PARK CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 9, 2013

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

Diane Foster, City Manager; Tyler Poulson, Environmental/Sustainability Manager; Matt Abbott, Environmental Project Manager

Insa Riepen, Recycle Utah; Jaren Scott, Summit County Landfill; Doug Dastrup, Fresh Market; Alison Butz, HPCA; Bill Malone, Chamber/Bureau; Kate Bradshaw, Utah Food Industry and Utah Retail Merchants Association; Jim Whitney, Summit County resident; and Glen Wright, Park City resident

Absent: **Council member Liza Simpson**

1. Disposable shopping bags. Mayor Williams relayed that no policy decision will be made today and the purpose of the meeting is to encourage dialog on the subject. Over the years Park City has come to be recognized as a leader in environmental policy and thought. There has been a lot of work done with private-public partnerships like Recycle Utah. In addition to being a resort community, we are also a community willing to look at new and different environmental ideas. The City explored this issue about three years ago and it seemed like time to look at it again with stakeholders at the table.

Tyler Poulson referred to his staff report. The last time Council discussed this subject was in the fall of 2011 and at that time, staff communicated that it appeared that a plastic bag tax is prohibited under the Utah Tax Code and in lieu of that type of tax, it was decided not to consider a ban of any specific product. Since then, there has been a growing interest in disposable bag ordinances and 112 were discovered by staff on record around the country. The ordinances typically cite things like waste issues, nuisance factors, environmental and sustainability goals, as well as wildlife impacts as motivation for taking legislative action. The staff report covers a variety of examples at a high level in terms of what ordinances exist over the country; from minimum per bag taxes to a ban of plastic to a ban of plastic and paper. He believed that ultimately what is at the heart of all of that legislation is the end goal of driving behavior change and hopefully encouraging reusable bags which is considered the ultimate positive environmental option. The trade-off between paper and plastic is featured in the report and when selecting between the two products, it is a choice of environmental values in terms of where the larger impact occurs.

Mr. Poulson continued to explain that Park City's demographics are a bit challenging because of the high percentage of visitors who are unlikely to bring their own bags. He referred to the legislative alternatives in the report and challenges from the industry some other municipalities face. He invited the stakeholders to provide comments.

Kate Bradshaw, Utah Food Industry and Utah Retail Merchants Association, stated that her membership suggests that the City not ban plastic. There is no clear cut advantage with plastic or paper and in terms of shipping costs, plastic bags pack a lot tighter decreasing the environmental impact of transportation. There are good reasons why the industry uses plastic. Contamination is a key consideration so there should be an exception for meat, produce and prescriptions. She encouraged weighing plastic and paper equally and a drive from plastic to paper increases the costs for retailers. She emphasized that reusable bags are also very expensive and even though stores are using a carrot approach, the uptake rate is very low and in Utah about 5%. Park City's demographic is unique because of its level of visitors but it also has an environmentally conscious component and the City has a higher rate of people using reusable bags than experienced in the rest of the state. But even at a higher rate, Park City is actually quite low even with a 5 cent discount per bag. Ms. Bradshaw noted that her membership prefers rules and regulations which are uniform and consistent state-wide. It is unfortunate when a store is fined or cited because of an unintended loophole in regulation. Stores are regulated by a variety of entities at the federal, state and local levels.

Mayor Williams pointed out that Maui banned plastic two years ago and meat is wrapped in paper and produce is still wrapped in plastic. Ms. Bradshaw explained that there is no precedent for this in Utah. California has several jurisdictions as well as back East but often those places have some exceptions and may have incentives or fees. Meats ordered from the butcher may be wrapped in paper but prepackaged meats are generally wrapped in plastic with a Styrofoam base and often bagged again to keep them from leaking and contaminating other foods.

Andy Beerman asked about the option of biodegradable bags. Kate Bradshaw explained that there is a wide variety of biodegradable bags available at different price points. Grocery has a very low margin of profit and asking stores to purchase a more expensive product will likely be passed onto the consumer. Doug Dastrup indicated that there are some chains trying biodegradable bags but right now the biggest problem is that they aren't very durable and can only hold about five pounds. Unfortunately, the technology is not there yet.

Cindy Matsumoto stated that the biggest problem she sees with plastic is littering on the roadways, in trees and fences, and the threat to wildlife. Bill Malone interjected that there are about 24,000 nightly rental pillows in town so it is not a matter of just training Park City's population in order to make a difference. Out of that 24,000 some are in the City and some are out of the City limits, but shop in the City. About 70% of the bed base has units with kitchens and a large number of guests go to the grocery store to stock up. He has a hard time imagining guests packing canvas shopping bags. There is a tendency to focus on grocery stores but there are plastic bags in a number of stores in the community. The Chamber/Bureau encourages people not to rent cars and to use public transportation and many guests are juggling several plastic bags and taking the bus. He heard a suggestion that rental units be stocked with reusable bags but there are sanitary issues related to that idea. The Mayor noted that Squatters uses corn-based degradable bags and spoke about partnering. Plastic bags create bacteria as well and he felt people will take the bags home as souvenirs.

Insa Riepen stated that it is not a question between plastic or paper but asking the community what they would like to see. She noted that Recycle Utah's survey revealed that people don't like plastic bags, acknowledging that the grocery stores are an easy target. She agreed with Ms. Matsumoto that plastic bags create litter. Banning plastic bags was tried with as a Leadership program which didn't work. She suggested charging a fee, not a tax, to actually make a difference. If someone has to pay 5 to 10 cents for a plastic or paper bag, it is likely people would bring their bags shopping. This is not an attack on the grocery stores.

Cindy Matsumoto appreciated Mr. Malone's comments but asked about practices in other resort communities. Tyler Poulson indicated that there are great examples in Colorado in Telluride or Aspen where a tax or fee is associated with the bag. In actually changing behavior of visitors, he felt they would defer to pay the fee. Washington DC imposed a 5 cent charge on paper and plastic and the Washington Post reported a 73% reduction in the first quarter after the fee was implemented. It wasn't necessarily the fee that drove behavior but it was more the cultural precedent. Insa Riepen explained that Aspen has its own bag which is very popular. Mr. Poulson indicated a reusable bag typically costs $1 but a reusable branded bag made in the US is $5 to $6 before any branding costs. It could become very costly if these bags are provided to the visitor base. Kate Bradshaw pointed out that a fee in Park City may drive customers to businesses at Kimball Junction. The Mayor invited the public to speak.

Jim Whitney, Silver Summit resident and owner of a marketing company, felt it would be easy to work with local businesses in the community to cover the cost for reusable bags at properties. This is about changing behavior and not about punishing grocery stores. He might travel into town to support the stores participating in a program. Reusable bags are more stable and don't tip over like plastic bags. They are stronger and easy to carry items. He feels environmental initiatives attract people.

Glen Wright, Park City resident, spoke about reusable bags being typical in Europe. He agreed with Mr. Whitney's comments and felt that environmental programs attract more tourists. There is no reason the lodging bags can't be washed with the sheets. It's a good idea and puts Park City ahead of the market.

