PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH 84060

February 9, 2022

The Council of Park City, Summit County, Utah, met in open meeting on February 9, 2022, at 9:00 a.m.

STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT

I. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Status
Mayor Nann Worel Council Member Ryan Dickey Council Member Max Doilney Council Member Becca Gerber Council Member Jeremy Rubell Council Member Tana Toly Matt Dias, City Manager Margaret Plane, City Attorney Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder	**Present**
None	**Absent**

II. INTRODUCTION

<u>Purpose, Context, Goals, and Outcomes:</u>
Mayor Worel stated the retreat was not to make big decisions, but to learn the historical context of the current projects, as well as the Vision 2020 study and results. She asked that Council look at the topics through the Equity lens to see what might be missing.

Matt Dias, City Manager, asserted decision making going forward would be critical. It was important for the Council to have all the information prior to taking action. He indicated staff was an incredibly strong team and they were focused on supporting Council's priorities.

<u>Myers Briggs:</u>
Jason Glidden indicated Myers Briggs Personality Assessment would help Council learn about themselves and their peers. The Council spent the next hour participating in this activity.

III. VISION 2020, PILLARS, AND CRITICAL COMMUNITY PRIORITIES

<u>Vision 2020, Pillars, and Critical Community Priorities:</u>
Matt Dias stated the community had a long history of visioning, including the General Plan and Land Management Code. For a number of years, the City focused on two priorities, then a third was added, and a few years later a fourth was added. After the extensive visioning process in 2020, COVID-19 took a toll. This retreat would allow Council to evaluate the outcomes of the visioning process and determine if the current priorities should still be the focus.

Jed Briggs, Budget Manager, and Linda Jager, Community Engagement Manager, presented this item. Briggs reviewed visioning helped Council focus on what the priorities were for the City. He gave the history of the visioning process beginning in 2009, which resulted in community values and goals, and the steps needed to achieve those values and goals.

Jager reviewed the Vision 2020 process. The City contracted with Future IQ, and that firm was chosen for its expertise in using data. A survey was launched in June, 2019. She displayed an extensive outreach list and the individuals and groups who participated with the creation of the City's priorities. Briggs stated five priority pillars stood out as a result of the process. He noted the four critical priorities were part of the five pillars: Affordability and Equity, Environmental Leadership, Transportation Innovation, Sustainable Tourism, and Arts, Culture, and Local Economy.

Jager noted March of 2020, the City shut down from COVID-19 and the Vision 2020 pillars were put on hold. In spring of 2021, a branding process for the pillars took place and in May, four of the visioning pillars were adopted: Social Equity and Affordability, Environmental Leadership, Authentic Local Culture, and Transportation Innovation (SEAT). Briggs felt this was a good starting place for the new Council. They reflected City priorities, but the Council could change them as needed.

Council Member Toly noted the five priorities from community feedback were not equally weighted. She asked why local economy was in the same group as arts and culture. Council Member Doilney stated homegrown businesses were part of the authentic local culture. He also noted some elements meshed with others. Mayor Worel stated it was important to find other attractions so the snow would not be the only draw to Park City.

Council Member Rubell asked what staff would like so the priorities could flow into the day-to-day. He thought it was currently muddled. The priorities should be looked at through the lens of outcomes. Council Member Gerber agreed and noted there was good information from the visioning process, but the Council got stuck on acronyms and graphics. She wanted the message to be clear with or without graphics. She thought it was more important to have four important priorities and develop four goals that went with the priorities. She also felt that not everyone was represented in the community with the SEAT acronym. Regarding "Embracing Bold Action," she thought the words used should reflect action, i.e., building, creating, etc. Council Member Toly agreed and thought the former values still applied to the community. She didn't want to be a city that was okay in many things. She wanted to excel in a few things and keep the focus on those priorities.

Council Member Rubell looked at the graphic and thought the expected trajectory was quite different than the preferred trajectory, which was a strong signal for the Council. In looking at the chart, the community was feeling hopeless. He wanted to shift the sentiment to one that reflected the City was going in the right direction. The community was concerned about the current trajectory. He wanted to do things to shift that trajectory. He didn't want to ignore the hopelessness versus the preferred trajectory.

