PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
February 16, 2022

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair John Phillips, John Kenworthy, Sarah Hall, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm, Bill Johnson, Christin Van Dine

EX OFFICIO: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; Jaron Ehlers, Planning Department; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

---

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. He noted that all Commissioners were present.

The following written determination was read:

> The Chair issued a written determination that because of the public health emergency, conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may attend in person. This determination is based on the ongoing risks and infection rates statewide and in Summit County. For these reasons, this meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location. Planning Commission members will connect electronically.
>
> Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but will not be read aloud. For more information on attending virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from January 26, 2022.

MOTION: Commissioner Doug Thimm moved to APPROVE the January 26, 2022, Meeting Minutes, as written. Commissioner Christin Van Dine seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Deb Rentfrow addressed the Planning Commission meeting protocols and the change regarding time allowances. She assumed that applicants were to be given deadlines for their submissions to allow appropriate time for the Planning Department to review and publish a comprehensive report. She wondered if anyone had considered enforcing deadlines. She noted that Planning Staff often has more than one application on their desk and would find timely submissions beneficial. The failure to meet a deadline should simply mean an automatic continuance until the next month.

Ms. Rentfrow further stated that applicants often bring new information to the meetings in the form of exhibits or otherwise. This information is therefore not available ahead of time for review by the Planning Commission or the public. She asked if it was worth considering having applicants provide a copy of all presented materials to be included in the next packet, along with the public input, for purposes of reference. She commented that there had been multiple instances where an applicant was asked a question and the response was that they had previously addressed the issue by stating what they believed to be the previous response, which may or may not be correct.

She added that when the presented information is provided onscreen only, it becomes difficult to reference the audio at a later date. Having access to a hard copy would be beneficial to both the Planning Commission and the public and perhaps make meetings more efficient.

Commissioner Hall agreed with Ms. Rentfrow's statements. She would like to see timely packets so that they can be fully considered, and would also like to see anything presented by the applicants become a part of the public record. She highlighted the need for easy reference on the longer applications.

Commissioner Thimm agreed with Ms. Rentfrow's statements and those of Commissioner Hall. He stated that in preparation for this meeting he went through the packet and noted that there was a submission made last Friday, which left no time for Staff to prepare a full and detailed report, as was normally the custom. He commented that there were important aspects to this late submission, including commentary to the third-party reviewer's remarks that cannot be analyzed. He stated that it is very important to have Staff's full report available not only to the Commission but to the public. He is accustomed to working with deadlines, and if something is not presented by the deadline it should not be on the agenda.

He noted that it appeared that they would move ahead with the agenda for this meeting despite not having that information. He would like to address this issue more often in the future. Commissioner Thimm commented that he would be only able to provide the most abbreviated of commentary without the benefit of a detailed report on this late-received information.

Commissioner Thimm presumed that tonight's presentation would be an overview rather than a full-blown presentation because it lacked 50% of the content that is needed.

Chair Phillips stated that the submission deadlines should be enforced, or at least allow Staff to make the ultimate decision on whether they received information in time to analyze it.

Chair Phillips also agreed strongly that any material shown to the Commission during a meeting should be included in the record for reference. He understood that on some occasions, issues might be raised where the applicant would show something to the Commission; however, things such as PowerPoints should be provided for the record.

Commissioner Hall asked Staff to explain how the deadlines for the Staff Report work. It was suggested that this discussion take place as part of Staff Communications.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken, stated that this meeting presented a somewhat unusual situation and the Planning Department shared in a number of the concerns raised by the Commission and the public. She explained that Staff received information for this meeting at a late date. In the past, Staff has worked with applicants to complete Staff Reports in a very short time. For this meeting, the workload did not allow them to do that and Staff let the applicant know they would be unable to provide a full analysis of the applicant's submission. The applicant requested that this information be shared with the Commission to obtain feedback prior to bringing it back to the next meeting.

Director Milliken reported that this has been a long application. She felt that the applicant wanted the opportunity to present this new information. Going forward, Staff would work to be better gatekeepers on the procedure so that the Commission has full Staff Reports prior to meetings.

Chair Phillips stated that at the last meeting, an applicant presented future information for feedback and he felt that it was hard for the Commission to provide substantial input. He recalled that he voiced his concerns about the process and wanted to make sure that it was done appropriately. He noted that it was difficult to provide objective input without all of the information.

Director Milliken offered her belief that the applicant was looking for some guidance on whether they are on the right path and was not looking for a full analysis of their presentation.

On another matter, Director Milliken confirmed with the Commission that there would be a Joint Session with the City Council on March 15, 2022. The meeting would be in-person and take place in the Council Chambers.

Chair Phillips stated that based on his discussions with the other Commissioners, he decided to return to in-person hybrid meetings, beginning in March. This would give the Commission one in-person meeting before the Joint Meeting. He felt that the infection rates have dropped dramatically and based on what governing bodies in Park City and surrounding areas were doing with respect to in-person meetings, it was appropriate to move back to in-person meetings. He invited the Commissioners to weigh in on how they implement it.

Commissioner Van Dine noted that they previously discussed a hybrid model, with attendees both in-person and virtually. If they conduct hybrid meetings, she asked if they could conduct those with a quorum present in-person, with others opting to attend via Zoom if needed for travel, illness, childcare, or other issues. She would prefer this type of hybrid meeting.

City Attorney, Mark Harrington confirmed that the Commission would have the option of conducting hybrid meetings and work with Chair Phillips to set up the hybrid model.

Commissioner Suesser was in favor of the hybrid model for meetings going forward but would recommend that they allow hybrid meetings without requiring a quorum in person. She would also like to allow attendance via Zoom without the limitations articulated by Commissioner Van Dine. She indicated that she would be in New York in April and did not know how long that visit would last. She would be able to attend meetings but only virtually for one to two months. Commissioner Suesser added that she fully intended to attend meetings in person when she is in town.

Commissioner Van Dine agreed with Commissioner Suesser's comments. She felt that having the option to attend remotely and still participate was ideal and would be of great benefit to the Commission.

Chair Phillips asked if the public would likewise be able to attend and provide comments if they attend in person or virtually. Commissioner Suesser stated that the City Council was allowing both in-person and virtual attendance and comment. Chair Phillips noted that public attendance has increased as compared to pre-COVID-19 attendance and commented that 85 members of the public attended the last meeting. He liked the increased attendance.

Commissioner Thimm agreed with the comments regarding hybrid meetings. He felt there should not be the requirement of an in-person quorum and that from a health standpoint and other reasons, each person should be allowed to make their own decisions on whether to attend in person. He added that it was important that the option should be afforded to avoid the pressure of having a certain number of Commissioners attend in person.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with the prior statements of the Commissioners and noted he would also be traveling in late March/early April. Commissioners Johnson and Hall also expressed their agreement.

Chair Phillips expressed his pride in the Commission taking the route it has taken during the pandemic and felt that it has done the right thing in considering when to go back to in-person meetings. He added that they would keep their eye on the infection rates and if there is a new variant they could reconsider and return to all virtual meetings in the future if that makes sense.

Commissioner Hall advised that she would have to leave this meeting at 9:30 p.m. and would stand by this end-time during future meetings even if the rest of the Commission wants to continue. She also reported that she received a voicemail on her cell phone before the last meeting, which she first listened to after the meeting that was a public comment on Sommet Blanc from Mark Fisher.

Commissioner Hall asked if there was anything on the website or on the agenda that gave the public clear instructions on how to provide public comment. Commissioner Van Dine echoed the comments of Commissioner Hall on both the time frame for meetings ending at 9:30 p.m. and receiving public comment via regular mail to her home address. Commissioner Hall stated that she serves on the Park City Community Foundation Board with Mike Gore.

Commissioner Suesser disclosed that since the last meeting on Sommet Blanc, she spoke with a number of Brighton Estates lot owners and homeowners about the Twisted Branch Road/Highway 224 issue. She expressed her belief that those conversations will not have any impact on her ability to be objective about the application.

Mr. Harrington stated that when Sommet Blanc is on the agenda, then those disclosures should be made again.

5. WORK SESSION

A. Park City Mountain Resort Base Parking Lots - MPD Modification Work Session-Replace Expired Exhibit D of the DA, the 1998 PCMR Base Area Master Plan Study Concept Master Plan, With a New Master Plan, Known as the Park City Base Area Lot Redevelopment Master Plan Study. The Commission Will Discuss the Applicant's Off-Site Parking and Transportation Mitigation Proposal.PL-20-04475. *Public Input will be taken via e-comments and Zoom* (A) Work Session, No Action Will Be Taken.

