PARK CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 3, 2012

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

Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Tyler Poulson, Environmental Sustainability Program Manager; Nate Rockwood, Budget and Grants Analyst; Jed Briggs, Budget Analyst; Kent Cashel, Transportation Manager; Rick Ryan, Police Captain; Jon Pistey, Ice Operations Manager; and Chelese Rawlings, Accounting Manager

Absent: **Mayor Dana Williams**

1. Council questions/comments. Andy Beerman congratulated Diane Foster on her appointment as Deputy City Manager. He reported that last Friday he attended a mountain transportation study meeting with stakeholders including UTA, Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City and a variety of other organizations. Fehr & Peers is the consultant. An element of interest is a connection between the Wasatch Front to the Wasatch Back with light rail or some other means. Participants rated their priorities.

Alex Butwinski stated that he attended a HPCA meeting where members discussed a time frame for potential improvements. Dick Peek reported on a Historical Society meeting where its budget was reviewed and funds are healthy. He attended the HPB meeting where the Historic Sites Inventory nomination process was discussed. Members expressed that they were comfortable with the current process because they can personally nominate sites to the Inventory to be reviewed by staff. Cindy Matsumoto emphasized that the Code provides that staff or a home owner can nominate and HPB members are not called out. Dick Peek understood the Council will discuss this topic on May 17^{th}.

Liza Simpson attended the Recreation Advisory meeting last Tuesday. The subcommittee working on the memorial wall has made progress and would like to get some work done the end of this summer or the beginning of fall, depending upon adoption of the CIP budget. Council will consider the results of the recreation survey update in June.

Alex Butwinski added that he and Mr. Beerman stopped by the Bonanza-Park stakeholders' meeting which was largely informational and well attended. Cindy Matsumoto reminded the public of the Museum's free days on Thursdays in May. A clean-up of Glenwood Cemetery is scheduled next week.

2. Transportation alternatives and partnerships. Tyler Poulson explained that staff is seeking direction from Council on whether to pursue public-private partnerships relating to alternative modes of transportation, specifically dedicating parking stalls and waiving the parking fee for car sharing. Staff has been approached by U-Haul car share, a national provider, interested in expanding in northern Utah. Motivation for considering car sharing is spelled out in the staff report and studies have indicated that car sharing decreases the level of car ownership and vehicle miles traveled and increases walking and transit use. Some of the objectives include increased alternative transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and based on some of the research that staff has done so far, indicates that car sharing may be one way to advance those goals.

He explained that none of the studies included communities like Park City necessarily as most are large metropolitan areas but Aspen is one town that currently has a car share program with nine vehicles and about 150 members. He relayed that the staff person running the program had very positive feedback about rental rates and second home users. In addition to having individuals participate and rent the vehicles, car sharing companies will often allow an entire organization to have an account for its employees. If Council concurs, staff will move forward with a RFP for car sharing services because there will need to be a public bid process to ascertain if any other firms are interested in partnering with the City.

Mr. Poulson pointed out that concerns include dedicating parking and enforcement of the restricted parking zone. Local transportation service providers do not provide car sharing and there might be some competition issues raised. U-Haul car sharing in Salt Lake is not aware of any negative feedback from transportation providers in the area.

Andy Beerman asked how many parking spaces are anticipated to be needed. Mr. Poulson stated that U-Haul proposed beginning with a pilot program with two or three parking spaces. Each vehicle would have its sole parking space and there is no specific recommendation on the length of a pilot program. U-Haul’s agreement contemplates a four-year term partly based of the purchase of new vehicles.

Alex Butwinski asked how cars are rented and Mr. Poulson explained that typically cars can be rented on-line in advance for a designated time period. The credit card can be swiped in the front window with a GPS system or a keypad on the door.

Liza Simpson felt this is a great idea to explore and she and her husband have a Zip Car account and have used it on the east coast which works well in urban areas. She would like to hear more about Aspen’s car sharing program. Ideally, the cars would have to be in covered parking and it might be worthwhile to do some more research before drafting the RFP. She felt the program would be used by international winter workers if international drivers licenses are honored. Ms. Simpson asked if dogs would be allowed in the rentals; it might be helpful to get answers from Aspen.

In response to questions from Dick Peek, Mr. Poulson spoke about submitting drivers license information as part of acquiring an account. There would be signs for the dedicated parking stalls indicating they are for car sharing with towing enforced. The limited marketing support means advertising through a community newsletter or marketing at a special event, but nothing in terms of a monetary commitment. Cindy Matsumoto expressed that she also wants to learn how the program works in Aspen. There may be a need for four-wheel drive vehicles. She asked if there is a maximum rental time and Mr. Poulson was not sure. Ms. Simpson explained she and her husband signed up in DC and their account was activated 24 hours later. The car has to be reserved on-line or by phone.

Andy Beerman commented that this is intended for locals and not necessarily tourists. Tyler Poulson pointed out that companies accept international drivers licenses for car sharing and memberships in other cities are recognized. He didn't know if there are age limits for renting vehicles. Mark Harrington doubted it because the most successful programs are on college campuses and Mr. Poulson agreed. The first U-Haul operation in Utah was at the U of U campus.

Diane Foster added that the Aspen program was started and funded by the Town. One of the advantages of this particular program is while there is some City in-kind support, the City isn't making an upfront investment to make it happen.

The Mayor Pro Tem invited public input; there was none. Liza Simpson clarified that she is not suggesting that we do a City program, but looking at Aspen's model and the types of vehicles in the car share program may be helpful in crafting the RFP. Alex Butwinski felt that four years is a long commitment and would like to know if the program can be tested for a shorter period of time. Tyler Poulson relayed that he asked U-Haul how many pilot programs failed and the answer was zero.

Tom Bakaly understood direction to move forward which may result in loss in parking which is a component for car sharing and part of the RFP. Ms. Simpson emphasized that ultimately, it is taking cars off the road. Dick Peek asked who is responsible for the shared vehicles and Mark Harrington advised that it is the same as any traditional rental relationship and addressed in the rental contract between the company and the member.

3. Presentation of FY2013-14 City Manager's Recommended Budget. Jed Briggs stated that the budget was delivered to members. He reviewed the proposed budget schedule. He pointed out that strategic plans will be presented rather than departmental budgets and adoption of the budget is anticipated on June 21, 2012. He emphasized that the budget is balanced.

Nate Rockwood displayed a graph on revenue projections; the budget is anticipated to balance for the next several years. Few changes have been made between February and April with regard to projects but building, planning and engineering fees have been coming in low so those revenues have been reduced going forward in the next couple of years. This category is one of the hardest to predict but on the other hand, recreation fees were increased because they have been coming in high. Sales revenue has been bumped up slightly. Inflation and growth factors were explained which are basically the increased costs of providing services and/or enhanced services. Nate Rockwood pointed out that the largest revenues are property and sales tax. Property tax is coming in at projections, including new properties added this year. Year to date revenue is on target. The General Fund is projected to come in about 3% over budget including the large transfer to capital. Liza Simpson asked about the reduction in court fees. Mr. Rockwood explained that court fees are based on a five year average which fluctuates a lot depending upon the year.

He reiterated that sales tax revenue is coming in well above average and above last year primarily due to the new large hotels in Deer Valley. Mr. Rockwood believed that they have been filing quarterly which caused the big spikes last year and hopefully the hotels will begin to file monthly so that forecasts are more consistent. Staff took a conservative approach with forecasting sales tax revenue because of the poor ski season but it is likely that sales tax will come in higher than the five year average in the past.

Jed Briggs explained that the Budgeting for Outcomes process was implemented last year as a hybrid including an incremental budget approach, which may focus on an increase for a program, for instance. In a BFO process all City services are considered. All of the budgets within programs were separated out resulting in 137 strategic plans. Last year there was somewhat of a disconnect tying programs to Council goals and the eight biennial strategic plans represent goals but have been refined to include a desired outcome or criteria. Mr. Briggs compared the BFO process to a RFP representing the goal and the desired outcome as the criteria relating to the RFP. The strategic plan is a bridge between the Council goal and the BFO program.

Mr. Briggs clarified that although revenues are always considered, they are used more as a threshold in the BFO process. A technical team reviewed all of the ways revenues are being projected to ensure the best forecasts and a lot of research was done on the market relating to property taxes. This information was presented to Council during Visioning. During January and February all of the department managers were preparing bids. The scope, how well it meets the desired outcomes, cost savings, funding at a lower level and performance measures are considerations. Staff also revamped performance measures.

Jed Briggs stated that the technical team focused on revenue sources and the results team invested a lot of time to make the BFO program work. Members represented the self-managed teams as well as each strategic plan team. The results team examined all of the bids, scored them and the scores were based on several criteria, vision, efficiency and value, cost savings, effectiveness of proposals, performance measures, etc.

Ms. Simpson asked the members of the results team in attendance about the process. Kent Cashel believed that scoring should be viewed as framework not just a raw score and overall ranking helped the results team to be able to prioritize. It is difficult to establish a metric system that reflects values that should be captured and there are complications within the funding sources. He felt this is an interesting, collaborative and effective process but it needs to be refined. Jon Weidenhamer stated that employees not just managers sat at the table. Captain Rick Ryan expressed that he learned a lot about other departments and Jon Pistey believed the transparency factor made it a good process.

Tom Bakaly stated that it was a very different budget process for him as it was the first time he didn't meet with teams or departments. He met with the results team once and he couldn't recall making any changes as it was a collaborative process. About $1 million in budget requests were submitted which was cut in half. This process was much better and it will continue to be refined.

Alex Butwinski recalled that Fort Collins reversed the process which he prefers. Jed Briggs explained that staff tried to spend under as much as possible and the group was trying to find money in existing resources and cuts. Cutting the $1 million in requests in half was a painful process and managers were asked to fund these requests within existing resources. The benchmark was not revenues but FIAR projections where ten years of history are considered.

Mr. Butwinski pointed out that narratives seem briefer and Mr. Briggs responded that descriptions could be improved in some cases. Scoring was discussed and Mr. Briggs noted that it took about two or three meetings to define the criteria. After bids were vetted and scored, the results team met with managers to discuss the bids and/or rescore some proposals. Voting was private but members saw the aggregate score which was used to make decisions on funding levels.

Andy Beerman asked what staff would do differently next time. Chelese Rawlings pointed out that now the process is in place, it should be simpler from now on. The first couple of meetings were devoted to formulating criteria. Sometimes scoring was surprising. Kent Cashel explained the importance of accurately drafting bids. Jed Briggs believed the BFO process is invaluable and it is a *staff recommended budget* in a lot of ways.

Cindy Matsumoto invited public comment; there was none.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 3, 2012

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 3, 2012. Members in attendance were Andy Beerman, Alex Butwinski, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Mayor Dana Williams was absent and excused. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney;

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

None.

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

None.

IV WORK SESSION AND REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2012

Alex Butwinski, "I move to approve the work session and regular meeting minutes of April 19th". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

V NEW BUSINESS

1. Consideration of an Ordinance amending Title 9, Parking Code, Section 9-9-4, Penalties for Illegal Parking and Illegal Idling, Chapter 9-10, Anti-idling, and Title 4, Licensing, Chapter 4-15, For-hire Vehicle Licensing, of the Municipal Code of Park City – Shelley Hatch explained that in order to comply with HB104, signed by the Governor and effective May 8, 2012, the City must amend its anti-idling and for-hire vehicle provisions in the Municipal Code. In response to a question from Liza Simpson, Tyler Poulson explakined tbhat the first violation for anti-idling is a $30 ticket. The Mayor Pro Tem opened the public hearing.

Tom Fey, resident, expressed that he would like to address a parking issue but not specifically this amendment. He did not feel that the parking signs at The MARC are appropriate and some people feel they are offensive. The signs may not comply with the City's parking code because The MARC and the parking lot are public property. The majority of people going to The MARC participate in individual activities not programs that are supported by a carpool. Yet, there are many carpool signs and he believes patrons ignore the signs and park there anyway. He spoke about playing tennis with a group who live all over the place making it difficult to carpool in an efficient way. The signs about hybrid and high mileage vehicles has nothing to do with an athletic facility. These types of signs are not displayed at the Marsac parking lot, City Park, trailheads and asked why they are installed at The MARC which is a public facility. The situation there is bureaucratic over-reach and urged the Council to remove them. People are ignoring the signs. He commended the City for the improvements to the tennis courts.

Without further comments, the public hearing was closed. Andy Berman, "I move to approve Business Item No. 1". Dick Peek seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

2. Consideration of a Resolution adopting the Revised Budget for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 and the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 for Park City Municipal Corporation and its related agencies – Cindy Matsumoto referred to the discussion in work session introducing the budget and the budget process. She opened the public hearing; there were no comments. Liza Simpson, "I move to continue the consideration of a Resolution adopting the Revised Budget for Fiscal Year 2012-2013 and the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 for Park City Municipal Corporation and its related agencies to May 17th". Dick Peek seconded.

The Mayor Pro Tem encouraged the public to attend work session on the budget. Tom Bakaly explained that cities are required to present a balanced budget by the first week in May. Revenues were discussed this afternoon and the process the City is budgeting is called Budgeting for Outcomes which aligns the budget with Council goals by having departments bid for the cost to provide a service. This is very different from a line item budget. The Capital Improvement Program will be discussed on May 17 and May 24. The total budget, including all funds, is $68 million but actual spending is in the $45 million range. The General Fund is budget at $25 million and alldocuments are on-line

VI ADJOURNMENT

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

MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 2:30 p.m. Members in attendance were Andy Beerman, Alex Butwinski, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Mayor Dana Williams was absent and excused. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Diane Foster, Assistant City Manager; and Mark Harrington, City Attorney. Liza Simpson, "I move to close the meeting to discuss property and litigation". Cindy Matsumoto seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting opened at approximately 3:15 p.m. Alex Butwinski, "I move to open the meeting". Dick Peek 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

Janet M. Scott, City Recorder