

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
APRIL 24, 1997**

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting at the **Olympia Park Hotel and Conference Center, 1895 Sidewinder Drive**, Park City, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, April 24, 1997.

A G E N D A

6:00 p.m.

I ROLL CALL

II PUBLIC HEARING

Flagstaff annexation, approximately 1,550 acres located at the southwestern corner of Summit County, within the Park City Annexation Declaration Boundary; and adoption of a revised annexation policy declaration

III ADJOURNMENT

* * * * *

**PARK CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETINGS
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
APRIL 25, 1997 AND APRIL 28, 1997**

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah has tentatively scheduled **special work sessions on the Flagstaff annexation proposal**. There is a work session scheduled on **Friday, April 25, 1997 at 2 p.m.** and a work session scheduled on **Monday, April 28, 1997 at 9 a.m.** in the Marsac Municipal Building, 445 Marsac Avenue. **No formal action will be taken.** Call Jan Scott, 645-5007, if you have questions.

Posted: 4/21/97

**PARK CITY SPECIAL WORK SESSION NOTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
APRIL 25, 1997**

Present: Mayor Brad Olch; Council members Hugh Daniels, Roger Harlan, Shauna Kerr; Chuck Klingenstein, and Paul Sincock

Toby Ross, City Manager; Jodi Hoffman, City Attorney; Nora Seltenrich, Special Projects Manager

Hank Rothwell, United Park City Mines (UPCM); Bob Wells and Bob Wheaton, Deer Valley Resort/Royal Street Land Company; Carol Murnin, David Staley, and Liz Hoey, Citizens Allied for Responsible Growth (CARG)

Flagstaff Annexation. Nora Seltenrich distributed a memorandum and explained that the following are components of the Flagstaff project that the applicant and City have agreed will be included and addressed. She felt it beneficial that these points be confirmed with Council; the applicants have received this memo. (Memo text is indicated in *italics* and comments on the text appear in regular font.)

ASSUMPTIONS

MPD - Specifics and details of the assumptions will occur as a part of the Master Planned Development Process. Chuck Klingenstein asked what happens to the density if there are significant issues that can't be mitigated at the MPD stage. Ms. Seltenrich responded that it probably goes away unless there is a range of density or density that fits performance criteria and this language is important to relay up-front.

Road Improvements - Highway 224 will be improved to include realignment, widening, passing lanes, runaway truck lane. The applicant will construct the necessary improvements (probably a traffic light) at the intersection on Deer Valley Drive and Marsac. Timing of these improvements will be addressed in more detail when a specific phasing plan is approved. In response to a question from the Mayor, Ms. Seltenrich indicated that the length of highway to be improved will be determined at a later date. Roger asked why the word "probably" is in the assumption. Ms. Seltenrich explained that there will be a traffic light, but there could be other features associated with the intersection.

Construction Mitigation - Prior to any construction commencing on the site, the City and developer shall enter into a plan specifying required construction mitigation measures. The plans shall address, but not be limited to:

limits of disturbance and vegetation protection

on-site batch plant

on-site waste separation, recycling and compaction

***on-site staging and material storage, stockpiling of construction material
off-site parking and carpooling for construction workers
construction traffic restrictions and routing
use of on-site materials (gravel, rock, etc.)***

Ms. Seltenrich noted that the Planning Commission felt that construction mitigation is important. The Mayor suggested that major construction traffic be limited to two or three days a week. Shauna Kerr emphasized that construction mitigation is an issue that determines density and types of structures, in her mind, and she doesn't want to discount it or exclude it from further deliberations because it is handled as a part of the MPD process by the Planning Commission.

Design Guidelines - The applicant intends to formulate and have approved detailed design guidelines for the development. These guidelines shall be approved as a part of the Large Scale MPD. Ms. Seltenrich stated that the assumption is that there will be design guidelines and Mr. Rothwell has indicated that these will be more stringent than Deer Valley's and that there will be a consistent architectural theme. The Mayor pointed out the attractive theme architecture in Maribel and perhaps the siding and roofing materials can be the same in Flagstaff. He would like to take a look at a consistent approach. Hank Rothwell discussed the Beaver Creek project where the roof and colors tied the project together and provided a quality feel. However, there is a real fine "balancing act" in incorporating an architectural element or two and not having the look repetitious. It is his intent to draft guidelines resulting in a quality architectural feel that could be replicated throughout the project. Paul Sincok stated that he doesn't want the hodge podge of architectural styles of the Silver Lake area in Flagstaff. Mr. Rothwell commented that the design guidelines will be submitted with the MPD before the Planning Commission.