Chair Phillips echoed the concerns of Commissioner Thimm and stated that he viewed this would be an abbreviated meeting. He felt that providing input on the information presented would be the most productive but noted that it was difficult to draw the line in terms of how much input and questioning they could have. He asked the applicant, the Commissioners, and the public to stay on topic with respect to what is presented at this meeting. He added that he would accept any other public comments relevant to this application.

Chair Phillips asked the applicant to highlight the issues on which they were seeking input and felt that a summary of what has been discussed at length was not really necessary.

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth reported that this application seeks to amend the 1998 Development Agreement and replaces the expired Exhibit D, which is the Site Plan, with a new Master Plan. She explained that one of the questions that she would like the Commission to discuss was the potential for a public hearing on March 23, 2022.

Planner Ananth stated that the applicant's off-site Parking and Transportation Mitigation proposal was necessary due to the fact that they are seeking an on-site parking reduction of 1,102 parking stalls from the existing requirements. This reduction is based on the shared and paid parking proposal, the proposed Transit Center, the lower Current Carrying Capacity ("CCC") and the Traffic Demand Management ("TDM") measures being proposed.

In terms of a project status update, Planner Ananth stated that during the Work Sessions in October and December, the Planning Commission identified a deficiency in the applicant's Off-Site Parking and Transportation Plan to mitigate their overflow parking during peak periods. She noted that the Planning Commission encouraged the applicant to work with potential partners to propose a more specific plan. The applicant would be presenting that at this meeting. She added that while the applicant has been working on that request, Staff has been working with AECOM, the third party Transportation Engineer, to analyze the costs associated with an increased level of transit service if the applicant chooses to rely on City parking and transit services in the Quinn's Junction area.

Planner Ananth reported that the City and the applicant met several times, however, to date no agreement has been reached. Subsequently, the applicant used the AECOM memorandum to propose the mitigation plan that they would present at this meeting. She added that the applicant identified alternative locations to Quinn's Junction for day-skier parking.

In addition to what the applicant would present tonight, Planner Ananth reported that the applicant was finalizing a comprehensive project submittal for the public hearing. Exhibit C to this meeting's agenda included an attachment that was taken out early from the comprehensive memorandum.

She reiterated that the applicant was still working on the memorandum, and acknowledged that everyone would like the memorandum released well in advance of the public hearing.

Planner Ananth stated that from a high-level perspective on the mitigation plan, the applicant was still proposing employee parking at Richardson Flat for both the resort and the new development, with private shuttles to the resort. In terms of day skiers, the applicant would no longer rely on parking at the high school and has identified some other dispersed locations, along with private transport of those skiers to the Base Area. Without the benefit of a thorough Staff analysis, Planner Ananth was looking for questions from the Commission on the proposed mitigation. She was also looking at whether Staff should schedule and notice a public hearing for March.

Commissioner Suesser asked if the March 23, 2022 meeting was the only scheduled meeting between now and then. Planner Ananth confirmed that March 23rd would be the next opportunity for PEG to present its application. Commissioner Suesser queried whether it would be appropriate to begin that meeting with analysis by Staff and AECOM of the application prior to the public hearing. Planner Ananth stated that Staff would be prepared to issue a comprehensive Staff Report for the public hearing and that one meeting would suffice.

Robert Schmidt from PEG Development, introduced Mike Gore, Vice President/COO for Park City Mountain Resort, and Kara Bowyer, Director of Community Development for Vail Resorts. Mr. Schmidt initially reported to the Commission that they have been preparing the comprehensive memorandum that would cover all topics within the application and reported that they have completed a draft of that memorandum and provided it to Planner Ananth. There would be refinements to the memorandum with a final copy delivered by the end of next week. Mr. Schmidt stated that they appreciated Staff working with them to publish materials. He added that they have also been drafting Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval that would be part of the conversation over the next couple of months. Those would also be provided to Staff when they are finalized.

Mr. Schmidt stated that over the past two months, they have prepared a Mitigation Proposal. He noted that they received the AECOM Study on February 1, 2022. He highlighted that the AECOM Study was started in October 2021, and the applicant requested a continuance of the November meeting because they had not received that study in order to respond to some of the questions regarding mitigation. Since receiving the study on February 1, 2022, they worked as fast as they could to prepare a Mitigation Proposal. He added that in particular, Vail Resorts had worked very hard to address the AECOM Study.

Mr. Schmidt stated that it was important to not miss another meeting to discuss these topics. He referenced the comments made at the beginning of the meeting and offered that PEG had been waiting for the AECOM Study for some time. He noted that it was critically important for their proposal. He added that the AECOM Study helped them prepare a Mitigation Proposal that would be highly beneficial. He stressed that this meeting was scheduled at PEG's request, and noted that Staff indicated that they would like to receive feedback from the Commission as well. He confirmed that the focus of the presentation at this meeting would be the Mitigation Proposal.

Mr. Schmidt added that they have reviewed the minutes and notes from the previous meetings and some of the key themes that they were prepared to address include existing traffic concerns that were causing challenges in the consideration of the redevelopment of this project. They also heard that the Planning Commission wants to have a voice in this Mitigation Proposal, as well as numerous concerns about relying on Quinn's Junction Park and Ride as the primary off-site parking solution for day-skiers. He also noted the request for him to conduct on-the-ground observations, which he did on December 18, 2021, and January 8, 2022. On those dates, he was on site for a good portion of the day from before traffic started until traffic had subsided around noon. He observed the parking lots, drop-offs, the high school, the park-and-rides, and The Canyons.

Mr. Schmidt reported that based on his observations, traffic and parking management were essential to the solution and pre-arrival communication to the guests would be critically important. He stated that one of the challenges was that a lot of people were arriving at the resort hoping to get a stall. If they did not get a stall, they were required to circulate back around which creates two unnecessary trips that cause traffic problems. He felt that their proposal would improve on this condition. He added that many of his observations have informed the discussions between Mr. Gore and City Staff and he felt that some of those solutions would be brought to bear for the President's Day weekend and beyond.

Mr. Schmidt noted that there were inherent challenges with the existing parking lot in terms of circulation, layout inefficiencies, and parking inefficiencies, and the ability to replace these parking lots with new structures would drastically improve the situation on the site. He addressed the long-term solutions that the project would bring. There would be 1,200 structured parking spaces for skiers and day visitors that would not be affected by the weather. The proposal also provides dedicated bus transit lanes on site, which would be a huge win for the Base Area. He noted that currently, buses are caught up in the traffic, which causes ripple effects for transit riders. As they put the buses into dedicated lanes, transit will be significantly improved over the current situation and help to encourage people to ride the bus. Transit would become efficient, fast, and safe.

Mr. Schmidt highlighted the proposed Transit Center, which would add capacity and safety, as well as a better arrival experience. They also prepared a TDM and Parking Management Plan ("PMP") that would help them guide, adjust and manage all of this well into the future. He added that part of the TDM and PMP involves communications to the guests, but some steps can be taken to improve that communication and help to change behaviors. He stressed that they need this change in behaviors, which could be encouraged by providing the new infrastructure and new solutions.

Commissioner Suesser asked Mr. Schmidt if he heard the Commission's comments regarding submitting the applicant's PowerPoint presentations for the public record so they could be referenced without having to review the video feed. Mr. Schmidt reported that several of the past PowerPoint had been submitted to City Staff. He indicated that they understood that these are part of the public record and they would be more consistent in submitting them.

Mr. Gore briefly addressed the current resort operations. He noted that there was a lot of traffic over the holiday periods, perhaps more than typical. He emphasized, however, that the Resort did not set any visitation records over the holiday periods. Season-to-date visitation has been very similar to prior years. He explained that record days were not driving the traffic challenges in the community. Over the holidays they experienced a "perfect storm" of several factors. Historic December snowfall resulted in an increase in local skiers and traffic slowdowns due to the weather conditions.

In addition, Omicron was impactful to the businesses across the community, the State, and the country. A significant number of their workforce was excluded due to positive tests or symptoms. He stressed that the health and safety of their employees are paramount and they needed to provide necessary recovery time to those employees so that they could safely return to work. He added that he was proud of their robust policy surrounding COVID-19 to protect employees and guests.

Mr. Gore stated that while December brought significant snowfall, October and November were dry, which limited their ability to open lifts and terrain. He noted that they are the biggest ski resort in the United States, with plenty of room to ski; however, the lack of snow limited the terrain they could safely open. He stated that it takes more than just a snowstorm to open a ski run. They are thorough in their safety inspections and protocols for opening terrain, and it is all about creating a safe and sustainable network of trails, which does not happen overnight. He reported that their team was amazing in its efforts to open terrain. They currently have just over 85% of terrain open, with 34 lifts, which is more than any other resort in North America. He stressed that there is a lot of good skiing.

Regardless of visitation, Mr. Gore stated that they have heard the community's concerns about operations. Their teams have been in close contact with City Staff and they have expanded and formalized those meetings to discuss current traffic concerns and ongoing mitigation. He expressed that they have partnered with the City to make modifications to traffic circulation and bus prioritization around the Base Area. Over the past weekend, they made meaningful progress that has been impactful. He added that they would be implementing additional changes for the upcoming weekend. The process with the City has been highly cooperative and Staff has been an amazing partner.

Mr. Gore stated that some of the changes implemented by the Resort include supplementing the express bus service from the high school, which has been a pinch point due to staffing issues at the City level as well. They had the opportunity to partner on that issue, and have provided additional buses and ran private transit to supplement public transit. They also worked with the City to produce additional signage consistent with other transit signage around town. He added that they have an in-house sign shop and were able to create these signs and get them out in the field quickly. He added that the City secured a contract with a third-party security company to provide additional manpower on the ground during peak periods. The Resort pays for this service and is working with the City to ensure that resort staff, local police, and the third-party security team were deploying consistent messaging.

Mr. Gore noted that the City positioned police officers at key intersections to help with the traffic flow, which he described as an amazing enhancement. The Resort was limited in what it could do as it does not control the roadways. He appreciated the police presence and the City's involvement in this regard. He stated it was important to remember that the Resort has always involved a continuous evaluation of operations in order to make improvements where they can. Over the past two weeks, they enjoyed a closer working relationship with the City in addressing these issues and additional changes were being implemented. He stressed that this partnership with the City was essential for working on traffic as a community-wide issue.

He felt it was beneficial for the public to understand the goals of these changes. The goals of the operational changes were set by the City and include public safety, transit priority, informed stakeholders, and resident quality of life and safety while reducing congestion. Mr. Gore stated that it was important to recognize that the underpinning of the "transit first" goals of these efforts was to prioritize safety and transit use, encourage the use of transit and make the transit experience as seamless and simple as possible.

With respect to this project, Mr. Gore offered that it is an essential part of continuing to improve and solve the problem of traffic in Park City. Traffic is not a problem that could be solved alone, and changes have to be made in order to improve the situation. Doing nothing would not address anyone's concerns. He opined that the project was integral in bringing benefits to the community, as mentioned by Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. Gore explained that they heard the Commission's various and extensive concerns about the reliance on Quinn's Junction parking as the sole source of redirecting traffic to achieve the mode split. In working with Staff, they have proposed several dispersed options, including use of parking at The Canyons Resort Village, use of Munchkin Lot for guests, and continued use of the High School in addition to park-and-ride lots along State Route 224. In addition, Mr. Gore stated that they were no longer proposing the use of the Quinn's Junction Park-and-Ride.

Mr. Gore stated that they recognize the critical role that a successful transit system must play in the community. To that end, the resort has proposed a contribution to the City in the amount of $5.3 million, payable over an eight-year period. This contribution would be sufficient to cover the purchase of three new electric buses for the City fleet, cover operational expenses for running supplemental transit during peak times, and a portion of fixed operating costs that are actually attributable to the supplemental service.

In addition, while the exact timing of payments would be written into the Development Agreement, the Resort proposed to begin payments to the City in advance of construction, as early as next year. This would be several years before the project begins to deliver new buildings. These payments would enable the City to make investments in transit ahead of the incremental tax revenue that would be generated by the project as realized.

Mr. Gore stated that the project would begin to produce significant incremental tax revenue prior to the eight-year mark, producing nearly $2.2 million in year 8. He believed that this proposal showed the commitment of PEG and the Resort to mitigate the impacts of the project. The contribution would be in addition to numerous other benefits that the project will bring to Park City, and is a key part of the solution to today's concerns.

Ms. Bowyer began by underscoring the work between the resort and City Staff. She expressed appreciation to Deputy City Manager David Everett and the team. She noted that she was on the ground in Park City and had the opportunity to walk some of the changes with the team, and she planned on being out there tomorrow morning when the next round of changes would be implemented. She reiterated that the resort appreciated the work that the City has done to partner with them.

Ms. Bowyer stated that the AECOM report they received on February 1, 2022, very much informed the proposal before the Commission. She expressed that the proposal addresses the right mitigation, and is fair and equitable given the actual impacts of the project. She reminded those present that the project was being asked to achieve a 20% mode split at the Deer Valley Drive/SR 224 intersection. In order to achieve this, Hales Engineering determined, and AECOM and the City have concurred, that approximately 420 vehicles must be removed or redirected out of that intersection.

She explained that the mode split could take several forms and be achieved in multiple ways. There could be increased occupancy in vehicles. Another way would be to promote local use of transit and/or increased transit use by destination guests. When these methods are combined with offsite parking, all would contribute to the mode split. Ms. Bowyer stated that the main focus of the discussions with the Commission and Staff was achieving the mode split through offsite parking and removing vehicles that would travel through that intersection to park at the resort.

She noted that the offsite location discussed to date has been centralized on Quinn's Junction. She echoed Mr. Gore's statements that they have heard the concerns raised by the Commission related to the reliance on Quinn's Junction to achieve the mode split. After the December meeting, the applicant began identifying alternative locations with which they could guarantee delivery and began looking at other locations controlled by the Resort.

The concept of finding multiple locations in order to further disperse traffic came up during their discussions with Staff. She noted that they had always discussed the SR 224 park-and-rides at Jeremy Ranch, Ecker Hill, and Kimball Junction. Mr. Schmidt spent several weekends observing parking volumes at the Resort as well as at these three parking lots that were very under-utilized. She noted that they have discussed usage of these lots with High Valley Transit, who feels that their existing service would be able to accommodate day skier guests who park in those locations.

Ms. Bowyer offered that they also have the unique advantage of having two established base areas with significant parking in both locations. They have 1,200 spaces on the Mountain Village/Park City side and approximately 1,600 spaces on The Canyon Village side. Currently, all of the employees at The Canyons park are onsite for free. She explained that they propose to direct the Canyon Village based employees to park at Ecker Hill in the spaces that are reserved and dedicated for use by the Canyons Resort Village Management Association ("CVMA"). She reported that based on their discussions with the CVMA, they have confirmed that they would be able to utilize those spaces. The applicant would also commit to continue to work with the CVMA should additional spaces need to be activated under their current agreement with the County.

Ms. Bowyer stated that they have also confirmed with High Valley Transit that they have sufficient capacity to transport these employees to the Canyon Village Base Area. In the event that supplemental service is needed from that location, the Resort is prepared to provide private shuttles. She stressed that their goal was to create a timely, reliable, and convenient transit option for the employees. Ms. Bowyer reiterated that they were committed to working with High Valley Transit to ensure that service is there. Usage of the 100 spaces at Ecker Hill that are dedicated for CVMA use would allow an additional 100 guests/day skiers to be accommodated at Canyons Village. From there, those guests could access the Mountain Village Park City side of the mountain via the Red Pine Gondola.

She added that there is also on-demand transit that could be activated as needed to transport guests to the Mountain Village Base Area. Ms. Bowyer explained that the high school was another location they have discussed. As part of their ongoing operations, they are currently in discussions with the high school to secure a multi-year long-term lease. The current arrangement is a year-to-year license permit with the School District. This would allow for an additional 400 spaces for guests. In the event that the high school would become unavailable, Ms. Bowyer stated they would work with the City to identify another offsite location to replace those spaces, at no cost to the City. She underscored that whatever location they use would be at no cost to the City. She explained that from the high school, guests would be transported via private shuttle.

Ms. Bowyer explained that the newest option is utilizing the Munchkin lot, which is owned by the Resort. There are currently approximately 100 spaces that had previously been discussed as a location for offsite employee parking. She explained that as they thought about it, they determined that Munchkin would be a good location to stage guest parking. She stated that they would direct the employees currently parked at Munchkin to Richardson Flat, which would open up these 100 spaces to guests who would then be transported by private shuttle.

Ms. Bowyer mentioned the current congestion that they were seeing at Munchkin. She referenced Mr. Schmidt's comments that a lot of congestion comes from those circulating to find a parking spot or to drop off. She explained that they have looked at ways to direct that traffic out of the intersections since their final destination was not the Base Area. As a result of these discussions, the Resort looked at the potential of relocating some of the local ski program drop-offs to offsite locations. This would remove the circulating drop-off traffic from the Base Area. She added that they had also talked extensively about carpool lanes. They felt that utilizing Munchkin as an offsite drop-off location could substantially reduce traffic within the Base Area.

Ms. Bowyer explained that today's proposal was presented for Commission input as a concept that they could continue to develop and pursue if it was of interest. This proposal would be to relocate programs for children age seven and up. They proposed that the ski teams would be dropped off in a similar configuration as previously discussed for the Parcels B and E garages. Coaches or representatives of the programs would be staged at the drop-off to meet the participants and accompany them on the bus, which would depart for the Base Area at a scheduled time. She added that participants would be accompanied on the bus, as safety is paramount to all of the resort's operations.

She explained that this proposal intended that for those parents, guardians, or caregivers who transport the children and who are circulating back out of the Base Area would not be creating additional traffic within the Base Area. If a parent, guardian, or caregiver who was dropping off also wanted to ski, they could go directly to the Base Area and park in the skier parking, and meet the group once they arrive from the offsite locations.

Ms. Bowyer noted that there are approximately 1,000 participants in the Saturday program and approximately 120 participants in the younger age group that would remain on site. Therefore, this would allow a significant amount of drop-off traffic to be redirected offsite and could potentially eliminate significant volumes out of the intersection. She added that they recognized that improvements would be needed on the Munchkin lot, and stated that the Resort was prepared to make those improvements should the Commission feel that this was an idea worth pursuing.

Ms. Bowyer stated that each of these locations, including the drop-off, has the purpose of reducing impacts on City-controlled lots and City transit resources. While they have worked to get away from sole reliance on Quinn's Junction, they recognized that there would still be potential impacts to City transit services.

In recognition of the continued importance of transit in the City now and in the future, the Resort proposed a $5.3 million contribution, payable over eight years. This would amount to $662,500 per year. This fee was based on the findings in the AECOM report received in February and would include $2.9 million for the City to purchase three new electric buses. The amount is based on the cost paid by the City in 2021 for the purchase of buses through the Utah Transit Authority. She explained that the second component of the fee was an hourly and per mile operating expense for the buses that could be used to enhance transit service. This figure was also taken from the AECOM analysis and totaled $940,000. This fee would cover the costs associated with the City providing enhanced bus service on peak days of the season.

The last component of the fee would be a contribution of $1.48 million for Park City Transit's fixed costs. These are costs that the City attributes to each bus based on its' general overhead. The applicant looked at those costs as identified in the AECOM study, and identified the elements that would actually be impacted by this enhanced service, such as staffing. Ms. Bowyer stressed that it is clear that behavioral changes would be necessary and that some would still be resistant to this change. She stated that the Resort was prepared to begin this financial commitment and begin making mitigation payments prior to the construction of the project. She added that the final terms of the timeline of payments would be worked out as part of the Development Agreement, but there is the potential that the payments could start as early as 2023.

Ms. Bowyer addressed some other issues voiced by the Commission, including the importance of early and accurate guest communication. They were currently working on this component, and the project would bring them an additional set of tools. She noted that the City's text service that had been in place was discontinued due to staffing challenges. The Resort was currently working to find and set up a similar text alert system. She understood from the Resort's internal teams that this system would not likely be set up before the end of the season, but she reported that they were pursuing it for next season.

Ms. Bowyer offered that the Guest Communication Plan would be reviewed by Staff and ultimately worked into Conditions of Approval, and would include elements that could potentially be pulled forward and put into place as early as next season. She noted that some of the elements would be tied to the project. She explained that they approached the Communication Plan with a few strategies in mind: reliability, clarity, and adaptability. They do not want to implement something that would be inflexible and not able to adapt to technology change or other needs that might be identified. They also looked at different periods of time when people need communication. These include pre-arrival, real-time, and programmatic. Like the TDM, these measures could become part of the regular meetings they would have with the City to ensure that the best strategies are in place.

She explained that pre-arrival communications would differ depending on the type of guest. Destination guests and regional guests are similar in that they do not necessarily know that a pass holder in Salt Lake City would be skiing in Park City. They would look to leverage websites and social media for those guests. There would also be an opportunity to use email communications with guests that could be tailored depending on where the guest is coming from.

Ms. Bowyer explained that they could use more targeted messaging for local guests that could utilize local media to provide updates on potential changes to operations, potential impacts, and consideration of offsite locations. The partnership between the City, the County, High Valley Transit, and the Resort would be essential to building that package.

With respect to the real-time information, Ms. Bowyer noted that day-of messaging is currently handled through variable message signage ("VMS") and social media. The Resort and PEG are committed to working with the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT"), the County, and the City to ensure that those VMS signs are used and have the right information that would reach guests as far back from the Resort as possible. They want the VMS signs to allow guests to make their decisions in the appropriate amount of time. She reiterated that they are exploring the text alert system with hopes of implementing that next season. She mentioned that pass holders for the existing Resort Center garage were offered a opt-in text service to provide updates on the status of circulation as it relates to that garage. She explained that the current system is a manual entry system, and is a small enough group to allow text alerts to be manually inputted.

She noted that the City requested the Resort change the timing of payment for the garage to be a "pay at exit" system. She reported that the Resort engaged a third party to put "pay on foot" systems into the Resort Center Garage that would allow traffic to free flow into the garage. She felt this would greatly improve the experience at that location. She explained that the biggest benefit of real-time information would come from the parking structures that are part of this project. These parking structures will let guests know how many spaces are available and where they are located in advance of arrival. This information would be broadcast through signage and through an app. She stressed that this would give the guest information to decide to redirect their path in the right amount of time.

The last component of the Guest Communication Plan is a programmatic element. Partnerships are extremely important for this component to get messaging out, offer incentives, offer carpooling and transit incentives, and make sure the information is up to date. Ms. Bowyer explained that they spent a lot of time thinking about a Mitigation and Compliance Plan, and they would preview this with the Commission for purposes of feedback. The first step in determining compliance is developing clear, objective, and measurable performance metrics. In other words, how they would determine if the mode split was being achieved. She explained that their proposal includes a series of data collection points. Traffic counts would show the movement of guests going to the Resort at the right-hand turn movement from Deer Valley/SR 224, the through movement on Empire Avenue, and the left-hand turn movement onto Lowell Avenue.

They would also collect data on Base Area lots and structures, as well as the offsite lots. They would work with the City to get data on the usage of Quinn's Junction or other offsite lots as well as transit ridership. She explained that they would look at all the data to see what was working, and what elements to mitigate. Ms. Bowyer stated that they could start collecting data and use a three-year window average for analysis. She commented that if the traffic counts were up and transit ridership was down, that would show that they would need to tweak something such as the price for parking. Incentives or media could also be used to promote transit use. She stressed that they want to approach this as addressing what might be broken within the system. The applicant proposed that they could start data collection earlier and continue all through project construction and five years after construction. She highlighted that the monitoring was meant to identify the problem and mitigate it.

Ms. Bowyer invited questions or comments from the Commission so that they could continue to develop this proposal and bring back the full package at a future meeting.

In response to a request for clarification from Chair Phillips, Ms. Bowyer confirmed that they proposed the Munchkin drop-off be for participants ages 7 and up. She explained that they chose age 7 as they felt that by that age there was a certain level of independence and they felt comfortable proposing a 7-year old ride the bus with their coach. In addition, many of the programs use age 7 as a dividing point. She offered that they were open to feedback on the age limit. She restated that there were approximately 120 participants in the under-7 age group and approximately 880 participants in the older group including programs run by the Resort and other ski clubs.

Mr. Schmidt thanked Mr. Gore and Ms. Bowyer for their presentations and their efforts over the past two months on the proposed mitigation measures. He stated that in the long term, they view the proposal as a solution to the current situation. He referenced the various measures proposed, which include expanding and improving the Transit Center delivered in Phase 1. He also mentioned the proposal for dedicated bus lanes on-site, pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, and street improvements, also to be delivered in Phase 1. Additionally, employee parking would move a large number of cars out of the City and to Richardson Flat with capital contributions, ongoing maintenance, and private shuttles.

The proposal also includes smart parking onsite and the use of technology to manage the parking resources and make them efficient and effective. He added that dispersed offsite parking in multiple locations would give people options. Mr. Schmidt also listed the improvements to the ski program drop-off, with flexibility both onsite and offsite. He also referenced the significant transparent contribution over eight years and noted that all of these changes add up to a significant, meaningful solution to traffic, transit, and parking at the base and in Park City.

Mr. Schmidt expressed appreciation to the Commission for allowing them to present this information and expressed hope that it was meaningful and was a good reason for them to conduct this meeting.

Chair Phillips invited input from the Commissioners as to how they would like to proceed prior to the public hearing. Commissioner Thimm suggested opening the matter up for public comment. Commissioner Suesser liked the idea of discussing the public hearing at the end of this meeting and agreed with Commissioner Thimm that public input at this juncture might be most efficient.

Chair Phillips opened the public comment.

Jeremy Buzzard stated that there were two distinct but related issues. The first is the traffic in town, and the second is the traffic at the resort. He expressed gratitude for those on the Planning Commission and noted that he could not see all of them on the video. The citizens deserve to see the representatives and noted that if they were in person, they would be able to see them.

Mr. Buzzard commented that Mr. Gore made the point that the traffic this year is no worse than in 2018-2019 and 2019-2020. He stated that anyone who has been in town during the past few years would recognize that those numbers are rubbish and they were lying with statistics. He has studied statistics and learned many years ago that any moron could use statistics to lie effectively, and Mr. Gore demonstrated that very well at this meeting. Mr. Buzzard invited Mr. Gore to reach out, as he would be happy to debate this in person. He stated that Park City is busier than it has ever been by a massive margin and making promises to commit funds to the town is a hollow promise. He added that they should not enable this rubbish and should maintain the town for the sake of the citizens.

Mr. Buzzard stated that Vail Resorts had no interest in supporting the town, other than as a way to support their profits. It would therefore be appropriate that they should not be supported for anything more than that. The traffic issue exists both on the mountain and on the streets, and both should be considered. He strongly recommended the Planning Commission reject any further development of the Park City Base until they have a commitment from all of the relevant parties that would be appropriate for people in town.

Lisa Pahl deferred her time to Deb Rentfrow.

Nancy Lazenby commented on Ms. Rentfrow's earlier comments about the deadlines. She agreed with those comments and stated that her heart goes out to the Staff and the Commission when they receive 200-page reports that they have to review in a short period of time to be knowledgeable on the information. Providing information at the last minute seems completely unfair and places an undue waste of time on everyone. She added that the push to have a public meeting in one month, when the Commission still has not received everything it needs to review, seemed ludicrous.

Ms. Lazenby agreed with Mr. Schmidt that traffic and parking are essential to the solution for what is going on in the City. The proposed parking plan seems like a crazy mishmash. She could not imagine going to a stadium for a concert or sporting event and having different types of parking all over the place. She noted that she lives in town and does not know even where the Munchkin lot is located. Because of this mishmash of parking, it was no wonder everyone was driving around and traffic was convoluted. Ms. Lazenby referenced the number of people that visit Disneyland and the parking structures they constructed with regular shuttles. She asked why it was so hard for Vail to build a parking structure at I-40 or I-80 and provide shuttles back and forth all day long.

She reiterated that this plan seemed like they were taking something that should be simple and making it complicated. She asked why it was becoming the City's responsibility to take care of the guests going to Vail. Ms. Lazenby reiterated that Vail should build parking structures to handle their guests and shuttle them back and forth. She added that she has been watching the Olympics and expressed pride that she is from Park City. Park City is the supermodel of ski resorts and she felt that this proposal was mediocre at best and they need to hold out for their Tom Brady. She added that Park City deserves a world-class resort and this piecemeal proposal needed to be improved. Ms. Lazenby explained that she was all for progress and development, but progress is only progress if it makes things better, not if it complicates it or makes it worse.

Dana Williams stated that the City has been going through a lot of Vail issues lately, and he saw nothing but more of the same. Tonight's presentation showed how the resort would be under parked, and how they would not live up to the obligations on parking. The presentation also showed how the City would supply its' parking areas around the community that were built to handle on and off traffic loads based on the neighborhoods and carrying capacity figures to the resort. He stated that he was sick and tired of fees in lieu and the notion that buying additional buses for the City was a good thing. He lives one block from one of the busiest bus stops at the High School and it is still horrible.

Mr. Williams expressed concern about the representations at the first meeting where it was stated that the applicant would not build underground and would not build enough parking. He wanted the Commission to remind the applicant that it has the responsibility to provide parking on their site and live up to certain agreements. He referenced the comments regarding Omicron and resort-based employment. He stated that he called five Vail resorts about whether their mountains were fully open and whether they were fully staffed, and was told "no." He also called five other resorts, and they were 100% staffed and 100% open. Mr. Williams referenced some important factors, including too many passes, and the fact that they were above the CCC of what the applicant's and the City's systems could handle. He felt that it was time to go back to square one and the project needed to be turned down.

Sherie Harding stated that it seemed like they were putting out a brush fire. Parking in the Park City Mountain Resort lots and the associated traffic congestion was an immediate problem and the satellite lot at Quinn's Junction is a Band-Aid solution to an immediate problem. She asked that they think larger and come up with an over-arcing transit solution that is innovative and visionary. Just as the first automobile was thought to be funny, people might think using technology and innovation would be funny. She offered the ideas of high-speed rail, partially on Vail property along each entry, or a gondola partially on Vail property along each entry corridor. Ms. Harding also offered the possibility of electric self-driving cars that could be sent home after the owner was dropped off. These types of visionary ideas need to be wrapped in climate sustainability. She urged them to embrace solutions that evolve and can go into the future. She felt that this looked like this would create another Olympics. Benefits could be over-arcing transit solutions or funding towards some of the visionary transit ideas.

Deb Rentfrow reported that she received a text from Deborah Hickey saying that she was not getting the notice that she could raise her hand, and asked whether there was anything on the admin side that would prevent Ms. Hickey from seeing that option. She read from a prepared statement. She stated that the Staff Report states that the applicant met with the City many times, and has been unable to reach an agreement. This should be a red flag. The proposed payment appears to be loosely based on AECOM's scenario 1, included in the packet. That scenario assumes only 43 peak days. Based on actual data collection for this season, the parking has been at capacity 41 days to date, including today. Ms. Rentfrow stated that there are 60 days left in the season, 27 of which are a Friday, Saturday, or Sunday. If they apply the rate of capacity for just Friday, Saturday, and Sunday based on the collected data since December 5, 2021, there would be an additional 22.6 more peak days where they are at capacity this season. Consequently, the analysis provided by AECOM and the applicant is flawed and the City would be getting shortchanged if the current proposal were accepted.

As to PEG providing their own shuttle service from Richardson Flat and the High School, if they were promoting civil service and encouraging it along with transit, the proposed shuttle drop-off area is even more insufficient now than anticipated under previous submissions. In addition, per a Summit County plat search, there are 62 parking spaces under the Lowell, which would require private vehicles to cut through the shuttle area for access to their parking. The most direct garage access for another space is reserved for the Resort Lodges south building, which also intersects with this shuttle area. Since nearly the beginning, the day skier parking split was proposed at 760 for Parcel B and 440 for Parcel E. This new submission has it at 770 and 430, respectively. More traffic to the furthest point of the resort area and on Empire Avenue would further reduce the balance of parking throughout the project.

In addition, those 10 spaces account for between 1,620 to 2,000 square feet. She asked if the applicant eliminated a condominium or an affordable unit, or changed the footprint to get these additional spaces. She also asked about the dimensions for each space and whether they were using the Land Management Code ("LMC") minimum of 9x18 or whether they were 10x20 to account for the higher anticipated and required Average Vehicle Occupancy ("AVO") to meet the 20% reduction.

Day skier parking was to remain at 1,200. As previously pointed out, multiple spaces, and now with the Munchkin lot of approximately 50 spots, would be lost during the peak arrival hours for drop-off. To date this season, there have been only two initial tweets for the lots at capacity after 10:00 a.m. All other tweets have been between 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m., indicating the loss of any day skier parking at that time would be critical. In addition, the day skier number includes private ski club parking that is not available to the general public.

Ms. Rentfrow stated that it does not look like the applicant was relying on Quinn's Junction but pointed out that that project is not out for bid and will not go out for bid until February 24, 2022.

Any assumption by AECOM or anyone else that it would be completed by the end of this year could be unrealistic.

RAD's attorney, Nicole DeForge, submitted a letter highlighting additional points and she hoped that the Commission took the time to read it.

Ms. Rentfrow stated that Planner Ananth mentioned the proposed public final hearing on March 23, 2022, as the standard fourth Wednesday of the month. Ms. Rentfrow pointed out since November 2020, 11 out of the 13 meetings have been held on the third Wednesday of the month. She noted that one of the two meetings that were on a different Wednesday were held in August because there were two meetings, one on the third Wednesday and one on the fifth Wednesday.

She stated that the applicant's reliance on High Valley Transit ("HVT") to help get people in from Jeremy Ranch is an issue given that HVT reduced that service from four times per hour to two trips per hour. She opined that this is going in the wrong direction since HVT is reducing service instead of increasing it. The Canyons has overflowed at their parking lots at least 20 times this season. It's not working now, so she does not see how they could rely on it as a possible alternative in the future.

Ms. Rentfrow referenced the Report that states there are 480 PCMR site employees and 720 Canyons employees, which would mean that they would need those 720 spaces at the CVMA and she did not believe that lot has that supply.

With regard to conducting drop-offs at the Munchkin lot, Ms. Rentfrow did not hear any plan for getting the participants back to the lot and how pickup would work later in the day. It seemed to her that the applicant was more concerned about getting everyone to the resort. The reference that Mr. Schmidt spent several weekends observing is not consistent with his observations on two days only. She questioned whether that was proper statistical sampling. In terms of timing, she suggested starting these various options today to see how they work over the next three years, so they could tweak things during that time and then resubmit the application. She appreciated the time the Commissioners spend on each application.

Chair Phillips clarified the reference to the fourth Wednesday was meant to reference the Planning Commission's normal meeting. He noted that the Commission has the intention of returning to its' regular schedule. They have been conducting special meetings on the third Wednesday.

Ed Parigian expressed agreement with the previous comments and specifically referenced the comments of Mr. Williams that too many passes have been sold and are likely increasing. Vail admitted that they do not know which pass holders are going where at any given time. He questioned whether anyone could accurately predict any user numbers. He felt that it was clear that Vail and PEG are just trying to meet the modal split and not necessarily attempting to alleviate traffic. There is no attempt to address any traffic coming up SR 248 onto Kearns. He felt this should be a no-brainer if they were actually trying to alleviate traffic. With respect to the 740 spaces, he commented that it is a gross number, not net. Mr. Parigian stated that Munchkin is a muddy mess and asked whether it would be paved. He felt that area is a "traffic zone" to begin with, so by bringing people into Munchkin he questioned whether anything was really being accomplished.

He asked what would happen to the High School lot when construction begins in a couple of years. He also asked if the City would receive rent and how much each parking spot would cost.

With respect to the 100 spaces at Canyons Village, he questioned whether it made sense to take employee-parking privileges away at a time when Vail claims it is having difficulty attracting workers.

John Rasmussen stated that he is an owner of the Silver King Lodge. He stated he would be excited if Disneyland were to open a resort near his complex or in his city because it would generate so much money. He felt that this is what PEG has proposed, and he thinks it is fantastic. He stated that Silver King and its Board of Directors are moving forward to prepare itself for this potential expansion of the Park City area and being the number one resort in the United States; they should look at the parking lot now because it looks terrible. He stated that the parking lot does not have the glamour that it should. Mr. Rasmussen offered a possible solution would be for PEG to put a parking lot between Park City and Kimball Junction, and noted that there is a lot of land in that location. He stated that he just attended a tennis tournament in Maui and no one parked at the tournament. Rather, attendees parked in another location and were bused in and bused out and it worked very well. He felt this opportunity was absolutely warranted and that Park City needs to dress itself up. Right now, there is nothing going on at the Base Area, and there should be. He felt that this project would balance things out and was a perfect opportunity for the City.

Deborah Hickey found it offensive that they were still talking about devising a transit plan for this major project. These issues have been talked about from the beginning and this project is being fit to what PEG wants as a development, as opposed to advancing the project for the community and for the traffic flow that the community desires and needs. She felt that this project was working backward and PEG had not provided a solution but was rather asking everyone to buy into the fact that PEG would add a few buses, which the City and taxpayers could easily pay for without Vail. The community is asking for access for the City's tourists and the locals. A bad experience will turn people away and she has heard many complaints about the overflow of too many guests on the mountain and too much traffic to get there.

Ms. Hickey stated that conducting data collection over the next three years as the plan is developed is a woefully inadequate approach. She believed that Vail should invest in a plan in advance of construction. She suggested getting the traffic flow solutions fixed before they add more density to the Base Area and asking for more leniency from the LMC. Ms. Hickey did not feel that $5.3 million would make all of this work better. She would like something built that would positively affect everyone. If the Olympic athletes that train here cannot get access to the mountains, the City will lose them. She added that there is not enough employee housing.

The idea of using Vegas parking protocols for Park City sounds like they are writing the City off the map. This used to be a quaint skiing town and she did not believe PEG was working in the right direction. She suggested fixing the transit now before any building permits are issued. She mentioned that there was not enough water to support the infrastructure and felt that there should be a moratorium on building.

Ms. Hickey stated that Mr. Rasmussen did not represent all of the owners of the Silver King. She felt it was outrageous to suggest putting a seven-year-old on a bus. PEG hasn't built a solution; it is just asking everyone to bend over backward. She felt that the Mayor and the City Council should have oversight over this decision-making process because if this moves forward, it would go against some of the basic premises on which Park City is built. The community has invested in the LMC, which deserves to stand tall instead of bowing to the developers. She urged the Commission to take heart and consider the traffic and water issues.

Doug Lee echoed the comments of Ms. Rentfrow and Ms. Hickey. He found it unfair that the public was being asked for substantive comments without sufficient time to review the documents. He stated that he is an architect and real estate investor, and is working on two projects in Concord, New Hampshire. There, if documents are not submitted 30 days before the meeting, the applicant does not get to go to the meeting. He urged Staff and the Commission to be more stringent on getting documentation in before deadlines. Mr. Lee stated that this proposal is a shell game with the parking spaces. He reiterated that Carolyn Rodrigues stated on the record that the County believes that the SR 224 lots are at 80-90% of capacity on peak days. There are only 220 public spaces available at those three lots, meaning that there would only be space for 22 to 44 cars.

He found it offensive that PEG thinks that having Mr. Schmidt drive by the lots on two days was any kind of substantive and accurate reading of demand. He offered that most of the numbers in the Traffic Circulation Study continue to be based on unsupportable mode split assumptions, and any empirical evidence does not support the AVO and Traffic Diversion Assumptions. The shared parking analysis is similarly not supported by any empirical evidence. Therefore, the analysis that PEG relies upon to justify this scheme is not supportable.

Mr. Lee reiterated that community members are working hard to find a solution, unlike PEG, Vail, and their consultants. The applicant keeps saying that they do not want to make any more changes and want a vote on this project now. He urged the Commission to take their time and do this right.

Susan Daniero stated that she is a full-time resident of the PayDay Condominiums and remarked that the Silver Star Lift is near and dear to the residents of Thanes Canyon. It is a community lift that services the businesses at the base. Residents can completely stay away from the base by using the community lift. She understood that the Commission has a difficult job. She added that there would be development on the parking lots by Vail Resorts and asked that a condition be added that moving forward, Vail must adequately staff and make sure that the Silver Star Lift is open. Ms. Daniero offered that there were a number of lifts similar to Silver Star and specifically referenced the Sunrise Lift that services the new condominium building.

By having the community lifts running, Ms. Daniero stated that people will be kept away from the parking lots and avoid the need for these residents to travel to the base. She understood that these lifts are not extremely profitable but urged the Commission to keep in mind the local businesses and community lifts that keep people away from the base. She thanked the Commission for their service and expressed appreciation for the time to speak.

Patty Forchette noted that most of the discussions were about day skiers and she wanted to know what was in the proposal to transport mountain bikers and bikes en masse to the resort. She believed that currently, they are allowed three bikes per bus, and wanted to know what would happen in the summer when there would be hundreds of bikers.

There were no further public comments. Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

Chair Phillips invited comments from the Commissioners. Commissioner Kenworthy thanked Planning Staff for their work on this application. He also thanked Mr. Gore, Ms. Bowyer, and Mr. Schmidt for their attendance at this meeting. He felt this was a very important meeting, even though Staff did not have a chance to review the submittal. He made it clear that the City has zero obligation to own the mitigation requirements of PEG or Vail. When he hears about transit hiccups at the high school, it makes him uncomfortable and it goes back to how they would accept whatever the mitigation plan might be. They do not want people pointing fingers at each other.

Commissioner Kenworthy stressed that this is clearly the obligation of the Resort and the developer. He asked if the applicant had any actual numbers for the past two months. This would include the days at capacity, the numbers at the Empire Avenue intersection, and how many times The Canyons was fully occupied. Mr. Schmidt stated that they do not have actual numbers on the ski operations, as it is not part of their purview.

Commissioner Kenworthy referenced public comment that this was a big guessing game. He disagreed with that comment and felt that Vail has zip code numbers for its pass sales and has tied it with first lift occupancy. He added that Vail had information ongoing for every single pass holder. He liked the fact that Vail was at the table and working with the City and emphasized that this partnership is what this project needs. They need cooperation and brains more than they need the money. While he liked the offer to contribute, Commissioner Kenworthy felt that City Hall needed to come up with the numbers. He did not believe that the numbers should be negotiated with Vail and should be a take-it-or-leave-it number arrived at by City Hall.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that CVMA might have the right to give Vail its 100 spaces but there are still issues and details that need to be addressed. He stated that the only certainty that Vail has is to own those spaces. Quinn's Junction is a general-purpose UDOT-owned park-and-ride that will come with a great deal of uncertainty. He stressed that ownership of those stalls brings certainty.

With regard to the Munchkin lot, regardless of whether he likes the idea or not Commissioner Kenworthy loved PEG's creativity and thinking outside the box to come up with a solution. He appreciated them working with an owned asset and the thinking behind it. It is that type of thinking that would make this work. Commissioner Kenworthy noted that Quinn's Junction would always be used as a licensed, UDOT park-and-ride. It will be a first-come, first-served lot unless the City spends a lot of money. He stated that the wayfinding signs were terrible and it was PEG's responsibility. Something has to be done with signage in terms of coordination and messaging to make it work and the City and the Resort have to work together on this issue. He liked the fact that this was being addressed.

Commissioner Kenworthy referenced the question of what happens if they lose the High School as an option. He loved Vail's response that if that occurs, they would be responsible for those 400 spaces and the transit, but questioned what would happen if they don't step up. He wanted to know what would be in the Conditions of Approval. He referenced Ms. Bowyer's statement that when the blackouts occurred, they never used the High School, which she claimed was evidence that this would work to achieve the 20% reduction. He indicated that the evidence showed the parking is not sufficient. He referenced Commissioner Thimm's question one year ago as to whether that was the right number, and now they know that during the blackouts the plan calling for 1,200 spaces does not work. He stressed that it is a known fact that 1,200 spaces do not work when locals are blocked out.

Commissioner Kenworthy focused on the words "evidence," "the stick" and "certainty." He appreciated the meeting and hoped that the applicant understood where he was coming from. Without a doubt, this aspect of the development is the most critical issue for the community.

Commissioner Thimm reviewed the Staff Report and Traffic Engineer's findings and recalled that he agreed with the idea of reducing the amount of parking at the resort and the positive impact that would have on traffic. He clarified that this was not a complete statement as they look at it now. He felt that they need to look to reduce the amount of parking needed at the resort and that the modal split is what gets them there. Commissioner Thimm noted that he did not disagree with the logic of the proposed modal split, but he wanted to make sure that it could be enforced from the standpoint of the TDM and Conditions of Approval that have teeth.

He addressed the proposed multiple locations for parking to alleviate stress at any one location. He offered that the real solution would be that if this were to work, it would have to be intuitive. He questioned whether a number of lots at different locations would be intuitive, as opposed to going to one place. While he appreciated the idea, Commissioner Thimm was not convinced that dispersing parking would necessarily be the solution. He felt that the bottom line question was how they could make the solution intuitive for the people that would be using this system.

With regard to the drop-offs for children's programs, he would have to be convinced that onsite drop-offs were not best for all age groups. He referenced public comment that the age cutoff of seven years might not be the right age. From his personal experience, despite their age, he liked to walk his children and grandchildren to the program. He added that others liked to do that as well, which should be factored into the issue. Commissioner Thimm suggested that onsite drop-offs were a better solution.

Commissioner Thimm stated that when this is brought before the Commission for a final presentation, he would like to see a consensus between Staff, AECOM, and Hales Engineering, along with a full and detailed Staff Report reviewed by AECOM.

Commissioner Hall agreed with Commissioner Kenworthy's stated appreciation for the work Staff has done on this application. She generally agreed with much of the public comment that the current proposal was inadequate to justify such an extreme parking waiver.

She stressed that the burden was on the applicant to demonstrate a solid plan for the Commission to justify the largest parking waiver ever granted, both in terms of number and percentage. This plan needs to be one that will last forever because once the buildings are constructed, there is no way to change them. She stated that offering parking stalls off-site that are neither exclusive nor permanent was not a great option.

Commissioner Hall appreciated the applicant trying to be creative in this proposal but as it stands, she felt it was lacking. She noted that her user experience both this season and last was that almost every day seemed to be a peak day. Therefore, using the AECOM analysis regarding peak days to justify some of the parking stalls and the transit system was leading her to want to eliminate the idea of peak versus non-peak days. She would like the assumption to be that all days were peak days. She specifically referenced the 100 spaces at Munchkin and asked if there should be a restrictive deed stating that those spaces would always be available. She expressed her understanding that there was development or entitlements on Munchkin to have something built there, so she would like parking at Munchkin in perpetuity confirmed.

Commissioner Hall had similar concerns regarding the high school. They need a forever solution for offsite parking. She echoed the comments of Commissioner Kenworthy regarding ownership because there is otherwise no recourse if something changes. She had numerous concerns with the AECOM report but would list those at the next meeting. She added that she would like to see summer transit built into this proposal, and not including it in the plan was short-sighted.

With respect to the public comment regarding the Silver Star Lift, she agreed that if AECOM's report and the parking waiver were based on old data when those lifts were running, they need to have all of those chairlifts running all of the time as they divert traffic from the base. Even if it is not enough to justify operations, she saw their use as a basic assumption needed for the parking waiver. She mentioned some of the transit details, including driver hours and round-trip drive times. She wanted to ensure that current data is used and is accurate because the assumptions seem to be at odds with current experience.

Commissioner Hall noted the important distinction between Staff's statement that all employee parking would be at Richardson Flat, versus the statement that all employee parking at Richardson Flat would be at peak days. She reiterated that she would like to eliminate the reliance on the concept of peak days because all days are essentially peak days. There is a strong disagreement between the current users and the old data as to the number of peak days.

Conceptually, Commissioner Hall would like the modal shift and would like to provide a parking waiver because an enhanced Resort Center with an enhanced transit system would make the community better and the resort base function. However, as currently proposed she felt that the plan was deficient.

Commissioner Suesser previously requested clarification on the Richardson Flat use by Vail employees, and Vail stated that employees would be directed to park at that lot. She requested clarification as to whether that meant that employees would be required to park there. Vail estimated approximately 132 employees from the new Base Area would use the Richardson Flat lot. Commissioner Suesser understood that the new Base Area would generate over 500 new employees, and requested further information on the balance of the employees created by the new development and where they would park. She recognized that there would be some affordable housing, but questioned where the balance of those employees would park.

She also referenced Vail's claim that 173 resort employees would park at Richardson Flat, which she saw as different from the reference to "all employees." She questioned whether employees would be required to park at Richardson Flat or directed to park at that lot, and only 132 of the new base area and 173 of the resort employees would be directed to park there. With respect to the high school lot, Commissioner Suesser appreciated Ms. Bowyer's comments that Vail had shifted away from looking at the Quinn's Junction lot and wanted to look at guaranteed parking. She noted that they have overflow parking on school and non-holiday days, so they do not have the High School lot available for overflow on those days. They also know that the school bond was approved and construction would take place.

Commissioner Suesser questioned the applicant's agreement to a Condition that would require replacement of those spaces and wanted to know where and how would those spaces be replaced. She stressed that this is the type of detail they need to approve this parking exception. She agreed with the concept of the modal split, but there was no agreement as to the location of the satellite parking. They initially discussed using the SR 224 park-and-rides but learned from Carolyn Rodrigues that those lots were at 80-90% of capacity. They then turned to Quinn's Junction, but now they are back at the SR 224 park-and-rides despite the fact that the statistics have not changed. She requested clarification of the conflict between Mr. Schmidt's observations and the County's data.

Commissioner Suesser asked where The Canyons' employees would park at Ecker if the lot is already 80 to 90 percent full. She explained that her comments were requests for information to allow a full commentary before making a decision. In terms of the direction the applicant was headed, she felt there was still quite a bit of information needed, as well as clarification of the information provided thus far.

With regard to the statements that the applicant was actively working with the High School to secure 400 parking spaces, Commissioner Suesser wanted to know what the issues were and why it was taking so long since they have been talking about the High School lot for some time. She recalled discussions during the October meeting about eliminating the High School as an option in favor of Quinn's Junction and Richardson Flat. This proposal now includes the High School without certainty or guarantee that those spaces are available.

Commissioner Suesser stated that there were long lines at the High School lot and Vail has said they would provide private shuttles if necessary. She asked why Vail had not already started the shuttle service. Similarly, if there was overflow parking available at the Munchkin lot, she questioned why it was not currently being utilized. She understood that the Munchkin lot was not improved, but would still like a response from Vail. She asked where the maintenance vehicles that are currently in the Munchkin lot would go if that lot is utilized for general public parking or ski team drop-offs.

Commissioner Suesser appreciated the creative thinking into alternative locations for drop-offs but agreed with Commissioner Thimm that it might not be the best solution. She agreed with Commissioner Hall's comments regarding peak days and eliminating that concept might be a good idea. She noted that it seemed as though they had a season of enhanced service needs.

With regard to the use of communication tools to get information to visitors to the resort, she asked why those communications were not currently working. They still see signs with inaccurate information such as "Lot Full" when the resort is closed, or at times when they know, the lot is not full. Commissioner Suesser referenced a comment during the City Council meeting last week that inaccurate information negatively impacts restaurant owners at the base.

She referenced the comments regarding congestion in Thanes Canyon and how appreciative residents are about the bus service that helps alleviate some of the traffic, especially given the fact that the Silver Star lift has been closed so much. The current plan is still unclear on whether bus service through Thanes Canyon would continue since buses cannot make a left turn off of Lowell Avenue when leaving the resort. It would be a loss to the community if bus service were eliminated, in addition to the loss of two bus stops on Empire Avenue that are always crowded.

Commissioner Suesser commented that there are currently no signs on Empire Avenue stating that the upper lot on Empire Avenue is full. She expressed that communication now is lacking, even without the development, and was concerned about the promise that it would work well in time. She referenced the statements regarding the collection of data during construction and felt that the time to collect the data was now to make sure that these analyses are based on accurate, current data. The data for this year is important given the increase in pass sales, the expansion of terrain, and other factors that drive people to the resort.

Specifically, with regard to Ms. Bowyer's statement regarding collecting data of people turning left onto Lowell Avenue, Commissioner Suesser offered that many people access the resort via

Empire Avenue, and collecting data at that intersection only would not be appropriate. The data should be collected throughout the resort for it to be accurate and usable.

Commissioner Suesser stated that the impact of this development is the responsibility of Vail and PEG to mitigate; it is not on the City to mitigate. This has to be included in the proposal before it is approved. She noted that the dedicated bus lane relied upon by the applicant is only approximately 100 yards long from the corner of Lowell Avenue and Silver King Drive to the Resort. The rest of Park City does not have dedicated bus lanes, and she does not know how this short lane would be a solution. If a bus is sitting in traffic on SR 248/224, people will not take the bus even with the dedicated bus lane on Lowell Avenue. A broader plan must be proposed for the modal split to work. Commissioner Suesser stated that a lot of work still needed to be done.

Commissioner Van Dine agreed with the comments of Commissioners Suesser, Hall, and Kenworthy. She added that traffic alerts were currently coming from the City, not from Vail. If they do not have that communication now, she felt that there was not a good basis for how it would work in the future. The proposal presented was beneficial, but she still expressed concerns. The City has been dealing with these traffic issues for a long time, and just this last week they got together to do something about it. She stressed that the changes cannot wait. She drove by the high school, and the lines to get on the bus were unbelievable. No one wants to stand in a line to get to the Resort, knowing that they will have to stand in a line on the mountain. Commissioner Van Dine felt that PEG was trying to push this burden onto the City by simply making a payment.

Commissioner Van Dine agreed that the uncertainty of the high school lot was a concern in terms of a long-term sustainable option. She agreed that peak times and peak days are not the same as they used to be. No parking is available on a Friday afternoon for locals who want to get in a few runs at the end of the day. It has become a challenge to navigate everything around the City and dedicated bus lanes close to the resort will not solve these problems, nor does just adding more buses.

Commissioner Van Dine reiterated her agreement with the prior comments, as well as most of the public comments, particularly with regards to using current data. Traffic has changed significantly since 2017 and more current data would make a difference. What they have before them does not seem adequate to allow them to evaluate this application.

Commissioner Johnson agreed with everything said by the Commissioners. He would like to see the Staff Report on tonight's presentation. He noted that the applicant presented a drastically different remote parking plan and he felt that they were continuing to have Work Sessions to assist in finding a solution when there has been no solution presented thus far. He wondered if they would continue to spin their wheels to find a solution. He noted that having parking at Munchkin would then create traffic on Bonanza and SR 224. Additional transportation studies would need to be done for the Munchkin lot.

Commissioner Johnson also referenced the assumptions and unknowns with respect to the long-term lease with the High School, as well as moving parking from The Canyons. He did not feel that they should continue along this path of using Work Sessions to try and find a solution. The applicant should provide a resolute solution supported by data.

Chair Phillips felt that there were some good discussions and was reluctant to weigh in too much without the benefit of the Staff analysis. In terms of the Munchkin lot, he liked the idea of utilizing the lot in some fashion and agreed with Commissioner Thimm regarding the experience of taking children to their programs. He echoed the comments of Commissioner Johnson that looking into the impacts of the use of the Munchkin lot was necessary. He could not comment on the impacts of having the offsite locations without Staff analysis. He could see some of the positives of the proposal in that these lots would capture people closer to where they were coming from, but having dispersed lots might be confusing to non-residents. Chair Phillips felt it was worth exploring, and would leave it to the Staff to provide their professional opinion.

Chair Phillips echoed the comments that expressed appreciation that Vail was present at the table and added that it would take everyone to arrive at a collaborative solution however that might occur. He mentioned the lifts that come into town and how their operations impact the rest of the base. He felt it was important to know whether they could rely on the operations of those lifts.

Chair Phillips noted that they keep getting new information and it has been difficult to keep up, especially when they do not have an opinion from all sides. With respect to employees being shuttled in, whatever solution they arrive at must be predictable for the employees. He also noted the difficulties in retaining employees and expressed concern over whether shuttling employees would be a deterrent and would impact the on-mountain experience. He wanted to know the details of who would be responsible for transportation from the Munchkin lot, and if shuttles are used, he would like to know how that would impact the shuttle drop-off.

Chair Phillips expressed his frustration and anxiety with this process and the fact that it keeps moving and changing. He will be looking for a final analysis of this project along with a consensus between the applicant, AECOM, and Staff in order to arrive at something that works.

Chair Phillips recognized that everyone was interested in not having a perpetual cycle of change and analysis and felt that they needed to press forward. He would encourage the next meeting to include a public hearing and sought input from the other Commissioners.

Planner Ananth deferred to the Commission on the issue of a public hearing.

Chair Phillips reiterated his desire to conduct a public hearing at the next meeting, stating that Staff will have completed their analysis so that they could come to an informed decision.

Commissioner Thimm reiterated his appreciation for Staff and the work they have put into this application. He agreed with the suggestion of having a public hearing at the next meeting, along with a potential vote as a goal. He noted that the transportation and parking were still an issue, and there needed to be a solution brought to the table. He wondered if they could receive the Staff Report a week earlier, which would give everyone more time to review it. That might help in having concise commentary and trying to get to a point of a public hearing with a vote or a public hearing with a continuance with a specific direction.

Planner Ananth stated that if everything was submitted 30 days in advance of the public hearing, Staff should be able to issue a memo containing her analysis. She mentioned that the applicant had called for a vote on multiple occasions and this application has been pending for nearly two years. She could see them moving forward with a public hearing.

Commissioner Suesser asked if Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval would be a part of the packet for the public hearing. Planner Ananth stated that was still under discussion. They could either issue potential Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, or they could wait until after the public hearing and deliberation when the Commission could provide direction should that become the next step.

Chair Phillips commented that they had previously been to this point, and felt that the better course would be for the Commission to direct Staff on the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval. By having a public hearing, they could certainly continue the matter for purposes of providing that direction.

Chair Phillips suggested conducting the public hearing, after which they could provide Staff direction for the following meeting where they could get to the point of a vote.

Planner Ananth suggested another option would be for the applicant to provide their redlined Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval as part of their submittal, with the understanding that there would still be work to do to finalize those documents.

Director Milliken added that these redlines could be included in the packet with the understanding that the packet would be provided to the Commissioners and the public with an additional one week. Planner Ananth noted that the additional week would mean that the packet would go out the same week as the Joint Planning Commission meeting packet.

In response to an inquiry regarding whether that would put undue hardship on Planning Staff, Planner Ananth confirmed that it would be a lot of work.

Commissioner Suesser liked the idea of PEG submitting their redline rather than having Staff spending time on the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval. There was agreement amongst the Commissioners.

Director Milliken clarified her understanding that the Commission would provide direction to the Staff regarding Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Hall agreed with that approach.

Ms. Bowyer clarified that the Commission would receive Staff's comprehensive memo by March 11, 2022, and that the applicant would provide its redlined Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval for inclusion in the packet. Planner Ananth stated that she would like to receive the applicant's complete submission by February 23, 2022, and she would expect to issue the report on March 11, 2022. She stated that she would notice the meeting for a public hearing and will be prepared to give a presentation, after which the Commission would open the public hearing and take public comment. After closing the public hearing, the Commission would provide its direction to Staff on how to move forward, likely at a future meeting.

Commissioner Van Dine commented that given that the current user experience has been a challenge when she hears how technology would be a good solution she felt it was hard given that the current proposal relies on text and social media that is not working. She felt it would help the Commission understand how it would work with the modal shift.

Chair Phillips reminded those present that the next meeting would be in person. He recognized the difficulties with Zoom but expressed appreciation to everyone's cooperation in conducting these meetings. Director Milliken clarified that the February 23, 2022, meeting would be on Zoom due to the holidays and school break, but the March 9, 2022, meeting would be in person. It was confirmed that the next meeting on this application would be in person.

6. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Kenworthy moved to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.