PARK CITY COUNCIL
VISIONING SESSION MINUTES
FEBRUARY 9, 2012

City Council Members: Mayor Dana Williams, Cindy Matsumoto, Alex Butwinski, Dick Peek, Liza Simpson, and Andy Beerman

Ex Officio: Carl Neu, Facilitator; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Thomas Bakaly, City Manager; Thomas Eddington, Planning Manager; Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager; Phyllis Robinson, Public Affairs Manager; Diane Foster, Interim Assistant City Manager; and Bret Howser, Budget Manager

MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 8 a.m. Members in attendance were Mayor Dana Williams, Andy Beerman, Alex Butwinski, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager and Mark Harrington, City Attorney. Facilitator Carl Neu was also in attendance. Alex Butwinski, "I move to close the meeting to discuss personnel". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting opened at approximately 1:45 p.m. Andy Beerman, "I move to open the meeting". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

Mayor Dana Williams opened the Visioning Session.

Council "Nits" and Small issues

Mayor Williams remarked that in visioning, "nits" is the time to bring up projects or small issues that are bothersome.

Council Member Butwinski recalled that a year ago, meeting protocol and procedure in terms of how members would listen to a staff report, ask questions, take public input and have their discussion was developed. He believed they have allowed that order to change. Council Member Butwinski recognized that while he prefers that type of structure, others may prefer flexibility in the format but both processes set a tone and he felt the tone should be consistent.

Council Member Beerman commented on emails sent to Council Members and understood that they could not have ongoing replies to all types of conversations. However, he recently read an article that he thought would benefit the entire Council and he wanted to know if it would be appropriate to forward the link to all the Council members.
City Attorney Mark Harrington clarified that City Council Members are not allowed to have discussion by email. It would be appropriate to forward a link or an informational item, but Council Members could not respond. If a Council member wanted to make comment or incorporate the information into a work session for discussion, they could send that request

to the Planning Manager or the Legal Department.

Mayor Williams stated that anytime he emails individuals, Council Members, Thomas Eddington and/or Mark Harrington are copied. He recommended that others do the same when communicating by email.

Council Member Simpson supported Council Member Butwinski's comment because it is easier for visitors attending meetings to understand what goes on if it follows a predictable format. When camp training was conducted for the HPB and others three years ago, the trainer pointed out that the public, who are encouraged to attend meetings, are not familiar with routine and jargon. She believed predictability would make the process more accessible. Council Member Butwinski remarked that a structured procedure also makes sure that every Council Member has the opportunity to comment.

Carl Neu, the Visioning Facilitator from the Center for the Future of Local Governance, stated that the presiding officer has a critical role in council debates, and that is to maintain the process rather than immediately inject into the content. He asked if anyone has constructive advice for the Mayor as to how he might handle procedures as the presiding officer.

Council Member Peek stated that Mayor Williams handles the schedule very well and keeps agenda items running on time. However, sometimes Council Members address issues through dialogue versus waiting to be recognized by the Chair.

Council Member Simpson thought Council members would all agree that Mayor Williams does a very good as the presiding officer. He also is good at recognizing each member to gain individual input. Council Member Simpson thought a better question to ask the Mayor is what Council Members can do to help him.

Mayor Williams stated that at times the process becomes anarchistic. Council Member Peek tends to be the quietest. It is difficult when he plays by the rules they all agreed to and everyone else is speaking out of turn. Mayor Williams remarked that free form discussion is fine, but it is in direct conflict with the procedure to allow everyone a turn to speak.

Mayor Williams agreed that he is strict about keeping the agenda on time. He asked if Council Members are willing to table further discussion on an important topic to another agenda in order to begin the regular meeting on time. He believes they have an obligation to the public to start meetings on time, and it is unfair to make people wait until the Council finishes its work session discussion.

Council Member Peek remarked that if an item is finished earlier than expected, they should not move forward on the agenda out of respect to the public who arrive to hear a specific item at the posted time.

Council Member Butwinski agreed that if a discussion runs late and it is clear that the matter would not be resolved timely, pushing it to another agenda would be appropriate. On the issue of discussions, Council Member Butwinski asked at what point in the discussion the presiding officer would offer his opinion.

City Attorney Harrington stated that without a formal rule there is no limit on when the presiding officer can interject into the conversation. It is within his power to initiate a comment; however, if someone formally requests recognition prior to initiating his own comments, he would need to honor that request. Mr. Harrington pointed out that in the past the City Council has rejected becoming overly formal and restrictive. There is an ability to limit input by rule, but unless it is a rule, it is left to the discretion of the presiding officer.

Mr. Neu remarked that the primary function of the presiding officer is to maintain the process. As a result, many presiding officers tend not to speak immediately, other than to start the process.

City Manager Tom Bakaly noted that the guidelines state that the Council should request to speak and the Mayor would recognize them by name. He pointed out that the Council could make a change to the current guidelines if desired. Mayor Williams believed the current process works well.

Mr. Neu emphasized the importance of avoiding the habit of allowing people to talk over another person or interrupt. When that continually occurs it becomes the norm and it is hard to reign people back in.

Council Member Simpson raised another “nit”. She noted that in the past the Council discussed finding ways for the staff to keep the City Council updated on different projects. An example is the Marsac Avenue light. Council Member Simpson thought it is incumbent upon the Council to help keep track of minor issues and to request updates from staff as opposed to making everything a work session item.

Council Member Beerman understood that a goal established from last year’s Visioning Session was to maintain an annual calendar and believed that goal should be carried forward. Council Member Simpson suggested a work session on how to use Outlook and the joint calendar, and how to use it on iPads. She explained that three years ago the City Council talked about using a central calendar so everyone would know who was or was not available and on which days. Council Member Simpson was unsure whether Members want to take it that far, but it may be a worthwhile discussion.

Council Member Beerman suggested that the Council think about taking the same Thursday night off each month to allow the opportunity to make personal or travel plans in advance. Mayor Williams stated that historically, if a council member is out-of-town, there is an effort to make that week a no meeting date. Council Member Matsumoto relayed that the no meeting date changes every month due to holidays, Sundance or other reasons. She favored the idea of a yearly calendar so Council Members can plan their vacations around items on the calendar.

The Council discussed the pros and cons of a yearly calendar and decided that it was best to start with a quarterly calendar and then add a month to keep the calendar four months in advance.

City Attorney Harrington reminded the Council about being diligent in announcing the location of the social meeting if one takes place after the regular meeting. The announcement should be made concurrent with adjournment to give the public and others the opportunity to hear the announcement and participate if they wish.

Financial Update

Bret Howser presented the Financial Impact Assessment Report (FIAR) to the City Council. The FIAR was started approximately six years ago with the goal of projecting expenses and revenues for ten years. The City Council uses the FIAR as a tool in making decisions.

In addition to the Budget Department creating the FIAR, this year a technical team looked at the projections and methodology used and the outlook of different departments regarding revenue services and expenditures.

Mr. Howser noted that a major change was the property tax recalibration that was conducted this year. The interactive model that was presented last year was updated. A graph was presented that was broken down by revenue sources. A red dotted line indicated the total expenditures compared to the revenue sources. Sales tax and property tax make up two-thirds of the projected revenue. The graph did not include any of the oldest projects, which was why total expenses dropped below the total revenue line.

Numbers are currently at an ideal revenue mix for 2013, meaning that property tax makes up the majority of revenues with sales tax close behind. Property tax is the least volatile source of revenue. The bump in property tax revenue was primarily due to adjusted property taxes.

Council Member Matsumoto pointed out that the bump was in the second home level rather than the primary level.

Mr. Howser pointed out that correcting mistakes and bringing in additional properties resulted in slightly under $1 billion in taxable value, which was close to 13% of the City's total taxable value. It was a one-time bump in new growth, but this revenue will continue to be collected every year forward. While the current mix is good, since property tax does not have an inflationary component, over time the property tax will get smaller as the property tax revenue shrinks in comparison to sales tax.

Other notable adjustments were presented and reviewed. *Fees and Others* is not a significant revenue source, but it does bring in significant revenue over time. Interest earnings is a major component that drives that revenue. Because of the market, the interest earnings have dropped and no one was making money on interest. The update projects a modest growth in interest earnings and fees over the next ten years. There were signs that growth through fees was beginning to recover. Specific fee projections were outlined and reviewed.

The formula used to estimate the property taxes was explained and specific changes were identified. The new formula is more consistent with accurate projections.

In the past, new growth had been projected only on a linear trend, but it did not capture inflation in new growth. The formula was changed and new growth figures are now estimated on a percentage of the total AV value. The percentage is based on an average of the new growth over the last ten years.

A graph was presented showing the projected tax levy, which showed growth over time. Another graph was reviewed showing the expenditures. A green line indicated the projected revenue. The graph also included OTIS, which was funded with sales revenue bonds.

Mr. Howser indicated that despite the bump in property tax revenue, over time it would still continue to go into a deficit because revenues do not keep pace with projected expenditures.

The updated model showed major capital issues. Projects and funding sources could be added to the model to see how the current CIP affects long term projections in the general fund. The model was intended to be flexible.

Mayor Williams clarified that Park City is not currently receiving the 1% transient room tax shown in the model. He stated that the City has had discussions about having its own separate TRT compared to the County. Mr. Bakaly explained that the City has the ability to raise the transient room tax, which is something the City Council could vote to do following a public hearing. A resort tax requires a vote of the people. Currently Park City has a 1% Resort Cities Sales Tax and a quarter of that goes to the Transit Fund. There is no requirement to spend the resort tax on transit.

Council Member Butwinski stated that this is the second time the Council had seen the model. He asked if it is possible to incorporate the model into the big expense decision-making process. He suggested that the model be included as part of the staff report when the Council looks at spending large sums of money. It would help them understand the financial impact. Mr. Bakaly believed it could be part of the budgeting process. He envisioned coming back with budgeting for outcomes and cost and to show how it all interacts. Mr. Bakaly thought the model could be an ongoing tool to help the City Council identify the impacts of spending or not spending.

Mayor Williams thought the model could also help them decide when it is time to charge a TRT in the City. With the bump in property tax from adding 200 properties, it appeared they were able to push a potential property tax increase to 2017. However, that depended on what capital improvement projects were done. Mr. Bakaly anticipated that the City Council would be faced with major capital decisions during the budget discussion.

Council Member Simpson was intrigued by the ability to use the model, because it gives the City Council the opportunity to think about tying revenue sources to capital projects. For example, they could decide to use the TRT to fund downtown improvement projects, which would benefit the business district and visitors, versus using property taxes to fund a recreation facility.

Mr. Bakaly commented on the community's willingness to vote themselves increases for open space. He reiterated that the City Council has the purview to implement a TRT; but he wanted to know if they would consider engaging the community in a vote of the people for a TRT. Council Member Peek asked for clarification. Mr. Bakaly stated that the Council could vote in a Transient Room Tax, but a Transit Tax must be voted on by the people. Mr. Bakaly noted that a Resort Cities Sales Tax is also a vote of the people, but there is no restriction on its use.

Biennial Strategic Plans & Goal Setting

The strategic plans were outlined and reviewed. The concept is what government does and how they do it. The link between the two is a strategic planning process. The strategic plan establishes the linkage between spending dollars and the broader goals. The community vision was determined through a public process. The City Council developed seven goals that encapsulated the community vision.

The strategic plan takes the goals and creates strategies for how to achieve those goals; and then links the programs and how the money is actually spent to those strategies. The budgeting for outcomes process becomes the link between requests in the budget process to the strategic plans themselves. One step in the process was actually drafting the biennial strategic plans.

Desired outcome is the basis of the strategic plan, and everything else should tie back to those desired outcomes. The plan looks at where the City is currently, where it is going and an action plan for the next two years. It was noted that the action plan includes very finite points that could eventually evolve into level of service changes that would have budget option bids. As Council moves through the discussions throughout visioning, it is important to be careful not to get lost in the finite points. If there are issues in the action plan, the question to ask is whether it accomplishes the desired outcome. If it accomplishes one of the desired outcomes, but the action taken is unfavorable, then possibly the outcome should be adjusted to become a goal.

The core indicators should be telling and adjusting information in the core indicators should be evaluated in a context relative to the desired outcomes.

The format for this portion of visioning is to present highlighted information to the City Council for discussion. The intent of the discussion is to make sure the desired outcomes are what the community wants. Once that information is available, staff could return with good bids during the budget process on programs, services, and capital.

Mayor Williams thanked the participants for listening to the Council and the community. He believed the information provided is well-done and helpful because it provides a defined way of being able to look at the issues and figure out the goal and how it relates to the vision.

<u>Preservation of Park City Character</u>

Planning Manager Thomas Eddington stated that the full team participated in preparing the Preservation of Park City Character and the result was a collaborative effort.

The presentation provided an overview of the desired outcomes, the challenges in general, and the action plan. The desired outcomes focus on the character of what Park City is. It is a resort town, but it is also a great community to live in. Therefore, part of the challenge was dual for maintaining the economy and maintaining what makes the community what it is. The team tried to build off of Visioning 2009, discussions from the Planning Commission/City Council joint meetings, and other various meetings to determine the outcomes.

The primary outcomes are to maintain the social fabric, the diverse population, a transparent government and engaged citizenry, vibrant community places, gathering spaces, neighborhoods that maintain connectivity, furthering the National Register Historic

District, utilizing arts and culture as an opportunity to diversify the economy, continuing to add to the resort experience, maintaining natural geography and open space, and expanding the trails system. Manager Eddington stated that the team tried to narrow the outcomes to the top three or four and chose diverse population, social fabric, vibrant arts and cultural offerings and protecting the natural environment. As they go through the next set of challenges and action plans, they would reflect back to see how this proposal achieves those outcomes.

Mr. Eddington reviewed the current challenges and noted that three stood out as more significant. The team believes that regional growth pressures are significant in maintaining the character of Park City, because they impact the diverse population as well as the natural setting. As the real estate market changes, the demand will go up, the supply will decrease, and costs will increase. Maintaining affordable moderate income housing will continue to be a challenge. Rapidly changing technology is another major challenge. As technology changes, the City will need to meet the demands. A third challenge is funding for capital projects and ways to allocate and prioritize those funds. It is also important to look for opportunities to expand on arts and culture as a critical part of the economy.

Mr. Eddington presented the action plan, which outlines the path to achieve the outcomes, recognizing the challenges. Following the presentation, the team requested discussion and input from the City Council regarding the action plans.

Mr. Eddington noted that Preservation of Park City Character is a difficult challenge because it involves many different teams such as the library, affordable housing, economic development, planning, and IT to name a few.

Mayor Williams referred to the action plan, facilitating work with the Advisory Committee on Latino Affairs. He asked if the Advisory Committee would become an advisory group similar to a *friends* group with the City, or whether it would incorporate as a 501C3 and stand alone. Mayor Williams thought it is important to have that discussion. He did not think the people who expressed interest in being on the Advisory Committee had money to contribute, but they would add significant value. He pointed out that the Latino group has been meeting with the Latinos in Action in high school and middle school, and is very excited to have another group working on this. Mayor Williams stated that the Latino Group did not want to duplicate existing services and he liked the direction the Latino Group was heading, but it is important to define its role.

Mr. Bakaly pointed out that the word “facilitate” means assist. He suggested that if the intent is to maintain a higher role as a direct service to the City, a better word might be “coordinating”. Mr. Bakaly stated that “facilitate” meets the desired outcome of the diverse population and social fabric, but if Council wants it to be stronger or more proactive it would likely change the action plan. If the City coordinates it, the bid could go up.

Mayor Williams thought the matter should be put on a work session agenda or a study session. Stakeholders should be invited to talk about their goals and visions to see what direction it should take.

Council Member Butwinski thought it was obvious from the materials presented that the staff believes the library is a high priority, since it is listed under Current Challenges. In a previous discussion, he recalled that the decision was to wait until Council members knew what they wanted to do with the building. Council Member Butwinski believes that part of the action operating plan was premature because it implies more of an action plan than Council is prepared to commit to in this document.

Mr. Bakaly understood that the direction was to come back with a strategic plan for the library. Council Member Butwinski replied that the plan presented is more than strategic.

Council Member Matsumoto stated that during the visioning for the library, it became clear that what the building becomes depends on what plan they have for the other building a block down. She thought there was consensus that the buildings needed to be planned together. Council Member Matsumoto agreed that what was presented looked more like implementing a plan, and it is premature because they are still in the planning stage.

Council Member Peek stated that in looking at desired outcomes in relation to the action plan items, he believes it is a reasonable outcome. Council Member Butwinski was unsure how they could budget for a library out of the capital plan expansion without first knowing what they want to do. He agreed with Council Member Peek that the library is one of the components, but it is not completely ready.

Mr. Bakaly stated that the direction they would likely see bids on would reflect the strategic plan for the library, as opposed to a capital extension. Based on comments, he understood that the message to the staff as they prepare the budget, as well as to the library community, is that the City would not be looking at a capital program for at least a year or longer because it would be working on a strategic plan. Mr. Bakaly clarified that that is the intended policy direction.

Mayor Williams stated that weeks earlier during a work session discussion, the City Council requested additional information before moving forward on capital improvements. However, based on the information provided, it appears that staff was moving forward with a capital improvement plan before a strategic plan was presented. If these are the overriding documents to prepare the budget, he is concerned that they may have moved ahead too far.

Council Member Simpson thought this is a good example of something suffering from a timing issue. With the timing of the library work session and the need for capital improvements, the City Council had asked for more detail. With that understanding, she believes everyone is aware of the need to reconfigure the Library and Education Center. Council Member Simpson is not opposed to budgeting money in the capital plan for reconfiguring the Library and Education Center, as long as it runs parallel with a track of what they want or need to do, based on the direction from work session. As part of the budgeting process, the City may find that there is not enough money when the fuller plan comes back. At that point they could decide whether to do it this year or next year. Including the library in the capital plan recognizes the fact that it needs to be reconfigured. It also supports three of the desired outcomes. Council Member Matsumoto believes it meets all the desired outcomes.

Council Member Butwinski is comfortable including the library in the budget process as long as the expectation is clear that it will be a placeholder and not a commitment. Mr. Bakaly believed the strategic plan could run parallel with the budget process.

Mayor Williams referred to the points for discussion and stated that he is comfortable with recommendations 1, 2 and 4. He thought the night sky ordinance should be discussed. Mayor Williams commented that the City has a night sky ordinance with variances. A number of complaints are received when the lights are on after 10 p.m. at the sports field at Quinn's Junction, and it is difficult to explain to people that the lights comply with the night sky ordinance because it has a variance. Mayor Williams questioned the purpose for having an ordinance if variances could be given.

Council Member Butwinski thought the question is whether or not Park City is holding itself to a higher standard. The City needs to make that decision and he suggested a study session to discuss the issue. The Council could decide to leave the current ordinance as is or taking it to a higher level and examine how the Code is written and whether or not there is compliance. He felt that enforcement is also a key factor for making an ordinance work. Council Member Butwinski believes the policy discussion of higher standard versus same standard should occur sooner rather than later.

Mr. Bakaly remarked that the issue goes back to the desired outcome to protect the pristine natural setting and staff believes the current ordinance achieves that outcome. If the Council disagrees, direction should be provided to staff.

Council Member Peek stated that his threshold is whether the Milky Way is still visible, as well as the addition of particulate pollution from lights. Council Member Matsumoto asked if not allowing variances would take away some of the desired outcomes. For example, it would be difficult to ask the resort to change the lighting on the ski runs. She agreed that the matter should be further discussed in a study session. Council Member Beerman thought a disproportionate amount of time is spent discussing the night sky topic. Very little time is spent on air quality, which is a much larger issue, and he prefers to broaden the discussion.

Mayor Williams commented that in terms of air quality, the County has placed monitoring units in various locations. Council Member Simpson believed Council Members Beerman and Butwinski were talking about two different conversations. One was a list of environmental issues. The other was deciding whether or not it was appropriate for the City to write ordinances that protect the night sky, but also allows exceptions to further other valid community goals. Both conversations are important but should not be addressed in the same study session.

Diane Foster clarified that PCMR does not have a variance but complies with the night sky ordinance by installing energy efficient lights two years ago. She pointed out that the head of the International Dark Skies Association had remarked that it was the best lighting he had ever seen.

Council Member Matsumoto requested discussion on Recommendation #1, which stated that older stock is not economically viable. She was told that in checking the MLS listing, the pricing on units from 200-400 square feet are very affordable, but no one would expect a family to live in a unit that small. Those units are privately owned and the City does not have the ability to combine units. Council Member Matsumoto asked if it is possible for someone to work with Mountainlands Housing to acquire a building and reconfigure the units to make them more livable. She was told that the units are condo projects, which have attached limitations, and the HOA fees were being evaluated in terms of affordability. Council Member Matsumoto's suggestion could be considered for the housing plan.

Mayor Williams stated that Charles Buki talked about these types of units in an RDA where communities rehabbed older projects as opposed to tearing them down and building from scratch. In the end, the cost was much lower as the housing stock changed from resort bed base to affordable housing stock.

Council Member Simpson understood that a challenge in funding affordable housing has been the position of the FHA with regard to multi-unit complexes. It is a constant struggle and she thought it is important to raise the issue in Washington, DC.

Mr. Bakaly stated that in the past with affordable housing, the City Council has not been interested in converting existing units, thinking that they were already available at a lower price point. He asked if the Council still held that opinion. Council Member Peek understood that if a unit is purchased, it would go from an affordable rental to an affordable ownership situation. Mr. Bakaly replied this is correct. The City Council has been reluctant to allow the private developer to purchase existing units at a lower price point to satisfy part of the affordable housing requirement. Council has typically required developers to build new units to add to the stock. Council Member Simpson commented on the importance of recognizing that the market has changed. She thought Council Members would be better able to answer Mr. Bakaly's question after they see the housing study. If the units are too small to be attractive to a small family and too old to be attractive to the resort rental pool, it might make sense to relook at the policy and purpose of the units

After further discussion, Mr. Bakaly summarized that the Council is open to a shift in policy; but only after Members review the housing study.

Council Member Simpson commented on Recommendation #2, and wanted to make sure it included wayfinding and signage comprehensively throughout the City. The Friends of the Farm, Recreation Advisory Board, and various other boards and groups have discussed signage, wayfinding elements and the use of queue cards.

Mayor Williams referred to the recommendation regarding child care and questioned whether it is too limited. Mr. Bakaly clarified that the recommendation is to facilitate the discussion as opposed to the City getting into the child-care business. The bids will reflect facilitating unless the Council provides different direction to staff.

<u>Multi-Seasonal Resort Community</u>

Jonathan Weidenhamer named the people who were involved in preparing this plan and presentation.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the world-class multi-seasonal resort community is a tourism economy. He has been doing economic development strategic plans for four or five years, and in many ways the question is the same; what will be Park City's role.

Mr. Weidenhamer reviewed the desired outcomes, which relate to balancing the resort economy with the quality of life for residents. A resort town provides amazing experiences, opportunities and amenities for residents and visitors and events continue to be an area that can grow and be more successful. However, more growth and success in major events creates competition for local events.

In terms of the action plan, the purpose of the discussion is to define the partnership relating to redevelopment. Mr. Weidenhamer commented on the success of the five joint redevelopment meetings between the City Council and Planning Commission. The result is a clear role and posture in redevelopment and that the City wants to be proactive. Now that the role has been established, it is important to determine the extent to which the City should be proactive and in which areas. He referred to the economic tool box and deciding which options to use.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that staff will continue the push for capital and world-class multi-seasonal resort community status, which includes amenities, town plazas and fun things. At the same time, it is important to recognize other capital needs in the City.

Mr. Weidenhamer emphasized that the action plan takes a more active role in facilitating events which is difficult because many events impact neighborhoods and business districts. Again, the challenge is balancing the effects. Mr. Weidenhamer requested input from the City Council on defining partnerships. That discussion would occur another day in a work session, and it will focus on the City's goals and roles.

Mr. Weidenhamer outlined additional points for discussion throughout the year, which include a robust Sundance discussion and the importance of keeping Sundance in Park City.

Council Member Simpson asked if the developed ski resort interconnect concept plan should be left in the action plan. Before a policy decision can be made the City Council needs to be better educated to understand the difference between ski link and the interconnect, as well as the impacts and benefits. Council Member Simpson did not believe the City Council as a body supports an interconnect or ski link until more information is provided. She is comfortable leaving the language in the plan, as long as it is understood that more discussion is needed before decisions can be made.

Mr. Bakaly suggested adding language indicating a dialogue on City roles and potentially a concept plan.

Mayor Williams referred to the citizens survey and expressed that the community does not think the City does well in creating employment opportunities. He felt that was a fundamental shift from the last 30 years. The economics of Park City has always been towards tourism and resort base economy, which creates minimum wage jobs. He noted that many children raised in Park City leave for college and come back with a degree and they want a good job. Lack of employment forces them to leave the town where they grew up. Mayor Williams believes those areas need to be looked at. More businesses are offering opportunities to Park City for higher paying jobs and those opportunities should be explored. However, the fact that the core business is the resort needs to be considered, and not every child who lived in Park City can come back to pursue a career.

Mayor Williams referred to questions asking whether the City's role was more active or passive with regard to Bonanza Park. He pointed out that Bonanza Park has a developer who is very open minded in terms of the project. As they determine the gives and gets they should be willing to look at partnerships. Mayor Williams believed the City has taken an active role with Bonanza Park so far and could see no reason to stop being active. In his opinion, there is demand from the community for the City to stop being reactive to new things coming in and being more proactive. He thought Bonanza Park, Lower Park Avenue, and PCMR are good examples of trying to be more proactive with the development community to find mutual *gets*.

Mr. Bakaly recalled a discussion from the joint meetings for wanting more locally owned businesses in the Bonanza Park area. He believes there are a number of tools to accomplish that, and asked if the Council is interested in offering any type of incentive to encourage local business. In the past, the idea of incentives was discussed for limited cases and Council always decided against it.

There was some discussion about criteria and mechanisms to identify which businesses the City might be interested in facilitating. Once that is established, the question then becomes how to actually facilitate. Currently the options are limited in terms of economic development trends and not geared towards targeting a certain business in a specific location.

Council Member Butwinski suggested that it would be good to have some version of the incubator idea in the action plan. He believes there is value in developing new business and to provide a financial benefit for a period of time until the business demonstrates viability.

Council Member Matsumoto stated that before the City Council institutes a business recruitment program, a study session should be held to discuss criteria for businesses and types of positive reinforcement.

Council Member Simpson was willing to consider almost any tool. If this is something they want to consider, the staff needs to come back with ideas on how it could be accomplished.

In terms of the business incubator, Council Member Peek suggested that the City establish parameters on what they are trying to grow. He cautioned against spreading out too far or focusing on industry types of business. Mayor Williams asked if it would be worthwhile to have the Innovation Center in Fort Collins conduct an informational meeting, open to the public, to explain what they did, how it was funded and who came into it. Council Member Simpson favored that suggestion because it would give Council a chance to look at a variety of ideas.

Council Member Beerman noted that Fort Collins recognized the need to narrow its focus, which made it particularly effective. In Fort Collins the college is the major industry and the list was narrowed to micro-breweries and green technology. It was very successful because all resources focused on just two points which fit with the community. He encouraged Council to follow the same procedure for Park City and focus on a small number of business types that match our brand. Mayor Williams suggested that the innovative groups they are looking for may be in outdoor recreation and the ski business.

Council Member Simpson commented on public art and stated that she would love to find a dedicated funding stream. She would be willing to follow Boise and include all capital projects. In talking about cultural tourism, public art requires a significant amount of money before it becomes art that people come to see. She likes most of the art in Park City, but there is little or no return on investment. Council Member Simpson preferred to find a source for a smaller revenue stream dedicated to public art that would not go through the CIP process and would continue to fund public art. Mr. Weidenhamer thought that would reflect the goals for more community place and preservation of Park City character. Council Member Simpson concurred.

Council Member Butwinski stated that if public art is one of the goals to identify character, the Council needs to commit to it and make it a high priority. Public art should be on the street and it should not be part of the CIP.

Council Member Matsumoto agreed with Council Member Simpson. In her opinion, public art belongs under Park City Character rather than Economic Development. She is willing to look for a more permanent, modest contribution for public art. Council Member Simpson wanted temporary art to be included in discussions regarding public art. Commissioner Peek remarked that public art can also be way-finding.

The City Council discussed Sundance in terms of impacts and benefits. Mayor Williams emphasized the critical need to keep Sundance in Park City. Council Member Beerman felt the long term lease issue should be solved. Council Member Simpson agreed, but suggested that part of that would be to have an after Sundance meeting with all the parties involved to discuss what worked and what didn’t to address the issues. It is different every year and the community, the City and Sundance need to be flexible enough to respond. Mr. Bakaly stated that the plan is to have a broader policy discussion about Sundance. The goal has been to balance Sundance interests with those of the business community and residents. Scheduling changes were announced for the visioning session the next day.

The meeting was adjourned and the City Council attended a social reception with managers, commissions and boards.

Prepared by Mary May, Secretarial Services
Edited by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

Janet M. Scott, City Recorder