Transfer Tax - The applicant has agreed to voluntarily collect a fee similar to a real estate transfer tax. A portion (50%) of that revenue shall be allocated to the City to be used for the preservation and maintenance of open space, trails and mass transit. In response to a question from the Mayor, Hank Rothwell stated that the other 50% goes to the Master Home Owners Association and Flagstaff Land Trust for maintenance of open space and other cultural activities within the project; this will be a 1% real estate fee. He explained that cultural activities could be an additional level of services for the Association members and guests within the project; cultural activities would not include the symphony and/or inviting special event traffic. Mr. Rothwell added that it may be for the purchase of additional open space and building additional trails. Mr. Sincok suggested that funds could be used for operating a private bus system or assisting the City in operating a bus system there. Mr. Rothwell explained that the transfer tax was a way of providing extraordinary services without increasing the home owners fees disproportionately and would be imposed at the land sale stage and at resales.

Mining/Soils Hazards - Site specific analysis will be required. All mining and soils hazards shall be address and mitigated as deemed necessary. Ms. Seltenrich assured Council that this would be dealt with and Ms. Kerr stated that the City would not want to invite EPA's scrutiny.

Employee Housing - *The applicant agrees to provide the required 10% employee/affordable housing.* Ms. Seltenrich explained that the applicant is not contesting 10% and if Council wants another number, that can be part of the negotiation.

Water Rights and System Development - *The applicant is aware that they will have to develop a source of water and a delivery system to serve Flagstaff. Water rights obligations will also be satisfied.* Ms. Seltenrich explained that the applicant is working with the Public Works Director and there are existing water right agreements with UPCM. The Mayor expressed his concern that the "paper water" be legitimately approved and transferred as "wet water" by the State Engineer and this needs to happen at the beginning of the process. The City Manager explained that the project is required to provide a wet water source.

Trails - *The applicant agrees to construct over 10 miles of trails in the area.* Ms. Seltenrich explained that the actual specifications and timing would be part of the phasing plan.

Emergency Access - *The applicant acknowledges that a seasonal secondary access will be required to be provided and maintained. In addition, a comprehensive emergency response plan shall be required. The proposal includes a public safety facility site.* Nora Seltenrich stated that the applicant is working with Ron Ivie, Chief Building Official, to provide a second access and the applicant is aware that it must formulate an emergency response plan. Hugh Daniels emphasized the importance of the Fire District's involvement. Staffing the facility by the Fire District was discussed. The City Manager explained that the facility also includes snow removal and police services, etc.

Transit Participation - *The applicant agrees that they will participate in providing for the transit needs for the development which shall include, but not be limited to airport shuttles, courtesy on-call van service to and from Main Street and other Park City destination and private van service within development pods.* The Mayor felt this should be a long-term agreement if there are complaints about the home owners funding a private transportation system in the future. Ms. Kerr pointed out that home owner associations can be dissolved and it would be better to enter into an agreement with a special service district. Chuck Klingenstein stated that he is inclined to explore other opportunities that may include Silver Lake.

Historic Structures - *There are some significant historic mine structures on the site which the applicant has agreed to preserve.*

Wood Burning Limitation - *The applicant agrees to limit wood-burning to one fireplace or wood-burning device per single family unit. The multifamily units will not be allowed to have wood-burning devices.* Ms. Kerr understood that the Fire District recommended that there be no wood burning fireplaces.

Protection Strip - The applicant does not object to the City controlling a protection strip around the boundary of the project. Paul Sincock asked if the ski expansion will be included in the MPD. Ms. Seltenrich explained that ski lifts are conditional uses.

MPD REQUIREMENTS

The annexation documents for this project would set forth general development parameters and entitlements. The more specific review generally occurs at the time of Master Planned Development. Many of the details and specifics of the items listed above as assumptions will be decided at the time of Master Plan approval. The Planning Commission review and approval of the Master Plan shall include, but not be limited to:

- *Design Guidelines*
- *Construction Mitigation Plan*
- *Mine/Soil Hazard Mitigation Plan*
- *Specific Parking Requirements*
- *Detailed review and approval of the proposed ski expansion*
- *Site specific design, building locations, limits of disturbance*
- *Phasing Plans*
- *Size and configuration of the protection strip*
- *Specific transit plan*
- *Specific design of roads and public improvements*
- *Trail locations, specifications and phasing*
- *Detailed Open Space Management Plan*
- *Historic Preservation Plan*
- *Emergency Response Plan*
- *Timing and details of water system development*

ISSUES FOR COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND DECISION

1. Does the City Council support the Planning Commission recommendation that if Flagstaff develops at greater than rural densities, it should be within the City of Park City?

Ms. Kerr disclosed that she has been a part-time seasonal employee of Deer Valley for the past three years and her husband's company has a contract with Deer Valley for health insurance services. All of the Council members agreed that Flagstaff should be within the City if it develops at greater than rural densities, with the exception of Shauna Kerr who stated she could not commit at this time. There was discussion about 1:20 or 1:40 densities. Chuck Klingenstein emphasized that if it is developed, it should be under the jurisdiction of an urban entity. He also commented on the Summit County General Plan which has been remanded back to the Planning Commission.

2. *If an agreement can be reached with Wasatch County, should a restriction on the 1500 acres controlled by UPCM in Bonanza flats be a part of this annexation agreement?*

There was debate about whether Question No. 3 should be answered first as density is an issue. The Mayor felt no matter how density is ultimately addressed, Bonanza Flats should be a part of the annexation agreement. Ms. Kerr understood that Bonanza is only on the table with greater densities. Council decided to discuss Item 3 first. Paul Sincock added that Bonanza was included as a density bonus as the staff recommended changing from 310 unit equivalents to 750 unit equivalents because of the associated value. Ms. Seltenrich explained that Mr. Rothwell never agreed to 310 unit equivalents.

Setting up a conservation easement was discussed. Roger Harlan stated that the recommended density of the Planning Commission is too high and hoped that Bonanza could still be negotiated. There was discussion of whether this is a Pod D question or density question. Ms. Kerr stated that she is not interested in looking at Bonanza unless there is agreement with Wasatch County and the developer. If this is a diversion to distract the Council from other details, she does not want to be consumed with this feature of the annexation. Ms. Kerr continued that it must work for UPCM and Wasatch County and there needs to be a process for dealing with Flagstaff.

3. *Is the Planning Commission's recommendation for the amount, location and configuration of residential and commercial uses acceptable to the City Council?*

Should development be allowed in the vicinity of Pod D? Hugh Daniels indicated that he initially believed there was potential for small development there, but now believes there is virtually no support for development of Pod D. He felt that developing a small number of units would probably require too much infrastructure to make it feasible. Ms. Kerr felt that nothing should go in Pod D as even one unit involves a road system, bridges, utilities, etc. It has a harsh environment and may complicate health and safety concerns, and aggravates transportation. Chuck Klingenstein agreed and felt that it would be difficult to service. There was discussion about other options of accessing this area. The Mayor agreed with Council members Kerr and Klingenstein. Paul Sincock also agreed that it would create more traffic on Guardmans Pass. Roger Harlan could not support it and did not feel that skiing past homes is a desirable experience and commented on the harsh climate in the area and fire fighting conflicts. Council indicated that there is also no support for multi-family in this area. Council discussed exploring conservation easements for property owners in this area.

Should single family lots be allowed, and if so, what percentage and where? Roger Harlan felt that it should be the prerogative of the developer; he added that the single family would probably be minimal. Mr. Sincock felt that single family could compliment the mix, but it is not tourist bed base which should be the primary focus and suggested 15% as the maximum for single family. Chuck Klingenstein stated he wasn't sure of the percentage, but it should be something that

works for both parties. He emphasized the importance of focusing on disturbed areas which may not be in the pods and carefully looking at Prospect Ridge. Mr. Klingenstein discussed dense mountain villages in Europe that were served well with a mass transportation system. The Mayor felt there should be single family there and it is up to the developer where it should be developed. Ms. Kerr stressed that an annexation should weigh the benefits and burdens of the community, and the benefit here is to increase the tourist bed base and disbursed single family does not do that and complicates circulation and construction mitigation. She explained that multi-family projects can be controlled better for soil erosion, construction traffic, etc. She also felt that multi-family projects are more likely to use mass transit. Ms. Kerr stated that she can not support single family in the project. Hugh Daniels felt there should be mixed use and wasn't sure about the numbers or percentage. He didn't believe that all of the single family homes will be occupied as primary residences. Roger Harlan felt that a single family home which is a second residence would create less traffic than a multi-family unit. Ms. Kerr pointed out that there is activity with a support staff hired to maintain a residence.

How big should one unit equivalent of Single Family be? Mr. Sincok felt that single family should be defined as one 2,000 square foot density unit and if a home is 10,000 sf., it would equate to five density units. Mr. Klingenstein believed that the unit equivalent needs to be reviewed, but he has not attached a number and doesn't know what's fair at this point. The Mayor believed that the current formula needs to be readdressed, especially in consideration of this project. There was discussion about the designation for a 500 sf. hotel room and Chuck Klingenstein and Hugh Daniels pointed out there is already a Code formula for this and the problem is single family. It was the consensus of Council that it takes more than one unit equivalent for single family homes over 2,000 sf. Ms. Kerr expressed her concern of developing smaller units and the resulting traffic impacts. Mr. Sincok felt there is an opportunity to get a lot of density in a hotel structure where guests would be inclined to use public transportation.

How many total units should be allowed in Pods A and B? Chuck Klingenstein stated it is very difficult to assign numbers at this point. Nora Seltenrich explained that the Planning Commission formulated a range of 650 to 750 unit equivalents based on certain performance criteria and that is something Council could do. There was discussion about determining a number as the maximum would be developed. Mr. Sincok stated he would be willing to transfer some of the acreage of Pod D down to Pods A and B. He discussed the overall construction density in Deer Valley and Silver Lake and felt that it is too high and would like to keep the construction density within the pods in the range of the average of Deer Valley. Silver Lake is twice as dense as the average in Deer Valley. The City Manager stated that staff is looking for guidance and Council may desire to limit the density so that it is commensurate with other development in Deer Valley, with the exception of Silver Lake, and look for areas that are immediately contiguous to Pods A and B that are disturbed or suitable. However, he felt that Ms. Josephson has probably already performed that study. Ms. Kerr felt that the mix of architectural styles in Silver Lake makes it more visually disruptive and Mr. Harlan agreed and referred to the success of dense mountain communities in

Europe with a common architectural theme. Mr. Sincock stated that he is not as worried about the total number of units if residential is defined and the architecture is tied together; he would prefer clustered density. Ms. Kerr stated that she did not mind more density in a well-designed structure that is compatible with the environment with more of the site preserved. Mr. Harlan brought up that development should not be visible from Old Town. Mr. Klingenstein referred to the 3:5 formula in the 1985 Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Seltenrich added that there are 150 acres in the two pods combined and Roger Harlan discussed the enormity of a potential 1,600 room hotel. Hugh Daniels pointed out again that it is desirable to have a mix. Paul Sincock referred to the 1:5 formula resulting in the 310 unit equivalents recommended by staff in February which could be a base. Bonanza Flats is 1,500 acres and at 1:5 is 300 more unit equivalents; Mr. Sincock felt it is adequate payment for the open space as it is not free. He would allow density bonuses for a transportation special improvement district for a gondola tram system or a density bonus for the 1% transfer fee for bus service. Mr. Sincock could support 760 to 900 units but emphasized that it would be calculated with the new equivalent formula. Ms. Kerr suggested using the staff base of 310 and 450 more for Bonanza. Hugh Daniels felt that he couldn't support that number and Council should move on.

Should the proposed Day Lodge be included in the 10% commercial allocation?

Ms. Seltenrich explained that this is a different kind of commercial space as it supports the skiers rather than commercial businesses. It should not generate additional traffic, although it will be served by a road but there is no parking for patrons. In response to a question from Shauna Kerr about deliveries, Bob Wells stated that delivery trucks would deliver on site. Paul Sincock felt that it should be included so that it is less confusing. He felt it important to encourage small scale grocery stores and laundry mats to cut down on the trips to town. Roger Harlan felt that the day lodge is an amenity that services the expanded skier potential, and he is not inclined to include it in the commercial. Ms. Kerr didn't feel strongly that it needed to be in the commercial calculation. Bob Wheaton of Deer Valley noted that the day lodge is needed for the skiers that are already there. The Mayor didn't feel that it needed to be in the calculation if it is truly a "day" lodge; a night-time use would be different. In response to a question from Shauna Kerr about it being a seasonal operation, Mr. Wheaton indicated that for the time being, it will be primarily for skiers, but there is a potential to use it for weddings or parties. Transporting wedding parties was discussed and the Mayor pointed out that it would be no different than performing weddings at the Mid-Mountain Lodge where people are bused. Ms. Seltenrich pointed out that if there were a Cafe Mariposa type operation, parking would have to be provided and the restaurant would have to be calculated as commercial. The Mayor recommended that the lodge be taken out of the commercial calculation and Ms. Kerr stated that this should be highlighted in the MPD approval process.

Should the Chapel be allowed, and if so, under what conditions? Ms. Kerr pointed out that there is a difference if it is a memorial or a structure with utilities. Hank Rothwell stated that it was intended to be an asset to the project, but didn't feel at this point it is feasible and didn't see a need to define it. He added that it would be ski-in, ski-out and possibly have electricity for

lighting. Hugh Daniels felt it could be a nice amenity. Ms. Kerr agreed, but the chapel should not have utilities which may add other issues.

There was discussion about development on Prospect Ridge and Hugh Daniels emphasized that he wasn't sure where the elevation or visibility solution is located to meet Council's goal. Mr. Sincok referred to the Citizens Allied for Responsible Growth comments at the public hearing that development should not be lower than the Silver Mine Adventure. Hank Rothwell understood CARG wanted a visual separation from Old Town. Carol Murnin of CARG added that there are also drainage concerns on Prospect Avenue. Mr. Rothwell pointed out that the most visual viewpoint is outside the building and there has been a visual analysis performed. Mr. Harlan pointed out that the height of a building would affect its visibility from different points in Old Town. Liz Hoey of CARG asked about the visibility of Pods A and B in Old Town. David Staley of CARG explained that they wanted more of a buffer from Old Town and the development should be distinct and separate.

4. *Is the skiing component of the plan consistent with the City's goals of enhancing the resort image and economy of the community while protecting the natural aesthetics of our surroundings?*

Should there be skiing in Pod Z? The Mayor commented that he is a proponent of ski area expansion as it is appropriate in a ski resort community and would support this. Chuck Klingenstein believed this area is wonderful expert ski terrain that could remain basically undisturbed in its natural state and could be a vital link between to the conservation areas. Ms. Seltenrich asked if grooming would be acceptable. Mr. Klingenstein stated that he would prefer it to be natural expert terrain like Jupiter Bowl. Hugh Daniels wasn't convinced that it will add to the Deer Valley experience, but agreed that if there was little glading, no snow-making, or snow cats, he could consider skiing in Pod Z. Paul Sincok stated that expert skiing and maintaining a conservation area are not mutually exclusive. Roger Harlan could support this but not at the expense of cutting ski trails. Ms. Kerr pointed out that the Council members are not ski design experts and suggested that this be open for MPD discussion as it will not affect many of the other decisions. She added that Commissioner Larson recommended holding Pod Z as an incentive if there are other accomplishments, and not making a determination at this time. Bob Wheaton discussed the vision for skiing in Pod Z and discussed the necessity of cutting perhaps two runs, but maintaining the balance of the area as natural terrain. Ms. Kerr again suggested that skiing be put in abeyance until a later date. Bob Wells indicated that the skiing should be reviewed at the MPD level as the skiing and the development serve each other. Ms. Kerr clarified that there should be skiing there but the level of detail addressed later. Mr. Sincok discussed the value of connecting ski areas and emphasized that the ski runs only comprise a relatively small amount of space. The Mayor summarized that the skiing would be allowed with a lift and one or two runs. Bob Wheaton discussed skier safety and access issues with regard to the run(s) there.

What other special restrictions or revision to the skiing component should there be? Paul Sincock suggested revegetation improvements for proper drainage. Toby Ross stated that hydrology will be dealt with in the MPD stage.

5. *What traffic and transportation issues must be adequately mitigated as conditions of the annexation?*

- *How much should the applicant be required to participate in transit service?*
- *What parking restrictions should be required to discourage private vehicle use?*
- *What road improvement, other than those already proposed, are necessary to mitigate traffic impacts on Marsac Ave? Should Guardsman Connection be restricted or one-way?*
- *Should there be a density bonus for an enhanced mass transit system?*

Mr. Klingenstein stated that he would like to see the applicant participate, but would like to reduce some of the associated cost. If a true transit system can be formulated to discourage automobile use there, he would look at reducing parking requirements. He would rather use the funds toward a transportation system than parking. The Mayor added that he discussed this strategy with Mr. Klingenstein and discussed a rubber tire system to Main Street. Ms. Kerr stated that she is willing to reduce the parking requirements in conjunction with a comprehensive traffic plan; this is integral to the ultimate determination of numbers. Mr. Klingenstein suggested Silver Lake Village as part of the plan. Mr. Harlan discussed the association of density and traffic and pointed out that this is a major concern of citizens. He continued that it would be helpful to have statistics on the percentage of guests that don't bring cars to Stein's, for instance. Hugh Daniels felt that the applicant has to participate in a transit service in the development, particularly on the private roads; this could be private or participating in the City service. He also would like to see a gondola, but understood it is extremely expensive and wasn't sure that it would be a fair requirement. There are certainly better ways to provide rubber tire transportation. Mr. Daniels stated that there is some merit to reducing parking requirements and pointed out the success in guests not bringing cars to Old Town. There also would be a benefit in saving costs in building expensive parking structures. The Mayor felt it was a good point -- minimal surface parking and everything else is subterranean. Paul Sincock discussed the gondola system in Telluride, an on-demand bus system, and transit site. He felt the Council could reduce the parking requirement. He would not like to see Marsac widened so that use isn't induced or increased and where SR224 diverts to serve Pods A and B should not be improved. He felt there should be a density enhancement for mass transit. With regard to the Guardsmans Connection Road, Chuck Klingenstein expressed that he doesn't have a problem with shutting down this road. He felt it could be electronically gated for snow removal and emergency services. Ms. Kerr questioned equipment working well in steep grades and wondered if it would be creating more problems than solutions. The Mayor suggested that the Council move on from the connection road topic. Hugh Daniels supported the upgrades for Marsac and the canyon. Mr. Harlan expressed that he differed from other members and although he could support a truck escape lane, he did not want to see an uphill passing lane on Marsac. Operating buses on this road was pointed

out and Mr. Daniels felt the improvements on Marsac addressed safety issues more than encouraging speeding cars. Mr. Harlan maintained his opinion.

6. *Is the Planning Commission's recommendation for the amount and location of employee housing acceptable to the City Council?*

- ***How much employee housing should be on site?***
- ***What kinds of units should be provided?***
- ***Where should the offsite units be allowed?***

Nora Seltenrich explained that there was a proposal for employee housing in Empire Canyon which would not be accessed by Daley Road. Ron Ivie had problems with this location in consideration of avalanches. The Planning Commission recommended that some housing be on-site, i.e., managers' units, but off-site housing would be acceptable. There would be no in-lieu fee option and there is also a timing mechanism. Ms. Kerr stated that she was a proponent of having more employee housing on-site until she toured the area. Aside from the safety issues, she felt that there may be mischief problems with too many employees living on the ski runs. Chuck Klingenstein relayed that Wasatch County has indicated that it doesn't want to be the area providing the affordable housing for Park City. Hank Rothwell explained that part of the annexation application is a 20 acre site that adjoins the City limits, Rail Trail and the corner of the Highway 40 frontage road and it is proposed for the majority of employee housing. Ms. Seltenrich believed that the Planning Commission wanted to provide as much flexibility as possible and there could be an opportunity to joint venture with a housing project already underway. Mr. Sincock discussed the distinction between affordable and employee housing and the Rosenthal study regarding generation of employees. He added that employee housing on-site is often beneficial when the weather is bad. He emphasized that he is open to having it all employee and no affordable housing. Mr. Ross clarified that all employee housing is affordable housing because of deed restrictions requiring that tenants be employees. Paul Sincock pointed out the lack of any type of dormitory housing. Bob Wells explained that with dormitories, there has to be some type of food service for residents. Roger Harlan indicated that he has changed his mind about providing employee housing on-site and now feels it is appropriate. He didn't feel it should exceed 20% and the recommendation of the Planning Commission is acceptable to him. Nora Seltenrich clarified that the Commission recommended that some should be on-site, but it needs to be based on traffic generation.

Chuck Klingenstein stated that he was surprised at the input last night about a school on site. Toby Ross explained that the School District would like all of the jurisdictions to consider school sites every time there is a project review. Mr. Klingenstein was curious about the rationale of the comment.

- 7. *How far should public infrastructure be allowed to be extended?***
- ***Should public roads and utility extension be improved only to Pod B?***

- ***Other than a protection strip, what other restrictions should the City place on the development to prevent extension of infrastructure to the Bonanza Flats area?***

Council agreed that there should be a protection strip and Chuck Klingenstein pointed out that the infrastructure would only be pertinent in the lower area.

8. *Would the Council consider an Open Space Acquisition Program in the area?*

The City Manager explained that there are six property owners in Pod D where Council has indicated it won't entertain development. Mr. Klingenstein stated that Council is looking toward creative methods. Shauna Kerr emphasized that the Council did not extinguish density; density did not exist there. There was a discussion of tax benefit incentives with conservation easements. Ms. Kerr warned Council that this is not an issue that it needs to be resolved under pressure.

- 9. *What elements are critical to address in an Open Space Management Plan?***
- ***Should snowmobile access be allowed?***
 - ***What uses are appropriate in Bonanza Flats, if that is a part of this agreement?***
 - ***Should UPCMC be allowed to retain the right to mineral extraction in the future?***

The Mayor believed that snowmobiles should be eliminated. Nora Seltenrich explained that the Planning Commission recommended that only those who have "prescriptive rights" to access their residences be allowed to continue, and all other snowmobiling be prohibited. Hugh Daniels emphasized that this may be an issue for Wasatch County as it has a rather large tourism segment that enjoys snowmobiling. He is not ready to omit the use. Toby Ross believed that the current intent is to phase it out. Paul Sincock personally felt that snowmobiling is an important part of the tourist component. Ms. Kerr pointed out the difficulty in enforcement and there are more important issues in the community. The Mayor added that the commercial staging of a snowmobiling operation should be prohibited with the staging of Pods A and B. Additionally, there will not be the open space available in the future and he recommended a phasing out of this use as because of compatibility considerations. Bob Wheaton discussed the disruption of people using private snowmobiles in the Deer Valley area, but warned against establishing a rule that can't be enforced. He added that the reason there is a parking area and snowmobiling facility by the Guardsman Road is because people were parking illegally and creating access and safety problems.

With regard to uses in Bonanza Flats, Mr. Daniels felt that Wasatch County is important to this decision. Paul Sincock added that there needs to be an open management plan that addresses trails, limits mechanized vehicles in sensitive areas, and provides for a ranger. Ms. Seltenrich asked for direction about the golf course proposal in Bonanza and Council indicated it is not very interested, although Hugh Daniels felt he could entertain it but it didn't make much financial sense to him. Mr. Sincock added that with utilities there, it may create more pressure to

develop adjacent properties. With regard to mineral mining, the Mayor stated that as long as there are no visual impacts and extraction takes place at the Keetley Portal, he has no problem with allowing it. Council had no problem with the mining, since there would be minimal trucking impacts.

- 10. What should the phasing philosophy be?**
- **Should all the roads and utilities be built at once?**
 - **Should there be restrictions on the number of multifamily and single family units which can be built in any one year?**
 - **When should the trails be built?**

Ms. Seltenrich advised that this can be left at the MPD review, but if Council members have strong feelings about any issue, it needs to be addressed in the annexation agreement. Ms. Kerr questioned the community benefit of not having the multi-family being built out for ten years. Nora Seltenrich clarified that the recommendation from the Commission considered the impact on the Historic District that would occur. Paul Sincock referred to the Mayor's earlier suggestion that trucks be limited to a few days a week, requiring materials to be stored on-site and felt that Ron Ivie could formulate a construction mitigation plan. Supplies could be stored in sheds and sold to contractors in the area. Nora Seltenrich echoed that Council would prefer efforts focused on construction mitigation rather than phasing. Hugh Daniels believed that the major connecting trails should be developed early in the process. Chuck Klingenstein felt that the developed trails could direct people so that they avoid construction areas. Shauna Kerr agreed that it would be a nice amenity and encouraged trails to be planned as people will get familiar to them and will become aggravated if they are not useable because of construction activity.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott