

**PARK CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT WORK SESSION MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 16, 2013**

Present: Mayor Pro Tem Alex Butwinski; Council members Andy Beerman; Cindy Matsumoto; Dick Peek; and Liza Simpson

Planning Commission members Stewart Gross; Jack Thomas; Brooke Hontz and Adam Strachan

Diane Foster, City Manager; Phyllis Robinson, Public Affairs Manager; Thomas Eddington, Planning Manager; Nate Rockwood, Capital Budget Manager; and Mark Harrington, City Attorney

Stephen Gerran, Technical Consultant

Absent: Mayor Dana Williams; Planning Commission members Mick Savage; Nann Worel; and Charlie Wintzer

Bonanza Park Plan. Thomas Eddington explained that staff has been working with Stephen Gerran on a model for Bonanza Park and a demonstration on the technology will be given. Phyllis Robinson added that the City has been working with Mr. Gerran from an emergency management perspective and the question was raised of how to model decision-making processes in real-time fashion that would allow more engagement and interaction in the creation process. Tonight's substation options will be presented to the City Council. Mr. Gerran explained that his expertise is not in creating renderings but to take that sort of information and bring it into a synthesized three dimensional form. This tool allows the public to interact and he would like feedback on issues of interest when he returns in June. He displayed a Bonanza Park model. In June, he will have a larger table capable of illustrating Substation Options 1 and 2, allowing people to see things like vantage points or what the power lines look like.

He will be working with the artist hired by the City to provide more visual information. Mr. Geffen spoke about representing elevations through Google Earth allowing anyone to set the altitude, the pitch or the heading of the camera to adjust views. The model is capable of showing a variety of information contained in GIS levels. He again emphasized that the table will be larger and the information more accurate for the meetings in June. Jack Thomas interjected that people perceive scale about four to six feet above grade. Thomas Eddington added that the buildings can be represented as they exist today and four and five story buildings can be added to gain a perspective of visual impacts. Discussion ensued on capturing sunlight and shadows. Liza Simpson suggested that the pedestrian view may be more meaningful than the view from a car. Jack Thomas pointed out how that lens type can alter perspective with regard to scale,

e.g. telephoto or wide lens and Mr. Geffen stated that he will look at other options other than Google Earth Plug-in. Ms. Robinson encouraged the group to think about vantage points important to them so they can be loaded in the model. Thomas Eddington confirmed that staff will work with Mr. Geffen to identify vantage points and looking at them from both a pedestrian and a vehicular experience. Ms. Simpson recommended modeling the view corridors so that height can be assessed, for example if a building is framing a view or blocking it. Mr. Eddington commented that others have expressed an interest in this as well. Ms. Robinson commented on the benefit of having the Google Earth overlay resulting in a much richer experience. She discussed having this tool at the public open house scheduled for June 11 and it will be available at the public hearing slated for June 20. This model is a work in progress but staff wanted to showcase it today to the group.

General Plan. Thomas Eddington stated that the General Plan schedule was discussed at the last joint meeting where Bonanza Park planning and the form-based code were identified as high priorities in consideration of the timing of the Community Development Area and Rocky Mountain Power's deadlines. Even though it was the general consensus to have the General Plan done prior to doing the other documents, given the time lines, it seemed more appropriate to deal with the General Plan after August and possibly through March. He asked the group if everyone is comfortable with that schedule. Another alternative would be adopting the document in its current draft form with the commitment that staff return in August to begin to refine it. He believes the new General Plan better reflects the four core values, City Council goals, and the Planning Commission's input over the past couple of years. This way, the group will have a holistic up-to-date document adopted, and decisions would not be based off of the existing 1997 General Plan. Diane Foster commented that members would need to commit to a schedule and the document would be readopted with edits.

Dick Peek believed the General Plan is very important because the LMC and other plans are guided by it. Cindy Matsumoto stated that if the guiding principles remain the same, it shouldn't be a problem. Alex Butwinski emphasized that the current LMC will be used.

Andy Beerman referred to concerns expressed at the last joint work session about not completing the General Plan. He has read most of the draft and feels it is far better to apply, although maybe imperfect, than working off a 17 year old General Plan that doesn't include current planning principles and/or strategies. Dick Peek questioned that in consideration of Mr. Beerman's comments about the schedule being onerous. He felt that August to March is a long time to get to an adopted General Plan. Thomas Eddington explained that part of that is going through the Planning Commission process and receiving public input and that schedule is based on reviewing the plan in sections. In a perfect world, the Planning Commission would have two hours to dedicate to the General Plan every meeting, but the number of applications has increased and meetings are pretty well booked through the summer. Dick Peek asked if it is prudent to adopt the draft General Plan without public input. Mr. Eddington believed there would

still have to be public input. Andy Beerman pointed out that public input has been received for four years, and the draft is the summation of those comments. He urged members to keep in mind that this is a living document and will be evolving constantly.

Jack Thomas stated that philosophically he prefers to plan from the big picture to the small picture or from the foundation up. To a great extent, the General Plan is the foundation of what holds the structure of the community together. He encouraged addressing the General Plan by breaking it into the visioning criteria for basic values of the community and simplifying it in some way but conducting a public process and making sure that the foundation for making decisions is sound. Perhaps there is a way to simultaneously review it with Bonanza Park because he does not support delaying it.

Brooke Hontz stated that she concurs with Mr. Thomas in terms of delaying the document. She has reservations about adopting the draft because words are powerful and matter and the draft could have significant impacts, in her mind, as it is written. She felt a significant portion of the General Plan should be removed and applied as a supplemental resource and not as part of the actual General Plan. She is somewhere in between and would like to see it moved faster.

Adam Strachan indicated that he tends to agree with Andy Beerman but he feels the principles are there. He didn't believe that a proposal can violate a general plan because they are designed to be broad. For instance, when reviewing Park City Heights, some Commissioners felt it complied while others didn't. The General Plan cannot be used to tell the Bonanza Park developer what he can or can't do; it's not the nature of the document. Mr. Strachan believed the form-based code is a far more pressing matter than the General Plan. He agreed with Mr. Beerman that 95% of the principles are there. The form-based code, on the other hand, is specific and will provide applicants more clarity and certainty.

Stew Gross expressed his confusion about the timing of reviewing the form-based code and Thomas Eddington explained that the plan is to consider the form-based code simultaneously with the Bonanza Park Plan. It won't be done prior to the Bonanza Park Plan which is planned for completion August 8. Adoption of the form-based code will fall behind that date. He added that the principles in the draft are similar to the 1997 General Plan, but have more detail and added principles. The strategy section and some other areas are pretty specific, reflecting the ideologies of both the Planning Commission and the City Council. He encouraged members to read the draft.

Alex Butwinski asked how specific the General Plan needs to be to meet CDA requirements and Thomas Eddington felt that it is there. Mr. Butwinski asked about flexibility to amend the document after the CDA is approved. Mr. Eddington explained that the General Plan can be modified if the amendments are not substantive. If they are, the Bonanza Park Plan would have to return to the Planning Commission and the City Council for readoption. The CDA is based on the Bonanza Park Plan as well as site specific plans, and the CDA primarily addresses square footage and tax generation.

Mr. Butwinski stated that it would be helpful to know for certain how detailed the plan needs to be for establishing the CDA. Nate Rockwood advised that the CDA is based on the Bonanza Park Plan and the form-based code. The CDA is adopted with the assumption that the development approved as part of the CDA will generate the revenue that will pay off the costs of the mitigation of the substation. For example, if the form-based code allows four story buildings and this is included in the CDA, and it is later decided to impose a lower height limit, financially the CDA no longer works because it needs the density from the fourth levels for economic return. The CDA includes the development plan and if the change is significant, it nullifies the CDA which should occur before spending money mitigating the substation.

Mr. Butwinski asked for a formula on density and Mr. Rockwood responded that the consultant does this type of calculation which is included in the data. As far as what needs to be included in the CDA, it would be ideal to have the Bonanza Park Plan in place and included in the CDA which is the reason for the push to get the plan adopted as quickly as possible. Mr. Butwinski expressed concerns about moving quickly on the CDA because of the specificity required in order to create the mechanism to pay back project money. He asked what would happen if four stories was denied by the Commission or Council. Mr. Rockwood encouraged that both bodies get through as much of the process as possible, and are comfortable with the density and the direction of the plan before the CDA is established. Dick Peek interjected that the form-based code is driven by the massing rather than uses but the pressure is coming from one industrial use.

Andy Beerman clarified that he was not proposing that the schedule change but to consider a parallel or expedited process for the General Plan so that we're not waiting until March. The other reality is that three City Council seats are up for election and three seats on the Planning Commission are up for appointment. Hopefully, many or all of us will be back but this group has been working hard on the General Plan for a long time and there is the potential of losing a lot of knowledge and investment.

Liza Simpson disagreed with Mr. Peek's comment about the form-based code being driven by one industrial use because the form-based code has been discussed for two and a half or three years as a concept for Bonanza Park. This occurred before conversations with RMP and the substation driving the time line.

Mr. Eddington felt that the form-based code will not have that much impact on the substation because it is somewhat independent. The question is the density issue to satisfy the CDA in terms of tax increment. Currently, the General Commercial Zone allows 35 feet heights in the area or three stories and a more conservative approach would be to base the CDA on three story buildings. It is safe as it is the current zoning but if there are opportunities for additional height, then that would be a bonus and the CDA might generate at a higher and faster rate and repayment made quicker. He encouraged using three stories which is probably the base for the form-based code.

Cindy Matsumoto understood that Mr. Rockwood is basing the CDA on four stories. Nate Rockwood agreed and clarified that the CDA is based on the Bonanza Park Plan and the form-based code which allows four stories. Mr. Eddington clarified that the form-based code has an enhanced option to get to the fourth story.

Ms. Foster encouraged discussion on a strategy to adopt the General Plan. Thomas Eddington believed that the draft General Plan could be adopted within 45 days with the commitment that it would return in August to make refinements. Dick Peek referred to this meeting's agenda which has been modified by two or three people to include a discussion on the General Plan. He is comfortable with an accelerated General Plan adoption but he questioned not having the General Plan designated as a topic of discussion on today's agenda and Ms. Foster responded that the General Plan schedule was in the packet.

Mr. Gross stated that he would like to see the General Plan addressed before everything else because of the substation and PCMR projects. Adam Strachan felt that more time should be spent on the General Plan to produce finished sections and if it is 95% complete, it is feasible to expect that the other 5% can be done before the Bonanza Park Plan. He doesn't want to rush into an approval after four years of work and explain to the community that an incomplete and less than perfect document was adopted to expedite it. Thomas Eddington emphasized that it won't be done in four months; either expedite it now or follow the schedule in terms of public meetings, applications, and workload. He clarified that there is probably not a middle ground in this instance.

Liza Simpson stated that she doesn't want to be in a position where the Planning Commission is uncomfortable making a recommendation to the City Council. Her priority is completing the Bonanza Park Plan and prefers to have the General Plan done well. It is 95% complete but she has only read a third of it and can't comment on the other two-thirds. She is comfortable with the schedule laid out in the staff report but is not comfortable with Council dictating to the Planning Commission that a recommendation be forwarded on a document. It is possible that the Commission may recommend denial and then Council is in a position of overturning a decision of the people who have performed most of the work on it. She supports the schedule in the staff report.

Brook Hontz stated that she is in agreement with Adam Strachan and Liza Simpson although she respectfully thinks there is an alternative schedule to the one presented where the Commission focuses on the *meat of the document*, which is the goals, the strategies, and the neighborhoods. Perhaps the trends section could be delayed to expedite this because the section isn't necessary going to guide decision-making and makes the General Plan harder to use. The trends could be included as an appendix to the document.

Jack Thomas agreed with Ms. Hontz comments and recommended looking at another time table, acknowledging that he doesn't have the answer. Mr. Eddington commented that he wished there was a middle ground but he doesn't think there is in this case.

Cindy Matsumoto expressed her support of the Planning Commission and understood that members would like to work through the General Plan. She agreed with Ms. Hontz about addressing the *meat of the document* first so it can be adopted earlier and can be applied to projects. If staff can't think of another way to approach this, she suggested adhering to the plan in the staff report. Mr. Eddington explained that the General Plan has four components; trends, how we got to where we are, principles and goals, and strategies. The General Plan also defines neighborhoods. Although the principles and the goals are the most important, it would not be prudent to adopt the document without the strategies. He encouraged adopting the complete General Plan. Getting the goals done is going to be as important as having identified them and he encouraged a holistic review. The trends can be put in an appendix, but the goals and how you get there are needed and are lacking right now.

Andy Beerman did not think it prudent to adopt it as is or place an unrealistic time frame of adopting it within 45 days. He would love to see the General Plan on an expedited schedule that might include some special meetings and adoption before March. The special meetings should be limited to focus on the heart of the plan and he is very much in favor of reviewing it in two volumes or a volume and an appendix section, similar to the budget. The budget document has grown to 800 pages but there is a 150 page executive summary. The plan summary could include the goals, some of the strategies and the neighborhood plans. The trends and some of the less relevant strategies and case studies could go into an appendix section.

Alex Butwinski acknowledged that members are divided and there is another option on the table that the Planning Department develop another schedule. Thomas Eddington expressed that another option is challenging to provide given the existing Planning Commission meeting schedule which includes the Bonanza Park Plan and form-based code over the next three months. Meetings would be added for the General Plan as well as for applications. Diane Foster pointed out that when a schedule for Bonanza Park is finalized, staff can return at the beginning of August and hold another joint meeting to kick off the General Plan. At that time, sections can be prioritized and based on work load. She pointed out the 17 day turn-around period needed for staff reports to the Planning Commission and the potential number of applications in the pipeline. Remaining productive can be a real constraint that needs to be acknowledged when there are many long meetings and all members agree that they want the product to be good.

Alex Butwinski understood that nine weeks from today, a joint meeting will be held to approve a schedule. Ms. Foster clarified that the number of applications expected in the future is the same level the Planning Department is dealing with now and she felt that waiting will provide a clearer view. A meeting could be scheduled on June 13

which is a no meeting date for the City Council. Adam Strachan believed the Planning Commission can review the goals and strategies within nine weeks. Ms. Foster did not think so if the Bonanza Park Plan is prioritized. Mr. Strachan disagreed.

Mark Harrington suggested that if there is a hybrid approach where the legal staff can facilitate to take some of the pressure off of the Planning Department, there probably is some middle ground. The idea of an executive summary under 50 pages that could run concurrently with the schedule but meet the intent that Jack Thomas, Andy Beerman, and Brooke Hontz are articulating, could be effective. A task force could be formed with one representative from the Planning Commission and one from the City Council to work through the General Plan. He pointed out that members have had the document since the end of March, but few have read it and he mentioned this because the posture gained from the Buki meetings has been *to facilitate and to be proactive*. A perfect planning document will never put members in that posture; it will maintain the integrity of the best plan, but there has to be a balance. If members are not willing to commit to the balance, you will remain reactive to external pressures. We are all accountable for the failure of completing the documents in a manner that puts us in a position to proactively address RMP. Now we are reactive and have hard deadlines controlled by a third party which was the fear we tried to avoid. He asked if we are going to proceed on the CDA schedule in an aggressive posture that can at least influence the outcome or lose the opportunity. The Legal Department is willing to dedicate additional resources to help the Planning Department, if necessary, and spearhead a more hybrid approach. Thomas Eddington stated that he just wants a realistic schedule because the General Plan is a big document. He suggested starting Planning Commission meetings at 1 or 2 p.m. to get through this and process applications, including MPDs. Alex Butwinski stated that this is a good middle ground because it accomplishes a lot that the group wants. He didn't see a problem with trying it and he asked if there are any objections.

Jack Thomas expressed that he has no objections and suggested that Planning Commission members take different sections to review to help facilitate the process. Diane Foster understood that Bonanza Park and the General Plan would be addressed concurrently and pointed out that at the last meeting most of the group clearly expressed that it is confusing to review two documents together and that you wanted to accomplish Bonanza Park first. Liza Simpson agreed that it was agreed that the documents would be reviewed sequentially which was supported by most of the Commission. Brooke Hontz explained that her concern was bouncing between two documents and never getting to the finish line. Thomas Eddington stated that he could try to put a schedule together but it is contrary to direction from last week. Liza Simpson stated that she is deeply concerned about pushing back the schedule on Bonanza Park. Alex Butwinski felt that Mr. Harrington's suggestion solves that problem and suggested putting a task force together to create a framework for review of the General Plan. Liza Simpson nominated Mr. Butwinski who accepted.

Diane Foster believed that members are unhappy because unrealistic schedules were set in the first place. The General Plan will not be done by the end of August and the

end of December or November may be more realistic if it is expedited, but she doesn't want members to leave with unrealistic expectations. Adam Strachan discussed appointing a Planning Commissioner, legal staff, a planner, and a City Council member to the task force and breaking the Planning Commission into thirds to review sections of the General Plan; members would rotate participating in task force meetings. He felt that this can be accomplished through emails.

Continuation of Bonanza Park Plan. After a short break, Thomas Eddington revisited the Bonanza Park Plan, specifically public-private partnerships. He pointed out that there are incentivized options for height in the draft General Plan. The General Commercial Zone limits height to 35 feet and the draft plan proposes incentivized enhanced options to get up to five stories, 50 to 60 feet, including road dedications, affordable housing, transfer of development rights and net zero buildings. He asked members if they want to consider additional heights and displayed photos of buildings in redeveloped areas in Salt Lake as successful examples of density and variations of height. He specifically pointed out the look of four story buildings in a mixed height environment.

Thomas Eddington stated that the current LMC provides that 15% of the development be dedicated to affordable housing which has to be built within the building envelope. In the spirit of the public-private partnership and in consideration of the recession at the time a few years ago, the City spoke about giving height and density and allowing the affordable housing to be located outside of the building envelope. There was a proposal to be able to build 75% of the fourth floor out and 25% of the fifth floor out. He explained that the *gives and gets* are still going to be opportunities for height and density but with the economy improving, he asked if members want to look at opportunities for more traditional incentives. This could be the City paying for some of the road infrastructure, similar to paying for open space.

Cindy Matsumoto asked if the 75% and 25% proposals are just for providing affordable housing and Mr. Eddington clarified that was the maximum for everything. Ms. Matsumoto hoped the SIM table can accurately represent heights and she supports variety in heights. Jack Thomas noted that there is no incentive for building three story buildings and is not comfortable with five stories because it is contrary to a small town feel and the scale of Park City. He felt four stories should be the maximum and buildings around open space may only be one story for sunlight.

Diane Foster stated that one of the reasons for the joint meeting is to receive policy input from Council because it would helpful for the Planning Commission to know whether or not to pursue height in Bonanza Park. Liza Simpson stated that she personally would like to keep height in the tool kit. There could be buildings where five stories can work and decisions like one story on the south side of a park is better left in the tool box.

Dick Peek pointed out that there are other things in the plan to gain additional height and at first blush, these items would fall under accounting (LEED standards, net carbon footprint, etc.) and not the built environment. Liza Simpson noted that there is a funding mechanism for purchasing right-of-way, building streets, and purchasing open space with the resort cities sales tax revenue which are core responsibilities of municipalities. However, she is not comfortable removing them from incentives because her goal is to have the best built environment possible and would like to keep height as a *give* but agreed with Dick Peek about narrowing what those incentives might be. Dick Peek spoke about the elements of the public experience.

Jack Thomas felt that this is the district that should have density and additional height but the magic number is unknown and the 75% and 25% formulas do not clearly work for him. It eliminates the potential for the other mix that contributes to community character. Mr. Gross agreed that this is an area for density and every available option should be considered. Adam Strachan stated that he prefers to reserve judgment on height; he needs to see how it looks. Brooke Hontz stated that she struggles with ever seeing a five story building in Park City but agrees this is the place for density. Even getting her to four stories would require a discussion on TDRs and making that work for today's developments so that a value is established for density rather than giving away four or five stories.

Dick Peek spoke about the photos of redeveloped areas in Salt Lake pointing out the built environments and in-fill development and asked how we can create a code that will give us that look without defined uses behind articulated facades. Thomas Eddington felt that part of that is dealt with by applying the form-based code. An appealing feature of Main Street is the variety in height of buildings. The zoning allows three stories or 35 feet and the MPD process allows some movement of density but if members want to have one and two story buildings, as well as three story buildings, you might not want to incentivize any additional development but may want to commit dollars to infrastructure. He added that if the developer provides affordable housing or TDRs, he is going to want the fourth story or there is also the option of giving money. Cindy Matsumoto understood that the City is incentivizing for affordable housing, rights-of-way, green building and TDRs but she didn't understand Mr. Peek's comment.

Dick Peek clarified his prior comment to mean that if the allowed vested density would be the volume of these four tables on a lot, the form-based code would allow this table to go up to there and these tables reconfigured, the accounting incentives would be taking the two food tables and bringing them over so if everyone came to the table with the same accounting incentives, everyone would have this newer larger volume in the area.

Ms. Matsumoto believed that instead of giving development rights for roads that maybe the City can come up with dollars. Affordable housing is certainly a top priority but the developer should be building green no matter what and maybe that shouldn't be an incentive. She felt this is the way of the future and suggested that green building be

removed as an incentive. She needs to think more about the TDRs. She commented on the 75% and 25% formulas and Ms. Simpson clarified that it is not 25% of the project in its entirety; the fourth story is 75% of the building footprint instead of 100%. Ms. Matsumoto feared that the majority of the buildings will be at that height and Thomas Eddington expressed that that is not the intent but it could happen. Ms. Matsumoto insisted that a safeguard needs to be added to ensure that it doesn't happen. She is not afraid of a five story building but would like to keep height in the tool box and four stories should not be a given. The City may have to come up with some money to remove some of the incentives. Diane Foster interjected that \$8 million is estimated for road infrastructure. Mr. Eddington noted that most of the roads are in but some of them will be redone and Phase 1 is estimated at \$2.25 million and it wouldn't be built out within a one year period but probably over a five to eight year time frame. At that point, the cost projection is about \$300,000 to \$400,000 for road infrastructure. Liza Simpson pointed out that the \$8 million is for the entire project. Ms. Foster explained that her comments are in the context of the FIAR. The City does not have a surplus of funds right now and Bonanza Park is not one of Council's priorities from a financial perspective.

Andy Beerman encouraged the group to talk about height rather than *stories* because there are different interpretations of stories. The goal of the district is density and he is not afraid of some height in the area and agrees that variety is key. The only way to facilitate five stories, in his mind, is utilizing TDRs either from other districts or using this area as a sending zone. Ms. Simpson suggested that maybe there is a multiplier, for example, getting a fifth story may cost the developer five affordable housing units instead of two and she acknowledged the concerns about variety in height. Keep all of the incentives but look at a way that will make the extra height cost more because it is a bigger *get* for the developer.

Alex Butwinski warned that members may be getting into too much detail and asked them for input on the question of maximum height and achieving variation. Thomas Eddington discussed a hypothetical application with all three story buildings but in applying the form-based code, two stories could be moved to create five or four story buildings.

Jack Thomas agreed with Mr. Strachan's comments about needing to see the visual impacts on a model. Dick Peek referred to Tony Camputo's city block as an example of successfully applying a form-based code by including tall buildings. Mr. Eddington agreed. Diane Foster interjected that the first meeting of the Planning Commission on Bonanza Park is June 12 and it could be a joint meeting with the City Council. She asked if this is a better option than providing a number tonight. Liza Simpson explained that she is not prepared to commit to a maximum height and would rather leave the Planning Commission with adequate tools to be able make these types of decisions. Mr. Butwinski asked if a joint meeting should be scheduled or a special meeting organized.

Andy Beerman believes that the bigger issue is variety than maximum height and the next meeting should address this. Jack Thomas clarified that this is the whole purpose of a form-based code. Mr. Eddington encouraged thinking about a maximum threshold for the form-based code. Dick Peek understood that when the form-based code is adopted, the Planning Commission is removed from the process and approval becomes administrative within the code. Mr. Eddington clarified that it does for smaller buildings and Dick Peek urged members to weigh in now. Mark Harrington believed that this is a topic that should be further discussed. Diane Foster advised that the next joint meeting will be at 3 p.m. on June 12.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
MAY 16, 2013**

I ROLL CALL

Mayor Pro Tem Alex Butwinski called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, May 16, 2013. Mayor Dana Williams was absent and excused. Members in attendance were Andy Beerman, Alex Butwinski, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Staff present were Diane Foster, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; and Dave Gustafson, Project Manager.

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

Council and Manager's Report questions/comments – Cindy Matsumoto invited the public to the Peace House fund-raiser luncheon to be held on May 23rd at St. Mary's. The Commonwealth Financial Group is donating a *Day of Love* to the Peace House. She attended a meeting of the Summit Lands Conservancy and a group from the schools. Liza Simpson participated in the Mountainlands Community Housing Trust meeting; it will be celebrating its 20th Anniversary in June which is Homeownership Month. Dick Peek stated that the Hope Alliance breakfast was a great success. The bike swap was also great and a good fund-raiser for the Young Riders.

Andy Beerman indicated that he attended the Wasatch Summit Mountain Transportation meeting which will meet on a monthly basis. An inter-local agreement for the steering committee is being prepared including the state of Utah, UTA, Salt Lake City, Sandy, Cottonwood Heights, Alta, Park City, and Summit, Salt Lake and Wasatch Counties. Between all entities, \$3.6 million in funding is committed for economic and environmental studies.

Alex Butwinski reported on a social dinner with Representative Kraig Powell which was very productive in terms of maintaining a good relationship with the state legislature. Liza Simpson stated that she appreciates the *Backhoe Report* because the public has many questions on construction in town. Alex Butwinski noted that Mayor Williams is in China speaking at an environmental conference.

III PUBLIC INPUT (*Any matter of City business not scheduled on the agenda*)

Presentation of Historic Preservation Award – Washington School – Thomas Eddington stated that the Washington School, located at 543 Park Avenue, is the City's recipient of the second annual Historic Preservation Award. This program was created by the Historic Preservation Board to recognize significant historic preservation projects throughout the community. The first award last year went to the High West Distillery.

The Board considered a number of buildings and ultimately selected the Washington School which was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1978 and has been considered a significant building for quite some time. It is designated as a local Landmark in Park City and was built in the late 19th Century as one of three schools at a cost of about \$13,000 and is one of the few structures, given its masonry construction, that survived the Great Fire of 1898. He displayed the painting of the Washington School which will hang in City Hall. Jessica Davis, General Manager, noted that the exterior was intact but many of the interior elements were missing but have been replaced. Puggy Holmgren, HPB member, interjected that both the project and the artist were well chosen.

IV MINUTES OF MEETING OF MAY 2, 2013

Liza Simpson, "I move we approve the meeting minutes of May 2nd". Andy Beerman seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

V NEW BUSINESS

Consideration of authorizing the City Manager to enter into a construction contract in a form approved by the City Attorney's Office with Newstar Construction in the amount of \$194,322 – Dave Gustafson explained that the contract is to refurbish the historic wall at the bottom of Marsac Hill, next to the liquor store. The historic wall was discovered during the construction of the liquor store and KPCW studio. Because of the chance that the wall might collapse, it was quickly buried again and the placement of the generator behind KPCW was relocated. Staff is requesting to uncover the wall, preserve it and create a pocket park to showcase the wall. In response to a question from Dick Peek, Mr. Gustafson advised that the contractor has historic photographs of the wall. No geotechnical work was done because of the concern of the stability of the wall at the time, but a study has been conducted since then. He emphasized that the preservation plan complies with the Historic District Guidelines. Ms. Simpson asked why the veneer wall was chosen. Mr. Gustafson explained that more stability is created by pouring another concrete wall and he reported that the tree directly behind the wall will have to be removed. He detailed the process including taking photographs of and numbering the stones and discussion ensued about saving any unused stones for repairs. The Mayor Pro Tem invited public input; there was none.

Liza Simpson, "I move that we authorize the City Manager to enter into a construction contract in a form approved by the City Attorney's Office with Newstar Construction in the amount of \$194,322". Dick Peek seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

VII ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the regular meeting of the City Council was adjourned.

MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 2 p.m. Members in attendance were Andy Beerman, Alex Butwinski, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Mayor Dana Williams was absent and excused. Staff present was Diane Foster, City Manager; Clint McAfee, Water Manager; Tom Daley, Deputy City Attorney, Roger McClain, Project Manager; Heinrich Deters, Trails and Open Space Manager; and Mark Harrington, City Attorney. Andy Beerman, "I move to close the meeting to discuss property and litigation". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting opened at approximately 4:30 p.m. Liza Simpson, "I move to open the meeting". Andy Beerman seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

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

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

**PARK CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 16, 2013**

Present: Mayor Pro Tem Dana Williams; Council members Andy Beerman; Alex Butwinski; Cindy Matsumoto; and Dick Peek

Diane Foster, City Manager; Phyllis Robinson, Public Affairs Manager; Nate Rockwood, Capital Budget Manager; Matt Cassel, City Engineer; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Jay Randall, Sergeant at Arms; Thomas Eddington, Planning Manager

Stephen Gerren, consultant; Steve Rush, Kevin Freestone, and Debbie Mountier, Rocky Mountain Power; Mark Fisher, Bonanza Park developer

Absent: Mayor Dana Williams

Rocky Mountain Power expansion/relocation. Phyllis Robinson explained that the expansion of the substation is critical to the City's power grid which is nearly at full capacity. Rocky Mountain Power has indicated to the City that the power station needs to be upgraded by fall 2015 in order to meet local power needs and the required one year lead time for engineering and ordering equipment. Over the past several months, this issue has been before the City Council in work sessions to review a range of alternatives including extending the substation in place. This would mean increasing the existing substation's height by 60 feet or spreading it out horizontally onto the land including Recycle Utah's space. She stated that the other option is relocating the substation across the street to 1555 Iron Horse Drive, property currently owned by Fisher West LLC.

She discussed critical path issues which are a number of items that still have to be resolved in order to make a decision. In March, four critical issues were identified including the Community Development Area analysis which is the funding source that will be available to the City if the substation is relocated. A preliminary analysis has been prepared. The second critical path issue is access for Iron Horse Drive and the apartments on lower Iron Horse. The third is cost-sharing based on the CDA analysis between the City, the developer and the area. Ms. Robinson explained that the substation has been discussed in work sessions and the decision point occurs at a public hearing which is scheduled for June 20. Prior to that meeting, a set of open houses will be occurring on June 11.

She discussed working with Stephen Gerren to develop a more integrated approach to visual analysis which incorporates Google Earth and renderings to provide a more holistic view of options and view sheds. This will be helpful in assessing the impacts of

the 100 foot power poles, for instance. At the open houses held on June 11, the interactive model will be available for the public to use.

Nate Rockwood explained that community development areas are like redevelopment areas by utilizing increment financing for the area that is proposed to be developed. The current property values are used and the property tax and sales tax revenue generated from the area is segregated from the new development that occurs as the result of the Bonanza Park Plan and relocating the substation. The increment that the new value has raised is used as the incentive tool in the area and the incentive is actually relocating the substation in order to facilitate the redevelopment of the area. He stated that that a portion of the costs is shared between the City and the developer and the gap is paid for by the CDA increment. The cost is estimated at \$7 to \$8 million which needs to be funded over time. Mr. Rockwood discussed hiring an expert who has been working independently of staff on arriving at values, the time frame, and generation of funding. The preliminary numbers are back which are being analyzed by staff who will also be looking at different scenarios. One of the key features of a CDA, like a RDA, is that it is not just the City's increment that is captured but all of the taxing entities. The preliminary numbers look good and show that there will be sufficient increment using property tax and a portion of sales tax revenue which would cover the cost of mitigation of the relocation of the substation. The CDA process is public which will be noticed and provides a protest period.

Matt Cassel explained that the other piece is the Iron Horse Drive access. A 25 foot section of road is owned by the condominium in the location of the proposed relocation site. It is critical for the City to have that portion of the road moved while maintaining access to the apartments. Staff has been meeting with representatives for two to three months and making progress. Staff continues to meet and discuss with residents their needs, issues and concerns including that electric magnetic forces are addressed appropriately. He felt that within two to three weeks, the City will have an answer from them as to whether an offer will be accepted resulting in moving the current access.

Stephen Gerren, technology consultant, explained that he has been working with the team for about six weeks. Many of the resources the City has with regard to GIS layers, sketch up models, imagery, etc. will be used on an interactive model. He displayed a preliminary version which illustrated a three-dimensional image of the area. Simulations can be achieved so that site plans can be visually understood in a shared environment. He discussed evolving to a point where people have these tools in their homes with the ability to interact with specific scenarios. This table will be available at the open house. He spoke about changing layers or perspectives on the model and the benefit of collective decision-making while giving a demonstration. Alex Butwinski interjected that there is a lot of interest in the visual impacts of the substation and the entry corridor and this is a great tool to discuss these concerns in a more fact-based and interactive way. Ms. Simpson agreed and felt that several years from now as it is refined, it will be incredibly helpful. The poles at the current substation site were displayed. Ms. Robinson commented that the new poles will be higher which prompted the desire to

underground them which is the lion's share of the cost of project. The relocated substation, including the 30 foot façade, was shown. Thomas Eddington explained that the perspective of the rendering is from a car or pedestrian angle. Andy Beerman pointed out a specific pole that he believed the Council agreed to underground. Cindy Matsumoto expressed interest in looking at the wall with the model when there is more data. Dick Peek understood that most people would not be looking down into the substation but suggested that other perspectives should be made available. Thomas Eddington stated that the façade will have variation in height and articulation and will be compatible with the design of the Bonanza Park Area. It is not intended to completely cover the substation but to hide as much of it as possible. Thirty feet may be higher than the wall needs to be, but it will be designed to visually mitigate the substation from the pedestrian scale.

The Mayor Pro Tem invited public input and asked that comments be kept to five minutes as it appears that there are many people who want to speak.

Irwin Craigman, property owner, stated that there are going to be a couple hundred people looking down on these power grids every day. Dick Peek clarified his comments to mean that the renderings need to reflect what people will experience. Mr. Craigman indicated that the CDA is a funding method in which money is provided from the developer in order to help the development. There will be an increase in property and sales taxes which hopefully will create jobs. The reason most people are opposed is because this is a private deal between the developer and RMP. CDA funds in the millions of dollars will not provide one single dollar in property tax, sales tax, and will not offer employment to anyone. He stated that the substation area is 82,000 square feet and presently the power station occupies 36,000 square feet. That property could be developed producing sales and property tax and they strongly object to the use of taxpayer money for a private deal which is nothing more than a land swap which will not give the City a return. Mr. Craigman referred to the traffic analysis which does not address Kearns Blvd. The development is going to put 60% into residences, 20% into offices which is going to put hundreds more people onto Bonanza Drive and Kearns Blvd. at prime hours. He asked what will happen to the Recycle Center and its services. The developer is paying millions of dollars in order to move an impediment to another location and Mr. Craigman asked how much he is paying the City to move the Recycle Center and asked where it will be moved. None of these things have been set up. The CDA talks about definite development plans and he has not seen a specific plan. If there are two viable options, he felt that the people that are going to be financially affected by this have a right to see exactly what the development is going to be with and without the substation. He believed there are more than two options because the power plant can be placed anywhere on the property avoiding building a 30 foot wall which looks like a federal penitentiary. There are only two entry corridors to Park City, Park Avenue and Bonanza Drive and the City is very strict about them. This is going to be two plus blocks away from downtown and if there was an alternative on Park Avenue we wouldn't be here. Mr. Craigman stated that the developer bought his property with the substation on it and fully knowing it. There are 600 people at Iron Horse who are

the working class people that the entire City depends on for services. They bought their properties without a power plant and now all of a sudden the developer doesn't want it anymore, *let's dump it on the working class people and the City says yes, let's figure out how to do that.* He stated that is not going to happen because they are strongly resolved and have a plan to start taking out newspaper ads to talk about what is happening at Homestake with the developer. There is no plan and they're not going to work on a plan until August but then the Council will have made a decision without a plan which is irresponsible. We're going to make sure that people know about this and the only way to stop what is going on here is to get the people riled up about how their tax money is being spent to benefit the developer and we're going to get nothing back. We're going to take 82,000 square feet out of the tax base for what is now 36,000 square feet which is a bad deal. The developer can hide it on his own property because he owns the problem and is looking at everybody else to help him get out of it. Mr. Craigman reiterated that this is a land swap and there is no development involved in the money spent to move this power plant. If you're going to give away 82,000 square feet for something that only needs 40,000 square feet, it is a waste of public money. He stated that the City is providing tax incentives and moving the power station is going to be detrimental to the condominiums. He stated that an appraiser was planning on buying or renting a unit at Fireside until she found out about the possibility of the power station moving there. He doesn't know if Mr. Peek has changed his mind, but he is the only one so far who said that the entry corridor trumps most all. It only takes one good reason not to move the power plant. With regard to the wall, there are people who will put lipstick on a pig and try to convince you that it is not a pig.

The Mayor Pro Tem asked that Mr. Craigman wrap up his comments because the Council would like to hear from others. Irwin Craigman objected to the time limit and stated he will continue to talk and Mr. Butwinski clarified that he is chairing the meeting. Mr. Craigman stated that he will need to be dragged out and Sergeant at Arms Jay Randall strongly encouraged Mr. Craigman to sit down. Mr. Craigman stated that they will be conducting a campaign in the newspapers and will be putting fliers everywhere. All the people here running for re-election better get their resumes ready. (applause)

Chris O'Neal, resident of Iron Horse Condos, mentioned the various jobs he has had in the service industry. He reminded members to look out for their best interests and in this case, their way of life needs to be protected as well as the Bonanza Drive corridor. Tourists driving by a big power plant on the way to a ski resort doesn't sound like a good idea to him. He asked Council to protect their property values and believes that a power plant in your front yard is not the best thing for your property. The Rail Trail should also be protected. He asked why the power station can't be left where it is and why it is in the City's best interest to move it. The rendering looks good but why can't it look good across the street. (applause)

Chris Dorsey, resident of Iron Horse, explained that he lived in Old Town for 13 years but when he was looking for a place to purchase, he was priced out of Old Town. He lived in Colorado before Park City and one of the worst things Aspen did was the way it

kicked all of its employees out of town to Avon. One of the things he loves about Park City is that he can live here. He stated that he would not have bought his condo had he known a substation would be moved there. This is where he lives and he is not looking to make a profit off of it. Mr. Dorsey asked why move something if it is not broken. Keep it in the same place with a low profile. (applause)

Liza Simpson interjected that it is important that the Council hear from everyone which is why the Mayor Pro Tem limited the length of public input.

Patricia Kempton, owner of a couple of Iron Horse condominiums, stated that she bought them about eight years ago as an investment and she likes the idea of providing affordable housing to people who live and work in the service industry. She never would have bought property adjacent to a power station. As a mom, she teaches her children to take ownership of problems; deal with them and not force them on other people. She feels that the developer is taking a problem and moving it somewhere else and making it 400 other people's problem. Ms. Kempton stated that she has a hard time accepting this because ethically it is wrong because it is greed-based. The project will probably become more desirable with the substation off of his property but that means that other people's property is less desirable. She doesn't want her tenants to leave and it makes her sick to think that this could happen and is very disappointed. (applause)

Alex Butwinski stated that this is not a done deal and there are a lot of things that need to fall in place to actually happen. He again encouraged everyone to speak. Liza Simpson understood why people want to clap to support neighbors but in this setting, it is entirely inappropriate. She pointed out that there are people in the audience who may not agree and if the room bursts into applause, it makes it more difficult for them to speak. We're not that kind of community. We want to hear all of the voices and opinions so we can make the best decision possible. Ms. Simpson asked the audience to be respectful so that other people aren't intimidated from speaking. Dick Peek reminded citizens of the Council's email address, [Council Mail@parkcity.org](mailto:CouncilMail@parkcity.org) especially for people who feel intimidated to publicly speak.

Sam Smith, 12 year resident, stated that he works at Deer Valley and bought an Iron Horse Condominium without a substation there. He felt this is someone else's problem. Mr. Smith stated that he doesn't see the need in moving it or why Park City has to have a big substation. It is going to be a problem until it moves out to an industrial park. He recognized that this is very expensive but it is the only solution. Aspen, for instance, doesn't have a big substation in town. The solution is moving it out of town in an industrial park next to the substation out there now. He would like to see Bonanza Drive improved but not something that takes away from our beautiful town.

The Mayor Pro Tem explained that there are certain engineering limitations with regard to power transmission and there is a necessity for a power station in the general vicinity of Bonanza Park. One of the options would be to expand that one in a larger footprint.

Moving it out to Quinns is not an option. Ms. Matsumoto clarified that RMP said it is too far away. Sam Smith continued to state that he disagrees and cited that the New York City area is not surrounded by substations.

Brandon Malmay stated that he just bought an Iron Horse unit after living in Park City for eight years. He is disappointed with the option of moving the substation into their neighborhood. Originally there were six alternatives which were in commercial areas and somehow it is now proposed in a residential area. He would not have purchased his place if a substation were located at the bottom of it. The Bonanza Park development is a good idea but not at the expense of his neighborhood. A lot of creativity has gone into the area which should be done in the development which has a lot of resources and money. There are a lot of people who will be negatively impacted by it and is not a good idea for Park City. It seems unfair and smacks of social injustice because there are a lot of people who are going to stand up for themselves. The developer bought the property with the substation on it and the burden of responsibility should be on him to figure out how to integrate this so it works for everyone. He emphasized that he will keep on fighting because this is not the direction the project should go.

Steve McIlvaine, resident at Iron Horse, explained that their decision to purchase an Iron Horse unit would have been dramatically affected if they realized that a substation would be put in directly adjacent to their driveway. They will be looking down directly into this thing and he hates to see this next to the Rail Trail. It's the only state park in town and a lot of people use it and the substation would impact that. He likes the Bonanza Park development idea and read the on-line file but he does not see a need for the development to come at the expense of property values. He is under the impression that if there are high voltage transmission lines within 200 feet of a residential development, properties will no longer qualify for FHA and HUD loans which can definitely affect the salability of any units.

Melinda Bellamy stated that she has been in Park City since the Olympics and decided to buy two condominiums at Iron Horse because she could afford it and the area has open space and trails out the back. This is her life investment which could be jeopardized.

Pat McDowell, 40 year resident, stated that he purchased his unit in 1986 and just like everyone else, he wants to know why he is going to lose money on his investment. Owners have lived here and worked hard and he asked if they going to be compensated. How much are property values going to decrease and this is the bottom line. That is what could happen and he asked for a guarantee that he doesn't lose money. He loves bike trails and the views but it really comes down to property values. If this investor has this much money and power, then let's make a deal so owners can be compensated. The developer bought this land knowing that the substation is there and he wants to put it on their land and they are not getting anything for it. Make it so that everyone wins.

John Phillips, owner of a Fireside unit, stated that he moved there just before the Olympics, lived there for five years and then moved to Old Town and may have a different perspective. He is also a Board member of the HOA. There were comments made about the entry corridor and he pointed out that no one knows when they are driving past the water treatment plant, for instance. He would assume that if the power station is moved there that it will be done in the same manner and fashion and that mitigation is achieved according to Park City standards. Mr. Phillips indicated that he is working-class and even if the substation is moved, he still believes it is a good investment for him long-term because people want to live near work. People in the area can walk to their jobs which is important. He now lives in Old Town where he can walk to Main Street and he understood there used to be a power substation near the bottom of Main Street. What he loves most about Old Town is the ability to walk to Main Street. Mr. Phillips acknowledged that he is undecided about the relocation because he doesn't know all of the facts. He plans to keep his condominium for a long time and maybe at some point his daughter will live there and be able to walk to her job which is the value of the property. For the long-term this is not a bad thing. As a board member, he stressed the importance of mitigation so it looks good and becomes part of the neighborhood. Mr. Phillips emphasized that Irwin Craigman speaks as though he represents all of us, but he doesn't and the goal should be mitigation.

Laurie Alexander, Fireside/Ironhorse resident on and off since 1993, stated that she manages the properties and lives there as well. She doesn't support the move at this point. The current substation hums and she thinks that if it is going to be moved and is going to be bigger below them, that residents will be able to hear the hum. She agreed with Mr. Craigman about building something else there that is tax-based and expand the substation at its current location so that it is not impactful to people living in the area. If there are any environmental concerns, hopefully there will be studies regarding health effects. She feels fortunate to be living there and doesn't think the move is a good idea.

Jamie Atlas agreed that the substation should be kept in the same location and enhanced. She acknowledged that this is a *not in my backyard* situation but if the substation remains in its current location, not as many people will be impacted. She feels that the focus is on moving the substation, and hoped that on June 11 residents will get to see how keeping it at the current site will look as well. Not moving the substation would have less impact on the community.

Alex Butwinski referred to Dick Peek's suggestion of emailing the Council at Council_Mail@parkcity.org. Andy Beerman addressed Mr. Irwin encouraging him to send the same emails to all Council members and not just him.

Matt Kelly, Park Meadows resident, stated that he heard about this early on and it is a big decision because wherever the substation is located, it will be there for about 100 years. He commented on the number of renderings and photos that have been shown that illustrate what Bonanza Park could be if the power station moves. It could be a

very vibrant community with mixed uses. A park is planned where the power station is now. He is sensitive to the owners but also feels that there is value to having a huge park, new retail, office space, coffee houses, etc. across the street from Iron Horse. The park could be a community feature which is lacking right now. He supports moving the substation and building something beautiful in the area that people can bike and walk to. He does not support development of open space but this property is already developed but is dated. There is an opportunity to set the stage for the community for 100 years. It is a big decision but the big picture is that everyone will win when the new product is available for everyone to enjoy. He also felt it will help tourism.

Bill Coleman, long-term resident and real estate broker, acknowledged that this is a tough decision but at the same time he can't help but think there is a way to do this. He spoke about reclaiming the Iron Horse/Fireside property years ago because it was the landfill and fixing it was a mitigation solution. He encouraged redirecting the focus on how much it will cost to figure how much more we can spend to mitigate it. This is not the time to be cheap and is the time to be careful which may cost more money if the substation is moved. Not moving it hurts the possibilities for many more people who could have homes in Bonanza Park which is the big plus. He pointed out that the residential portion of Bonanza Park is small compared to the entire area. Mr. Coleman hoped the conversation of spending more money to mitigate the site is occurring.

Mark Fisher, developer, expressed his appreciation of people attending the meeting. He stated that this effort has been going on for about three years and it's heating up because it is decision time. The plan has evolved to this point because there has been a lot of smart folks looking at this for a long time. He asked that the public objectively evaluate looking over the substation and not seeing it or looking at it. If the substation expands in place, he believes property values will decline because the view will be of a new big substation rather than looking at a park. This option will not provide nearly the economic development including more jobs, civic center, hiking and walking trails to connect Fireside to other areas. The whole intention has been to create a positive influence on the future of the community and it was never intended to hurt anyone. It saddens him deeply when he hears people negatively speak of him. Mr. Fisher stated that he believes in his heart he is trying to do something good for the community. When the substation is properly mitigated and landscaped, residents in Fireside and Iron Horse will not even know it's there. He urged the audience to objectively evaluate over the next month whether you want to look at the substation and no Bonanza Park, or whether you would rather look over a substation properly mitigated into a beautiful new world-class mountain village which will have a positive impact on property values. Mr. Fisher stated that he is happy to meet with anyone on site that takes the time to call him. He hopes people will understand that he has the greater good in mind.

Christy Harrington stated that she saved for ten years and looked for property about two years before buying an Iron Horse unit. She chose it because of the open space and trails. For the meeting on June 11, she would like to see more pictures of the existing substation expansion and hasn't heard much about the health implications. She has

read on the internet how power stations could be dangerous and Ms. Alexander mentioned the humming sounds. Ms. Harrington spoke about hearing about an explosion of the old substation on Park Avenue which concerns her. She is saddened that the power station will be near the Rail Trail and questioned why Mr. Fisher couldn't place it on other property. She commented on a rumor that he is buying the Homestake Condominiums to tear it down and build a hotel there. Ms. Harrington asked members if they have decided and asked how many signatures she would need to stop this.

Alex Butwinski indicated that members have not formally made a decision. Ms. Harrington understood that this has been in the works for three years but she only heard about it in January and was working when meetings were held on this matter.

Brandon Malmy asked if it is possible to look at other options than these two. There are sites that scored much higher for the relocation than his neighborhood. They are all in commercial areas and it seems like there are good ones out there. He believes RMP didn't really do great due diligence in checking out some of those sites and pointed out the property behind the Park City Market which merits further study. He understood that you can't develop open space except for public utilities and the City already owns the property. It could be blocked by commercial buildings and is out of the way. Alex Butwinski clarified that the City scored the sites not RMP.

Josh Anderson, renter at Iron Horse, feared that Park City like other resort towns, will kick out employees which is sad to see which happens in favor of money. There aren't very many affordable housing options in town.

Melissa Bellamy suggested building commercial on the relocation site so there is property and sales tax revenue. There will be no income from the power station. She thought the site was for more affordable housing.

Mr. Butwinski indicated that the development proposal has a big component of affordable housing. Ms. Bellamy asked about the other site alternatives. Matt Cassel explained that they were not large enough.

Chris Dorsey spoke about being impacted over the past three years with the roads being torn up. It is now very difficult to make a left hand turn on Bonanza during peak traffic during the winter. He asked how long this project is going to go on and how much more time is he going to spend in traffic. The cars on Kearns Blvd. line up past the high school on some days.

Cindy Matsumoto asked if Aspen has a power plant.

Steve Rush, RMP, answered of course it does. He clarified that substations are different than power stations which generate power. Trails have been mentioned by the residents and he works very closely with pathway organizations throughout his service areas.

Debbie Mountier, RMP, explained that FHA has strict qualifications and is not sure whether the condominiums would qualify currently. RMP receives questions from appraisers about transmission lines and a letter is sent from RMP verifying that the lines are engineered not to fall which seems to resolve any issues.

Kevin Freestone, RMP, stated that New York City has a large substation in Manhattan and every city has substations because power needs to be available for the demand. The decision that has to be made in every city is how they are constructed. Associated agencies have different tariffs and regulations and Utah has a set of rules that RMP works under. Every city has a substation and sometimes you don't see them because they are placed in buildings. Las Vegas puts a lot of them in buildings on the Strip but outside the Strip, the substations are outside in clear view which is a local decision. Ms. Matsumoto asked why substations can't be located further away from town. Mr. Freestone relayed that a power system operates a lot like a water system because the bulk utility needs to be in the use area and a distribution network installed. The bulk power is brought in on the transmission and if they try to reach too far with the distribution system, service is diminished at the end of the line. RMP creates a target area where the operation needs to stay within and seven sites were scored based on RMP's needs which resulted in the two sites being discussed. RMP has distribution facilities at Kimball Junction but cannot relocate Park City's substation that far away. Distance is also determined based on the density of the need in the area. For example, in city centers where the load density is higher, the substation can only be located a mile and a half or two mile radius.

Alex Butwinski asked about the explosion of the Park City substation years ago. Mr. Freestone stated that he doesn't know about that but has been working on substations at RMP since 1993 and cannot think of an incident where the substation burned down or caused damage or injury. There are special safety considerations because of unique equipment handling and RMP responds before the fire department.

Andy Beerman asked how many substations are in the area. Mr. Freestone stated at the Summit the substation is located next to the County building. Another substation exists continuing onto Kimball Junction, left of the Olympic Park. The Silver Creek area has a main substation. There is a substation in Park City and the next one would be on the Midway side which sits next to the Midway Cemetery. Heber City has one and another sits at the foot of the Jordanelle Dam. Kamas has one on its entry road and so does Oakley.

Steve Rush explained that in some areas the concentration of substations is very tight and Mr. Freestone described locations of several substations in Salt Lake. Andy Beerman asked if they buzz.

Mr. Freestone explained that in the past a standard was used by the industry and noise is measured in decibels. A lot of progress has been made with regard to emanation and

the Park City substation operates at the old standard level and newer ones will have a minimal decibel level. Liza Simpson asked for an explanation of electronic magnetic fields.

Kevin Freestone stated that RMP recognized that EMFs were going to be a hot topic in the 1990s and 2000s when developing sites. RMP had an expert on line who actually became the Chairman of the US Board and through his involvement, he set a number of standards for RMP. However, studies on EMFs are pretty inconclusive. Electric and magnetic fields are created by current flow and the higher the current, the stronger the fields. In water terms, current is the amount of water flowing and voltage is pressure. As voltages are increased in the transmission system, the actual EMF level drops which is a misnomer. Proximity to the line is another issue and if the line is buried in the ground four feet and you walk over it, you are exposed to a higher level of EMF than if you are standing under a transmission line with the same exact current.

Steve Rush reported that he and Matt Cassel spent an afternoon with Steve Preston going around Park City checking levels and as Mr. Freestone mentioned, as voltage goes up for the same amount of work, the EMFs go down. One to three milligauss is the nice low background level as you check things. There are no restrictions regarding EMF but there are guidelines and to put those numbers into perspective, they are in the order of five to eight hundred milligauss. A couple of states, including California, have set some guidelines which are high numbers. Walking the perimeter of the substations three milligauss is a typical number and they measured many other features. They were at the apartments and some of the highest ratings, because of proximity, were 50 milligauss right next to a transformer and stepping back three feet away registered in the five milligauss area. They measured levels at the transmission, inside the substation itself, immediately adjacent to the substation and around apartments and Iron Horse.

Mr. Rush explained that if it is something 40 feet in the air versus 40 inches underground you are closer to it when it is underground. Burying it from a visual standpoint is appealing but if minimizing EMF is a goal, the higher in the air, the better. He pointed out that the EMF from microwaves, hairdryers, etc. are higher than anything described here.

A person from the audience asked if there is anything wrong with where the substation sits now. Steve Rush explained that the role of RMP is to provide power for the citizens of Park City and meet those needs by October 2015. In response to another question from the audience, Mr. Freestone stated that the largest substation is at Silver Creek Junction. Park City is probably second and the one in Snyderville is 60 megawatts which is proposed at the new site. The current Park City substation is about 45 megawatts and what is being proposed is a standard design for comparable densities.

Steve Rush added that RMP generally builds substations next to their transmission lines and they have more problems with people building adjacent to their transmission lines and encroaching which he admitted sounds counter-intuitive.

Christy Harrington commented on the other sites and understood that they aren't large enough. Kevin Freestone explained that one site by the cemetery would have required 40 foot retaining walls back into the hillside to expand the footprint. Andy Beerman asked if the substation next to Bear Hollow was installed before or after the development. Mr. Freestone indicated that the substation was there many years before the area was built out and then was upgraded about four or five years ago.

Alex Butwinski announced that there will be more noticed meeting on the substation and the interactive model will continue to be refined. He again acknowledged the importance of public input. Phyllis Robinson encouraged the public to subscribe to *enotify* on the City's website where all upcoming meetings will be posted. Alex Butwinski again suggested that people use the group email to direct comments to the City Council. Liza Simpson thanked the public for attending and providing public input and acknowledged the civility demonstrated by the audience.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

