PARK CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION NOTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MARCH 1, 2007

Present: **Mayor Dana Williams; Council members, Marianne Cone; Candace Erickson; Roger Harlan; Jim Hier; and Joe Kernan**

Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Seth Atkinson, Budget Analyst; Gary Hill, Budget Manager; Jerry Gibbs, Public Works Director; Eric DeHaan, City Engineer, Jon Weidenhamer, Project Manager

Consultants Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design; and Matt Riffkin, Interplan Traffic Consulting

1. Council questions/comments. Jim Hier commented on a joint meeting with the School District on traffic issues on Kearns Blvd. where using the LDS Church's parking lot on Monitor Drive for student parking was proposed to mitigate the problem of student parking in the Prospector neighborhood. Policing the neighborhood now costs the City $30,000 annually. He stated that he suggested at the meeting that he would approach Council with the idea of using some of that money to improve lighting or for maintenance of the lot. Candace Erickson expressed her support, acknowledging that she doesn't have the numbers. Marianne Cone stated that she is not comfortable with the City's maintaining the lot and wished that kids didn't drive their cars so much. All other members agreed to consider Mr. Hier's proposal. Candace Erickson commented on the number of international visitors in town over Presidents Week due in part to the successful marketing efforts of the Chamber. Roger Harlan pointed out improved traffic flows on SR248 when the schools are not in session but felt the task force is making good progress. Joe Kernan reported on Solid Waste Task Force business. The Summit County Commission is considering providing increased funding for landfill operations by increasing property taxes and he is opposed to this approach. Mayor Williams commented on the walkability study meeting yesterday and is pleased with the level of public participation. The Mayor reported on meetings with our congressional delegation in Washington D C on identifying an appropriate location for a military facility in the Park City area. He relayed that The Blue Sky Program is the single most effective voluntary method of encouraging renewable energy in the country. He asked that an extended recycling program be examined during the upcoming budget session, specifically for businesses and the sidewalks on Main Street.

2. Legislative update. Seth Atkinson explained the funding proposed for HB102, land and water reinvestment, and reported that HB105, illegal immigration enforcement, failed. SB41 passed to create a task force dealing with changing the form of government. SB185 failed; it was authored to create amendments to special improvement districts for utilities. Mr. Hill addressed SB223, an omnibus tax bill, which includes renewable energy credits, a 5% reduction in income tax, and a reduction in the overall state rate on food sales to 3%. This reflects a revenue loss to the City but there is provision for cities to increase their transit tax rate from .25% to .3% and the resort cities tax from 1% to 1.1%. Cities are required to enact increases in rates. The state reduced its overall sales tax rate to offset impacts to cities. Council members acknowledged the great work performed by staff in promoting Park City's interests during this legislative session.

3. Water District agreements. Jerry Gibbs explained that there are four agreements before the Water Service District which represents over ten years of negotiations. Two agreements reserve 2,500 acre feet of water from the Weber Basin Conservancy District, the third agreement is with Mountain Regional to share capacity through its system, and the fourth agreement is an amendment to a three-party agreement between Weber Basin, Mountain Regional and Park City so that Weber Basin can fund water diversion infrastructure and install the upgrades to Mountain Regional's water system for Park City. There were no questions from Council members.

4. SR224 & Meadows Drive intersection. Eric DeHaan explained that in November 2006, Council held a work session on intersection options and input from the neighborhoods was rendered. Consistent with Council direction, UDOT conducted a signal warrant study and based on counts, concluded that a signal is still not warranted at this intersection. UDOT felt that the cross-traffic volume at Meadows Drive is insufficient to meet technical criteria and the gaps in the main line of traffic are adequate to allow for turning movements at the intersection. However, based on the corridor preservation agreement for SR224 between the state and Park City providing some flexibility, UDOT has prepared documentation on circumstances where it would agree to warrant a signal at this intersection. Mr. DeHaan noted that because the state recognizes this request as a planning tool and not a planned intersection, it is less inclined to participate in funding. It is likely that the City would be responsible for preparatory work on the legs on both sides of the intersection and for installing adequate pedestrian improvements at the crossing. UDOT is also concerned about disrupting the SCAT system on this stretch. This system has been successful; however, a sufficient number of licenses were not acquired for additional signals on SR224. Therefore, Mr. DeHaan stated that the financial burden would go to the City to acquire the software for an additional signal.

The City Engineer acknowledged the importance of Park City's entry corridor and the interest expressed by Council members to explore a round-about at this location. He asked for Council direction on negotiating the installation of a signal or pursuing changing criteria allowing round-abouts in the state. UDOT's guidelines discourage round-abouts at 90 degree intersections where the through leg is clearly carrying much more traffic than the cross legs. He estimated the cost of installing a signal at about $150,000, including the license. Pursuing a round-about discussion with UDOT would require approximately $40,000 of consulting work to technically address revising guidelines for this project. It is staff's recommendation to pursue the signal which would be considered during the budget process. In response to a question from Jim Hier, Eric DeHaan noted that construction of a round-about is estimated at $1.5 million. He explained that UDOT would be contributing some hardware and mast arms even though the signal is not warranted. In response to a comment made by Marianne Cone, he clarified that the SCAT system is not designed to control speeds; a round-about would force motorists to slow down to negotiate the curvatures. Ms. Cone expressed that no one crosses SR224 now because it's too unsafe, but a light may give pedestrians a false sense of safety and suggested perhaps building an underpass. Mr. DeHaan pointed out the underpass at the Farm and explained that using the pedestrian crossing button at a light adds 25 seconds to cross the street. Ms. Cone expressed that she is inclined not to support a light if there are pedestrian implications and discussed her continued interest in pursuing a round-about.

Mr. DeHaan again emphasized the necessity to change state guidelines if a round-about is pursued, and it is possible that after expending funds on a study, UDOT may still not be persuaded. Roger Harlan pointed out that the warrant doesn't seem to address left hand turn movements, which was identified as the main safety problem by residents. Eric DeHaan advised that this information is included in the warrant but is presented by measuring the gaps in traffic to make a left hand turn. Roger Harlan expressed his hesitation about interrupting scenic views with another traffic light and the scope of the SCAT system was discussed. Joe Kernan commented on the importance of a safe pedestrian crossing and supports the signal in the interim. Marianne Cone suggested lowering the speed limit and installing landscaping in the area to slow traffic. Mr. DeHaan explained the standard used by UDOT for establishing speed limits. The Mayor summarized that three members are in support of moving ahead with the signal and not the round-about at this time.

5. Walkability update. Jonathan Weidenhamer introduced consultants Mark Vlasic and Matt Riffkin and explained that the study originated from the last budget process. It was determined that rather than addressing improvements in one neighborhood when requested, to comprehensively look at problems and solutions on a City-wide basis. The two deliverables from the Landmark contract include an update to the trails master plan and a list of prioritized projects that can be reviewed with other capital recommendations during the budget process. He clarified the scope of the study which deals with walkable projects and does not address elements of the strategic transportation master plan, including traffic calming, signals, etc. On December 21, 2006, the City Council was updated with survey information and two public meetings have been held to date. At the January 13, 2007 workshop, goals and objectives were identified which include safety; efficiency, local and neighborhood connectivity; regional connectivity; and capital/maintenance costs. The public input from that meeting supported this approach. A comprehensive project list was presented at the February 13, 2007 meeting and ranked according to the five objectives listed above. He explained that the projects receiving the most points where ranked accordingly. There are five tiers with the top two tiers reflecting higher capital, operation, and/or maintenance costs. The initial project list was reviewed at the February 13 meeting where there was public input that the results are too constrained by capital costs with no associated standard; i.e., gold, platinum projects. Mr. Weidenhamer further explained that it was perceived that recommendations were based on past practices and were budget-driven and in response to this, the team prepared Exhibits D and E in the staff report. This analysis is based on financial considerations, not necessarily the budget, but an understanding among team members that there are limited resources to be allocated to a number of City-wide projects. Over the last ten years, the City has averaged spending about $200,000 a year on trails; typically 50% of the funding comes from grants and almost all of this has been allocated to recreational trails. Landmark has provided the criteria and the final list of projects, consistent with the contract and the walkable projects will be reviewed by Council during budget with all other capital projects. He stated that the trails master plan update is anticipated to be completed in April which will go to the Planning Commission for review. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the team will respond to concerns raised at the February 13 meeting, specifically to define gold standard projects, provide associated costs and compare Park City with other walkable cities. The next public workshop will be held March 7 from 5 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. in Council Chambers. Mr. Weidenhamer invited Council comments.

Jim Hier expressed his confusion over the selected projects. Without the benefit of seeing the ranking criteria, it is difficult for him to understand the results. The cost is not independent and needs to be related to the scope of the benefit; none of the scenarios provide information with regard to the number of people served with dollars spent. He also is concerned about using terms like *gold or platinum or safety and efficiency* without definitions. Jon Weidenhamer stated that there is more information regarding ranking the projects, which was provided at the last public meeting. The team was hesitant to present the projects to Council with a score and preferred the tiered approach. This is information that is available and can be provided to the Council.

Mark Vlasic indicated that terms are defined, were explained at the last workshop, and available on line. There is a lot of documentation supporting this presentation that will be included in the final report. For instance, *facilitating access to schools*, means considering walking or biking improvements within one mile of a school. There are descriptions for all ranked groups but they are lengthy and not included in the packet material. Mr. Hier insisted that there should be a summary of this information for members. Tom Bakaly interjected that the goal is not for feed-back on individual projects and a summary is available and can be distributed.

Marianne Cone discussed a section of sidewalk on Park Avenue which narrows to nothing, forcing pedestrians to walk in the street and wondered why it is not ranked higher because of its safety implications. Jon Weidenhamer reiterated that it will be reviewed by the CIP committee to submit recommendations to the City Manager and ultimately to the Council for approval. It is possible that a Tier 3 can move to a Tier 1. Matt Riffkin, Interplan, noted that safety represents 20% of the score and each goal is rated equally. Changing the assigned percentage is a policy decision.

In response to a question from Roger Harlan about defining *gold* standards, Mr. Riffkin referred to the 14 projects totaling $1.5 million which is based on increasing the amount of past appropriations. The team received criticism that this is too constrained and the consultants are contacting other cities about projects suggested to be researched by the public for comparison cost purposes. From that information and a five year walkability budget, the quality and quantity of projects can be identified. There are four projects in Tier 1, representing about $10 to $15 million, and Council will make the final funding determinations. Mr. Riffkin explained that the list of choices is consistent with projects previously budgeted by the City Council which he is hearing *is not good enough*. He stated that a revised list of choices can be provided in the event Council desires to commit more funding. Joe Kernan supported looking at achieving a gold standard by way of comparing Park City to successful walkable communities. He spoke about selecting projects identified in OTIS and unlike streets, this is a connected system and the focus should be on projects completing the system, which could even include a simple solution like directional signage. Candace Erickson expressed her appreciation of the work, and explained that several people were out of town and unable to attend the February 13 workshop. She agreed that connections are a priority which may be part of the next phase. She suggested that the school perimeter be adjusted to 1.5 miles which is consistent with the School District's busing policy. Roger Harlan stated that he was impressed by the level of participation at the last workshop and felt that a lot of progress is reflected in the study.

The City Manager asked if Council is comfortable with equal consideration for all five objectives. The Mayor understood that three members expressed an interest of reviewing *gold standard* projects without a budget limit. Jon Weidenhamer added that the team will define a gold standard. Tom Bakaly explained that if safety were to have a higher weight, it would change the draft study and the gold standard. Joe Kernan felt that an adjustment for safety may prompt Council to fund bigger projects. Matt Rifkin explained that the information before Council for all 14 projects includes optional elements and individual estimates will be provided for all 114 issues raised. The draft categorizes them in five cost ranges until cost estimates are available. Marianne Cone felt that the unsafe section of sidewalk on Park Avenue should be addressed immediately. Safety should come first. She pointed out that improvements require maintenance which should be shared with the public. Mr. Weidenhamer asked if the weight of safety and connectivity should be higher than other objectives. Candace Erickson noted that because she doesn't know what *efficiency* means, is inclined to rate safety higher because it is the main responsibility of local government.

Mayor Williams recommended that the study be completed and evaluated by the community with everything rated equally. It is probably unwise to change criteria which would significantly affect six months of work at this point and Council members agreed. Jim Hier expressed that he is uncomfortable with budget assumptions and Candace Erickson added that projects may have to be phased. Jon Weidenhamer asked if Objective No. 5 should be removed. Jim Hier reiterated that projects can not be ranked without a cost benefit analysis. The benefit relates to how many people are served and its part in achieving overall goals.

Mark Vlasic explained that capital projects were separated from budgetary maintenance type projects and #105, Park Avenue, could be addressed sooner. Jonathan Weidenhamer recommended that the consultants complete the study with consistently applied criteria and that Council prioritize projects during its budget review. Otherwise, the process may be compromised. Joe Kernan asked when it is appropriate to address the top projects and Tom Bakaly reiterated that specifics will be discussed during the budget process. Mr. Kernan clarified that he meant looking at alternatives. Mr. Bakaly understood that the completed study will be presented to Council in a work session by the consultants, which is not intended to be a negotiation with the consults on the selection of projects. Joe Kernan expressed the importance of being open to public input and discussed the Park Avenue sidewalk issue.

Mark Harrington interjected that Council has the same rights as the public with regard to participation but at the same time, the purpose of a consulting contract is obtaining a professional and objective opinion. The process outlined in the contract is intended to provide an opportunity for early input but also allows for objectivity. Mr. Harrington encouraged following the protocol for Council liaisons, and discouraged promoting a perception of individual members lobbying paid contractors on final recommendations. Secondly, the liaison communication should be consistent with the way that the public communicates ideas. He discussed the shortfalls of the process for the Quinn's Junction Study where it was sidetracked because of the absence of a defined core standard. The City Council will have final say in setting priorities and budgets and he again urged members to not diminish the objectivity requested.

Tom Bakaly understood direction to be holding the public meeting, maintaining the same weights, removing capital costs, adding definitions, and returning to Council for further direction. He added that the role of the liaison is to report back to the group, not to provide direction. Direction will be sought in April once the public process is complete and the budget will be presented in May. Jim Hier emphasized that he doesn't want to remove capital costs from the equation, but wants to capture relevance in a way other than dollars. The Mayor felt members are in agreement to support the original five elements and once the study is finished, the Council may make adjustments.

Tom Bakaly pointed out that if individual projects are modified, the process may become subjective. The Mayor expressed that ultimately the Council and community should set priorities and it may be that safety is weighed higher. The City Manager suggested that modifications be made overall rather than on a project-by-project basis. The Mayor reiterated that percentages should not be bumped now. Joe Kernan stated that he wants to see alternatives on projects and felt that Council members should be able to add unidentified options. The City Manager responded that *this is beginning to sound like direction on individual projects*. Mr. Riffkin stated that the goal is to obtain a full list of the issues and options. There has been an extensive public process to solicit this information, and there are more public meetings scheduled. He emphasized that the consultants want to *get it right*. Marianne Cone pointed out that Project #92 is complete. Jon Weidenhamer stated that they will return with cost benefit analyses applying the same criteria.

The Mayor invited the audience to comment during the public input session at the regular meeting which will follow after a short break. See regular meeting minutes.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MARCH 1, 2007

I ROLL CALL

Mayor Dana Williams called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, March 1, 2007. Members in attendance were Dana Williams, Marianne Cone, Candace Erickson, Roger Harlan, Jim Hier, and Joe Kernan. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Ray Milliner, Planner; Katie Cattan, Planner; and Craig Sanchez, Golf Director.

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

None.

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

1. Walkability study – Bo Andrini, Prospector resident, stated that he is pleased this project is moving ahead quickly. Staff has been extremely responsive to comments made at the February 13, 2007 workshop by redirecting Landmark toward *gold standards*. The gold standard should not be based on historical spending but in the context of all capital projects, i.e., parking garage, skate park, ice arena, etc., including a similar budget level. He agreed with Mr. Hier's comments about not limiting ideas to costs and felt now is the time to go to a weighted system rather than a binary list. Safety is clearly more important than connecting shopping and a cost benefit analysis should be conducted.

2. Signal at Meadows Drive/Aspen Springs Drive and SR224 - Vince Desimone, resident, commented on the significant number of citizens affected by the current unsafe condition at the intersection and the impact it has on adjacent neighborhoods. Because of the fear of making a left hand turn on SR224, motorists detour through the neighborhoods. A signalized system will produce the same level of traffic volume of flow and the same travel times as a round-about. It will help manage the flow so that it is steady and efficient. The Mayor informed Mr. Desimone who was not in attendance during work session, that Council directed staff to proceed with the signal.

3. Walkability study - Carol Potter, Mountain Trails Foundation, relayed that she is impressed with the level of public participation which was all written down. She feels a gold standard is to *dare to dream* and we all need to figure out what it takes to get there. Marianne Cone thanked Ms. Potter for doing an inventory of all of the bike racks in town.

4. Carbon sequestration - Peter Roberts, resident, stated that global warming due to green house gases is a huge problem and carbon dioxide is a major contributor.

About one-third of our country's contribution of carbon dioxide is due to coal-burning power plants and 130 new plants are funded and planned, none of which are designed for carbon sequestration. This is capturing the exhaust gases and preventing them from entering the atmosphere. Carbon sequestration can be sold as a commodity on the market and used to acquire tax pollution credits.

Carbon sequestration plants look like big ugly refineries; there are miles of pipe which cool, condense and separate gases. He pointed out that Park City has hundreds of miles of abandoned silver mines that could be used to cool, condense, separate and capture the gases underground and out-of-sight. Mr. Roberts detailed the process to provide the energy to produce purified CO^2 and stated that no toxic gases are created, and it is inherently safe. Collected gases can be either be compressed and stored in high pressure tanks or hooked up to a pipeline and connected to the intermountain *string of peals* carbon dioxide pipeline which runs from Montana to Texas. Mr. Roberts emphasized that the industrial demand for carbon dioxide is huge and unmet. The economic viability of this idea seems to be feasible and there is grant money available. Secondly the CO^2 can be sold on the market and thirdly, there is a tax pollution credit gained which can be sold on the open market.

Mr. Roberts stated that he met with the U S Department of Energy in Salt Lake City who indicated that this is a viable approach. He described his work as the principal investigator for two substantial projects under the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. The projects represented $2 million and he patented the resulting technology. He explained that the three phases for the proposed carbon sequestration project which be a white paper, testing, and the technology transfer. A feasibility study could be funded with a grant with an expression of support from PCMC; the costs would probably range from $10,000 to $30,000. He distributed his talking points to Council members.

IV WORK SESSION NOTES AND MINUTES OF MEETING OF FEBRUARY 8, AND FEBRUARY 15, 2007

Roger Harlan, "I move approval of the work session notes and minutes of the meetings of February 8 and February 15, 2007 (as corrected)". Jim Hier seconded. Marianne Cone corrected the spelling of Tom Fey's name in the work session notes of February 8, 2007. Motion unanimously approved.

V CONSENT AGENDA PUBLIC HEARINGS *(items listed will be open for public hearing prior to consideration for adoption or rejection; hearings may also be continued by vote of the Council)*

1. Consideration of an Ordinance amending Land Management Code Chapters 2.2 HR-1, 2.7, ROS; 2.23, CT; 4, Supplemental; 5, Architectural Review; 15 Definitions **(motion to continue to March 15, 2007)** – Jim Hier, "I move we continue Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2 to March 15 and March 29, respectively". Candace Erickson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

2. Consideration of an Ordinance approving the 255 Ridge Avenue, King Ridge Estates-Plat amendment **(motion to continue to March 29, 2007)** – See motion under Item 1.

3. Consideration of an Ordinance approving the 1160 Park Avenue Replat plat amendment combining all of Lot 16 and part of Lot 15 of Block 56 of the Snyder's Addition to the Park City Survey with a metes and bounds parcel located at 1160 Park Avenue, Park City, Utah – Ray Milliner explained that the lot combination will accommodate an expansion to the existing home, and staff recommends approval pursuant to the Ordinance. The Mayor opened the public hearing and with no comments, closed the hearing.

4. Consideration of an Ordinance approving the First Amendment to the Golden Deer Phase 1 Record of Survey Plat, located at 7570 Royal Street East, Park City, Utah – Ray Milliner explained that this application deals with the expansion of the Goldener Hirsch Restaurant converting limited common area into private area. Joe Kernan disclosed that the restaurant is a recycling customer of his. There was discussion about the improvements already being installed and that the owner did that at the risk of the plat being approved. The Mayor opened the public hearing and with no comments, closed the hearing.

5. Consideration of an Ordinance approving the 1045 Woodside Avenue Replat, combining Lots 11 and 12, Block 9 of Snyder's Addition to the Park City Survey, Park City, Utah – Katie Cattan explained the lot combination application and the existing historic home which sits on the lot line. The plat amendment will adjust lot lines to accommodate an addition to the back of the home. Ms. Cattan relayed that there was a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission. The Mayor invited the audience to comment and with no public input, closed the public hearing.

VI CONSENT AGENDA *(items that have previously been discussed or are perceived as routine and may be approved by one motion. Listed items do not imply a predisposition for approval and may be removed by motion and discussed and acted upon under "Additional Discussion – Agenda Items")*

Jim Hier, "I move approval of Consent Agenda Items 1 through 3. Roger Harlan seconded. Motion unanimously carried,

1. Ordinance approving the 1160 Park Avenue Replat plat amendment combining all of Lot 16 and part of Lot 15 of Block 56 of the Snyder's Addition to the Park City Survey with a metes and bounds parcel located at 1160 Park Avenue, Park City, Utah – See staff report and public hearing.

2. Ordinance approving the First Amendment to the Golden Deer Phase 1 Record of Survey Plat, locat4d at 7570 Royal Street East, Park City, Utah - See staff report and public hearing.

3. Ordinance approving the 1045 Woodside Avenue Replat, combining Lots 11 and 12, Block 9 of Snyder's Addition to the Park City Survey, Park City, Utah – See staff report and public hearing.

VII NEW BUSINESS *(new items with presentations and/or anticipated detailed discussions)*

Consideration of authorizing staff to execute a contract with Highland Golf, in a form approved by the City Attorney, in the amount of $278,580 for the purchase of golf cars – Craig Sanchez explained that the lease for the existing fleet is up for renewal. Staff prepared an RFP and received one response from Highland Golf. He asked the City Council for approval to proceed with a contract to purchase 75 new golf cars, which will be paid for by the Golf fund and a five-year loan from the CIP Fund. There was discussion about available grant monies that may be used to explore charging the cars with solar panels. In response to a concern about grant funding being used for a seasonal project, it was explained that the solar panels would be utilized all year because cars are charged during the winter at a low level so that the battery remains healthy. Candace Erickson, "I move we authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with Highland Golf in a form approved by the City Attorney in the amount of $278,580 for the purchase of golf cars". Marianne Cone seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

VIII ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION – AGENDA ITEMS

None.

IX ADJOURNMENT

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

MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 2 p.m. Members in attendance were Mayor Dana Williams, Marianne Cone, Candace Erickson, Roger Harlan, Jim Hier, and Joe Kernan. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; and Mark Harrington, City Attorney. Marianne Cone, "I move to close the meeting to discuss property, litigation and personnel". Jim Hier seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting opened at approximately 4:30 p.m. Jim Hier, "I move to open the meeting". Marianne Cone seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

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

Prepared by Janet M. Scott

Janet M. Scott, City Recorder