Doug Dastrup spoke about property management services using totes to stock rental units. It is a matter of training people. Every time someone brings in a reusable bag, the shopper is compensated 5 cents. Reusable bags sell for $1 to $1.99, far below Fresh Market's price, and they are doing everything they can to train customers. They are in the customer service business and try to provide the service that is easiest for guests. He emphasized that 5% or less of the population in Park City is using reusable bags. Kate Bradshaw agreed that they are in the customer service business and offer a full range of bagging options. A couple of years ago, reusable bags were promoted but it wasn't sustained and most stores will offer a nickel off per bag. If the goal is collecting revenue, it can be achieved but if the goal is to drive down the use of plastic or paper, that is more difficult. The Mayor asked if the City offered grants to help subsidize the program, would the industry partner. Ms. Bradshaw believed members in Salt Lake City have agreed to do so and spoke about the bagging contest which features only reusable bags.

Alison Butz, HPCA, reported that a higher percentage of businesses on Main Street offer plastic over paper. The majority of members are not interested in purchasing branded bags and some prefer to purchase their own bags with their own logos. Often the clientele on Main Street is not out intending to buy but may shop after dinner at a restaurant. Once a bag is full, the Association would not want them to stop shopping.

Dick Peek felt that using a menu of behavioral changes is great. In response to a question from Ms. Matsumoto, Mr. Poulson explained that a tax is collected by a municipality; half remains with the retailer and half goes to the city. Matt Abbot explained that all of the fees are bridged, starting out keeping a portion, and then reducing the following year, and eventually going away or capping out at $1,000 a year.

Ms. Bradshaw indicated that if Council pursues some type of a fee where the retailer is charged with the collection and remitting the revenue, the vendor should be compensated for administrative services. Andy Beerman felt that it is premature to regulate plastic or paper at this point, but he would like to formulate a phase-out plan with some real benchmarks and is hoping that technology catches up with the demand.

Dick Peek explained the Whole Foods model where people are given a wooden coin for using a reusable bag and the consumer can decide a cause to support. Bill Malone asked if Council is looking at all plastic bags, including the ones newspapers are delivered in. The Mayor indicated that the discussion is not that specific and the staff report suggests exempting businesses under 3,500 square feet which would cover 90% of Main Street. He tends to agree with Mr. Beerman about modifying behavior and although the City is supportive it would like Recycle Utah to run a program. Insa Riepen expressed her willingness. It is not the intent to damage local businesses and there is quite a lot more to talk about. If the City considers a fee, he contemplated opposition from the state legislature.

Cindy Matsumoto referred to Ms. Riepen's comment about the popularity of the Aspen reusable bag. She has not seen many people using recyclable bags locally, but it is different at Whole Foods where there is peer pressure to use recyclable bags. She likes the idea of a bag supported by the community that could be used by lodging and didn't feel that leaving a couple of bags in units would be that costly. It is worth looking into. The Mayor commented on the years of marketing the free bus system which has been wildly successful and bus drivers are great ambassadors.

Jaren Scott added that the landfill is the end-user and the County's goal is to reduce the amount of plastic bags to prolong the facility. As this matter moves forward, the County Council desires to be involved.

Alex Butwinski expressed concerns about enforcing an associated ordinance and government over-reach. A carrot approach should be the first step. He supported the idea of the Aspen bag with Park City's logo. The Mayor pointed out that the City is in its third year of the carrot approach and there is not a lot of fundamental change. If there is a concerted marketing effort involving lodging, transit and the business community it may not have to be legislated and Council is not interested at this point to direct staff to write an ordinance today. The dialog on this should certainly continue. Cindy Matsumoto would like to know Whole Food's rate of use of reusable bags. Matt Abbot indicated that staff has information on Aspen's behavior modification numbers. Aspen is currently in litigation over its legislation regulating stores over 3,500 square feet.

Ms. Bradshaw stated that if it is good for one retailer it should be good for all retailers; everyone should be treated the same. In response to a question from Mr. Butwinski, Doug Dastrup discussed the volume of bags Fresh Market uses in the high season and commented that grocery stores do not love plastic bags and the right solution needs to be found. He explained how grocery stores recycle plastic bags. Andy Beerman acknowledged the goal to move away from both plastic and paper to reusable bags.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

PARK CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 9, 2013

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

Jed Briggs, Operating Budget Manager; Nate Rockwood, Capital Budget Manager; Dani Lo Feudo, Human Resources Analyst; Clint McAffee, Water Manager; Kent Cashel, Transportation Manager; Jon Pistey, Ice Operations Manager; Rebecca Gills, Accounting Manager; Troy Dayley, Streets Superintendent; and Jasmina Juric, Acting Library Director

Absent: **Council member Liza Simpson**

1. Council questions and comments. Dick Peek spoke about attending the Joint Transit Advisory Board meeting and reported that SLC ridership has increased 50% and marketing efforts on this service will continue. He attended the Board of Adjustment meeting where an appeal was denied and also attended the Planning Commission meeting. Andy Beerman attended the Regional Recreation Strategic meeting. There is a needs study and statistical study of the greater Park City area and the committee is taking public input to arrive at a plan. COSAC met and there was a lot of discussion on the criteria for open space purchases. The Chamber had a great turn-out for its Tourism Day event yesterday. Mr. Beerman indicated that he also attended a Recreation Advisory Board meeting.

Alex Butwinski reported on the lengthy Planning Commission meeting last night and highlighted the agenda. He thanked the Chamber for hosting the Tourism Day lunch. The Mayor spoke about attending the Park City Heights and Treasure meetings.

Glen Wright, resident, reported that the Park City American Legion Post will be holding a Memorial Day ceremony at the cemetery at 10 a.m. and invited the public.

Andy Beerman asked if a working group should be assigned for the disposable shopping bag effort. Cindy Matsumoto, liaison to Recycle Utah, volunteered to be part of the group. Mayor Williams felt it worthwhile to hold another study session bringing in lodging and transportation groups to partner in promoting disposable shopping bags. There were no questions or comments on the manager's report from members.

2. Continuation of Capital Improvements Budget discussion, review of operating expenditures and strategic plans. Nate Rockwood stated that last week, the majority of the capital budget was presented. The one remaining component is the Water Fund. At the time the tentative budget was formulated, staff was still evaluating some of the water projects and included in this week's meeting packet, is a table showing the five year CIP for water. The amounts listed are the total amounts for the projects and the Water Department is constantly evaluating the best possible solution for meeting delivery and quality needs. The budget reflects what the Department currently sees as funding needs over the next five years. The Water Fund is supported by water service fees, water impact fees, some grant money, and water bonds which are paid for with water impact and service fees.