Council Member Dickey noted there were different opinions on where the City was headed, but there was a lot of agreement on the visioning. He thought there were some things that were more important than others. Council Member Doilney wanted to decide what was important and then do it. Council needed to figure out if they were starting from the same priorities and then pick a direction. The City proved it could do hard things, such as land preservation and environmental leadership. He knew if Council decided on priorities and stayed focused, a lot could get done. Council Member Rubell wanted to promote a building block approach, knowing what the ultimate target was.

Mayor Worel stated it was important to her to have a simple message and noted many in the City didn't know what the critical priorities were. Council Member Gerber thought the priorities were still as relevant as ever in the community. She thought the priorities should be elevated so progress could be made. She noted the term "pillars" gave a stagnant impression.

Council Member Toly felt there was a divide between businesses and local residents. She hoped that all the priorities would benefit small businesses as well as residents and noted small businesses were the fabric of the town. Council Member Rubell stated small businesses were part of the community and all would benefit. Council Member Toly thought the arts, culture, and local economy, and sustainable tourism could be combined into one pillar.

Council Member Doilney asserted the biggest problem was transportation and the ski resorts were not taking responsibility for their contribution to this problem. The City needed to hold these businesses accountable. Council Member Rubell indicated solutions needed to be proposed so there was a starting point. Council Member Toly noted the resorts were not listed in the visioning outreach process. Jager indicated the resorts were included in the focus groups.

Council Member Gerber stated some business owners no longer lived in town and that affected their decisions regarding traffic congestion and events. That division was something Council had to take into account. Council Member Toly stated many business owners in the community felt they were never invited to the conversation. Council Member Rubell thought a decision framework might be useful. Council would determine what looked good, and then weigh the pros and cons to come up with a focus.

IV. LUNCH

After a brief break, the meeting resumed.

V. HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND STRATEGIC DISCUSSIONS

Community Housing:

Jason Glidden, Rhoda Stauffer, and Elyse Kats, Housing Department, presented this item. Stauffer reviewed the Affordable Housing team's accomplishments this year, including forming a housing taskforce. Within the taskforce, there were subcommittees who agreed on the need for workforce housing, the need to preserve and create a complete community, and to focus on vulnerable populations. She stated it was unusual for a City to be involved to this extent in creating affordable housing. She displayed a timeline showing affordable housing efforts from the 1970s to the present and explained the City's efforts in acquiring a 650-unit housing inventory.

Kats stated the 800-unit affordable housing goal by 2026 was set in 2016. Council Member Gerber explained a housing study was done in 2016 and it found 15% of workforce lived in the City limits. The study stated the 800-unit goal was set to maintain the 15% workforce. Council Member Dickey indicated the Park City population was static and he didn't understand why the increase in housing was needed. Glidden stated the economy was growing and the workforce need was increasing as well. Council Member Dickey asked if the demand was resort driven, small business driven, etc., to which Glidden stated all of the above.

Council Member Toly asked what the requirements were for living in affordable housing. Glidden stated the applicants were required to live within the school district boundaries and he had data on where the workforce worked. Council Member Rubell asked if Council set the requirements to which Glidden affirmed. Council Member Rubell stated the City was behind in housing, and the current direction was to prefer housing in the City limits. He thought developments outside the City were good opportunities to help with the City's housing needs. Glidden indicated the current direction was to provide housing within City limits, but if there was an opportunity to acquire housing outside the City limits, that would be brought to Council for consideration.

Kats displayed a chart with City completed units and private party completed units. There were 679 units being planned. Council Member Doilney asked how many units were in City limits of the 304 planned private sector units, to which Glidden stated at least half. Council Member Doilney favored prioritizing units in town, with the next priority being next to town. Glidden indicated many of the planned units came from a private developer, and not from a housing obligation.

Council Member Rubell asked if City-built was defined as the City purchasing the building, to which Glidden affirmed. Council Member Rubell stated there were risk factors and he thought it would be helpful to know the risks that were related to the units to help determine how long potential developments would take to develop. Council Member Gerber stated the 375 potential units were based on the land currently owned by the City. If the goal was to maintain 15% of the workforce in town, building units outside of town would not contribute to that goal. She indicated units within City limits created community members, voters, and residents who could serve on boards and run for City offices. Council Member Rubell agreed there were benefits of having units in town, but there was a need to look at a broader picture for more opportunities. He didn't want to dismiss out of town opportunities.

Council Member Toly asked if the City wanted a certain number of attainable units and a certain number of affordable units. Glidden indicated the City wanted as many affordable units as possible. Council Member Toly asked what the process was if the City was approached to purchase property. Glidden stated the City was trying to stay ahead of the opportunities. Council Member Dickey related he participated in the recent Colorado Association of Ski Towns (CAST) meeting and some resort communities had some housing goals that were more qualitative and policy driven. He hoped the City could have some focus in that direction. Council Member Gerber didn't think every project would fit all housing needs. She thought no projects would get done if all housing needs had to be met, so the City had to move with new things and be nimble. She suggested having a housing emergency fund when opportunities came up. Council Member Doilney felt the measurement to a project was if it was community focused.

Council Member Toly stated there needed to be enforcement with the affordable units. Mayor Worel felt it was important that regional collaboration be considered for affordable housing. Council Member Rubell noted Crested Butte, Colorado, participated in regional collaboration and they reported it worked well. He thought the probability of reaching the 800-unit goal by 2026 was not attainable and that should be transparent with the community. He also thought the economic impact with affordable housing should be promoted.

Kats displayed the housing initiatives being worked on to move housing forward. Council Member Dickey asked for information on the Housing bond. Glidden explained in 2019, a bond was issued with the majority of funds going to the Housing Fund. Some funding was earmarked for a senior center, which was then tentatively reassigned for the Arts and Culture District.

Council Member Rubell proposed not taking any fee-in-lieu for affordable housing, since the actual units were needed the most. Council Member Gerber proposed increasing the fee-in-lieu to mirror the cost of building the unit. Council Member Rubell wanted the units prioritized over fees. He also proposed if a fee-in-lieu was accepted, it should reflect the cost of the unit at completion, since construction prices increased during construction. He wanted developers to think twice before opting for the fee-in-lieu. Council Member Dickey asked if the City was required to take a fee-in-lieu. Glidden stated housing options were provided so it wouldn't be considered an impact fee. Mark Harrington, Senior Attorney, stated a fee was not required and should be the last option in considering housing obligations. Council Member Gerber reviewed one developer bought deed restrictions on existing units, and she thought there was room to negotiate with each developer. Glidden stated he could come back to Council with a fee-in-lieu discussion.

Glidden reviewed he went before Council in 2018 to review all the City-owned parcels and their capability for affordable housing. Four parcels were prioritized: 100 Marsac, Mine Bench, Sommers, and Clark Ranch. Council requested to deprioritize 100 Marsac due to the steep hill and neighbor feedback. Council Member Toly asked why the property was purchased. Glidden stated he thought potential housing was the reason. Talisker deeded the land to the City as its housing obligation. Harrington stated the City acquired the parcel as part of the initial Bonanza Flat purchase, after ending a subdivision litigation. Council Member Gerber noted there were soils issues that would cost a lot to mitigate. Council didn't want to put a conservation easement on it in case it would pencil out in the future for housing. Glidden affirmed funds would be better spent on other projects. Council Member Toly asked if the property could be used as a trail. Council Member Gerber stated once a use was established, residents had a hard time letting it go at a future point.

Glidden reviewed the Mine Bench property was acquired in an exchange agreement with Redus through foreclosure proceedings. There were tenants on the property and Public Works used the parcel as well. This property was deprioritized for housing. Council Member Gerber explained other entities had interest in developing the parcel and Council asked them to bring a proposal, but the City didn't want to develop it at this point.

Glidden reviewed the Sommer parcel was purchased for open space and affordable housing. There were access issues and some slope issues on part of the parcel, and it was zoned Estate. Council Member Dickey asked what the City looked at before acquiring parcels. Glidden stated this parcel was offered at a good price. The City also looked at possible uses for the property. This property could be open space and affordable housing.

Glidden reviewed the Clark Ranch property was purchased in 2014 and the proposed use was affordable housing. In 2021, Council directed staff to get a feasibility study to know how much housing could be placed there.

Glidden stated the Woodside Park Phase II project was designed and the Planning Commission approved the Master Planned Development (MPD). A neighbor appealed the Planning Commission decision and the appeal was upheld. Council directed staff to redesign the project, but they didn't like the proposal. Staff was directed to move forward with the plat amendment and then come back to Council. Mayor Worel noted the senior citizens were interested in this development becoming a senior housing project because it was close to the senior center.

Glidden discussed the Homestake parcel and reviewed the history of the public/private partnership. Council would see concept designs in the next couple weeks. Council Member Rubell asked to see neighborhood strategic planning concurrent with this housing project. Council Member Toly agreed and asked what would happen with Recycle Utah and the future of Munchkin Road. She also asked to see more information on what could be done to create workforce on properties that already existed, such as lite deed, or ways to get people in homes that were vacant 70% of the time. Council Member Gerber asked for an emergency fund to make offers on available properties quickly. Council Member Doilney wanted to move forward appointing a housing authority to expedite the process and give Council clarity on direction. Council Member Rubell agreed with Council Member Doilney and expanded the request to be a regional housing authority. Council Member Toly thought it would be nice to know what the City's regional partners were doing with affordable housing. Council Member Rubell asked to see current data on the stratification of the workforce to know who the City was serving with these units and where they fell on the spectrum. He requested information on rentals versus owned units to understand how decisions were made with that regard. He asked to see the benefits of public/private partnerships and benefits of City developments so Council could have a well-informed conversation to set clear direction.

Council Member Doilney stated having a regional housing authority was a good idea, but it was important to have a local housing authority to maintain control over what could be accomplished as a City. He thought they could bring that data and give Council good direction. Council Member Rubell thought having a regional housing authority would achieve the outcomes the City was looking for. He felt there was a need to make decisions together. Council Member Gerber stated it was wise to look for new tools for this toolbox. She hoped to address workforce needs and vulnerable population needs, and she thought the City could learn from seeing what other entities were doing.

Council Member Dickey favored being bold and creative. He liked Council Member Toly's idea of making existing housing affordable. He wanted to take a look at nightly rentals, where they belonged, how to cluster them around resorts, and disincentivizing them. He requested to look at the nightly rental policy to see how the City could disincentivize them. Council Member Rubell wanted to revisit the parcel next to the Film Studio as a possible site for affordable units.

Glidden stated he would come back to review the Housing Resolution to look at fees-in-lieu and prioritization. He would also provide background and data of public/private partnerships. Dias stated the City was the most aggressive municipality in Utah with regard to affordable housing. The State would take notice if the City pushed developers too hard. It didn't mean risks couldn't be taken, but the Council had to be aware of them.

The City could build affordable housing, but it could work with private sector too. The City was running out of options for building affordable housing. He stated a work session would be planned in the next month or two to discuss these issues more. Council Member Gerber asserted equity and housing went hand in hand and wanted to talk about how housing reflected the community. Dias noted that would be included in the discussion.

Transportation:
Sarah Pearce, Deputy City Manager, stated there were many departments that worked regularly on Transportation. Kim Fjeldsted, Transit Manager, presented a timeline on Transit and other modes of transportation beginning in the 1970s. Julia Collins Transportation Planning Manager, continued reviewing the timeline. Alex Roy, Senior Transportation Planner, stated there were three time horizons: Immediate actions - peak traffic, people first streets, pilot programs; Short to mid-range actions and plans - transit routes, bike paths, crossings, NTMP, and road upgrades; and Long range planning - regional transportation projects, Bus Rapid Transit, environmental analysis, applying for federal grants, and the potential Olympic bid. He reviewed current transportation planning projects in progress, including the completion of the long-range transportation plan (LRTP), phase one of the short range transit plan (SRTP), which looked at transit routes and microtransit, the bicycle and pedestrian plan, which would include compiling a next steps list of the current plan, and different designs for the rail trail master plan.

Collins reviewed the planning process for a transportation project and noted the project could take years to plan and complete. John Robertson, City Engineer, displayed a list of transportation related capital projects and noted projects under construction included the Quinn's Junction park and ride lot, the Park Avenue bus shelter project, Rossie Hill roadway and utility improvements, and Rossie Hill stair connection to Deer Valley Loop Road. Projects in design were the McPolin Barn bus stop access improvement and the Homestake Road multi-use trail and road improvements. Projects in preliminary design included the Snow Creek Crossing feasibility study, Park Avenue roadway and active transportation improvements, Park City bus shelter and ADA improvements at 10 locations, and the Munchkin Road extension, roadway improvement, and multiuse trail installation.

Fjeldsted discussed transit solutions, including the SRTP, transit priority on SR224 and SR248, Bus Rapid Transit, Quinn's Park and Ride, the electric fleet, the microtransit pilot this summer, and bus stop improvements.

Collins reviewed in 2007, the City took out a $15 Million Walkability bond and a committee created a priority list. The last item on the list was being worked on now. The bicycle and pedestrian plan would create a new list of potential projects. So far, new bike racks had been installed around the City.

Pearce stated many staff were dedicated to working on peak day traffic management and she noted this was a regional effort. Jonathan Weidenhamer indicated they met with Mike Goar, Park City Mountain Resort (PCMR) General Manager, and he was very cooperative. Jenny Diersen stated transit priority would be focused on at the resort. The resort agreed to hiring additional transit on the weekends. They would have a queuing line in the parking lots. The City would give additional staffing and PCMR would help pay for that. Pedestrian crossings would be reduced so there would be less interaction with cars. There would also be continued residential mitigation. Weidenhamer indicated this plan would take place for the next few weeks as the ski season wrapped up. Council Member Gerber asked if charging for parking at the resort was discussed, to which Weidenhamer stated no. Diersen stated it could be discussed with the debrief at the end of the season. Council Member Toly asked how long it would last to which Diersen explained the plan was implemented on a week-to-week basis.

Pearce reviewed upcoming projects coming to Council. She asked for a Council liaison and also asked if the City needed a Transportation board, noting there was a need for higher level discussion as regional growth continued. Mayor Worel stated the Council heard the frustration of the community regarding traffic congestion.

Council Member Rubell asked if something changed in project prioritization. The community felt the City gathered information, but then they didn't see the improvement. He asked how the City would show results. Roy stated there was a lot of unseen projects, but some projects met the goals and timelines. He thought the projects could be publicized better as well as the current ongoing projects. Council Member Gerber reviewed a SR248 study was performed and a solution was given, but the community voted not to implement widening the road. Council Member Doilney stated people had a short-term memory. The transit operation center was a great accomplishment, as well as the bus barn and the Kimball Junction Transit Center. The efforts in bike sharing were amazing too. It would be good to remind residents of all the accomplishments. He was also excited for the Rail Trail Master Plan.

Council Member Rubell asked how Council could help move the visible things forward. There were event management successes, and he asked if staff needed more funding, workers, etc. Pearce stated as projects moved forward, neighbors would not always be aligned. It was important to have a liaison. Council Member Toly wanted the City to work on parking, intersections, and an overall neighborhood plan which included sidewalks, parking spots, snow removal, regional planning, etc. She also wanted to know the long-range goals. She expressed interest in looking at underground transportation. Collins stated the LRTP identified problem intersections. When the plan was complete, staff could get to work to develop solutions. She noted Roy looked at parking and they applied for a parking study grant. There was an Old Town parking study performed in 2016, but there needed to be one for the entire City. She was confident the plan would address some of Council's concerns.

Council Member Rubell asked for future discussions on what capacity the roads could handle, how ebikes played into the plans, how enforcement played into traffic management, and regarding regional transit, he noted there was redundancy in fixed costs in multiple bus systems and wanted to explore options such as bus size.

Council Member Dickey asked to look at efficiency with the two bus systems. Regarding, traffic and transit, what was the model, capacity, and was the City addressing the root cause. He thought it was a problem to discuss charging for parking at the ski resorts. Until the City figured out transit, he didn't want to force resorts to charge for parking and thought that could be an equity issue. He was excited to see the plans coming back and the progress that was made in the last week.

Council Member Doilney stated the two transit systems had been planned for a long time. There was intentional separation and that could be explained in depth. He indicated there was a limited capacity regardless of how wide the roads were. Building huge parking garages was not building community. The residents did not want that. It was not just about the roads, but it was the congested lines for amenities. There was a capacity that allowed the town to maintain its sense of community. He thought the capacity had been reached and now it was time to think about limiting capacity.

Council Member Rubell clarified he was looking for continued improvement. Council Member Toly wanted to know what responsibility the resorts had in the transportation plan. Council Member Gerber stated the redundancy in the transit systems would only be a problem if they had the same goals. She thought the City's goals were very different then a regional transit system's goals. She agreed with Council Member Doilney about capacity. She also agreed people took the transit improvements for granted and they didn't see all the work behind the benefits.

Council Member Rubell asked for information on what defined a peak day and how many peak days the City had. Pearce stated that would be addressed in the staff report for next week's meeting. Dias stated there was no silver bullet solution. Peak periods continued to be a major focus.

<u>Planning & Land Use:</u>
Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director, introduced her staff and explained the day-to-day duties of the Planning Department. Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director, detailed the process for Planning applications. She gave a history of land use regulations. The most recent General Plan was updated in 2014 and she noted there would be a visioning process as part of updating this plan. She noted the General Plan focused on the four community values. These values translated to Land Management Code amendments with regard to affordable housing, sustainability, dark sky code, transportation activity and long-range transportation planning. Ward indicated half of the Planning applications were for projects in the Historic District. A historic preservation consultant worked with staff weekly to help with the historic district design review process.

Alex Ananth, Senior Planner, explained the Planning Department staff's three boards and commissions: Planning Commission, Board of Adjustment, and Historic Preservation Board. She noted the function of each entity.

Milliken reviewed a timeline for starting the process to update the General Plan. She noted it could take two years or more, depending on the priority for getting it finalized, and the City could benefit from hiring a consultant. She hoped this process would receive feedback from the community. The State required that land use, transportation, and housing be addressed in the General Plan. Other elements the City might want to add was open space, conservation, historic preservation, and other City priorities. She noted this was a huge community engagement process.

Ananth stated the biggest challenges were growth management and handling new developments. Staff wanted to be aware of challenges as complete buildout came closer to realization. Council might need to rethink density. The City needed to be strategic and make planning an inclusive process, listening to all groups. It also needed strong boards that knew the rules and knew how to facilitate community engagement.

Council Member Rubell asked how the City could get out of the reactive mode, and asked if a moratorium should be enacted while the General Plan was drafted. Milliken stated staff discussed it many times. The fear was the flood of applications that would come in when the moratorium was over. Council Member Rubell thought Council could set expectations with community stakeholders, and he hoped the future applications would be rooted in a better foundation so they could be processed faster. He suggested some things could be streamlined so they would not have to go to Council for approval.

Council Member Toly stated Old Town wasn't the only area that had historic homes and asked if there was a plan for other areas so they would have a more restrictive code for remodeling or demolition. Milliken stated there was discussion of bringing in the ski era homes to the Historic Sites Inventory. She noted too many restrictions would kill the market value. Council Member Dickey thought a General Plan update was a different chance to have a discussion with the community. It was an opportunity to go to neighborhoods, HOA meetings, grocery stores, and write down the resident's responses. He was open to a moratorium to help with the General Plan process.

Council Member Gerber acknowledged all the Planning Department did and the divisive issues that were present. She was willing to do anything necessary to move the City goals forward. Council Member Doilney stated updating the General Plan was an opportunity to bring people together and educate them on where the City was going. The City was at capacity and a plan was needed to deal with it. Council Member Toly stated there was the extended community beyond the 84060 zip code. She realized the community was more than 12 neighborhoods. Even though the City was at capacity, the surrounding areas were not at capacity and they were growing fast. This needed to be taken into account as the General Plan was updated.

Mayor Worel opened the meeting for public input. No comments were given. Mayor Worel closed the public input portion of the meeting.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

____
Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder