



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
PROSPECTOR LODGE & CONVENTION CENTER  
2175 SIDEWINDER DRIVE  
DECEMBER 19, 2022**

**COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Chair Laura Suesser, John Kenworthy, Vice Chair Sarah Hall, Bill Johnson, Christin Van Dine, John Frontero, Henry Sigg

**EX OFFICIO:** Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; City Engineer, John Robertson; Housing Manager, Jason Glidden; Transportation Director, Matthew Neely; Transportation Planning Manager, Julia Collins; Jaron Ehlers, City Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

---

**1. ROLL CALL**

Vice Chair Sarah Hall called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and reported that all Commissioners were present either in person or on Zoom. She noted that Chair Laura Suesser was attending the meeting via Zoom.

Vice Chair Hall set forth the schedule for the meeting and noted that it would begin with a Staff presentation followed by a presentation by the applicant. Following the presentations, there would be 5 to 10 minutes for direct questions from the Commissioners, and then one hour would be allotted for public comment. A short discussion by the Commissioners would take place thereafter. She stated that the next meeting on this application would occur on January 18, 2023.

She reported that over 100 pages of public comment had been received to date and many people shared similar concerns. She requested that speakers express their shared concerns with those of prior speakers to allow the opportunity to hear the different opinions of as many members of the public as possible.

Vice Chair Hall encouraged members of the public to e-mail comments ahead of future meetings to [planning@parkcity.org](mailto:planning@parkcity.org). She stated that emailed comments are read before the meeting. She asked the public to remain respectful during the meeting and to adhere to the specified time limits.

## 2. REGULAR AGENDA

### A. **Deer Valley Snow Park Base Area Redevelopment - Substantive Amendment to the MPD; Conditional Use Permit for Phase 1; Petition to Vacate Right-of-Way - The Planning Commission Will Hold a Work Session With a Focus On the Applicant's Transportation, Circulation, Parking, and Right-Of-Way Transfer Plans. PL-21-04767 & PL-21-04811.**

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth introduced City Engineer, John Robertson, and the City's Independent Traffic Engineer, Wahl Consulting Group. She reported that a number of City Staff were in attendance via Zoom. She identified Housing Manager, Jason Glidden; City Transportation Director, Matthew Neely; Transportation Planning Manager, Julia Collins; and Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken. Planner Ananth reiterated the schedule for the meeting and reminded those present that there would be further upcoming meetings on this application. She indicated that public comment could be emailed directly to her or to the website identified by Vice Chair Hall.

Tonight's meeting was to serve as a Work Session on the applicant's Transportation, Circulation, and Parking plans, as well as the applicant's request to vacate portions of City Right-of-Way ("ROW"). After public input, the Planning Commission would discuss the applicant's request for parking exceptions as well as the City Council's request to forward a recommendation on the applicant's Circulation plans and request to vacate public ROW.

Planner Ananth reported that Deer Valley Corporation submitted two applications. The first was to amend the existing Master Planned Development ("MPD") with a new amendment to allow for the project. The second application was for a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") for Phase 1 only. She explained that Phase 1 included the overall conceptual Site and Circulation Plan, as well as the request to vacate ROW. Phase 1 also included the parking structure on the south parcel south of Doe Pass Road, the applicant's request for a 20% reduction in the required number of parking stalls, the new Transit Center, and road and utility improvements. Phases 2 and 3 would include the future vertical development, which would include the hotel, residential, and commercial development. Those phases would require future CUP applications to the Planning Commission and would come back for public discussion.

Planner Ananth reported that the Planning Commission has purview over the MPD as well as the CUP and the applicant's request for parking exceptions. The City Council has purview over the ROW vacation, but it expected a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Vacation of the ROW required two findings including (1) good cause for the vacation, and (2) no material injury to either the public or any person caused by the vacation. Since the applications were submitted in Spring 2021, the Planning Commission had already held six Work Sessions on the project and taken public input at each Work Session. The last meeting on the applications was held in March 2022 and was a joint meeting between the Planning Commission and City Council. It was at that meeting that the City Council directed the applicant to consider alternatives to the proposed ROW vacation and to work with the Planning Commission on a Circulation Plan prior to returning to the Council on the request to vacate ROW.

In terms of the existing MPD for the site, Planner Ananth stated that there was no approved Site Plan for this parcel. Density and Building Heights were considered approved under the existing MPD. She added that the applicant proposed to meet the majority of the MPD's requirements

including Setbacks, Open Space, Density, and Building Height. However, the applicant was seeking exceptions to the parking requirements and for the vacation of the ROW.

Planner Ananth reported that the City's transportation goals for the site were primarily focused on increasing the safety for all modes of transportation, improving emergency response and egress to U.S. 40, and reducing vehicle miles traveled by prioritizing alternative modes of transportation. She referred to the Staff Report for a further description of these goals. To date, the applicant submitted three different Circulation Plans, which are referred to as Alternatives A, B, and C. Alternative A was reviewed during the Joint Meeting in March 2022 and involved a bus-only lane. Staff referred to this alternative as the Transit Priority Plan.

Alternative B was submitted by the applicant over the past summer in response to community feedback for safe and separated bike lanes. This plan was referred to as the Bike Priority Plan. Planner Ananth reported that following the submission of the Bike Priority Plan, the City and the applicant worked on Alternative C, which Staff believes addressed the community's desire for bike lanes and the City's transportation and safety goals. They refer to Alternative C as the Shared Mobility Lane. This alternative was submitted in December 2022.

The Shared Mobility Lane ("SML") would add an 11-foot wide vehicle travel lane to the circulation pattern from the Y-intersection around the Deer Valley. She noted that the SML was contemplated as a bike lane for most of the year but could be re-purposed for public transit and buses during peak traffic times, which would include the ski season and special events. Planner Ananth indicated that Alternative C was the City's preferred option moving forward.

With respect to the applicant's request for a parking reduction, Planner Ananth explained that Deer Valley currently has 1,340 day-skier parking stalls in the surface lots. The applicant would be required to have 2,262 parking stalls for both day-skier parking and the new development. The applicant proposed to eliminate the overflow parking that happens around the Loop on those 10% of ski days as allowed in the MPD and during special events. This would increase the day-skier parking requirement to 1,500 stalls plus the new development stalls. She advised that the applicant was seeking to provide 1,810 total parking stalls for the new development and day-skier parking, which is a 20% reduction among all the various uses.

In terms of the vacation of the ROW, the City identified the following possible good cause for the Planning Commission's consideration. First, the Transportation and Circulation Plan prioritized bike lanes for the majority of the year with the addition of the SML. Secondly, the SML prioritized transit during peak congestion times when it is needed the most. Finally, it would allow for improved access for emergency vehicles.

On behalf of the applicant, Todd Bennett, President of Deer Valley Resort, indicated that he grew up in Lake Placid, New York, and relocated his family from Southern California to Park City this past summer. His wife was a ski racer and they were excited to raise their family in Park City. He was thrilled to be a part of the Deer Valley community, and the Park City community, and to have the opportunity to lead the team. He has a professional background in hospitality and spent nearly two decades integrating experiences that balanced communities, creative commercial, and operating disciplines.

Mr. Bennett felt that Snow Park was an important evolution in Deer Valley's reputation of service and hospitality, food and beverage, and providing a great ski experience. He added that this project provides an opportunity to thoughtfully create a new village that staff, the community,

and their guests could be proud of. He commented that the Snow Park plan hit on a couple of important pieces for the future. First, it would respect Deer Valley's history and the people that built it. The plan was part of Edgar and Polly's original vision for the resort, and the goal was to thoughtfully evolve the experience. He commented that the proposed Snow Park Base Area was reflective of a world-class experience and an arrival and departure experience that they are trying to create for their guests. It would also support many of the goals of the community. Mr. Bennett stated that they want to reduce single-occupancy vehicle traffic, which is good for Deer Valley and the community at large. They also want to spread out the peak load demand associated with skier arrivals and departures. The project will support the City's overall transportation grid with a state-of-the-art Mobility Hub, create a safer and optimized circulation pattern, and add many opportunities for year-round retail, dining, and entertainment for guests and the community.

Wade Budge was also present on behalf of the applicant Deer Valley Resort and stated that they were taking notes and considering the comments not only from the Commissioners but the public. He recalled the joint meeting in March 2022 where they received input about the redevelopment of the Snow Park area. Over the past eight months, they have been busy locating all prior plans for how the Snow Park parking lots could be developed. He noted that some of the plans date back to the 1980s. They took the prior plans and married them with what this community has expressed through the General Plan and communications from elected officials, staff, and experts. He stated that they understood through these communications that the community values of having this resort operate in a way that has created the recreational asset that they all enjoy. Deer Valley is a top-class, world-renowned resort because it is operated so well.

Mr. Budge added that they have also taken into account one of the concepts in the General Plan that calls for prioritization of transit as part of any redevelopment effort. He identified this as a key element as they thought about how to ensure that the redevelopment of Snow Park would accommodate that goal as communicated in the General Plan. The applicant evaluated various options, some of which involved maintaining current routes and the current arrangement whereby those who arrive by transit are dropped off have to walk across travel lanes to the ski hill. They also looked at other opportunities to create the type of multi-modal facility called out in the General Plan. Mr. Budge stated that they also discussed how they could keep the arrival experience the same or better than what it is currently. They wanted to avoid creating impacts that would take away from the fantastic resort that they all know. They determined that to do Snow Park correctly, they need to create a village in the area. He explained that a village would be a unified structure whereby those arriving by car were able to enter the village seamlessly without having to travel through a drop-off area.

Mr. Budge added that they have created a new drop-off area that would be closer to the current location of the Carpenter Lift. They also created additional connectivity by bringing the Carpenter Lift down into the village and by upgrading the Silver Lake Express and turning it into a gondola to provide yet another transportation link that could operate during ski operational hours and which would allow travel between villages. Mr. Budge stated that in addition, they incorporated an arrival experience that would be unrivaled in this community for those coming into the Transit Center. The Transit Center will be located in the parking structure and allow those arriving by transit to arrive by bus in a covered location and walk into a lounge area. Guests could then use an elevator or escalator to the village and the extended lift and gondola options mentioned previously. He felt the village concept would allow them to create a world-

class experience for both locals and out-of-town guests and allow them to experience the village in an unrivaled way.

Another important element was the opportunity for those guests coming off the mountain to have a place to mingle and utilize restaurants and retail, which would benefit the community by lessening impacts down the line in terms of traffic in the afternoon and evening hours. Beyond the traffic value, Mr. Budge offered that there was value in creating a place where those who have been skiing are allowed to continue their experience on the mountain or in the village. He commented that it has been a marvelous opportunity to interact with the community and particularly referenced the previous week where they were able to meet with approximately 500 members of the public through three open houses. During these open houses, they were able to explain what they have seen and incorporate the input received into the plan.

Mr. Budge introduced Jake Romney, from Alterra Director of Development, on behalf of the applicant, who reviewed some of the specifics of how they would address the circulation concerns and illustrated how the extensive modeling, re-design of facilities, and expansion of opportunities for drop-off would ensure that the experience would be even better than it is currently. Mr. Romney recalled that from the March 2022 meeting, the applicant was directed to come up with more options and public outreach. He presented the different iterations of the Traffic Circulation plans presented since April 2021 and how they arrived at the preferred Circulation Plan. They were able to set up several meetings with surrounding Homeowners' Associations ("HOAs") and individuals and garner letters of support. They also reached out to the broader community and undertook some polling. He highlighted the value of the recent open houses, where they had five sessions over three nights, in which they had approximately 500 attendees. He felt it was educational for both the public and the applicant.

Mr. Romney stated that the result of this work could be found in the updated Circulation Plan, which marries the July submission that included more bike lanes, with the plan calling for dedicated bus lanes. He presented a video to help illustrate what the roadways would look like from the Y-intersection down Deer Valley Drive East. He highlighted the proposed SML and reminded those present that the images in the video were conceptual. As the video played, Mr. Romney highlighted the entrances to the garage and the new and improved drop-off. He also noted Snow Park Lodge and the extended Ski Beach. He mentioned the multi-use path, which would also be used for emergency vehicle access across the plaza.

Mr. Romney next addressed the applicant's Traffic Analysis. He commented that in working with the community, they came up with a very efficient layout at the intersection of Deer Valley Drive East, Deer Valley Drive, and Deer Valley Drive West. They created a free-flow right-hand turn leaving Deer Valley Drive East by removing the stop sign and mitigating the traffic coming down Deer Valley Drive East. He offered that the City liked this concept. He added that they took this concept a few steps further by including a traffic signal controlled by the bus operators. These changes would create better flow through the intersection and improve the intersection.

With regard to Deer Valley Drive West, he mentioned the SML, which would create a purpose-driven and intuitive arrival experience. Day skiers arriving for parking would turn down Deer Valley Drive West and into the garage; whereas, if one was going to drop off skiers, they would turn down Deer Valley Drive East to the drop-off area. They also retained Jon Nepstad, Fehr & Peers, to do the analysis to ensure they would meet the Levels of Service goals of the City.

Mr. Budge added that when arriving by Deer Valley West, there is a one-way driveway before Royal Street used for egress. A major component of the plan is to convert it into a public-width road and make it work in both directions and continue Deer Valley West onto Doe Pass Road. He stressed that this would contribute to the free flow of traffic into the parking garages and drop-off areas and would also help the flow for the homeowners in the area. The majority of traffic will free flow onto the new and improved Doe Pass Road, which was key to creating the same connectivity needed for this system to operate and meet the Deer Valley standard of a flawless arrival experience. He noted that there was some confusion during the meetings with the public and stated that the Loop would be two-way with the SML lane. Doe Pass Road would be widened and become an integral part of the system by creating an inner loop to allow for the flow of traffic. He reiterated the continuation of traffic onto Doe Pass Road, and the only traffic movements would be to turn right into the parking garages or drop-off area. Right turns are traffic movements that could be made without interruption into the arrival.

Mr. Nepstad mentioned the Mobility Hub on the southeast corner and noted that all transit vehicles would also take advantage of the right-turn access. In terms of the Traffic Analysis, he reported that they met with City Staff who provided the ground rules by which they would complete the analyses, including when to collect data and the City's Levels of Service requirements. He referenced the grading system of A through F, with A representing free movement and F representing gridlock. He explained that the City standards were a Level of Service C. Mr. Nepstad explained that they took the data and layered on the net new trips from the development. He mentioned that the way the land use is planned for the village they would have a lot of people who would linger after their ski day, which will in turn have a big impact on traffic flows. He mentioned that they were conservative with the numbers because they would initially take a "wait and see" approach.

They also took into account the complementary land uses, transit usage, and other factors. He presented a table reflecting the analysis and noted an issue with the Y-intersection. He stated that the ultimate solution for that location would be a traffic signal. Mr. Nepstad stated that they proposed some geometric improvements at Solamere and would initially take a wait-and-see posture since the community did not necessarily want traffic signals throughout the Loop. He highlighted that this plan met the City standards in terms of Level of Service, which was vetted by the City's third-party traffic consultants. He addressed the questions regarding a signal at the Y-intersection and parking ingress/egress from the village and noted the current percentages of traffic inbound and outbound and the forecast for the future.

Mr. Nepstad reiterated that they thought through a lot of the arrival experiences, including who arrives and leaves when and by what entrance. He presented a simulation of the traffic flow and explained that this platform allowed them to look at the benefits of the SML for transit vehicles. He emphasized the benefits of Doe Pass Road and noted that it would be a lynchpin in terms of the overall circulation pattern. Parking would not only be a free flow inbound from the roadway system but once a visitor entered the parking structure there would be extensive wayfinding and traffic management to give users the best real-time information possible. He referenced the short-term parking at Salt Lake Airport, which is managed level by level. He stated they would model that and take it even further.

Mr. Romney clarified the simulations reflected 2040 in the a.m. and depicts a typical day on the left and a congested situation on the right. He introduced a simulation for 2040 p.m. that starts at the Y-intersection. Mr. Nepstad identified the transit vehicles in the simulation and stated that they would have a travel time advantage. He added that as a bus leaves Doe Pass Road to the

east, they would also have a specialized traffic signal that bus operators could activate remotely to provide a travel time advantage on Deer Valley Drive East as they loop around.

Mr. Romney wanted to expand on the polling they completed as part of the public outreach, and invited Matt Lusty, Honey Communications, to explain the work they conducted. Mr. Lusty advised that he was brought in to help Deer Valley gauge community sentiment without bias as to what people were saying about this project in Park City and Summit County. He explained that they designed a survey instrument that was distributed via MMS, or peer-to-peer texting, to a random sample of individuals throughout Summit County. They wanted to reach a 95% confidence level and a margin of error below 4.5%. This required them to get 450 responses, and he reported that they received 501 responses throughout the County.

Mr. Lusty advised that they found that support for Snow Park Village was high, and a majority of the respondents who read the summary of the proposed village supported the plan. He noted that 54.4% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal, while only 20.4% responded with strongly disagree or disagree entirely with the proposal. The rest of the respondents either needed more information or were neutral. He noted that his firm was brought in because the applicant wanted to minimize peer bias and have a randomized sample.

Mr. Lusty explained that they designed the survey so the questions were holistic, meaning they described the project in its entirety and then broke out the individual components. Within the individual components, they saw that there was particular interest in a couple of areas. He reported that 70.4% of the respondents stated they would be more likely or much more likely to support this proposal if these changes reduced "up to 20% of peak hour arrival or departure traffic out of the Snow Park area on peak ski days." He also reported that 69.6% of respondents supported a flex lane (bus and bike) being funded by this plan. Mr. Lusty also pointed out that 57.86% of respondents supported the redevelopment of the Deer Valley day-use surface parking lot.

Mr. Romney noted that currently there is one arrival point at Deer Valley located right below the Lodge where all the various users arrive at one location. They have proposed providing multiple arrival options, which would create safer conditions and help distribute the arrival traffic. The ski school and shuttle drop-off would be located below Snow Park Lodge, and the Mobility Hub would be located off of Doe Pass Road. The other arrival options include utilizing the parking garage. He emphasized that this was directed more toward the shared bus and bike lanes, and also the multi-use path circulation. He noted the concerns raised about crossing the plaza and noted that users would be able to make that loop in the future by bicycle or on foot.

Mr. Romney presented slides that depicted all of the benefits of this plan, and how it aligns not only with Park City's goals but also with the Lower Deer Valley Neighborhood General Plan. He stressed that these roadway improvements would provide better flow for transportation, bikes, pedestrians, and vehicles.

Mr. Budge touched on the overall benefits of this proposal and noted the key component of the intermodal hub and the multiple drop-offs. He highlighted the drop-off at the ski school and added that the idea was that in the future, Snow Park would be primarily used for the ski school and other employee purposes. The drop-off would be located right next to Snow Park Lodge so that those dropping-off children would not have to cross anything. He also noted that the ease of parking and multiple ways into the parking garage could encourage those who want to get their children dressed in their car could do so. He explained that they would still be providing

a loop for the drop-off, but by also having four entrances into the day-skier parking areas, they would encourage many to come in and park to help get their skiers ready before sending them to Ski Beach. This would meet the Deer Valley standard of having multiple days to arrive and begin the ski day.

Mr. Budge stated that another benefit of the Village was that they would have another area for the amenities such as restaurants and shops. There would also be a skating rink. He added that Snow Park Lodge could be active year-round. He noted that they were still modeling out how they would develop above the parking structure, but the current thinking was that with the present entitlements, they would look at having a hotel with approximately 100 rooms, and the balance of the building would house 50 to 60 condominiums. He stressed that this was a well-thought-out way to utilize the existing, approved entitlements in a way that would also be coupled with creating a place that would be usable by the public. They were not just creating a community that could be used by its members; rather, they were locating the existing entitlements on top of a planned and intentional public area. He added that this proposal would provide an amenity that is over and above what they have currently and would convert Snow Park into something that could accommodate an après experience that does not currently exist at Snow Park.

Mr. Budge wanted the Commission to think not only about these benefits but also what they would be able to achieve alongside development of the parking lots that were approved in 1978. The proposed development would be done in a way that would take into account the input received and marry it with the best-in-class science and best-in-class design to ensure that all of the pieces would operate in a way that would enhance the arrival experience with minimal impacts to the surrounding areas of the Loop.

Mr. Bennett felt there had been good collaboration and they looked forward to the public comments.

Vice Chair Hall invited the Commissioners to ask direct questions to the applicant and Staff before taking public comment. She also acknowledged that Commissioner disclosures had been made in prior meetings and invited the Commissioners to make any disclosures regarding this application. Commissioner Henry Sigg disclosed that he had worked with Fehr & Peers in the past.

Commissioner Kenworthy disclosed that 15 years ago he built a seasonal housing compound and campground underneath the dam, and Deer Valley has been his tenant for the past 15 years. He added that they have a substantial number of cabins, but he leases others as well.

Commissioner Van Dine disclosed that she owns property in Lower Deer Valley Lakeside and stated that this ownership would not affect her decision on this application.

Chair Hall reported that she is a longtime client of Snell & Wilmer.

Chair Suesser understood that two boutique hotels were envisioned for the plaza and asked the applicant how the hotel guests would be encouraged to take public transit. She expressed concern that hotel guests would rely on car shares and shuttles rather than using public transit.

Mr. Budge explained that the design was the gold standard of transit multi-modal centers. It includes a covered transit center that does not just put transit riders near the development; it



puts them in the development. The users step out into a nice lounge area that facilitates the transition up into the village. The current concept was to have only one hotel that would be within a couple of hundred feet of transit users. They also added drop-off areas specific to the hotel. Therefore, hotel guests would be able to arrive at the hotel in the same manner as a skier, without impeding the arrival experience for the ski school or the day-skier parking structures.

Mr. Budge explained that the applicant was seeking approval for an MPD that would allow the parking structure on which all of the vertical development would be located. The approval for the parking structure would allow them to understand what they are working with, so they could then prepare the design for the vertical development. He emphasized that the function of the parking structure and the multi-modal center would allow for connectivity with the hotel.

Mr. Nepstad was asked to comment on the trips generated by the hotel. He stated that the design of the Mobility Hub would also encourage hotel guests to utilize transit by virtue of the wayfinding and the design of the six bays in the Mobility Hub. He added that the six bays would be enumerated to allow all visitors, including hotel guests, to recognize and select convenient transit.

Chair Suesser asked if the applicant gave any thought to prohibiting car shares for pickup and drop-off at the hotel to encourage transit or hotel shuttle use. She understood from this discussion that shuttles would be dropping off people near the ski school and wondered about the staging of those shuttles and whether that might impact the flow.

Mr. Romney addressed the issue of car share and stated that the applicant had not yet addressed that detail, but would make a note of it for discussion. He added that the plan to date had been to accommodate car share and to ensure that the applicant's modeling took into account car share operators as part of the experience. In terms of shuttles and staging, he felt that was more of an operational question. He noted that the shuttles would be arriving and dropping off in the same loop. It was noted that Deer Valley currently does not stage any shuttles.

Chair Suesser observed that there are many hotels and shuttle services around town, and while they are great, they also take up more space than a passenger vehicle and often wait in the parking areas. Mr. Romney reiterated that they would look at this issue. Mr. Budge added that the new drop-off zone would still have three lanes and would still be staffed with "greencoats" to help direct the function and flow in this zone. By having a drop-off, the same length as exists currently, a good "greencoat" crew has enough room to accommodate those shuttles that might have to wait, while at the same time moving guests through the zone.

Chair Suesser referenced the width of Deer Valley Drive East and Deer Valley Drive West and wanted assurance that it would not interfere with the multi-use path. Mr. Budge represented that the applicant's engineer was nodding his head and stated that he had analyzed this down to the inch in terms of the paved surface and how they would configure these lanes within the ROW.

Chair Suesser confirmed her understanding that the multi-use path would be usable year-round and would not interfere with the Shared Mobility Lane or the other two lanes of traffic. Mr. Budge concurred.

Commissioner Johnson echoed the concerns of Chair Suesser regarding the drop-off zones. He asked the applicant if they ran the numbers on the existing drop-off count versus the new configuration. He also asked if they eliminated the proposed drop-off within the building for the ski school. Mr. Budge responded that they could look at some numbers. Commissioner Johnson felt the numbers would be helpful. In terms of the ski school, Mr. Budge stated that the design was to place the drop-off as close as possible to the ski school. He acknowledged that people could still park in the building and then use an elevator or escalator to come up on the deck to access the ski school.

Mr. Romney reported that they did a recent one-day study that looked at the rate of usage for passenger vehicles at the drop-off area versus the overall parking. He stated that they would do some additional studies for traffic counts. He added the belief that the proposed plan calling for the lifts to be brought down closer to the parking lot would result in a reduction in the number of drop-offs needed. He stated they would obtain the data on existing numbers versus proposed. It was clarified that in addition to passenger vehicles, the requested numbers should also include pick-ups, drop-offs, and transit.

Commissioner Johnson sought and received clarification that the Traffic Analysis numbers were based on pre-pandemic numbers. He asked City Engineer Robertson to confirm that the City's standard for Level of Service was C. City Engineer Robertson agreed and added that the City had allowed Level of Service D as an acceptable Level of Service. In terms of the existing capacity for buses at the Old Town Transit Center, City Engineer Robertson stated he would have to defer to someone in the Transportation Department and offered to provide this information at a future meeting.

Commissioner Johnson mentioned the Park-and-Ride shuttle service and requested that this issue be discussed at a future Work Session. He noted the reference to Richardson Flat and sought confirmation that Treasure Mountain was no longer part of the applicant's plan.

Hannah Tyler, Deer Valley Vice President of Resort Operations, advised that Deer Valley currently has a lease for Treasure Mountain for overflow parking; however, due to the planned future redevelopment on that site, they would not be counting on that property in the long term. She stated that they were always willing to have discussions with the City regarding Park N Ride solutions.

Commissioner Van Dine referenced Levels of Service at Solamere and Deer Valley Drive East and wondered if the applicant could break it down in terms of time so the Commission could evaluate when the intersection was most impacted. She requested clarification of the proposed traffic controls at Deer Valley Drive West and Doe Pass Road. Mr. Budge confirmed that this intersection would be free flow inbound and stop controlled outbound. There was discussion about the slight left from Royal Street onto Deer Valley West, and Mr. Romney noted that all of the traffic would be diverted ahead of Royal Street onto Doe Pass Road. The only drivers that would continue up would be those going to Trail's End.

Commissioner Van Dine clarified that she was asking about the driver leaving Royal Street to go back into Park City who would have to cross traffic. She would like to see numbers for the residents coming down from Royal Street. It was noted that those residents could make all rights and travel the entire loop; however, Commissioner Van Dine observed that many would like to take the more direct route and turn left onto Deer Valley Drive West.

Commissioner Van Dine asked about oversized parking. Mr. Budge advised that the parking structure design would fit a Sprinter Van, but not a mega-Sprinter. He stated that it was designed for a Suburban with a rocket box. He confirmed that Lot 5 would be the alternative for vehicles that could not fit in the parking structure. Commissioner Van Dine echoed the concerns about the staging of shuttles and acknowledged that the “greencoats” do a good job of keeping vehicles moving.

Mr. Budge requested further information regarding the concerns over the staging of shuttles so that the applicant could address them fully. Commissioner Van Dine stated that currently, there was generally plenty of room for all users, and it was the heavy peak days that they want to ensure are being well mitigated. She stated that they do not want to see the area clogged with waiting shuttles on those peak days and felt it important to establish that now when they have the space. She would like to know how it gets mitigated going forward. Mr. Budge confirmed his understanding that the Commission wanted to make sure that the Level of Service and the space works, and that they would be able to operate a majority of the time at the same Level of Service they have today.

Commissioner Van Dine felt that the layout for the entrance to the parking lots was intricate and asked the applicant to keep in mind the plowing plans, how the flow would be on a big snow day, and where the snow would be stored.

Commissioner Frontero stated that his main concerns were the ROW and mitigation, and the 20% reduction in parking. He felt this was not the proper time for those discussions but stated he would focus on those when the applicant returns.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked the applicant what the estimated increase in vehicle traffic would be at full build-out. Mr. Nepstad offered that the P.M. peak would increase by approximately 225 to 230 trips. Commissioner Kenworthy asked if the applicant had the room to build the parking required by the Land Management Code (“LMC”) in the current configuration. The applicant answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Sigg wanted to know more about the circulation inside the parking garage and asked whether the “greencoats” would be present, where the oversized parking would be located, and electric vehicle parking. He would like to see the Parking Plan and how orderly parking within the garage would be accommodated. He also wanted to know how the internal plan at Deer Valley dovetailed with Park City’s Master Transportation Plan. He asked how many buses would be designated for capture lots if any. Commissioner Sigg would like to know how the transit plan would get people out of town, and how the plan at Deer Valley would impact the overall traffic mitigation, especially as one heads towards the roundabout, which becomes gridlocked during the busy times of the year. Commissioner Sigg also wanted more information on Doe Pass Road and its connectivity with Lot 5.

Vice Chair Hall reported that public comment should be limited to the Circulation and Transit issues, as outlined in the Staff Report. Issues such as affordable housing would be addressed at a future meeting. She advised that there would be another meeting on January 18, 2023. She noted that emails could be sent to [planning@parkcity.org](mailto:planning@parkcity.org) with comments.

Based on the number of people who expressed a desire to speak, Vice Chair Hall stated that each speaker would be allotted three minutes and requested that each speaker abide by the

timer so that everyone's time was respected and they could allow as many people as possible comment.

*Bill Watson* identified himself as a Board Member at Solamere and President of the Board of the Solamere Oaks Swim and Tennis Company. He stated that approximately nine months ago, they formed a small group of eight people from Lower Deer Valley and American Flag. He mentioned Scott Martin, who worked on the airport transportation. Mr. Watson advised that they had attempted to work with Alterra Development over the past nine months, however, it had been a slow process. He stressed that this group needed more meetings with Alterra Development and added that Mr. Martin would love to meet with them. He commented that Deer Valley is customer-focused and he felt they were losing some of that. Mr. Watson mentioned 30 letters from locals, primarily from the Lower Deer Valley Association, which objected to abandonment of the Loop.

In terms of traffic, he felt there would be a problem with putting three lanes on a road designed for two lanes. He stated that Deer Valley East is 31 feet wide. Buses are 10 feet wide and would be given an 11-foot lane. Mr. Watson felt that the third lane was not needed and offered that the traffic problem was getting out in the evening. He stressed that there is no backup in the morning hours. He added that the lights were another problem. Currently, the traffic moves, albeit slowly, by alternating, but he felt that installing lights would create a bigger problem than they currently have.

Mr. Watson noted that next week would be a high week and asked the Planning Department and Planning Staff to visit the area and observe the traffic in action. He stated that they loved the idea of reducing parking by 20%, but wanted a plan other than charging higher fees, on how it would work. He mentioned reduced fees if a vehicle left by 3:00 p.m., or stayed past 6:00 p.m. Mr. Watson felt there was still a lot of work to be done, and although he heard many good comments, they have to work together. He mentioned a meeting last April with Alterra Development and noted it was a different group. He also mentioned a great meeting with the City but nothing ever came of it. His group of eight represents approximately 500 people, and most of them have lived in the area for 15 to 20 years, have seen the area grow, and might have some ideas to share. He would appreciate people listening to his group.

*Mark Duross* gave his address as 1774 Amber Road and identified himself as President of the Amber Daystar Homeowners' Association, located at Deer Valley Drive East and Solamere Drive. He concurred with the prior speakers' comments and stated that on behalf of the HOA, they were generally very much in favor of the Deer Valley development. They were concerned with maintaining the current neighborhood integrity of no stoplights. He felt that traffic studies within the Loop were constrained by the canyon and the traffic circle below. He reiterated that they would like to maintain the integrity of their neighborhood as much as possible and eliminate the flex lanes.

Mr. Duross appreciated the public relations spin on the texting, and offered that people were generally in favor of flex lanes; however, when they do not go anywhere, they do not do any good. He stated that the biggest flaw in the development was the uphill traffic. He felt that if there was a collection point for day skiers on the west side, they could effectively preserve an exit from the west and distribute the pain equally in the neighborhood. Having all of the garage collection points on the east side of the development would allow the traffic to morph over to the east side, which they saw as fundamentally unfair.

*Allison Keenan* reported that she lives in Deer Lake Village in Lower Deer Valley and is one of the founding members of Protect the Loop. She added that she is in regular contact with HOAs that are part of the Lower Deer Valley coalition, other HOAs in the area, and area residents who are concerned about the proposed Snow Park Development. She commented that after the March 15<sup>th</sup> Joint Meeting, she emailed Planning Staff and asked how the residents could best participate and be heard. This email was part of the public comment attached as Exhibit N. She noted that she never received a response.

Ms. Keenan stated that Protect the Loop wanted to understand the community's concerns, and hired a consultant, Angela Moschetta, who created a survey to obtain community feedback. She stated that they were not anti-development, but they want the community to be informed. Collaboration among community members, Alterra Development, and the City would help to equitably balance resident concerns about quality of life and safety with the resort experience and transportation improvements. She acknowledged that development was a reality and that community benefit and resort growth did not have to be mutually exclusive. She stressed that the community deserved to be represented in these discussions and collaboration was essential. Ms. Keenan felt there had not been significant collaboration.

She reviewed the plans in detail and requested Planning Staff and Alterra Development provide clarification on two items. First, she observed that Alterra's exhibit showed Doe Pass Road as a ROW dedicated to the City or an easement. The Staff Report indicated that Alterra might retain rights to Doe Pass Road. She stressed that an easement was substantially different from a ROW. In one situation, the City would own Doe Pass Road, whereas, in the other, Alterra would own Doe Pass Road. She wanted clarification of what was proposed.

Second, Alterra's ROW Vacation Petition filed in January 2022 included a portion of Deer Valley Drive South at the Snow Park Base where the Transit Center was currently located. She offered that Alterra now asserts that they own the land since they have been paying taxes on it, yet the road above was dedicated to the City in 1995. Ms. Keenan reported that she read the Planning Commission Agenda and Minutes from 1995 and it was clear that a ROW was to be dedicated to the City at that time. She referenced Ordinance No. 95-59 which approved the dedication of the ROW plat for a portion of Deer Valley Drive South. The portion dedicated to the City is the current portion of the road in question at the Snow Park Base. She added that Alterra has maintained the underground portion of the road where the current Deer Valley Tram turnaround and tunnel to the Resort are located. The City has maintained the portion above the road and paid for capital improvements for over 20 years, clearly establishing public use as noted in the Staff Report.

Ms. Keenan asked if Alterra's application for the road vacation should include this portion of the road. She felt it should be based on the 1995 City Ordinance, but it should be clarified who owns that portion of the road. She believes in transparency so that all community members are informed. Ms. Keenan advised that Protect the Loop would continue to read, listen, research, and do its best to be informed community advocates.

*Donna Wells* indicated that she works as a Concierge at the Deer Valley Lodges and supports the proposed development. With regard to transit, a drop-off where guests do not have to cross the street was much safer. Currently, it is very dangerous in that location. She also liked the idea of separating the buses in a transit area away from the drop-off area. She felt that Deer Valley and the "greencoats" could manage the stopped shuttles. She agreed it should be flowing all the time and felt the management would do that.

Ms. Wells also felt that all of the Concierges in the area do a good job of encouraging people to not use their vehicles to get to the area. She commented that the development is a good idea because now all of the guests go down to Main Street, where the restaurants are overcrowded. The idea should be to keep these guests at Deer Valley, and if they have more restaurants it would keep people off of Main Street, which would in turn improve the traffic pattern. Ms. Wells felt that having a village would encourage people to stay in Deer Valley instead of going elsewhere.

*Angela Moschetta* stated that in her capacity as a private resident, Alterra's application violated LMC Section 15-1-14, Termination of Applications for Inaction. She read the Code as follows: "Recognizing the length of the Planning Review process will vary with the size and complexity of each proposal, applicants must move their applications either to approve or deny in a reasonably expeditious manner. The Planning Director may formally deny applications which remain inactive for a period of 180 days or longer, due to acts or omissions of the applicant."

She argued that this application has not been before the Planning Commission since a Work Session was conducted during the Joint Meeting on March 15, 2022. At that meeting, Alterra introduced its proposed ROW vacation, but it was not included in any of its materials. She recalled that Commissioner Suesser expressed frustration that the application was not moving forward and the lack of other options offered by the applicant.

Ms. Moschetta recounted that during a November 9 Planning Commission Meeting held 239 days after the Joint Meeting, the Planning Director indicated that Alterra re-submitted an amendment to its application and would be back before the Commission on December 14, 2022, which would have been 274 days since the last public action on the application. She commented that this matter was presented today where Staff has ignored this violation of the Code and accommodated the applicant while placing the burden on the public and the Planning Commission to scrutinize an application that should be canceled and resubmitted under an entirely new MPD subject to current Code.

Ms. Moschetta next addressed the results of the Protect the Loop survey, which she was professionally commissioned to execute. She stated that she would furnish the survey results and relevant conclusions via email to the Commission, the applicant, the City, and the media for equitable consideration. She stated that the survey was open for a period of 105 days from August 23 to December 6, 2022. It was promoted on KPCW, in the *Park Record*, and on Future Park City. It was also circulated among HOAs and other community groups. She explained that nearly all of the 30 questions required an answer before the respondent was able to proceed.

She stressed that this was an objective survey that functioned to glean respondents' usage habits regarding the Loop, ski access, public transportation, and more. Unlike the Deer Valley survey, this survey did not ask a series of questions such as "would you support the plan if..." followed by reference to various unconfirmed promises such as workforce housing development. She felt this was done to garner manipulated support for certain outcomes.

Ms. Moschetta reported that the Protect the Loop survey garnered 1,113 responses, which were well balanced between Upper Deer Valley and Lower Deer Valley residents, as well as adjacent neighborhoods. More than 50% of respondents were primary, local residents, and another 46% were secondary property owners. She stressed that 96% of the respondents had a tax-based, financial stake in the impacts of any development of the Snow Park Base. Nearly 30% of

respondents admitted to never using public transit. She offered that this must be accepted inside of the wishful plans about transit adoption, especially when the survey also revealed that 38% of respondents stated that nothing would make them utilize public transit more than they already do.

Ms. Moschetta reported that nearly all respondents use the Loop for ski access. They also use it for dog walking, leisure bike riding, and to access hiking, biking, The Ponds, and more. She stressed that it was very much a part of the public domain and acts as a year-round portal that supports quality of life for people living in and around it. She added that 88% of respondents were somewhat familiar with Alterra's plans, and despite the claims of extensive community outreach and positive feedback, respondents remained overwhelmingly opposed to anything beyond what was granted in the original MPD. The survey also showed that respondents were opposed to the ROW vacation and were clear that the community benefit was limited to a couple of the HOA communities immediately adjacent to the ROW that would end up with ski-in/ski-out properties. She noted that these HOAs had provided letters of support for Alterra.

Ms. Moschetta stated that it would not be impossible for Alterra to offer improved significant community benefit, which should not be confused with consistency or compliance. Community benefit means a significant gain in ways that are quantifiable for the entire 84060 community. She urged that this burden should fall on Alterra, not Planning Staff. She noted that it would be a waste of taxpayer investment and Planning Commission time to assume Alterra would prove broad community benefit and be granted the ROW vacation by City Council. She urged that it was wise to demand that Alterra work on an actual alternate plan through Planning at the same time.

*Tom Moore* reported that he has lived in Park City for over three decades. He asked whether the option of building a ski bridge, much like that at the Town Lift project, had been considered. He opined that this could allow for the skiers to access the village, and they could still maintain the Loop. This would be a win-win wherein the Loop would maintain its integrity, and Alterra would get access to the village. He also mentioned the emphasis on public transportation; however, as he queried Ms. Tyler, he wondered why there was such a big push for a Transit Hub when only 8% of Deer Valley visitors use public transportation.

Mr. Moore also addressed the Y-intersection and noted the comments by Commissioner Van Dine that except for Christmas week and President's weekend, that intersection works perfectly fine. He noted that it has a natural zipper-line effect as people exit during peak times. He felt that peak periods were bad case study test times to use as far as determining whether that intersection fails.

He mentioned his discussions with Mr. Nepstad during a recent meeting, wherein Mr. Nepstad indicated that while the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") controlled the lights in town, the City would control the light at the Transit Hub, and the City would be in charge of the light at the Y-intersection. Mr. Moore asked whether the City would turn off the signal at the Y-intersection during the rest of the year to allow traffic to flow naturally.

*Carol Shenevert* reported that she serves on the Board of the Deer Lake Village HOA. She stated that for years she and her neighbors have used the Deer Lake shuttle, at great cost, to get to and from the mountain. She felt that this shuttle was important in keeping the Deer Lake residents from driving and parking. When she comes off the hill, the shuttles are generally already at the pickup spot or arrive within eight minutes. She observed that the new plan

showed three lanes for drop-off, whereas the current configuration has six lanes, with three of them dedicated to shuttles and three dedicated to passenger vehicles.

Ms. Shenevert queried where the shuttles would be staged when they come off the hill at the end of the day, and wondered whether the residents would be required to wait 45 minutes for a shuttle. If this occurred, she felt many would just drive to the resort. In addition, she felt that the Transit Hub was a nice idea but noted that there was no access to transit for most of those who live in Lower Deer Valley. She did not see its advantage given that residents cannot take a bus without walking a mile. She added there is no place in town to catch a bus because there was no parking along the bus routes.

*Maureen Murtaugh* stated that she also lives in Deer Lake Village. Her comments focused on the traffic beyond the Deer Valley because last Thursday at 5:00 p.m. it took her 30 minutes to get to Prospector. The traffic was not stopped until well after the Loop, and she advised that the traffic problems persist well beyond the Loop. She did not see that this plan addressed this issue. These traffic issues affect her lifestyle and she was worried that in the future she would not be able to go anywhere between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., particularly on the weekends. With regard to transit, Ms. Murtaugh stated that she can walk one-third of a mile to the bus; however, this requires her to walk on the street, as there are no maintained sidewalks. She added that there are no streetlights, which compounds the safety issue. She did not see how this plan addressed the safety of emergency vehicles for the neighborhoods. She felt it was fair to ask whether the evacuation plan for the area worked now, let alone with increased density.

*Wes Richards* stated that he lives in The Oaks in Deer Valley. He advised that he left his house, which is 2.2 miles away, at 4:30 p.m. to come to this meeting. He arrived at 5:20 p.m. He felt that the applicant made a great presentation and believed his community supported the development; however, he felt they were missing the point. The focus on the arrival experience is only half of the equation. People have to leave to get to their homes or hotels. He felt there could be 10 exit points out of the resort, but they would all have pinch points. He mentioned the huge planters and bike lanes along Bonanza Drive that only allow for one lane in each direction. He commented on the road configuration along Kearns Boulevard where there are two lanes for a block that get reduced to one lane even though the road base is capable of handling two lanes.

Mr. Richards urged the City to look at this from the perspective of not just the project, but from five miles out. He offered that those who do not like the experience were blasting the City on social media. The fact that people are turning away from Park City is not good for commerce or the perception of the community. He hoped the City would take a broader view going forward.

*Jeff Whipple* stated that he is a 14-year resident of Park City and has lived in Solamere for 1½ years. He echoed the comments of Mr. Richards. Mr. Whipple relayed that on July 31 he suffered a heart attack, and emergency personnel arrived at his house in three minutes. As the local hospital did not have a cath lab, it took 57 minutes from the time his daughter called 911 to when he arrived at the Murray hospital. The responders advised him that was record time. He posited that if it took 33 more minutes, he would have suffered serious, lifelong complications, or worse. If his heart attack had not occurred when there was no traffic, he might not be here today.

Mr. Whipple stated that it took him 24 minutes to get from the Y-intersection to this meeting, and that did not include the excess traffic it would have taken to get to a freeway. He expressed



gratitude for the emergency services in Park City and felt the excess traffic could put the City's residents at risk. He urged the City to be careful and consider all traffic implications.

*David Glew* reported that he lives on Rossie Hill Drive and felt that the Traffic Plan should include not just the Loop, but also the traffic circle up to Snow Park. With regards to the Levels of Service issues, he noted there was a four-way intersection halfway up the street between the Y-intersection and the circle. At this location, Rossie Hill Drive, Coalition View Court, McHenry, Deer Valley Loop, and several other streets funnel into the street. He also mentioned all of the driveways that come into Deer Valley Drive. He noted that the third-party evaluation alluded to the fact that the data is somewhat limited below the Loop. He felt this area should also be considered as part of the overall movement of traffic.

*Alvid Avenon (sp?)* reported that he resides full-time in Aspen Wood. He echoed some of the prior comments about the lack of communication. He felt that a fancy website and fancy open house, along with select HOA outreach was not cutting it. They can and have to do better. He felt that a traffic signal would not sit well with full-time residents. He would like the Commission and the applicant to take into account the human in the equation. He noted that humans take the path of least resistance. Creating an arrival experience that is 2½ times the size of taking Deer Valley West was probably not going to be the most used experience. He appealed to the applicant and to the Commission to look at what is being done if they truly want to mitigate traffic and ensure that it is the experience that everyone would like to have. He reiterated that humans want to use the shortest route.

Mr. Avenon echoed the comments regarding snow removal. He also felt that there was no answer given to a question regarding bus traffic and the Transit Center as it related to hotel traffic. He felt that there was no transit traffic from where the people want to go to where the people are going. Deer Valley gets a lot of traffic from the Wasatch Back, the Wasatch Front, and the airport. He would like to see the non-stop transit options that service these areas because currently there were none. As a result, visitors would continue to use car share, and rental cars and the traffic would continue to increase.

*Bob Dolan* reported that he lives in American Flag and requested that his written comments be entered into the record. Vice Chair Hall accepted Mr. Dolan's written comments.

*Albert Gutierrez* identified himself as the President of the Lakeside HOA. He echoed the comments about the need for more cooperation. He stated that the HOA supported the development, but some of the Doe Pass Road and traffic issues were of concern. He also echoed the comments that there was a much bigger problem. He felt this was all simple math. Currently, there are effectively six lanes, and if they were to replicate the six lanes then traffic mitigation would be the same. However, he felt it did not sound as though that was what was being contended.

*Keith Golan* advised that his family has resided in Park City for over 40 years. He felt that all elements of planning would come together in this one project. He understood that it involved a 47-year-old entitlement, but they could bring it up to 2023/2024 and make it the best project that the country or the world would marvel at. He believed that if the community and Alterra worked together to make this a state-of-the-art village, they could make this so outstanding that even Park City residents will love it.

*Paul Bromley* assumed that the Carpenter Lift would be the one to take guests to the top of the mountain. He noted that everyone uses Carpenter Lift and that the drop-off is right next to this lift. He assumed that everyone would be using Deer Valley Drive East. He expressed that the applicant vastly underestimated what was going on with the congestion at Deer Valley Drive East. There is traffic going to and from the drop-off, along with two garage entrances and exits. He felt this was potentially the biggest problem, excluding the Y-intersection.

*Phil Palminteri* reported that he lives on Solamere Drive and represented that it is a 1.8-mile walk from his home to the closest bus stop on Deer Valley Drive. As a disabled skier, this would not allow him to entertain the thought of taking public transit. He found the simulation for the traffic to be misleading. He noted that simulations were always a function of the assumptions built into the mathematical models. He felt it was clear that the models used assumed there was never a traffic jam at the traffic circle, Bonanza Drive, Kearns Boulevard, or Park Avenue.

He wondered why Alterra did not show an animation with more realistic assumptions that would show precisely what the traffic would look like at the end of the day. Mr. Palminteri strongly suspected that it would show that traffic would continue to be clogged on Deer Valley Drive past Solamere Drive and up to Queen Esther Drive as happens currently. He also wanted to make sure that everyone would focus on the fact that the proposed development would bring more automobiles through Park City and into Deer Valley. A hotel with 100 rooms would mean roughly 100 automobiles. He doubted that people would come from Salt Lake City in public transit.

In addition, the hotel staff would also translate into more automobiles coming into and exiting Deer Valley. He requested that these assumptions be built into the traffic model. The same was true for the 60 condominiums, where one could assume 2 to 3 vehicles per condominium. He commented that these assumptions were not built into this model. In terms of public participation, he found Alterra's claim of broad community support disingenuous. He has tried to engage with Deer Valley on numerous occasions and found it difficult to engage with them.

At the recent open house, he asked how he could be a part of the conversation, particularly for those who are permanently disabled skiers. He was told that the applicant wanted to work with HOA presidents. Mr. Palminteri understood that HOA presidents wanted to do the right thing, but this was not a representative democracy wherein they speak for him and he could not speak for himself. He found it odd that Deer Valley claimed it wants public participation, but when the rubber meets the road, they do not.

*Tom Petro* identified himself as a member of the Chaparelle HOA and has been an owner for 22 years. He echoed the concerns raised by the neighbors regarding traffic lights and the third transit lane, which he described as the transit lane to nowhere. He addressed concerns about the recreational path around the existing Loop. From Deer Valley Market to Snow Park, this path is on the inside, and from Snow Park to the Market, this recreational path is on the outside of the Loop. He asked how the Traffic Plan would allow pedestrians to cross a busy road to safely access the existing sidewalk/path.

*Sally Jablon* stated that she is a resident of Queen Esther. She expressed concern over the fact that they glossed over the chart that discussed the current Levels of Service versus the Levels of Service after the proposed changes. It seemed to her that both Queen Esther Drive and Solamere Drive would have a worse Level of Service once the changes are completed. Currently, it is almost impossible for residents of Solamere and Queen Esther to get out of Deer

Valley at any reasonable time. She reported that as she was returning home from the market today, she observed the traffic coming toward her and could not imagine it being worse.

*Christina Shiebler* stated that she has been a Coalition View Court resident for nearly 20 years. She would like the communities to take into consideration student and children transport. She has observed that the traffic and speeds are alarming. As they discuss traffic and transportation impacts, she would like to keep the children in mind.

*Andrew Walter* stated that he is the President of the Black Bear Lodge HOA. He felt that it was clear that there was a lot of opposition in the community to this proposal. He challenged the Planning Commission to make sure they could do a better job asking for things from public and private companies that dominate the economics around Park City to encourage positivity for Park City. He felt that this was a rare opportunity for the community to come together and ask for more negotiation in a way that would benefit all of Park City's residents, homeowners, and taxpayers.

*Stefanie Wilson* stated that she lives at Queen Esther Village, and is on the Board. She clarified that she was not speaking on behalf of the Board. She concurred with many of the prior comments. She highlighted the issue of public participation and the survey touted as showing support. She started to take the survey and quit partway through because the questions were so slanted that it did not allow her to say she did not support this project. She felt the survey needed to be taken with a grain of salt. Ms. Wilson added that this development would likely take five years to complete, and she asked what would happen to skier traffic during construction. She felt this was an important consideration because it could be quite awful for quite some time. With regard to the traffic signal, she understood that no one preferred a traffic signal in the neighborhood; however, she suggested consideration of a roundabout and noted that this solution had worked well in other parts of the community.

*Paul Lakin* stated he has been an owner in Lakeside for approximately 20 years. He supported the development and felt it was an exciting opportunity for the community if it is done right. He concurred with many of the speakers in terms of concerns regarding traffic in Deer Valley and how it feeds into the rest of Park City. He was hopeful that the Planning Commission and all involved with this project build in the potential for adapting as time goes on and things change.

*Alison Kitching* advised that she is the President of the Portico HOA, which is located below the Y-intersection in the Rossie Hill area. She stated that during the Joint Session there seemed to be a need for the community to come together to condense the issues and come together with a more collective voice. She commented that the community seems to have spoken that the ROW and shortening the Loop would not be the optimal solution from a community perspective. She was optimistic in thinking that Deer Valley and Alterra would come back with a Plan B that would leave the Loop alone. She was still waiting for the opportunity to weigh that plan against the current plan. She would like to see collaboration with Deer Valley, Alterra, and the City to achieve a ski village while keeping the Loop intact. She added that if this was truly a world-leading development opportunity, they could collectively achieve that if that is the goal.

*Michelle Dement* stated she is a 20-year owner at Bristlecone Condominiums, located next to the fire station. She felt that Alterra and Deer Valley were not accurately representing how people arrive and depart from the ski hill. She advised that she takes public transit to the ski area, and she represented that those buses were not very full even during peak times. She reported heavy reliance on the shuttles and felt that Deer Valley needed to get a handle on the

numbers of how skiers arrive and depart. The City's emphasis on public transit for this development might be slightly misplaced and she felt that more attention needed to be placed on where the shuttles would be and where they would stage. Ms. Dement also noted that not much attention was paid to what would be done to preserve the summer atmosphere and experience of the Deer Valley Loop in the non-ski season. Many longtime residents and owners want to ensure that the non-ski season experience and sense of community would be preserved.

*Rachel Solomon* reported that she is an owner of the Sunspot Condominiums. She would like to see information regarding service vehicles. She noted that currently, there were vehicles making deliveries all day long, and with the addition of the hotel and condominiums she felt there would be additional service vehicle traffic. She agreed with the prior comments objecting to a traffic signal and a three-lane roadway.

*Kristen Gentilly (sp?)* reported that she lives on Lower Deer Valley Drive. She agreed with the prior speaker and many other residents. She works as a nurse in the hospital and referenced the speaker who discussed his medical emergency. She shared these concerns and noted that when she is on call, she is required to be at the hospital within 30 minutes and it has taken her over an hour to get to the hospital. She expressed concern about traffic during construction and after construction is completed.

There were no further public comments. Vice Chair Hall closed the public hearing and reminded those present that there will be future meetings where people could provide comment.

Mr. Budge asked to be allowed to respond to some of the comments. He noted some confusion about the ROW and explained that there was no question that the ROW was owned and operated by Park City. There was also no question that if the ROW were vacated, it would come back to only one entity, Deer Valley, as Deer Valley owns the land underlying and adjacent to the ROW. He added that they would utilize the ROW as part of the village. With regard to Doe Pass Road, he confirmed that the applicant was completely willing to make that a public road or hold it and operate in accordance with the public requirements. He stressed that their focus was to operate in a way that would be two-way, with a third lane, and in a way to ensure that people could traverse through it.

Commissioner Johnson referenced the identified concerns in the third-party consulting group analysis and asked if the applicant was addressing those concerns. It was noted by City Engineer John Robertson that many of those items were considered Conditions of Approval moving forward. They were comfortable moving forward with the study, as recommended, given those Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Johnson understood and noted that the first concern related to much of the public comment on the City's stated goal of reducing peak traffic hour volumes by 20% citywide. Robertson understood that many of the concerns centered on conditions outside the influence of the development. He mentioned that PC Forward was recently adopted as a long-range Transportation Plan, and it highlights how they would improve many of these congestion issues. The focus was on transit and other mobility modes of transportation. He added that there was an additional challenge given that these intersections were owned by UDOT, so they must work with them to come up with workable solutions. He mentioned the Bus Rapid Transit Plan ("BRT") nearing approval by the County. He felt the Environmental Document would be finalized within the next 6 to 8 months, and anticipated that they could be 2 to 3 years from completion of the BRT construction.

Commissioner Kenworthy heard that the community was looking for a holistic plan. The applicant could contribute to the holistic plan, and he felt it fair that the public understood the phasing. He asked Mr. Nepstad if he looked into a transit study wherein Deer Valley would operate Mayflower and some of the mitigation that they could be pushed over to I-40. Mr. Nepstad knew those issues were out there, however, nothing was formalized to where the applicant felt comfortable considering it; rather, they had to look at what was in front of them currently and what they know is approved. He confirmed that they do not have a study that says how many potential cars could be shifted over.

Chair Suesser referenced the BRT from Kimball Junction and noted that the BRT would not end at Deer Valley. Mr. Nepstad advised that the current plan called for the BRT to be a shoulder-running lane up to SR-224 and SR-248. They would then work with the County to arrive at solutions at the two traffic signals to get priority for the BRT. She asked the applicant if they explored access to the parking garage for day skiers off of Doe Pass Road via Deer Valley West. She felt an access point on that side might take some of the strain off of Deer Valley West. She recalled some discussion about day-skier access off of Doe Pass Road.

Mr. Budge explained there would be two entrances for day skiers off Doe Pass Road. They looked exhaustively at entrances off of Deer Valley West and ran into an issue with the grade. They would have to start retaining to achieve the level for the vehicles to get into the garage. To mitigate that, they arrived at a design wherein Deer Valley West flows naturally onto Doe Pass Road. Mr. Romney added that they also connected Levels P2 and P3 so they could cycle between those two floors.

Chair Suesser echoed Commissioner Kenworthy's comments regarding a holistic plan desired by the community. She recalled a comment by the applicant that they would be willing to work with the City on remote parking solutions; however, the Commission was looking at Alterra to come up with those solutions, rather than expecting the City to come up with those solutions. She emphasized that they were looking to Alterra to come up with a good traffic mitigation strategy that would involve planning beyond the Loop that would benefit all of Park City. She referenced her questions about shuttles and how visitors staying at Deer Valley would be encouraged to use transit. She noted the comments that the buses were not heavily utilized, and urged the applicant to present a strategy for getting more people on transit and fewer car shares. Chair Suesser felt the car shares were a huge problem, and they needed to do better at getting people on shuttles and transit. She observed people using shuttles more and would like to see Deer Valley or the hotel provide a free shuttle from the airport, from the Wasatch Back, and the Wasatch Front.

Chair Suesser agreed with the commentary regarding the desire to preserve the summer experience and did not think that enough attention was being devoted to that. She noted that the summer activities were very dear to the community, and she would like to know the applicant's plan to preserve them. She queried how someone arriving by bus with a mountain bike would access the lift during the summer.

Chair Suesser stated that the alternatives presented have all been variations on the same, and have always assumed that the City would vacate the southern ROW. She wanted to know whether there was a backup plan, and if so, what it entailed. She felt it would help the community and the Commission to understand these plans better if they had a thorough understanding of why this design was the only one being considered.

Mr. Budge referenced a graphic showing the key elements of the project and noted that if the southern ROW were not vacated, then there could not be a village. He explained that during the open house, as they walked people through the experience they could expect, a majority were in favor of the plan. He highlighted the comments of one person who understood why the vacation was necessary because there was a village that would go from the ice skating rink to Carpenter Lift, and if there was a road going through it, it "cuts its throat." Without the vacation of the ROW, the continuity would be broken. They are trying to create an experience where visitors arrive and where the ski experience begins, without the need to travel over asphalt to experience what is Deer Valley. He stressed that this was the genius of this plan.

Mr. Budge confirmed that they have looked at other options; however, they all lead to a plan without a village and hundreds of townhomes or condominiums that would be isolated with amenities only available to those owners. This would be antithetical to the vision of creating a village that would be usable by the community. He added that by exhaustively reviewing and comparing all of the other plans, they came back to the parking structure plan they started with. They want to focus on how they could provide these benefits that justify the small vacation of the ROW.

Commissioner Frontero asked the applicant to give more consideration to alternatives on the ROW in terms of what the City would receive in return. He was not sure that Doe Pass Road would be a good trade for the City and suggested that alternatives could include shuttles to the residents in Lower Deer Valley, and the provision of shuttle stops. He heard many comments that people could not get to the bus stops. He wanted to see a more detailed, robust plan of what the City would receive if the applicant received the ROW vacation.

Vice Chair Hall suggested providing the applicant and Staff with some specific questions or directions and felt that from a high level, they needed to discuss whether the Commission was conceptually in favor of transitioning away from the current configuration to the two-way on Doe Pass Road and changing the drop-off zone. She also suggested that they determine whether they liked the new Alternative C. She also mentioned the parking reduction.

Vice Chair Hall wanted information on the width of the three lanes to confirm that they could operate City buses and oversized shuttles within the three lanes. She also requested an analysis of the pros and cons of the ROW versus an easement for Doe Pass Road. She would also like to see an analysis of the feasibility of a roundabout, or other options instead of a stoplight at the Y-intersection. Vice Chair Hall was in favor of Alternative C and would like to see how far they could extend the SML past the Y-intersection.

Commissioner Johnson agreed and observed that they had asked for quite a bit from the applicant. He stated he was favoring Alternative C, but there were a lot of "ifs." He could not support the parking reduction until they have some sort of holistic view on transportation. He felt if they were not to grant the parking reduction, the use could be shifted at a later date in the development, but he could not support the parking reduction at this point.

Vice Chair Hall recalled that the applicant stated they could go either way. She wondered how the applicant could incentivize the use of public transportation when only 8% of residents use public transit. She acknowledged that a parking reduction with paid parking was not popular among locals, but it was a reality.

Commissioner Frontero understood the concept behind the parking reduction that if they do not build it, they will not come. He has seen evidence in other studies that this is the case. He would consider the 20% reduction, but noted that allowing the reduction would substantially reduce the applicant's costs, and roughly estimated the savings to be around \$22 million. He wanted to know what the community would be getting in exchange for the reduction. He charged the applicant with being more creative and providing a holistic solution for the community. He stressed that the community needs more in return given what the applicant has requested. At present, the application was fairly one-sided towards what the applicant needs, and not what the community needs. He implored the applicant to try to come up with more alternatives that the community could support.

Chair Suesser echoed Commissioner Frontero's remarks.

Commissioner Kenworthy would like to see more mitigation for the additional 225 trips. He echoed the comments that they are all in this together and all want what is best. He added that while there are positive aspects, they always come back to parking and transportation. If they could not get the buses out of traffic, he would like to see from the City how they could micro-transit from SR-248 and SR-224. He stated that the key was to get the Average Vehicle Occupancy ("AVO") up and make it efficient. He noted that during the pandemic they had a great reduction of AVO for good reason. They need to go back to what would help the AVO and would create fewer cars through this loop. He acknowledged that it was difficult to get the Deer Valley demographic onto buses. He added that it would be difficult to increase transit use from 8% to 20% to offset the parking reduction, and would like to see the raw numbers on how that would work.

Commissioner Kenworthy understood the Doe Pass Road option and felt it was a good solution, although he would love to keep the Loop. He averred that the elevations would make it extremely difficult. He thanked the applicant for the element that would help with emergency issues and felt that the 12-foot path would keep the summer aspect tied in. He agreed with the other Commissioners about equity. He liked the idea of the gondola and felt it would take cars off the road. Commissioner Kenworthy felt they had a wonderful window of opportunity if they stay united as Park City.

Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, addressed the claim of inaction under LMC Section 15-1-14 and stated the standard was not based on meetings. Before the City could try to declare an application inactive, the Planning Director must give the applicant 14 days' notice, which has not occurred in this case. He noted that there are many aspects to processing an application that occurs behind the scenes. Many applicants do not get to their first meeting during the first 180 days because they are working with third parties, or addressing utility issues and those types of things. He acknowledged that was difficult for the public to track, but in this case, it was not even a close call, as the applicant has been engaged the entire time.

## **2. ADJOURN**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Van Dine moved to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.