In response to questions from Alex Butwinski about user and impact fees, Clint McAffee explained that user rate increases are contemplated over the next few years. Nate Rockwood noted that all of the capital water projects will be put into the water model which will determine rates. Water rates for 2013 and 2014 are similar to what they were last year and a huge change is not expected. Mr. McAffee explained that a few large users have talked with the Department about upsizing meters; however, many connections are designed for fire flow systems. An updated impact fee study has been delayed because of the potential partnership with regional water suppliers which could change the study dramatically.

Mayor Williams understood that Rockport water is stored at ponds at Promontory and operation and storage totals about $1 million a year. Clint McAffee explained that the cost will rise with inflation and is a rate set by Weber Basin and Mountain Regional. Part of it is to pay debt service on the infrastructure built to transport water from the Rockport Reservoir to Park City. Part of the cost is water, the lease, and storage is somewhat misleading because there is not really storage there. Operations and maintenance increase over the years which affect the rate. Facilities replacement will continually be funded. In response to a question from the Mayor, Nate Rockwood explained that the Prospector Drain was pulled from the Water Fund, at the suggestion of the auditors, and is now in the CIP. Water quality is budgeted at $250,000.

Andy Beerman asked if the existing Empire Tank is still needed with water being pumped directly to Spiro. Mr. McAffee indicated that it will need to be replaced because the Department of Drinking Water requires storage to meet the demand on peak days. The Judge Tunnel will be converted to a raw water supply and its water will be treated at Quinns for potable water. He stated that the Empire Tank is only meant for Judge because there is no way to get other water sources to that tank, so the City is losing storage from the tank. The existing tank holds one million gallons and the new one will be closer to two million because there is a shortage of storage in that zone. He stated that the Judge still has a useful purpose but the water is not potable anymore. Cindy Matsumoto understood that there will be two tanks and Mr. McAffee confirmed but they will be at different elevations and locations. Stantec Consulting is exploring sites for the new tank and the elevation will match the existing Woodside Tank which is lower than the Empire Tank. The new tank will not be constructed until next year. Andy Beerman pointed out the $1 million dedicated to micro-hydro and asked about the status of the grant. Mr. McAffee responded that the Department has not received notification on the grant for $250,000; the total project cost will be about $1.5 to $2 million.

In response to a comment from Dick Peek about the Judge Tunnel, Clint McAffee pointed out the antimony problem at the Judge which is at the maximum contaminant level set by the Department of Drinking Water. The City has a compliance agreement with the Department which expires in June 2014 and unless Judge is treated, the City can't use it for potable water. The solution for that and the pending discharge permit is treating the water at Quinns. This concluded the capital discussion.

Jed Briggs stated that the Results Committee included Rick Ryan, Jason Glidden, Michelle Downard, Rebecca Gillis, Kent Cashel, and Jon Pistey. He thanked them for their work and added that members took their jobs very seriously. The process took some time, but not as much time as in the previous year where all items were scored. The group was mainly focused on the proposed changes since this is the off-year of the budget and to ensure zero sum impacts resulting from the modifications. Increases were offset with decreases somewhere else. Part of the recommendation included the Pay Plan Committee and Fleet Committee requests for funding. He pointed out that the CIP Committee is making its own recommendation on the capital side which has already been presented. The Results Team and CIP Committee formulate the City Manager's Recommended Budget.

Mr. Briggs explained that the Results Team looks at established need and the BFO information to make sure that a recommendation is based within the confines of the FIAR, or in other words, revenues available over the course of the next fiscal year. The Team knew that sales tax revenue would decrease and made recommendations based on that information. Many decisions were difficult but ultimately members were able to present a balanced budget where revenues are matching expenditures for the next fiscal year. He referred to the attachment in the staff report outlining the biennial strategic plans. Last year, there were eight City Council goals which have been reduced to four on which the budget is focused. The Strategic Plan teams will rewrite the plans for the next budget process and the Results Team can elaborate on them tonight. Council prioritized the goals and the first one is *preserving and enhancing the natural environment.*

Alex Butwinski interjected that right in the middle of the long-term budget strategies, it says that the FIAR projection is based off a ten year historical analysis of average annual increases which is basically incremental budgeting so we don't know if those numbers would have been higher or lower had we had the BFO and as we go forward that number should be based off the regular increase. The on-going incremental budget projections should not impact what we think. With regard to personnel, he arrived at four reductions and eight additions and asked how that fits with our overall FTE neutral plan. Jed Briggs clarified that in some instances contract positions were turned into a FTE which would be added while decreasing the funding for the contract position. Mr. Butwinski referred to the staffing plan for ice which decreases two positions and adds three positions and there is no mention of a contract change-out in this instance so it appears like a net increase in personnel. Mr. Briggs explained that there is a difference with a contract going from the materials and supplies budget into the personnel budget which does not change any of the FTEs. There are also FTEs that were contract positions that become FTEs which increases the FTE count but the budget remains neutral; parking services is a good example. Alex Butwinski stated that he focused on positions that do not reference a contract position and the report implies that there is an increase in the gross number of FTEs whether they are called contract or not. For the sake of clarity, there needs to be a better understanding of how to explain this to the public and there has to be way to equate the increase to either maintaining a service level or increasing the service level. Andy Beerman stated that he would like a list of part-time and contract employees and Jed Briggs pointed out that the chart in the staff report includes part-time employees but it doesn't include contract employees.

Alex Butwinski was pleased that the budget summary is significantly shorter this year. Mr. Briggs returned to the goal of *preserving and enhancing the natural environment* and explained a table on Page 30, showing all of the programs within the goal. A program can be supported by a combination of departments. The chart includes the score created by the Results Team based on criteria, then the 2013 recommended cost, the department's 2014 request, and the Results Team and City Manager recommendation are combined. Next is the revenue offset if there are direct revenues associated with the BFO program and then the total cost which is the net between the City Manager's recommendation and the revenue offset. He pointed out that every BFO program is changing because of increases in health insurance and other technical adjustments.

Clint McAffee explained that most of the changes to water programs and environmental or regulatory programs are attributable to a couple of things. Some are increasing and some decreasing at net sum zero. There are two water worker positions open which are in the distribution group and necessary to keep up with maintenance. The Department is beginning to get a better idea how to best fill these two positions. Scenario 2 looks at combining those two positions into one distribution superintendent position, which would result in one field supervisor. Treatment has an identical set-up with a superintendent and water workers under the position, which is working very well. The distribution operations team leader spends most of his time in the office because of technical needs like the implementation of the asset management software, water rights work, energy management, leak detection, and a safety program. This position is getting pulled farther away from the field. He stated that one option is combining the two operator positions into one supervisor position. In the end, there is one less person and some cost savings. Someone directing the bigger picture in distribution would create more efficiency. The savings from this was moved to the seasonal labor budget for production and maintenance work. There is a small scheduled increase for inflation in materials and supplies and contract services. He commented that the environmental regulatory number is generally going down and a large part of that is because the need for outside legal services in this program is beginning to diminish. A large portion of the money will be shifted to a CIP fund which is money currently funding the Environmental Regulatory Affairs Manager position. The portion paid by the Water Fund for the Environmental Program Manager will be treated as an inter-fund transfer.

Jed Briggs referred to the second goal, *world-class multi-seasonal resort*. Kent Cashel stated that a number of programs are associated with this goal. Over the last four years, the level of sensitivity and common sense expected in day-to-day parking enforcement has continually risen and staff has worked diligently to satisfy expectations. It has become apparent that under a contract situation, employees are paid a low wage and it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the level of staffing needed. Additionally, under a contract situation, City management should not step in to direct employees and he finds himself required to do that in order to achieve these service levels. Mr. Cashel stated that staff is recommending that the operation be brought in-house. The City has had the paid parking program since 1998 and he believes the in-house experience is capable of managing it. The budget option reflects bringing the current level of staff under the contract; two FTEs for enforcement; a FTE supervisory position and seasonal employees for peak winter and summer periods. Andy Beerman commended staff on this direction because the parking staff is often the City's front line ambassadors and not always in the best of circumstances. He takes pride in all of our staff trained in customer service and bringing parking in-house could be a big plus.

Cindy Matsumoto asked what parking meter revenues offset. Kent Cashel responded that the intent was to cover future parking cost increases. However, revenues are allocated to PSSM, HPCA, and a piece was held out to fund cost increases. The Department has not been able to achieve the level of revenues forecasted because of things like street dining and other activities that diminish parking revenue opportunities. Staff is not asking for a budget increase since any increase is offset from reductions in other areas and service levels will be retained. In response to a question from Ms. Matsumoto about future donations to PSSM and HPCA, Mr. Cashel acknowledged that it will be increasingly tough. It seems like this revenue stream is continually being hit with requests for fee waivers or free days and if those types of requests increase, the fund will have to be balanced somehow unless the requests are denied. Jed Briggs noted that Mr. Cashel has been concerned about this issue and from an accounting standpoint; parking has been separated out from transit so the information better relates to actual expenditures and revenues.

Kent Cashel stated that transportation includes a recommendation to fund $5,000 of overtime both in police and transit related to the Tour of Utah. Last year, the departments absorbed those costs and were directed to budget them. Mr. Cashel commented on the utility reduction in the China Bridge Parking Structure.

Jon Pistey explained that an increase in staff for ice represents adding referees at a cost of $12,000 but there will be a revenue offset. The proposed staffing changes include a reduction in FTEs for the Business Development Manager, Operations Manager and front desk Supervisor which is not mentioned in the staff report. Staff is proposing to replace that position with a general manager, a program coordinator and a front desk team leader which will reduce the budget by about $40,000 and provide better customer service oversight with the program coordinator which replaces two part-time positions. Cross-training staff is also a goal.

He continued that the Building Maintenance Department is moving utility costs to individual departments so that there is better oversight which affects the Recreation Department. A budget increase is proposed to increase funding for the tennis lesson program and there is a direct revenue offset from fees collected for lessons.

Jed Briggs stated that the position of Economic Development Manager will be overseeing the special events program which has grown significantly over the years and this position will help with special projects from the City Manager.

Mr. Briggs addressed the next goal of *inclusive community and diverse economic and cultural opportunities*. Last year, code enforcement was enhanced for Sundance and $12,500 was in the economy budget which will be allocated to the Building Department for its code enforcement services and is considered a sum zero change. Another position in the Planning Department is proposed because of the increase in planning applications and associated daily demands. He explained that the current Planning Manager would be added to the budget and the Planner Architect would be removed at the same dollar amount of $120,000. A Planner II position is intended to fill the Planner Architect at $98,000 and in essence, this is adding two positions and losing one.

He pointed out the next goal of *cutting edge and effective government*. The Capital Budget Manager was funded out of the Transit and Water Funds which will be moved to the General Fund which is an increase in the Budget Department's budget but represents a net zero impact. The Budget Department is changing a contracted Performance and Budget Analyst to a FTE position which is zero sum change.

Rebecca Gillis discussed changes to IT which is moving the Analyst I, front desk receptionist, to the Sustainability Department and is a zero sum change. This position will assume some additional responsibilities from Sustainability. IT requested $115,000 and the Results Team recommends $74,000 for support services and software improvements. Executive is moving the Organizational Development Manager to Human Resources which is a .5 FTE and Diane Foster clarified this is Craig Sanchez' position. She added that Jolene Weston is on contract to assist the Human Resources Department. The City Manager's Office is changing the part-time non-benefitted assistant to a contracted employee.

Jed Briggs stated that there are some notable requests that are not recommended. The Team struggled with the Library reciprocal borrowing program with Summit County. It was funded equally by the County at $10,000. He later discovered that the total cost is about $12,100 but the County decided not to contribute to the program anymore. The Results Team decided not to fund in consideration of the sales tax decreases and viewed it as a policy decision that should be brought to Council. In response to a question from Cindy Matsumoto, Mr. Briggs explained that it was originally estimated that the program would cost $20,000. The program is only for County residents ages 5 to 18 living outside the City limits. Diane Foster interjected that the Results Team doesn't hate kids and the issue at its base is a policy question. She asked what happens in the future if the same thing happens with a more expensive shared program.

Dick Peek felt that the County *needs to pay to play* because it is not fair to burden Park City taxpayers and he emphasized that the County will receive $650,000 in additional sales tax that City staff discovered. It is Summit County's decision not to continue the student program and they need to own it. Andy Beerman expressed confusion about the School District not being involved and Ms. Foster explained that the program is tied to the libraries. Mr. Beerman believed that this program benefits education and he struggles with the lack of School District participation. Alex Butwinski believed that these situations should be evaluated individually rather than having a broad policy.

Cindy Matsumoto pointed out that the County overpaid for several years and asked if the City could pay $12,000 to retain the program. In response to a question from Ms. Foster about the level of funding to keep the program alive, Interim Library Director Jasmina Juric stated that she needs to look at the numbers to gain a better understanding of the preliminary study. The program grew from 160 in 2008 to 264 participants currently. Jed Briggs stated that the original $20,000 was an estimate and has stood as the program cost for the last several years based on staffing projections. Ms. Matsumoto asked the cost of a library card for County residents and Ms. Juric stated that it is $40 for a household. Cindy Matsumoto suggested a reduced rate for County cards or that the City pay $12,000 to retain the student borrowing program. Andy Beerman felt that there are times and places to draw a line in the sand, and he is not sure this is one of them. It's not a real savings of $12,000 and he felt the City can absorb the cost without setting a precedent. Dick Peek emphasized that the County chose to reduce this funding. Ms. Matsumoto felt the City should pay for it and continue to work with the County on regional issues. It was pointed out again that the $40 fee is for a household and Ms. Matsumoto elaborated on her position. Alex Butwinski agreed with Mr. Peek who again expressed that he feels that the County needs to own its decision and should not burden Park City taxpayers with the cut in funding. The Mayor expressed his support to continue the program. Ms. Foster understood consensus to be that Council would like to fund this program but send a clear message to the County that this is not setting a precedent for future joint ventures.

The Mayor asked how many times snow was hauled and Troy Dayley indicated that Public Works conducted four *mini-hauls* last winter and four regular hauls are budgeted per year. The Mayor expressed the goal of removing windrows from the curbs and Cindy Matsumoto stated that this was a priority for her as well. Mr. Dayley pointed out the option for enhanced sidewalk maintenance for Main Street was not supported by the Results Team. Mr. Briggs stated that there will be an opportunity to discuss this again as part of the operating budget review.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH,
MAY 9, 2013

I ROLL CALL

Mayor Dana Williams called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, May 9, 2013. Members in attendance were Dana Williams, Andy Beerman, Alex Butwinski, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Staff present was Diane Foster, City Manager; Tom Daley, Deputy City Attorney; Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager; Wade Carpenter, Chief of Police; Anya Grahn, Preservation Planner; Thomas Eddington, Planning Manager; and Nate Rockwood, Capital Budget Manager.

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

Police Torch Run - Jon Weidenhamer reported that the Police Department has received administrative approval to hold a torch run this Saturday morning at 8:30 a.m. Chief Wade Carpenter interjected that this is an annual event but the dates were changed so it won't be held in conjunction with Running with Ed this year. Members had no concerns.

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

1. Treasure Mountain Leadership Program - Emma Laudon, Treasure Mountain Junior High School, thanked the Mayor and stated that the best towns have the best leaders. The Treasure Mountain Leadership Program members have had Dana Williams as their mayor most of their lives. She relayed that he has demonstrated the best qualities of a leader. Leadership is love and she presented him with a cap as a gift from the class. The Mayor spoke about the benefits of listening to the students' messages which mean a lot to him and he gained a lot from the experience.

2. Yellow Ribbon Program - Annie Elliott asked for Council's support of the Yellow Ribbon Program for dogs and asked for permission to post flyers at trailheads and parks so that the program can be started as soon as possible. The Mayor encouraged Ms. Elliott to visit the County Commission since animal control is under its jurisdiction. Diane Foster suggested that this could be brought back as a work session item on the agenda so a decision can be rendered by members.

Andy Beerman didn't feel that a work session is necessary since Mountain Trails handles the education and signage components and he didn't feel Council's permission is required. Members expressed support of the program.

IV NEW BUSINESS

1. Consideration of an Ordinance adopting the Revised Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 and the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 for Park City Municipal Corporation and its related agencies – The Mayor opened the public hearing; there was none. He requested a motion to continue to May 30th. Liza Simpson, "I so move". Cindy Matsumoto seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

2. Consideration of a Declaration of official intent of the City Council of Park City, Utah to reimburse itself from the proceeds of bonds for certain capital expenditures advanced by the City; establishing the maximum principal amount of such expenditures; and authorizing incidental action – Nate Rockwood explained that the City, through the additional resort cities sales tax revenue, arrived at a plan which includes several bonding issuances for different projects. The Resolution allows the City to reimburse itself up to $10 million and does not change the budget or phasing of projects. The City can wait up to three years before issuing a bond and money can be spent now and be reimbursed. It is critical that the City adopt this because funds have already been spent for the Toll Canyon open space purchase. He explained that reimbursement resolutions have been used for the walkability general obligation bond where money was spent before the issuance which is similar. He added that one of the strategies with this approach is having the money in the bank before paying for the project. He assured members that there is no cash flow issue money is available in the CIP obligated to other projects. The Mayor invited public input; there was none.

Cindy Matsumoto, "I move that the Council adopt the Sales Revenue Bond Reimbursement Resolution allowing the City to reimburse itself with proceeds of future sales of revenue bonds for specified capital expenditures". Alex Butwinski seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

3. Consideration of authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract for consulting services for Historic Preservation and Intensive Level Survey of Main Street National Register Historic District with CRSA in the amount of $373,482, in a form approved by the City Attorney – Anya Grahn explained that the Council approved the contract in December 2012 and in March, it was brought to the attention of staff that CRSA had inadvertently eliminated 155 intensive level surveys. A second RFP was issued, proposals were evaluated, and staff determined that CRSA is the best choice for this project.

Thomas Eddington discussed the selection process and added that CRSA has a tremendous understanding of the Historic District and submitted a good price. In response to a question from Cindy Matsumoto, Ms. Grahn stated that the previous bid was for $219,205 representing a difference of about $154,000. Preservation Solutions actually reduced its bid somewhat at $640,983 but it is significantly above the recommendation. The boundaries for the study is the Main Street District and the secondary aspect is bringing up to seven buildings back onto the National Register. Intensive level surveys will be conducted for landmark structures, significant structures and all structures in the thematic district which could be outside the Historic District.

Liza Simpson expressed that she continues to be troubled by the differences in prices, especially for the intensive level surveys. Mr. Eddington relayed that staff reviewed intensive level survey examples from responders and they all were relatively the same and CRSA actually had more information in terms of archival research. Alex Butwinski felt comfortable with the award. The Mayor invited public input. There was none.

Andy Beerman, "I move we authorize the City Manager to execute a contract for consulting services for historic preservation and intensive level survey of Main Street National Register Historic District with CRSA in the amount of $373,482, in a form approved by the City Attorney". Dick Peek seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

4. Consideration of the approval of addendums to the sale of 1450 & 1460 Park Avenue with Greenpark Cohousing, LLC, according to the terms outlined in the proposed Addendum #3 Real Estate Purchase Contract, in a form approved by the City Attorney – Diane Foster explained that Greenpark is going through the planning process and has requested extensions to its deadlines associated with the Real Estate Purchase Contract. Deadline changes include changing due diligence from May 15 to August 15, 2013 and the settlement deadline from June 15 to October 1, 2013. Staff is recommending that Council approve this request. The Mayor invited public input. There was none. Liza Simpson, "I move that we approve the addendums proposed with the sale of 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue, according to the terms outlined". Cindy Matsumoto seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

V OLD BUSINESS

1. Consideration of an Ordinance adopting Title 4, Chapter A – Special Event Temporary Alcoholic Beverage Licenses described in the Municipal Code of Park City and amendment Title 4, Chapter 4, Beer and Liquor Licensing; Title 4, Chapter 5, Beer Licenses described; Title 4, Chapter 6, Liquor License Described, of the Municipal Code of Park City – The Mayor opened the public hearing; there was no input. The City Recorder advised that the Legal Department would like the matter continued to June 6, 2013 to allow more time for Main Street businesses to weigh in. The Mayor requested a motion to continue to June 6th. Liza Simpson, "I so move". Alex Butwinski seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

2. Consideration of an Ordinance approving the Third Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units at the Belles at Empire Pass Condominiums amending Unit 4, located at 59 Silver Strike Trail, Park City, Utah - Planner Kirsten Whetstone explained that the request reflects the final as-built conditions for Unit 4 in accordance with the Utah Condominium Act, the Empire Pass MPD, Silver Strike Subdivision and the underlying amended consolidated and restated condominium plat for the 17 Belles condominiums. This also ensures documentation of unit equivalents at Empire Pass which is 90,000 square feet and 45 unit equivalents, mostly single family individual detached units. The Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the

City Council on April 24, 2013. The Mayor opened the public hearing; there was no input and the hearing was closed.

Liza Simpson, "I move that we approve the Third Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units at the Belles at Empire Pass Condominiums amending Unit 4, and approve the plat based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft Ordinance". Dick Peek seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

3. Consideration of an Ordinance approving the Fourth Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units at the Belles at Empire Pass Condominiums amending Units 5 and 6, located at 77 and 83 Silver Strike Trail, Park City, Utah – Kirsten Whetstone stated that this is identical to Item No. 2 but are duplex units. This was heard by the Planning Commission on April 24, 2013 and a positive recommendation was forwarded to the City Council with the same change to Finding No. 18. Andy Beerman pointed out an error in the recitals which will be corrected to read May 9, 2013. The Mayor opened the public hearing; there was no input and the hearing was closed. Alex Butwinski, "I move we approve the Fourth Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units at the Belles at Empire Pass Condominiums amending Units 5 and 6, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the draft ordinance". Dick Peek seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

VI ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the regular meeting of the City Council was adjourned and a joint work session with the Planning Commission convened.

MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 2 p.m. Members in attendance were Mayor Dana Williams, Andy Beerman, Alex Butwinski, Cindy Matsumoto, and Dick Peek. Liza Simpson was absent and excused. Staff present was Diane Foster, City Manager; Tom Daley, Deputy City Attorney; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney; Phyllis Robinson, Public Affairs Manager; Clint McAffee, Water Manager; Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager; Roger McClain, Water Project Manager; and Heinrich Deters, Trails and Open Space Manager. Andy Beerman "I move to close the meeting to discuss property and litigation". Andy Beerman seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting opened at approximately 3:20 p.m. Alex Butwinski, "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 AND PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT WORK SESSION MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 9, 2013

Present: **Mayor Dana Williams; Council members Andy Beerman; Alex Butwinski; Cindy Matsumoto; Dick Peek; and Liza Simpson**

Planning Commission members Charlie Wintzer, Stewart Gross; Jack Thomas; Brooke Hontz and Nann Worel

Diane Foster, City Manager; Phyllis Robinson, Public Affairs Manager; Katie Cattan, Planner; Thomas Eddington, Planning Manager; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney; and Kirsten Whetstone, Planner

Michelle Barrelle and Tim Brenwald, representing PCMR

Absent: **Planning Commission members Adam Strachan and Mick Savage**

Planning projects and schedule for completion. Diane Foster explained that staff is looking for direction on the priority order for documents and the processes. The third item is the timeline and milestones for each document. Mayor Williams acknowledged the large amount of work on the draft General Plan and feels it is easy for a citizen to understand. Nan Worel expressed the Commission's appreciation in being proactive with planning and to set a time schedule together. Ms. Foster stated that there are a significant number of planning applications and a realistic schedule should be established so the work is achievable. If a date needs to be moved, it will be collectively agreed upon by Council and the Planning Commission.

She pointed out the five documents to be discussed, (1) Bonanza Park Neighborhood Area Plan; (2) Form Based Code; (3) General Plan; and (4) Lower Park Avenue/Resort Center Neighborhood Area Plan. A consolidated document for lower Park Avenue will be split because there will probably be an application submitted soon. She asked members what order and why. Liza Simpson asked why the consolidated plan for Lower Park Avenue since it is third on the list even though its only 30% complete and has the first time trigger of June 1. Thomas Eddington explained that the consolidated plan for the Lower Park Avenue Area is not that demanding and all of the work that has been done to date, will be consolidated. It is not as much work as the Bonanza Park Plan. He estimated that it would reach the City Council by mid-July and PCMR will submit an application late July or early August. Cindy Matsumoto felt that maybe it should be the first project done. Mr. Eddington advised that it will probably go to the Planning Commission first at its June 12 meeting. Charlie Wintzer asked the scope of the application from PCMR and consultant Michael Barelle felt the application will be comprehensive although it might be reviewed in phases.

Charlie Wintzer expressed concern about not starting with the General Plan and the Planning Commission is being asked to look at a project and compare it to something that isn't written to see if it is compliant with the General Plan. The General Plan should be completed first. Thomas Eddington noted that in a perfect world, the General Plan would be the first document, but there are real external implications that will impact our neighborhoods like Bonanza Park and Lower Park Avenue. The way that the draft General Plan is written, the Lower Park Avenue Area Plan will come from the existing neighborhood plan so it's kind of in the General Plan. Bonanza Park came in the middle of the General Plan, and Bonanza Park relates to the proposed General Plan just as Lower Park Avenue will relate to the proposed General Plan because that is how it is outlined in the neighborhood section of the General Plan. In a perfect world, the General Plan would come first, but he doesn't know if that is a good idea at this point.

Diane Foster acknowledged that this is not an ideal situation. Alex Butwinski agreed with Mr. Wintzer, stating that the General Plan is very important to all of us with a focus on getting it right. He referred to Bonanza Park and asked how 90% complete was measured and the same applies to the other documents. He asked PCMR how critical the submission date is to the resort and whether it could be delayed. Tim Brenwald stated that the resort would like to be in construction mode this time next year. Michael Barelle indicated that it is pretty critical because of the MPD and CUP processes and building permits to be reviewed. Mr. Butwinski felt that there isn't enough information to prioritize projects.

Jack Thomas pointed out that both the MPD and CUP processes involve finding compliance with the General Plan. He believed the General Plan process needs to be accelerated and the other priorities are a matter of applications and process or create a broader outline of the General Plan. Cindy Matsumoto remarked on staff's priorities, listing Bonanza Park as first. Diane Foster advised that a Community Development Area cannot be formed without a plan for the area. In response to Mr. Butwinski's comment about lack of data, Ms. Foster explained that it is a professional opinion based on how far is it, how many Planning Commission meetings away is it, what else is it affecting, etc. Mr. Butwinski stated that in his business, he uses data and appreciates professional judgment, but projections need to be based upon some data that helps in making a decision. Staff has been working on the General Plan for a year and a half and he doesn't know what 70% complete means. He agreed with Messrs. Thomas and Wintzer that the General Plan is the most important priority but is unclear how long it will take to complete. Mr. Eddington believed it will take three to eight months to get the General Plan through the Planning Commission and the City Council. Charlie Wintzer expressed that this document is not like any others and it will take a while to get through it and absorb it. It is not intuitive.

Andy Beerman encouraged viewing the General Plan as a working draft because the broad principles have been agreed to. He pointed out that the first two issues are based on the timing of the CDA which may not be needed if the substation is not moved. Liza Simpson disagreed and believed the CDA is needed in any event as it is intended to provide funding for mitigation of the substation at either location. Ms. Foster indicated that the substation is scheduled next week and on the 30th. It is likely that the City will need CDA funding for design work and Ms. Hontz pointed out that the CDA doesn't need to be created by a certain date unless the assumption is made that the substation is moved. If the substation remains in place, the funding is needed but perhaps there is more time. Matt Cassel explained that the funding is needed in either instance and the CDA should be in place by June or July. Ms. Foster asked if the CDA can be delayed. Mr. Cassel believed there will be design costs this summer and construction costs next spring. Stew Gross asked for a date certain. Phyllis Robinson explained that the additional tax increment earned because of the Bonanza Park Plan will produce revenue which will allow the City to move forward. If the Bonanza Park Plan is not adopted, then the parameters change with regard to resources. Ms. Hontz felt that the CDA process should have started two years ago. Ms. Foster reiterated that the Plan has to be defined before setting up a CDA. Mr. Wintzer believed that the most important element in the Plan is whether the substation moves and the Plan will change if it doesn't move.

Dick Peek expressed that everything flows from the General Plan. The Mayor didn't feel that the burden of work falls on staff or a consultant but rather meetings held by the Council and Planning Commission. He didn't feel that the PCMR project is as dependent on the General Plan as other projects may be. Tim Brenwald agreed and believed the proposal is consistent with the old and newly drafted General Plan. The Mayor again expressed that there shouldn't be a problem reviewing PCMR's plan. Thomas Eddington pointed out that there is a supplement to the existing General Plan for Bonanza Park which contains underlying documents for decision-making. There is an opportunity to create a planning document that could guide both Lower Park Avenue and Bonanza Park.

Ms. Matsumoto asked if the General Plan could be adopted in a draft stage or does the Plan have to be complete. Charlie Wintzer stated that as a property owner and developer that if a conceptual General Plan is available, he would begin to design according to that document. But because it may change, the design work he has achieved is at his own risk. Polly Samuels McLean pointed out that the project becomes vested once the application is complete but there is a lot of work, especially with big projects, that occur before the applications are complete. Under state law, once the application is complete, it stays based on the Code today and if the Code today is relying on an old General Plan because a new one has not been adopted, then that is the one that controls. Andy Beerman understood that the General Plan provides guidelines and he questioned if it really is going to be a problem unless the changes are so significant that it would significantly modify projects. Mr. Eddington did not feel changes would be significant to an individual project, especially given that there are pretty strict parameters for Lower Park Avenue and Bonanza Park which are two large redevelopment areas.

Dana Williams asked that if the City Council and Planning Commission approve a draft General Plan, realizing that it is subject to refining, does it hold any weight. Ms. McLean answered yes, there is a pending ordinance section of the Code which would also be applicable; the General Plan has its own area, but people are on notice of what those changes are and under the pending ordinance section, there is a chance to adopt it within six months.

Alex Butwinski agreed with Ms. Hontz about the urgency to get the CDA done because the City is going to fund some of the upfront costs anyway unless the City can pay itself back. Diane Foster explained that it doesn't from the perspective that Phyllis talked about. Mr. Butwinski understood that, but if we're not rushing to get the CDA done because the money doesn't have to be spent until 2014, then there is time to define the CDA if we fund the initial design costs upfront. It is a bonus if we can pay ourselves back. Diane Foster stated that she did not think Council can make a decision on moving the substation and undergrounding lines or not moving the substation and undergrounding lines until a decision is made on the CDA. Partners need to be on board and the area must be defined. Mr. Butwinski relayed that if all of those things have to happen by June, that is an absurd rush to finish a task. He emphasized that the cost for enhancing and/or moving the substation and undergrounding lines is unknown so why would the City rush to establish a CDA. We can accomplish the same goal by investing in some minor design work and exploring partnerships. There are a lot of questions that need to be answered.

Cindy Matsumoto recalled a checklist for the substation decision and Phyllis Robinson interjected that one is access and the other is the CDA and whether is there potentially enough funding based on the current draft plan of Bonanza Park to provide the resources necessary if we were to move the substation. There will be more information next week. If the access issue cannot be resolved, then moving the substation becomes a moot point. Another fatal flaw would be if there isn't substantial funding being identified through the CDA analysis based on the draft Bonanza Park Plan as it currently exists. We could do what Mr. Butwinski is suggesting as long as the City is willing to financially stand behind the entire cost of the project should the CDA not be able to generate the resources needed.

Diane Foster emphasized that there is also a fundamental piece, not the substation, but Council's interest in burying the lines regardless of location. If Council is willing to say if the CDA doesn't happen, we will fund all $3 to $5 million, and the CDA doesn't have to be decided upon this summer. The City has to let Rocky Mountain Power know whether or not we want to buy lines and if the School District and County do not sign, then the City will be on the hook for $5 million. The Mayor stated that the driver is RMP's timeline. Diane Foster relayed that a CDA cannot be adopted without an adopted area plan. Alex Butwinski believed the discussion should be whether the City is willing to spend the $5 million regardless of what happens because he felt there is a fair amount of support for that idea. Mr. Butwinski pointed out the many unknowns and the Council needs to know how much money the City has to commit to the project.

Brooke Hontz understood from bond counsel that it actually takes two years before the City can actually bond for the money and money cannot be collected until a year after the project is established resulting in a two to three year window. Ms. Robinson agreed and noted that there has been discussion of how the flow of funds to the project is structured and what money comes in first which could potentially be considered a loan to front some of those other costs. Ms. Foster stated that if the City doesn't have the commitment from the partners, then the City has to be comfortable funding everything it has committed to on day one to RMP. Brook Hontz pointed out that it doesn't matter if it is June, July or November because the City knows it needs the money. Ms. Foster explained that the biggest tax generator is the School District and if they are out, the City will probably not do the CDA to bury the lines. Liza Simpson emphasized that in order to approach our partners with data-driven numbers, there needs to be an adopted plan. Ms. Foster stated that the partners must be on board at the time the City tells RMP what to bury which is in June or July, which is the biggest driver. Ms. Simpson stated that is her point, we need a plan. Ms. Foster continued that the CDA can't be done without the plan and if we don't have a plan, we don't have partners.

Diane Foster shifted gears with regard to scheduling meetings. Charlie Wintzer discussed the benefits of modeling a project which is very helpful. Ms. Foster stated that a model is in process. Jack Thomas stated the difficulty in getting everyone at special meetings and Diane Foster believed that a realistic schedule can be set within normal meeting times. Andy Beerman suggested a full day joint meeting with Council and the Planning Commission. Charlie Wintzer did not support a full day joint meeting.

Liza Simpson felt that the group needs to seriously discuss adding full time staffing because of the level of potential applications. Nan Worel pointed out the time needed to get new employees up to speed and Mr. Eddington acknowledged that it would take a couple of months and it could take two months to hire someone. Brooke Hontz pointed out that the group has been discussing this for two years and it hasn't been resolved. The City needs more full time staff or consultants and these are critical issues. Ms. Simpson asked the Planning Commission about the estimate for number of meetings in the staff report. Charlie Wintzer stated that he read the form-based code document but since it wasn't addressed again, he forgot the context which is one of the problems with jumping from project to project. Ms. Foster explained that the approach is to consider one item at a time in sequence.

Charlie Wintzer felt that if staff worked on the General Plan, the Bonanza Park map could be completed quickly which is the simplest part. Diane Foster stated that if the Planning Commission can commit to four two hour segments to complete the Bonanza Park Plan, she would suggest adding one to that. At that point pencils down. She wants both groups to be on the hook for the same schedule. The Mayor didn't think anyone minds doing that but no one will make a decision if it is not ready. Bonanza Park is critical and RMP is driving this. It must be done in the next couple of months and there is nothing the City can do about this schedule. There was discussion about holding joint meetings or separate meetings on Bonanza Park. Ms. Hontz expressed that access points, residential and mixed uses, and connectivity are her issues. The Mayor suggested the Planning Commission meet first and then hold a joint meeting. Mr. Wintzer believed joint meetings take longer simply because there are more people. Planner Katie Cattan felt that a joint meeting upfront would be very helpful because staff can return to the Commission with higher level policy questions about height, right-of-way dedication, funding, etc.

Jack Thomas felt there are valuable things the groups can do together like field trips. Alex Butwinski pointed out that the plan contains a number of roads and right-of-ways through the existing power station and moving the power station is almost de facto if the plan is approved. The Bonanza Park Plan has to be approved first. Jack Thomas stated that the Commission doesn't make assumptions and needs to hear from the City Council. Liza Simpson stated that she is comfortable with discussing and approving a Bonanza Park Plan and changing it if the substation doesn't move. Mr. Eddington stated that the Council has the ability to alter the plan, but the draft Bonanza Park Plan recommends a CDA be created. The Mayor stated that in order for RMP to be in the ground next year, the City has to decide by June 20. Liza Simpson suggested holding a joint meeting before the Planning Commission deliberates on the Bonanza Park and General Plans. Charlie Wintzer pointed out that the form-based code was distributed and read and then rewritten.

Considerable discussion ensued on setting a meeting schedule for both the Planning Commission and the City Council on Bonanza Park which is outlined as follows:

Bonanza Park Neighborhood Area Plan 2013 schedule for review, editing and adoption:

May 16	8 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.	Joint meeting
June 12*	5:30 p.m.	Planning Commission
June 26*	5:30 p.m.	Planning Commission
July 10*	5:30 p.m.	Planning Commission – possible vote
July 25*	TBD	City Council – possible vote
August 1*	TBD	City Council – if needed

**These meetings will be noticed stating that a majority of the City Council or Planning Commission may be in attendance at the other body's meeting.*

Conducting a field trip was discussed. Polly McLean pointed out that back-to-back meetings are not ideal because minutes need to be expedited so they are available for preparing the next staff report for the following meeting. Ms. Foster confirmed that the Planning Department will figure out how to produce expedited minutes.

Thomas Eddington relayed that if PCMR submits in August, the MPD would be heard by the Planning Commission in mid-September. He didn't feel it will take long to write the

Lower Park Avenue Plan because there is so much existing documentation and it might be ready by late June. Diane Foster asked if the group wants to review two plans at one time. Liza Simpson referred to a comment made earlier that the General Plan was something that could flow along with other discussions but heard an opinion that the next project was the General Plan and not the Lower Park Avenue Plan. Ms. Foster asked the Planning Commission if members could hear discussion on an application without some version of some document. The reason for the consolidated Lower Park Avenue Plan *Lite* is for the group. Ms. Hontz stated that she doesn't need it.

Ms. Simpson referred to what Michael Barelle said earlier that what they are bringing forward fits within the General Plan. She asked if the Planning Commission is okay with that without direction from the Lower Park Avenue Plan. Jack Thomas stated that they can with the existing General Plan and Brooke Hontz pointed out that there are five or six existing documents on Lower Park Avenue. Mr. Eddington referred to the 1993 plan which is very dated but there is a Master Plan. The idea is taking those plans, written by individuals and private entities, consolidating them into a document, addressing the PCMR area as well as some of the land that the City and others own between PCMR and the Miners Hospital so there is a conceptual layout of what will be there in the future. Nothing is on the books.

Ms. Foster understood that Mr. Thomas is not concerned about following the guiding principles of the General Plan and the plan to produce a consolidated version may not be needed. Jack Thomas felt that if staff can bring them together, members may want to see that document. Brooke Hontz preferred receiving the studies separately and she is good to go. She doesn't need the consolidation and would like to keep going forward. Ms. Foster stated that in order to give the Planning Commission the documents is somehow anointing them but until they are adopted plans, they shouldn't be guiding documents. Brooke Hontz clarified that she doesn't expect them to guide her, but to provide historical information pertinent to the site which may have value. They are public documents and members can use them, the Code and the existing General Plan. Kate Cattan added that the document is 20 years old and much of the plan has been implemented. There are two Jack Johnson studies, and a Design Workshop study. Mr. Eddington felt that the studies could be combined in a simple document making them easier to understand and comprehensive. It would be beneficial to have those documents available relative to the MPD. Liza Simpson pointed out that the Lower Park Avenue Plan has not radically changed so much in philosophy over 20 years that our current General Plan with the MPD won't give the Planning Commission enough guiding principles to talk about what PCMR is bringing forward. Thomas Eddington is worried that is not the case because our plans are not that up-to-date or good representations. The Mayor interjected that there is no time to do anything else.

Thomas Eddington and Charlie Wintzer felt that the Commission will need this information. Ms. Hontz pointed out that the studies are not adopted plans and this is kind of a waste. Ms. Foster suggested that the Planning Department conduct a work session with the Commission about the lower Park Avenue Area Plan and put it in context. Mr. Eddington expressed his desire to get the information to the Commission by the middle of July. Ms. Foster emphasized that the study information will not be formally adopted which will cut down on meetings. Charlie Wintzer agreed that members will probably not read the separate documents, but would benefit from having the information compiled with an executive summary. After lengthy discussion it was determined that the executive summary could be created by August 12.

Nan Worel reiterated that it will take a couple of months to hire new staff, it will take a couple of more months to get them up and running, at what point do we start the hiring process. It was pointed out that staffing is part of the budget process. Andy Beerman asked if it still makes sense to hold meetings on the form-based code because of the General Plan. The Mayor felt that everyone has acknowledged that the General Plan will not be completed until next year and all of these other things have taken priority until the end of August. Liza Simpson would like to talk about the schedule at the next meeting.

Mr. Wintzer referred to the lengthy discussions on scheduling but there should be more of a focus on the quality of the documents which concerns him. Also the decision made in the next six month will have to be lived with a very long time which should be the guiding principle here. The Mayor felt that everyone is doing their best to arrive at a schedule with the possibility that some things may take more time but let’s agree to get it right. Ms. Foster believed that setting a realistic schedule will result in quality. Ms. Worel asked when planning staff will be hired and Ms. Foster explained that staffing is a upcoming budget discussion with Council.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder