

**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 COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
FLAGSTAFF MOUNTAIN ANNEXATION
PUBLIC HEARING
APRIL 24, 1997**

I ROLL CALL

Mayor Brad Olch called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Olympia Park Hotel and Conference Center, 1895 Sidewinder Drive, Park City, Utah on Thursday, April 24, 1997. Members in attendance were Brad Olch, Hugh Daniels, Roger Harlan, Shauna Kerr, Chuck Klingenstein, and Paul Sincock. Staff present were Toby Ross, City Manager; Nora Seltenrich, Special Projects Manager; and Jodi Hoffman, City Attorney.

II PUBLIC HEARING

Mayor Olch read a prepared statement, stating that there is light at the end of the tunnel as the City moves toward culmination of a process that started years ago, and the Park City Council wants to hear from the community on how to proceed with the Flagstaff Annexation application. He explained that the City Council's job as elected officials is different from that of the Planning Commission. It is charged with not only weighing public sentiment for or against a project, but also understanding the political, legal, and administrative realities that surround it and make decisions difficult. The decisions made about Flagstaff will fundamentally impact Park City and its residents. It is the Council's ultimate responsibility to insure that whatever happens is accommodated in the most positive fashion possible. The purpose of this public hearing is to hear public feelings for or against the Flagstaff proposal and to more directly seek public input on creative solutions. The Council knows the community has invested heavily in time, energy, education, and emotion. Mayor Olch thanked everyone for their involvement, interest, understanding, and passion. He explained that this meeting is devoted to public input and presentation. The Council is here to listen and will not make a decision tonight. A City Council work session is scheduled for Friday, April 26, at 2:00 p.m. at City Hall, with a second work session tentatively scheduled for Monday, April 28, at 9:00 a.m. at City Hall. Both work sessions are open to the public. The City Council intends to reach a decision that is balanced, fair, and representative of the variety of interests that have participated in the public process since the beginning. Each Council member seeks to arrive at the very best decision for the community given the alternatives available.

Special Projects Manager Nora Seltenrich introduced herself and reported that the Planning Commission has reviewed this application for a number of years. Several public hearings were held, and the Staff has received a large amount of written comment, all of which has been forwarded to the City Council. The City Council has also received minutes, summaries of public hearings, and all comments received at the Planning Commission level.

Manager Seltenrich explained that United Park City Mines submitted an annexation petition for Flagstaff in June 1994. The application was made on behalf of six property owners and in conjunction with the Deer Valley resort. Upon receiving the request, the Staff tried to determine what information would be needed by the Staff, Planning Commission, and City Council for adequate review. As a result, the applicant was asked to provide studies of traffic, wildlife, water, and other important issues. The first few months was spent gathering enough information to adequately assess the project before the Planning Commission started its review. Based upon a number of preliminary input sessions and work sessions with the Planning Commission, the applicant revised the request in May 1996. Over the past year, the Planning Commission, Staff, and applicant have reviewed the proposals in numerous work sessions. Last month the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council on the Flagstaff Annexation.

Manager Seltenrich explained that the City Council makes the final decision regarding annexation and under what conditions an annexation can occur. They have received reams of paper packed with information and comments and have held several work sessions to discuss the matter. The City Council will make their decision fairly soon, primarily due to State Legislature action beyond their control. There was a change in State law at the last legislative session affecting the philosophy on annexations. Previously, the State viewed urban development as occurring in cities, and it was felt that cities should annex because they are better equipped than counties to provide urban services. The change in the law will make it more difficult for cities to annex property if and when it develops. This new law goes into effect May 5, 1997, and the Council wants to analyze the data and make a decision before then. If a decision is not reached before then, the annexation can move forward, but it will be bound by new laws, making the process a little more difficult.

Manager Seltenrich noted that the applicant, representing six property owners, is requesting approval for development on 1,550 acres of land annexed to Park City. The property currently lies within unincorporated Summit County. Summit County has a rural zoning designation for this property of one unit per 40 acres. In its revised draft General Plan, the County is looking at one unit per 40 acres and one unit per 20 acres as a base density, with language regarding the appropriateness of resort-related development in this area that is very non-specific about numbers. This application was submitted under the 1985 Park City Comprehensive Plan which addresses development outside existing City limits in a very general fashion and states that some skiing and resort residential expansion may be appropriate in this area with a map showing two areas where development should occur. The Planning Commission compared the project using the Comprehensive Plan and the Draft General Plan Update.

Manager Seltenrich explained that annexations occur by mutual negotiation. and a property owner or applicant must come to the City to request an annexation. The City and property owner set forth the terms of annexation by zoning the area, and the City enters into an annexation

agreement addressing entitlements that goes along with the property as it is annexed. This applicant has made application with both Summit and Wasatch Counties, but continues to work in good faith with the City. At any time before or after a City Council decision, the applicant could decide to pursue the application with either County. This property is uniquely situated, because the access and most impacts affect Park City. The Planning Commission and Staff believe that, if and when this property develops beyond a rural one unit per 40 acres, it should occur within the City. The City Council has the task of deciding if it makes sense to annex the land at this time and, if so, how much development should occur. If the property develops in the County, the City is likely to receive a huge impact without any mitigation compensation or benefits.

Liz Josephson, representing the applicant, gave a slide presentation identifying the underlying goal of Flagstaff and described the process as an applicant. She noted that the goals were mainly the same as the City's goals. The first goal is to provide for the highest quality experience and product for skiing and improving on the tremendous Deer Valley reputation. The second goal is to meet the City's goals and annexation policy by providing a resort tourist bed base, a tax base, and an expanded recreational opportunity. The third goal is to be economically feasible, which is market driven. The fourth goal is to be environmentally sound. The fifth goal is to provide a community benefit.

Ms. Josephson stated that the applicants looked at the existing adopted plans, ordinances, and direction, all of which contained years of community input. Input came in the form of the Deer Valley Master Plan, the Park City Comprehensive Plan of 1985, the Park City Annexation Declaration Policy, the Affordable Housing Committee recommendations, traffic infrastructure, impact and air quality, adoption of the Park City Sensitive Lands Ordinance, the community's desire for continued recreational open space and trails, and understanding of the future users' needs. These guidelines and concerns, together with the resource-based analysis, formed the framework for all planning decisions. The process was driven by recognized planning standards and procedures calling for community involvement, environmental stewardship, and economic feasibility. After assembling a team of biologists, wetland specialists, geo-technical specialists and other engineers, they inventoried, analyzed, and mapped the features and uses of the area. The site design started with a layout of the ski component as the skiing had to work to Deer Valley's high standards. The resource-based analysis, together with many community issues, provided for numerous changes in the plan over the last three years and for the basis of the plan as it stands today.

Ms. Josephson reviewed the proposal consisting of 100 single-family lots at the top of the mountain in the area known as Pod D, 30 single-family lots in the areas now known as Pods A and B, not to occur below the 7,800-foot contour level, 620 multi-family unit equivalents clustered in Pods A and B, and a day lodge and 75,000 square feet of support commercial. Throughout the planning process, logical methods for protecting environmental entities such as the Lady Morgan Pond and other habitat, steep slopes, ridge lines, wetlands, view sheds, etc., were explored. They

also looked for a buffer of significant open space at the City's request. The applicants planned to provide miles and miles of trails and access to lands beyond. Day skier parking was removed as proposed in the 1985 Comprehensive Plan. Ways were found to place people close to the ski trails, providing ski-to, ski-away access in the best fashion possible. They addressed increasing the safety of Highway 224 at Guardsman and limiting utilities and roads at the top of the mountain to eliminate any of the growth-inducing impacts caused by Flagstaff. Construction staging on site was considered and tied to mass transportation to reduce impacts in Old Town. Affordable housing was addressed at a rate of one unit for every 10 units built on site.

Ms. Josephson presented a computer-generated 3-D slide of the north side lift and trails at the center of the project. An oblique view from the air showed Main Street, Old Town, and some of the north side in the upper left portion of the property. Other areas shown included Flagstaff and Bonanza, the Wasatch National Forest, and Wasatch State Park. With the proposed elimination of any future density on more than 1,500 acres of Bonanza Flats and United Park City Mines commitment to its perpetual open space status, the applicants felt that a density calculation of 750 units was appropriate for Flagstaff Mountain. By eliminating potential density for Bonanza, Park City's desire to create open space and an open space buffer will be met. Ms. Josephson felt this should be considered as a tremendous benefit to the regional community and be well considered in their request for the units presented. She felt the proposed project would meet the criteria set forth by the City's plans, ordinances, and guidelines.

Bob Wells, representing Deer Valley Resort, discussed the skiing expansion included in the annexation proposal and placed it in the context of Deer Valley's operation. Deer Valley currently operates with 70 runs and bowls covering about 450 acres of developed skiing within 1,500 acres of ski pods served by 13 lifts. Present operating capacity is approximately 5,000 to 5,500 skiers on a peak day, and peak day capacity is generally 10% of the number of ski days in a season. The average ski day over the course of the season approximates 50% of peak. Deer Valley skiing currently falls under three governmental jurisdictions. A portion of the ski area is in Park City, with a portion in Summit County and a portion in Wasatch County. Under the annexation proposal, most of the Summit County portion of the ski terrain would be annexed into Park City. Under the current master plan, Deer Valley's build out would take the capacity up to approximately 9,000 skiers on a peak day. The skiing expansion in the proposed annexation area would represent two-thirds of this increase, or an increase in capacity of 2,300. The development density proposed in the Flagstaff annexation has been integrated into the existing ski area master plan and achieves an approximate balance with the skiing expansion. It has the advantage of being a direct ski access development.

Mr. Wells explained that the two components of the skiing expansion are in-fill on existing Flagstaff Mountain and expansion into Empire Canyon. The Flagstaff in-fill would consist of three lifts. One would run from the base of the existing Red Cloud Lift to the top of Flagstaff Mountain which would be an access lift and would not open any new ski terrain. This lift is

proposed for installation this year, and application is pending. The lower portion of that lift is currently within existing Park City limits, and the upper portion is in Summit County. A second lift on the north face of Flagstaff would open a small amount of ski terrain and add approximately five runs for an additional 300-person capacity on a peak day. A third lift is in the area between the top of Bald Mountain and the top of Flagstaff Mountain which would be a relatively small beginner teaching terrain area. There are six acres of skiing which could handle 300 people in beginner teaching format. The portion of the expansion in Empire Canyon consists of six lifts. Pod B in the development plan serves as the base for three lifts. A fourth lift to the north serves Pod Z. The fifth and sixth lifts are primarily access lifts and do not add a significant amount of ski terrain. The skier mix from this expansion is important to Deer Valley as they would pick up an 18% increase in beginner, novice, and low intermediate terrain and maintain a 47% balance in advanced and expert.

Mr. Wells referred to discussions regarding Pod Z and suggestions that it be left in its present state. He explained the importance of this Pod in balancing the ski terrain, an important factor. A component of expansion would be a third day lodge. The existing two day lodges primarily accomplish skier feeding. A third day lodge would be added at Daly West and would include a 750-seat skier restaurant.

Hank Rothwell, representing United Park City Mines, thanked Liz Josephson, Steve Deckert, John Demkowitz, and the myriad of planning professionals who had been involved with the project since the outset. He stated that the goal has been to create an exciting new quality addition to Deer Valley. Although the project has been anticipated since the 1960's, the intense design and planning effort started four years ago. Following the direction of the 1985 Comprehensive Plan, Ms. Josephson and her team designed an expansion to Deer Valley that was half the density per acre of the existing Deer Valley. This was before Bonanza Flats was added to the proposal. The current multi-family proposal is similar in unit numbers to Silver Lake Village, but the site is 50% larger and, therefore, significantly less dense. Mr. Rothwell addressed concerns about the impacts to Old Town. He did not deny that traffic impacts are anticipated on Marsac, Highway 224, and Deer Valley Drive, but traffic will not be directed down Daly Avenue. Traffic will not be directed down Main Street. The proposal does not include widening Hillside Avenue nor tearing up Main Street for a new sewer line. It does propose significant improvements to Highway 224 to help mitigate traffic impacts. Mitigation efforts on Highway 224 were designed when the combined Flagstaff/Bonanza Flats proposed density and traffic impacts were anticipated to be twice what is proposed today. A mass transit study has been completed at the request of the Planning Commission which recommended a rubber tire solution of vans and connections to the City bus system. Similar to some of the existing Silver Lake project, they anticipate providing on-call, on-demand van services to guests to aid in traffic mitigation. The most important traffic mitigation effort is the design of the project which allows winter guests to access skiing without using a car by utilizing Deer Valley's on-mountain mass transit/ski lift system. Mr. Rothwell agreed that Empire Canyon and Flagstaff Mountain are

important open space elements to residents, and he has worked closely with the Mountain Trails Foundation and others to design permanent public access to trails within the proposed project. Flagstaff Mountain contains over 80% open space, not including the 1,500 acres of Bonanza Flats. He referred to previous comments regarding the magnitude of Flagstaff and agreed that it is a significant project, but certainly not another Deer Valley. In terms of Park City as defined by its municipal boundary, Flagstaff would represent only 7% of the City's eventual build out. Flagstaff is a well designed, thoroughly studied resort expansion to Park City and Deer Valley. It is a tourist bed base and second home product which would add to the resort nature of the community while retaining 80% to 90% of the site as permanent open space with public hiking and biking access.

Manager Seltenrich commented on the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council. A significant change in the Planning Commission's recommendation from the proposal discussed in the last public hearings was the applicant's offer to deed restrict Bonanza Flats from future residential development. Throughout the process, the Planning Commission and Staff strongly encouraged the applicant to include Bonanza Flats and designate it as open space because, if Bonanza Flats were developed, most of the access and impacts would come into Park City. It is difficult to look at Flagstaff without considering what would happen beyond Flagstaff in the future. The thrust of the General Plan recently adopted by the City Council is to make Park City a distinct community with an open space buffer around it. The Planning Commission felt that, if Bonanza Flats was not brought into the equation, the open space buffer would have to occur on the Flagstaff piece itself.

Manager Seltenrich explained that the original Staff recommendation was for units in the lower parts of Pods A and B, leaving the open space buffer on the upper Flagstaff property. After that, the applicant offered to include Bonanza Flats and restrict it from future residential development. The Staff and the Planning Commission felt this was significant, and in exchange for that, the Planning Commission recommended that some development occur higher in Flagstaff in Pod D. They also recommended that a mix of multi- and single-family units might be appropriate in that area. The Staff initially recommended that Pod Z not be approved, but once Bonanza Flats was added to the proposal as open space, the Planning Commission recommended that Pod Z move ahead for skiing. The Planning Commission recommendation was not unanimous, and the dissenting opinions revolved around skiing in Pod Z and the development in Pod D. The Staff feels that the inclusion of Bonanza Flats is a unique opportunity for Park City to control its destiny, and the City Council was encouraged to look carefully at that consideration.

Mayor Olch opened the public hearing.

Representing the Citizens Allied for Responsible Growth, the following three people presented slides and made comments.

Ann Critchfield, a 13-year resident of Park City, thanked the City Council for the opportunity to express the organizations concerns and ideas about the Flagstaff Annexation proposal. She stated that CARG is not against growth or development but is a pro-community group that works to inform and educate their neighbors about proposed developments and hopes to help the community select projects that are beneficial to their quality of life. She felt that her group spoke for a majority of the residents on this proposal. She commented that the Flagstaff proposal as recommended by the Planning Commission is clearly too dense and will be detrimental to Park City's quality of life and damage its guests' outdoor recreational experience. While CARG understands the benefits of increasing the resort bed base, the City should not sacrifice the resort experience to do so. Bob Wells said in a Park Record interview, "From the ski experience, we probably lose something." Ms. Critchfield noted that, for the first time in years, as a community Park City can make a decision about a development that is not overshadowed by the threat of lawsuits or compromised by 15-year-old promises. As representatives of the people, the Council did not have to accept what Bruce Erickson called, "the best worst deal" nor approve this project just for the sake of an approval or be a referee between a developer with vested rights and a balky citizenry. The City Council has the power, privilege, and right to define and limit the scope of any development in Daly/Empire Canyon. After several public hearings before the Planning Commission, the community overwhelmingly expressed its opposition to the current proposal. Daly Canyon is a special place to Park City residents. The commitment to preserving its open space and recreation value is evident in the number of people who have written, spoken, attended, called, and campaigned against this proposal. Ms. Critchfield presented slides of aerial photographs illustrating the approximate locations of the development pods. The members of CARG have listened to their neighbors' fears, values, and ideas, and this presentation is a compilation of those conversations. Ms. Critchfield asked the City Council to remembers words by Gary Snider, "This is a nature in which the pursuit of profit is a totally acceptable goal. Is not the pursuit of quality an equally acceptable goal?" No apologies are due for trying to hold the line against disruptive growth or intrusive induced industrial uses. In doing so, we help to sustain community values and the biological viability of the landscape. The CARG presentation intended to address the more important impact issues and offer some alternatives to this proposal.

Carol Murnin, a 19-year resident of Park City, remarked that, due to its location, the impacts of any development in Daly Canyon will directly impinge upon Old Town, the crown jewel of Park City. While many of these issues have been raised before, CARG wanted to point out several major concerns that were never clearly addressed.

Traffic - As shown by the increasing number of fatalities on the new and improved Highway 224, widening roads does not make them safer. Approving more development that will funnel onto the mine road is not only foolhardy, but negligent. Ms. Murnin asked the City Council to remember that Silver Lake is not yet built out, and because of its sprawling nature, people are forced into their cars, and most take the mine road into town. She expressed concern that the Town

Lift Bridge will close Woodside, and since Park Avenue is one way in the winter, all the traffic will be rerouted onto Swede Alley and Marsac. Additional plans to close Main Street to cars will further snarl traffic on Marsac. She asked the City Council to imagine 10 years of construction traffic added to that mess, and she feared someone would get killed. Ms. Murnin stated that any development in Daly must be tightly clustered to promote the use of public transportation. The City must find a definitive way to mitigate tourist, local, and construction traffic, remembering that Silver Lake is not yet finished. She suggested that the City require the developer to provide transportation alternatives such as a Gondola like the one at Telluride. Perhaps the system could eventually connect with Silver Lake.

Geology of Daly Canyon - Ms. Murnin explained that, although the developer claims that the mine tailings in Daly Canyon are non-toxic overburden, the studies have not been released to the public. Learning from the painful experience in Prospector Square, tailing dust is difficult and expensive to contain. If a batch plant is established on the tailings piles in Daly Canyon, she asked how the dust would be kept from blowing down the canyon into Old Town and how the builders would be monitored for compliance with EPA regulations. Even more worrisome was what might happen to the water supply in the Judge Tunnel when the tailings piles are disturbed. Before any approval is granted, there must be solid confirmation that these tailings on which nothing grows are not dangerous. As early residents discovered, Daly Canyon is subject to avalanches and landslides. The current routing of the Guardsman Road is a result of having to avoid landslides. The more the mountainside is disturbed with roads and clear-cut ski runs, the more likely that slides will occur. Ms. Murnin used a slide to illustrate how major flooding could pour down canyon onto Main Street. Another concern are the numerous mine tunnels underneath the mountains. The area underneath Pods A and B is some of the most heavily mined land. Numerous mine collapses have occurred in Park City, including one in Daly and another one during site clearing operations at Stein's Lodge. Ms. Murnin questioned whether this land was suitable and safe for large developments. As currently proposed, the Flagstaff project violates the land use element of the recently revised General Plan in a substantial way. The proposal does not comply with any of the environmental and open space objectives nor the community design objectives, and it specifically flaunts the City's commitment to avoid urban sprawl. In referring to development in Daly Canyon the plan states that single-family, detached homes spread out across the mountain are not considered easily serviceable, easily protected from wildfires, or consistent with the preferred land development pattern. She asked why the community should accept a proposal that completely ignores all of the City's careful and expensive planning efforts. The developer has held the carrot of preserving open space in hope that the City will grant more density in Flagstaff. She asked how open space in Bonanza Flats would reduce the traffic generated by 750 units or keep the wind from blowing tailings dust into Old Town. She felt the offer of Bonanza Flats was a distraction, and she urged the City Council to focus their attention on the proposal at hand. If only limited, low-elevation development were allowed in Daly Canyon, there would be no year-round access and no convenient utility service for any development in Bonanza Flats. If Flagstaff were limited, Bonanza would be cut off.

Dave Staley, a seven year resident of Park City, stated that, based on the impacts of this development, CARG believed the community could reasonably choose between three options. He presented overhead visuals to illustrate these options and their possible outcomes. In addition, CARG believed several conditions must be met prior to approval. The first condition would be to allow no development in Pod D. This area should serve as the buffer between the City and the ridge line, and the single-family homes proposed for this area would significantly increase the impact of the entire development. Second, there should be no development on Prospect Ridge below the mine ride, and the area should be conserved as a buffer between Old Town and the development. Third, Pod Z should be left in its natural state to protect prime animal breeding habitat. Mr. Staley stated that Park City visitors and residents alike value and respect their neighbors. Eliminating Pod Z would maintain an undisturbed corridor for the migration of wildlife. He asked that the City Council not allow ski runs to be cut in Pod Z. The fourth condition would require that all densities be approved in clearly delineated numbers, not unit equivalents. If the limit is 200, that should mean 200 units total and not more because they are small. Finally, employee housing for any development must be on site or within public transportation access in order to mitigate traffic impacts. Mr. Staley felt the first option would be to limit the size of the project. CARG recognized the benefits of expanding the ski area and bed base, but in order to mitigate the impacts of the expansion, it recommended a maximum of 200 units tightly clustered in one or two small pods located near the Silver Mine Adventure Tour and/or the base of the north-side lift. The lower pods of the current proposal are sprawled all over the canyon floor, which would result in a mess like Silver Lake. In order to facilitate the use of public transportation and conserve undisturbed open space, CARG urged the City Council to tighten up the pods and limit their size. Mr. Staley recognized that the developers include a coalition of landowners, and in order to be fair to the people who own land that the City deems inappropriate for development, perhaps the Mining Company could grant those landowners an equity stake in the lower pods. Another option which CARG felt was most viable was to buy it. In essence, this option is similar to the first one, and they continue to recommend two small pods with a total of 200 units. If those limits are unacceptable to the developer and if the City still feels that annexation is desirable, then the City could offer to buy some of the 1,500 acres and hold it with conservation easements as open space, allowing the landowners of the undevelopable property to received some benefit while preserving the community's values. Residents of Park City have repeatedly expressed a willingness to use tax money to buy open space. CARG has also investigated the possibility of using Utah Open Lands as a way of preserving open areas in this canyon. According to Wendy Fisher, the City may not have to approve any units in Pod D in order to retain its tax benefit to a conservation buyer or partnership. So long as Pod D does not become part of the entire package, the tax benefit may be used on densities used for Pods A and B. The third option would be to turn it down. In a recent article in the Park Record, the developer said that he needed a minimum of 750 units to make this project viable. The City's professional planning staff recognized that such a figure is clearly impossible, and that is a sentiment echoed by a vast majority of the local citizens. While CARG has no problem with some development in Daly Canyon, they believe the City does not need to grant huge profits to a mine company at the expense of the citizens'

quality of life, quality of resort experience, and perhaps even their public health. If the City decides to turn it down, the developer may seek permission to go to the County. However, the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission has reconfirmed its commitment to the current one per 40 zoning in Daly Canyon, and there is no reason to believe that the County will approve this project if the City rejects it. The people in Wasatch County who preserved hundreds of acres of Snake Creek Canyon have already expressed concern about development in Bonanza Flats. There is strong sentiment in Wasatch County against development in Bonanza Flats because it can lead to the some problems of unwanted growth in their community. Fear of the County is no reason to accept a bad project. Members of the community have repeatedly turned out to speak against this proposal and will do so at the County level if necessary. CARG understands that the annexation process involves density and negotiations, but if the developer refuses to come down to a reasonable level that the community can live with, they should turn down the proposal. The City Council does not have to appease anyone but their constituents, their neighbors, and everyone attending this meeting. For nearly two years the citizens of Park City have spoken loudly and clearly against massive development in Daly Canyon. The Citizens Allied for Responsible Growth is not trying to put anyone out of a job or deny anyone a chance to make money off some long-held property. Many projects are already approved that will keep the construction industry, realtors, and interior designers at work for many years to come, and there are certainly options in Daly Canyon that will offer those landowners a good profit. The question is whether the benefits of this development outweigh the massive impacts, and most feel they do not. The City has an opportunity to call the shots, and Mr. Staley urged the Council to insist that the developer respect the community's concerns regarding traffic, mine tailings, quality guest experience, environmental degradation, and preservation of undisturbed open space. In making a decision, he encouraged them to say yes to community values, open space, positive growth management, and the issues important to everyone. Limit it, buy it, or turn it down.

Mike Hamill, a resident of Park City since 1981, commented on the amount of building growth he has seen. He supported Flagstaff as a responsible development and substantial generator of taxes that could dramatically improve the quality of life in Park City. Whether they like it or not and whether Flagstaff becomes a reality or not, the Olympics are coming, and Park City will have to generate revenues to accommodate expenses, improvements, and additional management requirements. Aside from the Olympics, Park City will face normal increased expenses to accommodate the urban sprawl that is already in motion throughout the Snyderville Basin. The present \$20 million annual budget will get very thin as the Olympics approach. As a man with a family, he stated that he shares the same concerns about open space as he does with growth management. He felt that approving Flagstaff would make substantial strides in both areas. The City and County would realize increased tax revenues of between \$7 to \$10 million a year, all of which would benefits all the residents of Park City. The City would also realize the inclusion of Bonanza Flats as a substantial piece of open space and create a major finite control over what happens to future development in that area. There are those who are focused only on what they think they will lose or how they will be inconvenienced, but Mr. Hamill had concluded that, although it

may be a compromise in some areas, it is a positive compromise that will benefit everyone in coming years. He cited revenue to build new schools and advance them with modern technology and school supplies as one benefit. Tax revenue from Flagstaff could also be used to purchase other open space lands and to help set off urbanization in the Snyderville Basin. He felt that Bonanza Flats was an excellent part of this application and a substantial contribution to open space issues that concern everyone. Additional Flagstaff tax dollars could also be used for improving the trails system and recreational facilities and could be a major contribution to the funding of additional Main Street parking to accommodate the Olympics.

Mary Beth Mizodium, an Old Town resident and homeowner, did not think Park City should overbuild just to accommodate the Olympics. She referred to Mr. Staley's comments presentation regarding development on Pods A and B and nothing in Pods Z and D and noted that it looked like the original recommendation before Bonanza Flats was thrown into the equation. She did not think that Bonanza Flats was worth it, and she recommended going back to the original recommendation of development in Pods A and B only. She recognized that the quality of life in Park City had already changed, and development would continue. Referring to a comment by Manager Seltenrich that the City will lose the revenue if the project goes to the County, she questioned what price should be paid for over development, and she did not feel that the gain of Bonanza Flats was worth it.

Neil Grisnick, a resident of Park City for nine years, focused on the traffic intersection study conducted by Centennial. He commented that this town had seen a boom before in the form of the silver boom. It brought uncontrolled growth which left when the boom left. Consequently, people were left without work and without a future. He did not believe uncontrolled growth should be allowed again. The people of Park City and the elected officials should not be blind to the fact that, once 2002 has passed, demographics indicate a sharp decline in the growth of tourism. Most people who profit from the Olympics will have to go to the next development at the next Olympic site. He suggested finding something to provide a better economic atmosphere than construction growth and dependence on nightly rentals. He did not agree with the opinions expressed in the traffic study and felt the estimates were too low. December through April are the peak times for traffic which includes 130 days. The study indicates 30 days plus as peak times with peak impact from tourism. Using his own figures, he estimated 3,000 cars would come down Marsac Avenue if the development is approved, and he felt that was not acceptable.

Rory Murphy stated that, if control of growth is the most pertinent issue faced by Park City today, he could not conceive of a greater opportunity to do so than the current proposal. He believed United Park City Mines was giving up too much and that this would be the only opportunity Park City would have to preserve this much open space so close to town. He noted that there are many small towns in Utah which will not change much in this lifetime, but Park City is not one of them. This town will change. To live in a ski resort community and expect it not to change is

unrealistic. He did not believe the Mine Company was due a special privilege, but he believed it was entitled the same rights as everyone else. He noted that 35% of Park City's economy is driven by the construction industry, and despite what others may say, many citizens in the town support this project. Flagstaff is not an anathema to the issues facing Park City. Park City is a growing, vibrant community surrounded by 2-1/2 million acres of National Forest Public Lands. The 1,300 acres in Daly Canyon is not the last piece of open space in the area. The more he listens, the more he believes that the opposition to this proposal has ceased to be about growth and planning issues but about public access to Daly Canyon. He noted that Daly Canyon is private property, and under the current proposal, public access remains in Daly Canyon. If the primary reason for opposition to development in Daly Canyon is to maintain the right to trespass on private property, it is not a very good reason. He stated that one thing he could be sure of is that the present land use situation in Daly Canyon will change. He believed the proposal on the table was an earnest compromise and a fair deal. There will never be another opportunity to preserve Bonanza Flats and control growth south of town. He hoped the City Council could see the benefits this proposal has to offer.

Chase Peterson, a resident of Park City for six years, commented that the citizens are there to find the common good, not as adversaries. There are no enemies, and he hoped the efforts of those who seek to modify and improve the Flagstaff proposal would not be seen as merely oppositional. He believed he was realistic enough to anticipate that this process probably would not make everyone completely happy. Property owners have rights. People who live near them have rights, and their unborn grandchildren have rights. All these rights have to be blended in a democracy. In his grandfather's day, a horse and plow and scraper could create a farm out of sagebrush, but nature was never defeated and could always repair mistakes. Now we have the mechanized and financial power to change nature irrevocably. Therefore, it is important to be more thoughtful and careful because we are so powerful. No one wants to deny anyone else an economic opportunity unless it is at the cost of the greater good, and especially if much of the same economic opportunity can be realized at a lower cost to the community. He referred particularly to the construction and development people who spoke at the last hearing. They will continue to build condos, houses, and hotels as long as the world continues to have children who want to live full time or part time in Utah. If they plan such, then Utah will continue to be a place that will attract construction, and the homebuilding will continue in Summit County and places that are compatible with good living for everyone. In 20 years, he could not imagine that there would be less construction within a 30-mile radius of Park City, only that it could be well planned with pleasing and economically sound open spaces. Mr. Chase admitted that he had neither the time nor the expertise to propose specific arrangement, but he offered a few principles such as protecting views from below, locating pods of construction in areas already disturbed, considering access to pods as part of the construction effect, keeping the pods as tight and efficient as possible, considering a conservation easement on all lands outside the pods. Zoning is in place, and to increase density, the City must be convinced that the change is valuable to the community and its impacts are mitigated. If Summit and Wasatch County annexations are suggested as more liberal options for development,

Mr. Peterson suggested negotiating with them to insure that the weakest coinage does not drive out the best options. He felt that Park City should not repeat a Silver Lake development and that they should learn from Aspen's mistakes and the terrible sadness of Los Angeles.

Gary Weiss opposed the project, particularly the Planning Commission's recent recommendation. Not since the original Deer Valley project had the City faced a proposal of such magnitude, and at the same time, never had the City been presented with such an opportunity for clean deliberation. With every other project of importance, decisions have been colored by the claim of prior vested rights or lawsuits or fear that the County might be less than diligent in preserving Park City's interests. With this proposal, the first two are not at issue, and for the first time since he could remember, the County had been explicit and unequivocal with regard to this area. The County recently clarified their zoning to 20- and 40-acre minimums with no options for increasing density for concessions by the developer. It was done before the fact and with clear knowledge that they were sending a signal to the City. The lack of swords hanging over the Council's head is extraordinary and presents the Council with a defining moment. While the last several elections have focused on growth issues and how each candidate would approach them, these debates have been somewhat academic until now. How this important issue is decided is the only thing that can be pointed to as the time each had an opportunity to put their principles into practice. This is the only time when the best deal under the circumstances and the best possible deal can be starkly drawn. He believed this City Council had done more than any other to affect the environment in ways that reinforce the town's often stated goals, and this is the big one that can never go away once the decision is made. Park City is already a place with empty retail spaces and is among the most densely built major western ski towns. Projects already in the pipeline will add to that. For good or ill, what's done is done, but this is not done. He begged the City Council to not get lost in details until they are able to say that what they decide is good for the town on each and every major point. He believed the Planning Commission's recommendation would fail, and he asked the City Council to reject this proposal.

Carol Murphy, representing the Park City Board of Education, reported that she had delivered a letter earlier today from the Board. A few education questions must be answered when this project is considered. Although Flagstaff has been designed and presented as a second home area, past experience has shown that there is no place in Park City that is not or does not become a primary home area. She asked the City Council to keep that in mind. Quite often areas defined as non-primary areas quickly turn into primary areas with children, and that has a large impact on the school system. The second element not discussed at length is the affordable or attainable housing element. Ms. Murphy explained that those types of housing do have impacts on school systems. To say that a project like Flagstaff has no impact on the educational system is not correct. The grades in this particular subdivision would never allow for safe access for school transportation. If it remains as a second home area, this will not be a problem, but she envisioned a public hearing 10 years from now with people wondering why school buses can't reach the children. When and if these

lots are formalized, she asked that it be made perfectly clear that this is not and will not be considered safe school bus access. She noted that a proposed school site was missing from the plan, and she believed that a project this large with this much impact on the whole community had an obligation to the community in the area of education. Before there was a formal Park City Board of Education, the mining companies provided for education. She hoped that some of that responsibility would trickle down into the decision with United Park City Mines.

Quentin Scott, a supporter of the development, considered proposals by Hank Rothwell and his team to be credible. He was convinced that this team would not propose a scheme that would negatively affect Deer Valley, and Deer Valley supports this application. He recognized that the opponents wanted less density, but he reminded the Council that, if density is decreased, Mr. Rothwell will walk to the County. Mr. Scott understood the term bottom line, and he also understood that, to fund infrastructure for this proposal, a certain number of units have to be developed. He stated that they live in the municipality of Park City, not the Republic of Park City, and it is still legal to make a buck. He quoted Council member Chuck Klingenstein as saying, "You can't build your way out of a parking problem," but he believed that a few million dollars from the impact fees provided by Flagstaff could provide an extension to the parking structure in Swede Alley and prove Mr. Klingenstein wrong. Mr. Scott stated that, as a neighbor to Prospect Ridge, he would be most affected by the construction, but he was willing to accept the negative impacts that are bound to happen because he believed the ongoing financial and job securities provided by this project are vital to the town.

Aaron Georgelas, a student at the University of Utah, came to speak out of fear for the future. If the City did not take the opportunity that this project provides to have 80% to 90% of the land set aside as open space, they would never again have this chance, because 10 years from now they might not have a population that is as environmentally sound and environmentally educated. This project is well organized and offers a wonderful opportunity. Ten years from now someone else will come back and want to develop the same property and not even offer this opportunity.

Peter Metcalf, a Park Meadows resident and business owner, stated that he is also the Secretary/Treasurer of the Utah Economic Development Corporation, an organization committed to being a catalyst for healthy economic growth in the State. He commented that he and most of the business people he is associated with oppose the Flagstaff development as recommended by the Planning Commission. The densities, sprawl, additional roads and traffic, and extensive slope cutting would significantly degrade the desirability of Park City as a preferred place to live and as a preferred world class resort destination. This is an undeniable fact that even the Deer Valley Business Manager acknowledged in a Park Record interview. Mr. Metcalf commented on traffic mitigation and mass transit and Park City's negotiating philosophy. A significant amount of discussion has occurred over allowing higher densities beyond 200 or 300 units in exchange for tight

clustering and mass transit limitation. He agreed with that and believed it must be an explicit, detailed part of the City Council recommendation. He felt it was important to create a project where it is not cruel and unusual punishment for a typical guest to walk to the lift, the restaurants, and their lodge. Regarding negotiations, he stated that one is not negotiating if one cannot walk away. The proposed development site is zoned one in 40 and one in 20 units per acre. They have the right and the need to decide what they believe is best for the community as opposed to an outside party dictating to them. As a long time witness to the proceedings and discussions, he felt there had been a strong appearance of community, first being represented by the Planning Commission and now the elected City Council. All are reasonable people looking for a reasonable compromise with what they hoped would be a reasonable negotiating partner. They had all united in the shared belief that this project would be better in the City's control and feared it going to the County. However, there does not seem to be consensus by the Planning Commission or the elected representatives as to what the City's position should be, which has resulted in various recommendations. Each time the Mining Company's response has been a non-negotiable no, and each time the City has revised its position. Mr. Metcalf urged the City to develop a position and negotiate from there. He asked the City Council to be bold, visionary, and principled.

George Hansen, a resident of Midway and President of the Preservation Society, commented that the Society has preserved nearly 1,000 acres with easements and purchases. He discussed Guardsman's Pass and Bonanza Flats and explained that there is more to the situation than just a tradeoff of Bonanza Flats versus Flagstaff. Salt Lake is the crossroads of the West, and Bonanza Flats is the crossroad of the Central Wasatch. Park City Mines has 1,500 acres, and 400 plus or minus lots of record from Brighton Estates were approved by the County before zoning. Ira Sachs has extensive holdings in Bonanza, and 20 other owners in Bonanza Flats have five acres each. If infrastructure ever goes into that area, the State Park has plans to put in large campgrounds. If ski access is taken to the top of Ten Four Twenty, they will see access into Hidden Canyon and will see Brighton Estates come back with their 1990 master plan to get into Hidden Canyon from Salt Lake County which was turned down at that time. Mr. Hansen believed there was much more at stake in that area than Bonanza Flats. If something doesn't happen to preserve the ridge line, the land could eventually be consolidated by a large landowner who would be able to do something extremely large. He felt the City Council had the ability to stop this by purchasing the land. A third party would have to hold the easement. Future politicians or future economic tax bases to have political entities could not be trusted to hold those easements. If the City wants to preserve it, they should buy it. If a few people from Midway can raise \$1 million, certainly this audience could do a lot better.

Wendy Fisher, with Utah Open Lands, suggested engaging opinions from Jim Hire, the City's newly appointed appraiser, for some of the issues in Pod D to allow some tax benefits and purchase alternatives. Utah Open Lands is willing to offer Stephen Small's help, who wrote the

federal tax law on conservation easements. She appreciated the time given by the City Council and the community in looking at this issue.

Chris Bella, a citizen of Park City for the past five years, was concerned with the rapid growth of the community. He supported CARG and believed that the top of the mountain was a sanctuary and that they don't belong there. The Park City Mine Company has taken enough from the community, and they don't need to be given any more.

John Helton, a property owner and taxpayer for 10 years, stated that, if it was a perfect world, he would request that the entire project be denied and made it into a park. He believed that growth should be limited to the lower pods and clustered together as much as possible. In response to issues regarding taxes, he believed that growth paying for itself was a myth. Growth creates more road damage and environmental damage and requires more police and fire department and government officials. Tax should not be a reason for approval. The project will be built as quickly as possible to maximize profits and means more workers, not more jobs. The workers come in short term and don't care about the community. He felt that explosive growth was shortsighted and profit motivated. Enough is approved already to keep everyone employed for the next 10 years. Relative to wanting control of the project, it doesn't seem like much control if control is giving in to everything the developer wants. He firmly believed in personal property rights and individual rights if it's your house, your land, and you live there. It's an entirely different issue when it's a money making business that impacts everyone. Then you have to answer to the community. He asked the City Council to take leadership and fight this development if they agree it is not good planning.

Phil Archer, a Park City resident, did not feel that Flagstaff was the death knell for Park City nor believe that Hank Rothwell was trying to wreck the town. He felt they should be looking at the development in terms of what is best for the City and how they could turn it into their best option. He did not agree that they are in a position of no options and believed they had all kinds of options. He believed annexation could be good, and the City Council has the ability to make it advantageous for the City. Annexation should not be done on a defensive basis. Regarding Bonanza Flats, he asked the question, "At what cost?" He agreed that it would be great to preserve it, and at this point in the negotiations, it is a carrot. However, he did not think they should throw everything out the window just to get the carrot. He felt they could win the battle but lose the war by allowing development on Pods D and Z and allowing access for other development up there even if Bonanza Flats is completely deed restricted. He strongly opposed single-family housing in those areas and felt that only clustered multi-family units should be acceptable in order to stay in the footprint and allow open space and wildlife movement up and down the mountain. On the issue of traffic, he saw this as another opportunity and did not think that rubber tired solutions were the only options. He was encouraged to hear that the City Council is looking at gondola and monorail situations. He believed that development should be limited to Pods A and B, and the City should not get hung up

on Bonanza Flats. He felt it would be a mistake to allow a new road to be built with truck runouts tearing up the canyon. A narrow road at both accesses is a definite advantage and expected in a mountain town.

Joe Dalto remarked that he and his partner are property owners in the Bonanza Flats area designated as open space in the Flagstaff proposal. As landowners in the Bonanza Flats area, they met with other nearby landowners and had questions concerning the designation that might be given to the land they own or are adjacent to. He asked the City Council how the designation of open space would affect the rights, privileges or entitlements to their property which accompanied the deed. Mayor Olch suggested that Mr. Dalto work with the Staff at City Hall to find answers to his questions since the City Council does not have the information he needs at hand.

Damon Georgelas remarked that, after educating himself on the proposed development and what it means, he felt it was the most reasonable and responsible use of the land.

Karen Wilson, a resident of Park City since 1989 and a Summit County landowner, asked the City Council to think hard about the consequences to the City and its residents as they make final decisions on the Flagstaff development. She clarified that she was not asking for no development, but she was asking for responsible development. She agreed with the three recommendations made by CARG for scaling it down, turning it down, or buying it. She stated that she works in a local restaurant and has contact with Park City's guests on a daily basis. This winter she heard numerous comments on the current growth of the City including disappearing open space, the quaint little ski town is not so quaint anymore, and we could have gone to Colorado if we wanted to see all this development. She suggested that they not continue to spoil the community so tourists choose not to return as they are a large portion of the town's income. She encouraged the Council to be prudent in their decisions on zoning. The current restrictions of one house per 40 acres on slopes over 30% and one house per 20 on the lower angled slopes are in place for justifiable reasons, including preservation of habitat for local wildlife, reduction and consumption of water, and preservation of open space for themselves, their guests, and future generations. She asked that the final decision on this important issue not be swayed by dollars only. She asked the Council to consider the far-ranging implications and let the citizens be proud of Park City.

Victor Wilson, a resident of Park City and a Park City business owner, stated that he did not envy the City Council for the decision they face with its enormous and far reaching implications. The results of their decision will be felt by the entire Park City community and its visitors for years to come. In making their decision, he asked the Council to consider the impact that such a huge development will have on everyone in and around Park City and to consider what they will gain and what they will lose. Park City Municipal Corporation will gain an extended tax base, but along with that will come a larger, more expensive city to take care of. The cash flow will increase, but will there be a net gain? He questioned what Park City residents would gain or lose.

He believed they would gain jobs, particularly in the area of maintaining residential, retail, and resort spaces, but they would lose wetlands and other important and irreplaceable wildlife habitat, and another awesome area for back country skiing, biking, and hiking. They would gain an exhaust fuming traffic snarl. He believed this project would move the City one giant irreversible step away from what brought most people to Park City in the first place, the idea of living in a small but prosperous resort town within an exceedingly high standard of living. He wanted to go on record as strongly opposing the Flagstaff development in its current form because it is too large and intrusive and must be scaled back.

Linda Karz, a resident of Park City for 15 years, stated that she was impressed by the CARG presentation. She commented that many excellent remarks made by others before her echoed what she intended to say. One issue she mentioned was pollution. She stated that she had been "trespassing" a lot in Daly Canyon this winter, and as the season progressed, she noticed that the snow where the snow cats travel is turning black. She wondered where that goes when the snow melts and what effect it has on the water supply, wildlife, and vegetation. She felt this was a big issue that she wanted to have an answer for. She stated that, if development is limited to Pods A and B and upper Guardsman Road remains unimproved, that alone should limit development into Bonanza Flats. If development occurs, she felt the most logical areas to develop would be areas already disturbed. She referred to comments about using revenue from this project to buy open space in other areas. She felt there was no other area they could purchase that was as unique or beautiful as Daly Canyon.

John Tinklepaugh, a resident of Park City for 20 years, stated that the reality of the issue is whether any of the citizens will want to live in Park City five, 10, 20, or even 40 years from now and whether their guests will have an impetus to come to Park City or will also choose to go somewhere else. He believed the quality of this development would determine that for Park City. He opposed development in Pods D and Z and wanted to see the development curtailed to some degree. The Planning Commission has an opportunity to do this and he hoped they would set up a situation where all of them could continue to live in this little town.

Mark Oliver stated that he has worked in the area for 14 years and noted that his job involves evaluating various land uses for runoff, soil erosion, channel stability, wetlands, etc. He explained that his interest this evening concerns his profession and trying to protect the resource. He referred to the letter he submitted to the Planning Commission regarding flooding, drinking water supply, and ski run issues. These are not hot button issues, but they should be considered as they can easily be addressed with simple control techniques. He was certain that an annexation would occur, resulting in a large amount of development in Ontario and Empire Canyons. Since Ontario Canyon already contains a relatively large amount of residential commercial and ski run land uses, the amount of runoff in that canyon is relatively high. By contrast, Daly Canyon is largely undeveloped, with small amounts of runoff. He explained that construction of the Flagstaff project

will increase runoff from Ontario Canyon. Daly Canyon will experience significant increase in runoff due to the construction of large numbers of ski runs, roads, plazas, rooftops, driveways and the like. He noted that he performed a study in August 1995, just after a large rainfall event in the Ontario and Daly area. This study concluded that the ski runs in Ontario Canyon contributed significantly to the amount of runoff due to the lack of proper revegetation and soil stabilization. By contrast, Daly Canyon had a small amount of runoff because it is undeveloped. The damage is already done to Ontario, and Mr. Oliver recommended a condition of annexation for the ski runs that they be constructed using proper construction and revegetation techniques and that no more ski runs be constructed in the present Deer Valley area. He asked that the City Council not approve Pods D or Pod Z because of their biological value.

Peter Marth, an Old Town resident on Hillside Avenue, urged the City Council to focus on the issues and mechanisms in finding the best solutions. These issues include protection of the citizens' and community's quality of life. Even with 250 and 300 units originally approved by the Planning Staff, the quality of life will decrease significantly. He asked the City Council to rely heavily on community input and Planning Staff recommendations and to compromise and focus on the immediate area impacts, not on Bonanza Flats. He suggested that they pursue creative financial mechanisms to buy out higher densities. He asked them not to let United Park City Mines mitigate or encourage traffic impacts in the canyon. He felt that the Planning Staff's original recommendation would provide the developer significantly higher densities than currently allowed and ski area expansion. It will also provide protection of key quality of life issues and economic base for the community.

Lisa Carlson, a resident of Brighton Estates since 1980 and an Old Town homeowner since 1992, stated that she lives and breathes this canyon. She discussed the negotiation and deed restrictions on the 1,500 acres in Bonanza Flats. She noted that there is wet water, and private entities as well as United Park City Mines have rights on it. She asked the City Council to consider all the options and require golf course mitigation within the deed restriction, because it will happen. If it is not declared perfectly with each and every word, they will still get a golf course because irrigation water is available. She saw this as a development potential for United Park City Mines, with skiing in the front yard and golfing in the backyard. It is a highly marketable area with a lot at stake. She was concerned about flooding and stated that she and her husband had seen it first hand. From the way Deer Valley has cut their ski runs, she stated that she had literally water skied across where the lift was put in up to Stein's. If the City does take on Bonanza Flats, she suggested they put guard rails on Guardsman Road to mitigate problems caused by the traffic impacts. She asked they do whatever is necessary to discourage car travel and to keep the 1,500 acres fenced. She requested that they have no bathrooms, no signage, no camping, and absolutely no campfire rings. She suggested eliminating commercial snowmobile tours because of the black snow she mentioned. She asked that they encourage walking and peace and quiet within the open space. She stated that, if it is left alone, Wasatch County can police it. However, if Park City takes on the deed, she urged

them to make sure a management plan is in place for the impacts that will be created by pushing people into certain recreational venues on the property. Park City should either pay Wasatch County to respond with public safety and fire protection, or other response from Park City public services should be available, including a fire department house at the top.

Char Quart, property manager for the Utah Girl Scout Council, explained that the Girl Scout Council has operated Camp Cloud Rim on the shores of Lake Brimhall since 1937. They are proud of providing six decades of Cloud Rim magic for thousands of girls in Utah which only happens at Camp Cloud Rim. The location and program gives young women an opportunity to experience the outdoors in a safe, protected environment where they learn to appreciate and live in harmony with nature and each other. They have a responsibility to insure that tomorrow's children have the same magical opportunities to experience Camp Cloud Rim. The Council cares about the environment in Bonanza. They have been there a long time and wish for it to remain as it is today. The Girl Scout Council supports the permanent open space of Bonanza Flats.

Christian Gunnerman, a property owner and resident in Brighton Estates and former Old Town resident, shared memories of his days in Old Town when he could bike up Daly Avenue and encounter wildlife. He was afraid to see that disappear and that he would not an opportunity to come in to his cabin and ski on this private property when the City can purchase it and make it public property. He encouraged the City Council to consider a gondola or monorail and, if at all possible, to purchase the land and save it for everyone.

Celeste Puckett, a property owner and Park City resident, remarked that if she was queen of the world, she would say no more development in Park City. Unfortunately, she is not queen and is a realistic person. She stated that she knows development is inevitable and that more people are going to move to Park City because it is a great place to live. She noted that at some time they were all newcomers to Park City, and they do not have the right to shut the door behind them, but she felt they had the right and privilege to change how they develop. She suggested four items for development in Daly Canyon. It should be aesthetically pleasing in terms of views, open space, and access to trails. It should be safe. It should allow reasonable access to traffic, both ski traffic and local traffic. It should have access to fire and police protection and ambulances, and they should plan for school buses, because it will be a reality. Development should also be affordable. The City has the right and the privilege to allow both low and high income people to live in Park City. Finally, the development should be environmentally sound in terms of wildlife and existing hazards such as flood and avalanches as well as unknown hazards like tailings piles. She did not feel the current plan addressed these issues and, therefore, should go back to the drawing board. She clarified that she did not believe there should be no development in Daly Canyon, only that it should be thought out more than it is now. She also disagreed that Park City needs growth to provide construction jobs. As an emergency room physician, not once had she heard anyone say they needed to create more accidents to keep them in work.

Ann McQuoid, a long time resident in Park City, completely agreed with CARG. However, seven years ago Park City did take the initiative to buy it, and it cost \$4 million for 40 acres and the Osguthorpe Barn. She submitted to the dedication of 1,500 acres of open space as a buffer to Park City, and she agreed that the City should buy it, but she could not begin to imagine what the bond issue would look like based on 40 acres at \$4 million seven years ago. She supported the inclusion of 1,500 acres of open space and hoped it would not be turned into a golf course.

Mac McQuoid, a 17-year resident of Park City, commented on the number of changes he has seen in that time and the number of families who have left Park City because there were no jobs. He noted the number of old timers who are happy with what they see because they don't see their friends leaving like they did when the mines were shut down. He felt it was important to consider the tax base of the development because of the amount of money generated for the school district. He commended the people opposed to the project who are willing to take their concerns to the County if that is necessary, but he reminded them that they will be up against others in the County who will attend those public hearings to favor the project because the tax base will support their schools. He feared that County residents would see this as a good deal because Park City would get the impacts and they would get the tax revenues to support their children. He was unsure if the County will be quite as sympathetic toward preserving the canyon. He urged the City Council to look hard at the impacts and consider them as positive for the community.

Mark Stonehawker, part owner of a business located in Park City, did not consider United Park City Mines to be the typical developer because they have been around a long time and tried to support local business. He stated that he generally supports this development and believes clustering three pods in 1,500 acres is good. He recommended putting as many amenities as possible in Pods A and B to keep people from coming into the City for small items and services. He agreed with the suggestion of a school site designation in the area. He stated that he could not think of anything less sustainable as a one in 40 development.

Holly Carlin, who has lived or worked in Park City for the last 13 years, wanted the City Council to think of the infrastructure, growth, open space, traffic, impacts, the future, and the future of future generations, the "bottom line," and alternatives. She would love to think they could buy it all, but she believed it was most likely a dream. She believed change was inevitable and asked the City Council to look at it long term. She wished the City Council a lot of luck in whatever they decide.

Noah Lavine commented that he has been disappointed by this government many times. He referred to the American flag behind the podium and stated that it was supposed to embody democracy, not capitalism. He felt that the City Council had been dictated to this evening, and he believed there was an overwhelming response to curtail this project and limit development

to Pods A and B or dismiss it altogether and that there was very little support for the development as proposed in its entirety.

Linda Wilcox noted areas of undisturbed open land on the maps provided. In the corner she noticed a square indicating the size of Liberty Park. She was trying to assess the relative size of that square, but when she looked at it closer, she noticed it said 10 acres. She recalled Liberty Park as being eight city blocks, which would make it 80 acres. She suggested that the City Council question the representation and look at the actual size.

Melissa Briley, a resident of Park City and private property owner, stated that she is surrounded by commercial development on three sides, and she, too, would like to maximize her profits. She requested that her land be zoned commercial, and she was told by the City that the line has to be drawn somewhere, and her property is on the other side of that line. She explained that her property used to be owned by United Park City Mines, and despite the fact that she filters her water, she believed her future children might grow in the dark. She noted that one argument in favor of the project is bed base, but if that is true, she did not see a need for more trophy homes. Her main concern was traffic, and she asked the City Council to closely review the traffic study. Her interpretation of the study is that some of the developments would not impact the intersection because development does not cause intersections to fail. She believed that was because intersections are already failing. She was concerned that these homes will not remain second homes, and school buses and public transportation will become a problem.

Matthew Lenz, a resident of the Snyderville Basin, preferred to see no development in the canyons. However, he realized that nothing could stop it. He was pleased that there had been some compromise between the City, the citizens, and the Mining Company and that wildlife and open space areas had been preserved. He commented on the importance of Pod Z and areas of Bonanza Flats remaining open as a model for all the other canyons stretching to Parleys Summit. When those canyons are developed, it will not be done by process of open forum, and if there can be a model of protected ridgelines, those ridgelines may also be protected, and the Forest Service land going into Big Cottonwood Canyon, Millcreek, and Lamb's Canyon can be saved as well.

Bill Edwards commented that the areas proposed for wildlife habitat are avalanche zones. He did not feel that the top of the mountain should be given away. The City does not need another Autobahn or Deer Valley Road. If the top of the mountain is given away, he felt it would be like the Aeries and that this Council did not need a reminder of what happened with prior Councils. He recognized that there would be some type of development on the land, but he asked that the City not give it away. He favored keeping the development lower on the mountain and believed that people would live there year round.

Tim Henney stated that he has heard Staff recommendations, densities lower than what the applicant wanted, building pods closer to the existing town and infrastructure, and preservation of large areas of undisturbed open space. The Planning Commission recommended a negotiated plan to City Council while disparaging key components and justifying their recommendation as the lesser of evils and that the only thing worse would have been to do nothing. A Planning Commissioner who voted in favor of the recommendation stated that 200 units may be too many for the town. Citizens without ownership or economic ties to the plan are concerned with quality of life and how the plan adversely affects the community. Long term view and current plans threaten the viability of a place where tourists and residents choose to visit and live. He asked if the point of diminishing returns had been reached. Comments made by a tourist at the last meeting indicated it might have. There are a litany of risks and threats in the short term--traffic, congestion, runoff flooding, water contamination, services to support development, loss of open space. Citizens with ties to the plan and United Park City Mines have vested development rights based on past involvement and commitment to the community. Some believe allowances unsupported by law should be made to United Park City Mines based on its history in Park City. He was surprised anyone had chosen to open this can of worms. At a previous public hearing he had heard a citizen state that there was a reason it was called Poison Creek. Park City is still dealing with the consequences of United Park City Mines' past mining activities. Mr. Henney quoted a comment by the applicant stating that the plan is driven by return on investment. He felt that much of the applicant's plan and the ensuing debate had focused on mitigation of adverse impacts associated with the development, and he wanted to know what unique attributes this plan brings to Park City. As a citizen who chose to move here five years ago, he wanted to know how this plan and all future development proposals would enhance his family's quality of life. He had heard nothing about recreational opportunities, and he wanted to hear less about bed base and tax increase and more about creative recreational enhancements. Many people view additional ski resort terrain as a net loss, and the cost of lost habitat and open space is questionable. He had not heard discussion of a high altitude cross country facility or hut system for overnight ski tours or other winter recreation additions. He wanted to hear that the extended tax base would reduce the student/teacher ratio in the Park City School District from the current 24 plus to 12. He believed that, once additional services required to support the development are budgeted, few funds would be left for tangible enhancements to the existing educational system. He wanted to know that this plan will make getting his family around town safer, less stressful, less time consuming, and that it would be a better experience. Those are the criteria he wanted his elected officials to use when judging every development proposal. After two years of scrutiny, the fact that this debate is still focused on how to mitigate what is bad is a clear indication that the plan can be improved. The inclusion of Bonanza Flats, while a significant benefit, will not, in itself, make the plan better, it just makes the tradeoff between development and nondevelopment easier to take. He wanted to see a discussion focused on enhancement, not mitigation. If that goal could not be accomplished, why continue on the present course?

Todd Wallack, a resident for two years, stated that he mostly agreed with CARG. He asked the City Council to keep development minimal and dense and to decrease impacts on the natural environment.

Brad Dix discussed the fact that there will only be 750 units on 1,500 acres and stated that, whether it is 1,500 acres or 3,500 acres, the number of cars going up Marsac would be the same. He requested that the number of units be reduced significantly. Regarding the fact that the applicant can only accept 750 units, he did not believe this was the line in the sand, and he saw it as only a negotiating tactic. He had lived in cities such as Cleveland, Dallas, Seattle, and Atlanta and moved to Utah four years ago. He stated that bigger is not better, and he wanted to preserve the quality of life.

Rebecca Genovese, who lives in Park City, stated that she works for the school district and was excited to hear that people are concerned with the impacts this type of development will have on the community. She asked the City Council and the proponents of the plan not to get too excited about a \$2 million revenue for the schools, because she knew just how far \$2 million would go in a growing school district the size of Park City. It would not meet existing salaries nor go toward new schools or buildings. She encouraged the City Council to think long term and be very farsighted in their planning. The area should be protected for the quality experience that Park City is trying to promote. If the quality of experience for visitors is not protected, the tourist trade will dry up. She did not support development in Pod D, and although Bonanza Flats is attractive, the Council should consider what it really means and what the community must give up if they take that option.

Patrick Cohn, a resident of the County, stated that he has lived in the area for four decades and his family for 14 decades. He is Chairman of the Summit County Historical Society, and he stated that he supports annexation of this project because Park City will carry the impacts, but he could not envision many people living in that area. He envisioned a degradation in the Old Town experience that people come to Park City for and felt the City had turned the corner on why people come to the town for a historical experience. If that is not seriously considered, people will stop coming. He did not think this project in the size proposed made sense at all.

Rick Martinez was born in Park City 40 years ago and remembered when the number of people sitting in the room would have been all the people living in Park City. He believed that, without United Park City Mines, he would be the only person standing in this room, or in a vacant field because the room would not exist. United Park City Mines had helped make Park City what it is today. He recalled the Mining Company donating equipment to plow roads because the City did not have anything. They also donated money for the cemeteries and playgrounds. He suggested that maybe this is the time the City should pay back. United Park City Mines has let people trespass on their property for years, and he believed this was part of the objection. People tend to think that

they own it when in fact they don't. The Mining Company has the right to develop, and although it will impact the City, he felt the benefits would outweigh the impacts. He felt the quality this development would add to the Olympics and make people want to return to Park City.

Jeff Smith, a 15-year resident and building contractor, generally favored the project. He addressed the tourism industry and noted that Park City residents live here today because 35 years ago some visionary people strung cables up the hills and people started sliding down. This is a continuation of that process and a fine tuning. He believed that the City Council stands at a crossroads and that their decision would be very important. He commended them for their effort at scrutinizing this project.

Dick Erv, manager of Stein Eriksen Lodge for three years, stated that he has grown to love the area. He believed that Park City was on the brink of becoming one of the best areas in the world, whether you are a resident or tourist. Any development, if well planned, would only add to its enhancement. He felt this project was well planned and that the City could only benefit from any development if it is planned well and done right. He felt that this type of forum would make sure it is done right.

With no further business, the meeting of the City Council was adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.

* * * * *

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

Prepared by Creative Office Services, Salt Lake City



Janet M. Scott, City Recorder



