additional details must include who is responsible for enforcement, the penalties for non-compliance, and traffic circulation for the first year of construction. She commented that the applicant wants to further delay providing a more detailed TDM and PMP, despite it being required during the MPD process. Ms. Deforge expressed concern over the annual management plan and how it would be implemented as well as methods for enforcement.

With regard to the Mountain Upgrade Plan, Ms. Deforge stated that it is required at the MPD stage, yet PEG has provided nothing for review stating that it is a process unrelated to the application before the Planning Commission. Ms. Deforge stated that this plan does contain improvements over the 1998 Plan, but there are also elements that are not; what needs to be shown is that the current plan functions and works now and will work into the future.

Tana Toly wished to highlight the reliance on public transit. She referenced page 38 where it states that Hales Engineering collected data to identify how people would arrive at a ski resort. Hales noted that 57% of people used a vehicle, 18% utilized shuttles, 15% used Uber, 9% used a black car, and .6% used transit. She questioned how they would convince 99.4% of resort users to now take public transit. She expressed concern with the statements that there are no plans to modify the intersections on State Route 248, and the plan for a light at Richardson Flat. She is baffled that the City is not addressing the choke points in town before they approve this project.

Ms. Toly highlighted the statements that there are no exclusive bus lanes after the high school leading to the resort and no exclusive bus routes from Kimball to the resort. She also noted the statements about the lack of discussions with the County about having a bus exclusive for skiers from the County park and rides. If Richardson Flat is to be used exclusively for PEG employees, she questioned where there would be parking for skiers and small business workers who do not work for Vail. There are thousands of people who come in every day that do not work for Vail Resorts. No consideration has been given to streets south of the resort and this plan completely ignores the entrances to the south of the resort via 8th and 10th Streets.

Jennifer Adler focused her comments on the Thaynes Canyon neighborhood and stated that she has not seen anything in the plans that were an improvement on impacts to that neighborhood. She is not convinced that signage would be effective in preventing people from accessing 400 stalls at the end of Three Kings Drive. As a resident of the area, she would like more reassurance. Ms. Adler stated that for years parking at the base of Park City Mountain has been free. With paid parking, there would be nothing to stop people from parking through Thaynes and walk to the mountain and Silver Star lift. She expressed that it would be unfair to the residents to require them to enforce parking in the neighborhood. There needs to be a better plan around parking enforcement.

Ried Schott is involved with retail and commercial tenants at the resort. He expressed concern about the plan to provide parking for Vail employees only. In the 1998 Agreement, there was an allowance for parking for approximately 100 employees. There needs to be some accommodation for parking at the resort for management personnel and some employees. He has discussed this with PEG, who stated that it is up to Vail as part of their management of the

parking. The fact that there is no designated employee parking at the resort is a problem that should be addressed.

He also raised the issue of small management companies that have a need for short-term parking at the resort to accommodate housekeeping and repair personnel. He expressed that there has not been a concerted effort to address that need, especially in Parcel B. Mr. Schott stated that PEG should be recognized for the work they have done in creating a transportation center that seems to work. On the other side of the transportation center, there is a drop-off area that he would like to be looked at more carefully. He questioned whether there should be a separate drop-off for Lyft and Uber.

He stated that the multi-use trails and pedestrian walkways need to be looked at more closely since it seems to separate the current new development from the existing resort center. He opined that a better connection between these two areas is needed. There is no multi-use trail that comes up to the current resort plaza and no pedestrian walkways in that area. He stated that based on prior discussions, he felt this would be addressed. Whether the NAC might actually facilitate the use of walkways or discourage them needs to be reviewed.

During a break in the public comments, Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the hurdles that the applicant and Vail would have in securing satellite lots in the County's jurisdiction. City Attorney Mark Harrington stated that they are currently working through those issues through consideration of an inter-local agreement as the County memorializes the formality of their new district. The inter-local agreement would presumably address the joint ability to route or use some of those lots. This falls within the Staff's approach of adjusting this plan as necessary. As this matter moves forward, they would address the contingencies of what reliance would be necessary on those third-party contracts, whether it be a school district contract.

Mr. Harrington reminded the Commission that they have had the same condition with the school district for the past 20 years. The final conditions of approval could address that contingency of reliance on an Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Harrington stated further that the inter-local agreement would, at a minimum, frame the process for the requests involving the City, Vail, and/or the applicant. They could then adjust from there. The commonality of maximizing the use of these lots for traffic mitigation is the common goal. He noted that City Staff has a fair amount of confidence that all parties would be on the same page.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked whether there is already a draft agreement for Richardson Flat. Mr. Harrington stated that the City has a standard agreement for park-and-rides but does not believe that has been circulated as of yet. He stated that he could easily finalize the agreement, as he would not expect significant variation from other agreements in place.

With regard to the potential expansion of the Richardson Flat, Mr. Harrington stated that is still variable, as is the Hideout situation on the periphery, which goes to a referendum next week. There are additional possible improvements depending on which way the City's litigation or the Hideout annexation plan goes. UDOT is heavily involved in operating those access roads and potential interchanges if additional development in that area does occur. If it does not, then the City would have ample opportunity to address options for expansion of Richardson Flat. He stated that staff is relying more on the Quinn's Junction lot as well since for other access reasons, it is a more preferred location.

Lisa Paul addressed the parking garage access at Building D. She commented that Powder Point has balconies and a Jacuzzi at that location, and she expressed the need for a pollution study on cars utilizing that access point. She stated that this project is not supposed to impact the neighbors as much as it is. Lot D is the only lot that could push over towards the golf course. She also inquired whether the parking garage access could be shifted to Lowell Avenue. If changes in this access are not possible, she requested a sign that restricts turning movements out of that garage.

Ms. Paul also stated that even with free parking, there are parking issues in the neighborhoods. When the City utilized the police during the Sundance Festival, it was just enough of a deterrent against people parking in the neighborhoods. She suggested that PEG set aside monies for a uniformed presence in the morning to dissuade people from parking in the neighborhoods. She stated it is not fair to dump enforcement on the private property owners when they are not creating the problem at the base.

Ms. Paul stated that it would be prudent to wait until the analysis discussed by Planner Roy is completed, since there are so many different aspects to the transportation plan that requires that everyone work together. She suggested taking the time to let these things occur to make sure that they rely on assumptions that are accurate. She also asked if all of the buses would be electric since this plan brings more congestion to Empire Avenue. She also inquired whether additional buses would be purchased by the City to be used for resort transit. Ms. Paul asked whether the construction of the transit center, dedicated bus lanes and signals, and Building B would take place at the same time.

She agreed that the outside lots need to be finalized because they cannot change them after they are constructed. Ms. Paul expressed that she does not understand why they would construct a development before the traffic methods are already in place. This development has already waited 20 years, and she questions why they cannot wait a couple more years to get this right. Ms. Paul stated that while she appreciates the work that PEG has done, she is disappointed with what she sees on this plan. She mentioned the exceptions for building heights and noted that while she understands the economics involved in this project, someone should analyze the density if building heights were kept at 35 feet. She also referenced the building moratorium in Oakley due to the drought and questioned whether that has been considered as part of this project. Ms. Paul disagreed that this development, as it presently stands, would enhance the neighborhood.

Justin Keys represented the Three Kings Neighborhood Association. He expressed appreciation to PEG for their efforts to mitigate traffic issues but stated that he is concerned with the assumptions that have been made. He noted that the risk associated with the TMD and PMP is that if they do not work out, the area could be in a worse situation than they are now with regard to parking, without the ability to correct it. He commented that many of the risks could be mitigated now before the development is in place. Leaving items for future review and discussion would be risky because if changes need to be made in the future, the buildings cannot be re-built. He understands PEG's position that the City has to make transit improvements apart from this development, however, this argument ignores the fact that it is PEG's responsibility to include the City's transit plan as part of their proposal.

Mr. Keys commented that PEG is not proposing to build 1,000 parking stalls required under the development agreement and the LMC because they think their TMD and PMP will work. He questioned what happens if the plans do not work. If the City cannot purchase the necessary

buses, or the inter-local agreement falls through, what will happen is that people will drive to the resort area and park in private neighborhoods. He was concerned with staff's comments that parking enforcement is the responsibility of the neighborhoods. The adjoining neighborhoods and landowners are the ones who are bearing the risk of this going wrong. He suggested that five years down the line, Vail would not own the problem and undertake to solve it. While he appreciated what PEG was proposing, and while he is on board with the traffic plan that the City is putting together, he did not agree that under the current Code that they can just rely on the assumptions and not mitigate the potential downsides to the surrounding neighborhoods. There needs to be some way to ensure that this does not happen down the road because they cannot add parking after the buildings are constructed.

Jeremy Rubell stated that for "transit first" to be a priority, it must be convenient. For example, if someone wants to take the bus from the Thaynes neighborhood at a peak time, they will have to go to the Three Kings area. He questioned whether the transit plan would really drive people to use the services. People walking in areas with no sidewalks or multi-use paths create a safety issue. Mr. Rubell stated that they need to look at things from a bigger perspective and look at the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods that might not be as obvious as those around the main arteries. He also stated that he is hopeful that they do not plan anything that would preclude expansion of transit options or multi-use paths just to meet the immediate needs.

Deb Rentfrow echoed the concerns raised by the prior speakers. She commented that assumptions are being made without verifiable data. AECOM stated in earlier meetings that for scenario 2b to work, they need to reach an AVO of 3.0 or more. She stated that the applicant is admitting that their target AVO is 2.7 and hopefully at 3.1 on peak days. The applicant, however, does not have any verifiable data to show that could be achieved. Ms. Rentfrow referenced page 62 of the plan that discusses arrival/departure times. The applicant states that 59% of cars arriving at the valet-only hotel parking during a Saturday morning and only 41% leaving. This seems to contradict standard check-in/check-out times for hotels.

She also referenced the data on page 40 that shows a decrease in parking needs on Parcel C between 4:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., which seems to suggest people leaving the hotel during early morning hours. She offered that most people would likely check out and then ski for the rest of the day. The basis for the applicant's AVO calculation would not be an adequate statistical sampling to draw any conclusions or make any decisions on mitigation or implementing changes to the plan. Ms. Rentfrow echoed the concerns expressed by others regarding enforcing changes after the project is constructed.

The shuttle drop-off at the south end and opposite the transit center used to hold 8 vehicles. The plan reduces it to 6 vehicles and is labeled a general-purpose drop-off zone accessible to Building B residents and visitors. AECOM previously recommended a separate drop-off zone for ride-shares. Ms. Rentfrow mentioned that the applicant's comments regarding sidewalk width in the transit center would be based on the assumption that setback requests were granted. If the setback request were not granted, then the sidewalk widths would not necessarily be 20 feet. She expressed concerns with the simulation and highlighted that it shows five people crossing at the signal, which was a concern previously expressed by AECOM.

Ms. Rentfrow referenced Planner Ananth's comment that other pages regarding the Construction Mitigation Plan were not to be included in the packet. This is concerning because the Phase 1 Construction Mitigation Plan shows the transit hub and intersection being

developed, however, it does not show traffic circulation. Phase 2 does include traffic circulation and it clearly shows the buses using Empire Avenue and Shadow Ridge Drive to get to the transit station, rather than using any dedicated bus lanes on Silver King Drive or Lowell Avenue. This continues until the final year of the build-out, which is 2026-2027. It concerns her that they would not have dedicated bus lanes in Phase 1.

There were no further public comments. Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Suesser asked how many of the 1,721 parking spaces proposed by the applicant are above-ground. Mr. Schmidt stated that they have not done an above-grade stall count.

Planner Ananth invited the Commission to identify any issues that they would like addressed at the July meeting.

Chair Phillips stated that the applicant has done quite a bit of work on this plan, and there are many professionals who have worked on this that agree that this plan would work. He acknowledged that there is no guarantee that every element will work, but there is a commitment to work together in the future. He does not view this as just dealing with issues at a later date; rather, he sees a team of professionals who state that they can address these issues at the CUP level. He stated that, in general, he is in agreement with everyone who is advising the Commission at this point. Chair Phillips suggested that the Commission give the applicant and City staff the direction they need to move forward.

Commissioner Thimm raised issues that he would like to discuss at the next meeting. He stated that he believes that architectural heights have been addressed satisfactorily. He does not disagree with the 20% modified modal split but stated that the TDM initiatives need to be conditioned and periodically checked. The conditions need to be carefully written. The bus layout seems to be working. He appreciated the full-scale mockup and the flexibility of the applicant in using that as a laboratory. Commissioner Thimm questioned whether this location for bus chargers is necessary as opposed to some other location.

Commissioner Thimm stated that circulation has evolved to the point where it works in concept, and further development would be expected as further approvals are sought. He expressed concern over what Building C does to public access to the base of the mountain. The connection to the intersection of Shadow Ridge Drive and Lowell Avenue is a key node. He stated that with a better understanding of the proposed connection, it is described as a pedestrian plaza path, and he opined that the path needs to be more robust and provide access at the east edge of the mountain base to Silver King Drive.

Commissioner Thimm commented that the plan for the drop-offs improved with the added locations as presented at this meeting. That said, the drop-off stalls need to be factored into the parking model. He sees this as a new use that has been added and should be addressed. The drop-off stalls and circulation areas should have increased vertical clearance areas in the garage. He stated that a minimum garage height would not work since he expects that it needs to accommodate vehicles with Thule storage containers and ski racks.

He stated that additional discussion might be needed in a public hearing regarding construction mitigation and circulation, as well as a presentation on the phasing of the project and how traffic circulation and parking would be handled on an incremental basis to avoid loss of the uses they presently have.

Commissioner Suesser expressed her agreement with many of Commissioner Thimm's comments, particularly with regards to adding the skier drop-offs to the parking model. It is an additional use that should not take up any of the 1,200 spots. With regard to parking and what is required under the LMC and the 1998 Agreement, she could see eliminating the 600 extra spaces added into the 1998 Agreement, but she does not see any justification for the reduction in parking from the minimum required under the LMC. She would like to see 2,223 stalls rather than the 1,721 stalls proposed by the applicant. Commissioner Suesser stated that a big concern is the under-parking of the hotel. She did not see a justification for that and expressed concern that the parking needs of the hotel would spill over to Building E and impinge on the day-skier parking.

She noted that the applicant must demonstrate how they have conformed to the General Plan objectives, the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval from the 1997 approvals, the 1998 MPD, the critical priorities of the City Council, and the LMC. This must be done as part of this MPD review process.

With regard to the City's General Plan objectives, she stated that the applicant has only partially met objectives 1 and 7. The other objectives are lacking. She also stated that the applicant's plan does not adequately address the critical priorities of the City Council as presented. If the applicant makes changes to the pedestrian access ways, particularly around Building C, keeps the trail widths as represented, and adds more bike access to the mountain and decent access into the garage, they might meet that priority.

Commissioner Suesser stated the applicant still must address 1997 conditional approval items 3, 8, 9, 13, and 14. She agreed that conditional approval items 13 and 14 are needed so that if adequate parking is not provided to handle peak day parking requirements, the City has the right to restrict ticket sales under a parking mitigation plan. She stressed that they need that hammer to ensure that the parking works.

She agreed with the Planning Department that the Construction Phasing Mitigation Plan should be updated with all details listed in the June 15 Staff Report. She also agreed with the recommendation that the applicant and Vail Resorts provide a Traffic and Parking Operations Plan that includes all of the details listed in the June 15 Staff Report. If the project is approved, Commissioner Suesser agreed that the Traffic and Parking Management Plan and the Construction Phasing Plan need to be reviewed and modified as necessary with each phase of development during the CUP process for each parcel.

She stated that the applicant has not addressed the 1988 Mountain Upgrade Plan and the requirement that the resort have adequate parking and mitigation for any expansion of lift capacity. The applicant has also not addressed the fact that they are not including the 450 parking stalls that the resort regularly uses from the high school.

Commissioner Suesser stated that the applicant needs to meet LMC Section 15-6-5(G) regarding site planning because the pedestrians and bicycles are not adequately separated from vehicle circulation. She noted that pedestrians cross in front of two express bus lanes at two places on Lowell Avenue, which is not adequate separation under the Code. She remarked that the applicant still has not met Land Management Code Section 15-6-6 because there are no design plans for mountain bike access to the resort. She agreed with staff's recommendation that the applicant and Vail need to advance the multi-modal transportation

options and consider off-site parking options, including making payments in lieu of contributions at Quinn's Junction and potentially outside the City limits to try and keep traffic outside of Park City. This should potentially be a condition of approval.

It was noted that the applicant has not met Findings of Fact items 6, 9, or 13 from the 1997 approvals.

Commissioner Hall agreed with Commissioner Thimm that they should discuss the height for the parking garages as well as whether they should allow drop-off stalls to be counted as part of the parking stalls. Based on the application as presented at this meeting, she does not see a justification for a reduction in parking stalls. She stated she would approve a reduction if there were a better plan in place to move day skiers and commercial users to the base. She would also like to see the updated Construction Plan with each parcel, so they could evaluate how it could be improved as each phase occurs.

Commissioner Hall also questioned the 450 stalls from the high school, especially since historically they only needed that overflow for the holidays and weekends. She would also like to know the split between above-grade and below-grade parking. She inquired as to whether it would be feasible to change the lane configurations depending on the time of day. Commissioner Hall also desired to see more details regarding amenities for the bus stop. She would also be in favor of trying to fit in eight buses rather than six. More details regarding deliveries, trash, and general services are needed for the loading docks.

She asked if there would be a buffer between the sidewalks and the roads and between the multi-use trail and the roads and would prefer to have a barrier between the road and the pedestrian walkways and the multi-use trails. She would also like to see the walkways be wider than five feet. Commissioner Hall raised the prospect of bike valets in the parking garages or some sort of covered bike stall parking. She would like to understand the enforceability of Vail being party to the parking plan since they are not part of this application. She understands that they cannot enforce something with a third party. With regard to off-site parking and shuttles, she would like to see more information on that aspect, and it would be helpful to have someone from the County provide input. If they are relying heavily on the offsite parking spaces, this needs to be a bigger focus of this application.

Commissioner Van Dine expressed her agreement with many of the comments raised by other Commissioners. She added that she has concerns with the shuttle drop-off areas, especially with the increase in the number of shuttles that will likely occur. She also raised concerns over snow storage in those areas. Overall, she agreed that the traffic circulation plan is better but stressed the importance of signage and wayfinding. She appreciated the public comments around finding ways to keep people out of the neighborhoods. The exit at the Parcel D garage needs to be looked at given people trying to make left turns. Forcing a right turn just puts more traffic onto Empire Avenue, which is not ideal for traffic circulation.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with the comments of the other Commissioners that the County needs to be part of these discussions. The County holds many keys to the mitigation that they are looking for in terms of the City's "transit first" goals. He has not heard anything about a satellite parking lot in Park City. He also stated he has not heard enough about the mobility plan. He queried whether staging areas at the resort are needed for shuttles and ride-share vehicles, or whether staging areas should be put elsewhere in the City. How shuttles translate into the AVO needs to be explained. He stressed that he is not looking for 100%

certainty on the mitigation efforts, but they have to do better as a team. He was disappointed in the plan and did not see it as a team effort. He commended PEG who has listened and made a lot of compromises and advances, but he expressed that there is a lot more that could be done to do this right. He wanted more certainty as to how this plan would work and who is willing to step up to get the transportation and parking plan as good as it can be.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that incentives for employees are necessary and have not been addressed. They knew density in the resort center would be increasing 20 years ago and they have had these transit goals for five to 10 years. He is not confident that the “transit first” plan would now come together simply because there is an application before them. He wanted to see more and he wants to see it work. They want the community thrilled about this project and rushing it through with the concerns expressed by each Commissioner is not the answer.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that he wants more information from the County, more information on micro-transit, and more information on employee incentives. He wants to know what is being done with the choke points that have been identified in reports for 10 years. If the guiding principles regarding green space that govern the City remain, he questioned what happens if they fail with this project. He stressed that he needs certainty that they have done everything they can to get this project right. Transportation and parking should be the first issue addressed, not the last.

Commissioner Kenworthy stressed that he was not pleased with where they are with transportation and parking.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the other Commissioners addressed his concerns.

Mr. Schmidt stated that PEG has been working on this project for over three years and have made many changes to the transportation plan and the architecture all in an attempt to get to a point where they can move forward with the project. He disagreed with Commissioner Suesser regarding meeting the objectives of the General Plan. They have met the goal of increasing opportunities for public transit. They have proposed a complete re-build of the transportation network around the resort center, added sidewalks, pathways, pedestrian crossings, and signals to improve safety. He also stressed that they have implemented alternative parking locations with public transportation connections. He encouraged the Commissioners to read the TDM and PMP, which contain significant details regarding how they are accomplishing these goals.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they have developed traffic demand management strategies to decrease vehicle traffic and improved multi-modal connections between the resort center Main Street, Deer Valley, and the Bonanza Park areas. He stated that the proposed improvements to the roadway system decrease resort impacts on surrounding residential neighborhoods. The improvements in and of themselves are a mitigation to the surrounding neighborhoods. The PMP details the strategies that would be taken in conjunction with the City to mitigate parking impacts in the surrounding neighborhoods. They have discouraged resort through traffic on Three Kings Drive by adding islands.

Mr. Schmidt also described how the plan meets the provisions of the LMC with regard to pedestrian and bicycle circulation. Staff is in agreement with the Geometrics Plan and Circulation Plan. Using generally accepted engineering principles, there are separations from the pathways and protected pedestrian crossings. They have addressed snow storage on their

landscape plans. Trash and recycling containers have been addressed on each parcel. They have more than adequately met the condition of drop-off zones.

Mr. Schmidt continued by stating that the requirements for access and loading docks have been met. He stated that they have made every effort to address the concerns of the Commission and he does not know where this process ends. He expressed that they have gone beyond the MPD process and into the CUP process in terms of the standards and what they are being asked to provide.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they need to know if they have an approvable Master Plan because if they do not, they should just take a vote and move on. He commented that based on the discussions tonight, he is not sure where they stand. He reiterated that they have met the standards of the MPD requirement. They are proposing a world-class improvement to a world-class resort. It is problematic that he is getting resistance based on 'what ifs.' PEG is excited about this project and they know it is a complicated one. They want to get this project right and they are confident in the plans presented.

Chair Phillips reiterated his prior statements that there is agreement amongst the professionals regarding this plan. The City set goals regarding modal hierarchy and modal shift to reduce traffic. By building more stalls, you are building more traffic. He feels strongly that the reduced parking is in the best interest of the City and would fit within its goals. He expressed his belief that the satellite lots would kick start this process and would go hand in hand with this project.

Chair Phillips stated he would rely on the professionals and their conclusions but stated that there are details that need to be refined. The applicant has demonstrated the willingness to work with the City to address these concerns. He pointed out that this is the tenth meeting and everyone needs to know this process will move forward towards an endpoint. He noted that much of the discussion is going beyond the MPD and getting into the CUP process.

He expressed his agreement with many of the other Commissioner's comments, but he is trying to move this along. He asked Planner Ananth if there is anything else that they need to prepare for the next meeting. Planner Ananth clarified that for the July meeting, they would focus on some of the details, including involving the County, addressing the parking garages, and construction phasing and mitigation. She anticipated working on Conditions for Approval with a target in August. Chair Phillips noted that they are looking at amending the Development Agreement that currently exists. In the end, they are looking at whether this is an improvement on what was done previously.

Planner Ananth stated they would address the specific questions and concerns raised during this meeting. It was noted that they would focus on drop-offs, construction mitigation circulation and phasing, inner City mobility, and information from the County as to their vision for access through their corridors. They would target these more at the MPD level, rather than the CUP level.

5. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 p.m.