



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JANUARY 18, 2023**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Laura Suesser, Vice-Chair Sarah Hall, John Kenworthy, Christin Van Dine, John Frontero, Henry Sigg

EX OFFICIO: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; John Robertson, City Engineer; Matthew Neeley, Transportation Director; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Laura Suesser called the meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. She reported that the only item on the agenda was the Deer Valley Snow Park Village Redevelopment – Master Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit. There would be presentations from Staff, the applicant, Commissioner discussion, and public comment. Chair Suesser was not sure how much input would be received during the Work Session but there would be another opportunity for public input at the future City Council public hearing. The meeting would not run past 9:00 p.m. During the public input portion of the meeting, Chair Suesser explained that she would turn the time over to Vice-Chair Sarah Hall. Since Chair Suesser was participating in the meeting remotely and Vice-Chair Hall was in the Council Chambers, it would be easier for Vice-Chair Hall to navigate that specific portion of the meeting.

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken reported that all of the microphones were on. She hoped that communication would be better for those watching and participating virtually. Roll call was taken and all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Johnson, who was excused.

Commissioner Kenworthy disclosed that he is a landlord and has a seasonal campus underneath the dam. Deer Valley has been his tenant for more than 15 years. He stated that it would not impact any of his decisions.

Commissioner Van Dine disclosed that she owns property in the Lakeside Condominium area. That ownership would not impact her decisions.

Vice-Chair Hall disclosed that she is a longtime client of Snell & Wilmer. That would not have an impact on the Deer Valley Snow Park application.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked for an update on the street capacities and intersection ratings. City Engineer, John Robertson, reported that some traffic studies had been gathered. An evaluation and analysis had begun but he did not have anything to present tonight. He wanted other departments to review the material first to ensure that it is consistent.

2. Deer Valley Snow Park Village Redevelopment – Master Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit – The Planning Commission will hold a Work Session Focused on Transportation, Circulation, and Parking. PL21-04767 & PL-21-04811.

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth was joined by Transportation Director, Matthew Neeley and Engineer Robertson. All three would share presentations with the Planning Commission. In addition, the City's independent third-party Traffic Engineer, Gary Horton, from Wall Consulting Group ("WCG") was present. After the Staff presentation, the applicant would present. The presentations would be followed by Planning Commission questions, public input, and additional discussion. Planner Ananth reported that the purpose of the meeting was for the Planning Commission to determine if they were ready to make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the overall site, circulation, and the parking plan.

Planner Ananth reminded those present that the application involved an amendment to the existing Master Planned Development ("MPD") as well as a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") for Phase 1 of the project. Phase 1 included the Conceptual Site and Circulation Plan, South Parcel Parking Structure, and the new Transit Center, as well as Road and Utility Improvements. There was one major change since the project was last discussed by the Planning Commission. The applicant had since dropped their request for a Parking Waiver and would now construct the required number of parking stalls as stated in the Land Management Code ("LMC") or defer the request to a later CUP phase. The Staff Report included responses to some of the questions raised at the last Planning Commission Meeting. It also included Exhibit A, which was the applicant's responses to many of the questions from the December 2022 meeting.

At the December 2022 and March 2022 meetings, the Planning Commission and Council asked the applicant for circulation alternatives that did not rely on the vacation of the public right-of-way. Alternative plans had not been submitted to the City to date. The applicant was requesting a review of the plans that were submitted. Alternative C was reviewed at the last Planning Commission Meeting, which included the Shared Mobility Lane ("SML"). Of the three plans the applicant submitted, the City preferred the SML plan. Planner Ananth reviewed the transportation goals the City put in place for the project, which were as follows:

- Prioritizing and incentivizing increased transit use with dedicated bus lanes between the Y-intersection and the resort as well as an improved transit station at the resort;
- Prioritizing safe pedestrian and bicycle access and connectivity to and around the site, including the popular Deer Valley Loop;
- Right-sizing parking and using paid parking as a tool to support increased transit use;
- An actionable Traffic Demand Management ("TDM") program for the resort that prioritizes transit and ensures a modal shift is achieved through annual review; and
- Sufficient emergency egress to US-40.

Staff felt that the SML plan responded best to the transportation goals listed above. The SML plan, as well as the traffic signal at the Y-intersection and Doe Pass Road, prioritized transit on peak days and provided safe crossings for pedestrians. The SML lane provided a substantial 11-foot-wide bicycle lane when it was not being used during the ski season. Planner Ananth noted that the traffic signal at the Y-intersection was warranted and would assist with traffic between Deer Valley Drive East and West and also provide a safe crossing for pedestrians. The applicant had also proposed a 12-foot-wide multi-use path, which would improve the pedestrian experience around the entire Deep Valley Loop. The applicant submitted an actionable TDM and agreed to annual review meetings with the City. The SML would also improve emergency response times. Staff believed

there would be sufficient emergency egress to US-40 between the various roads, including Snow Top Road, Deer Hollow Road, Rising Star Lane, and Aerie Drive. The Emergency Response Plan was attached as an Exhibit to the Staff Report.

Director Neeley reported that last fall the City Council adopted the Long-Range Transportation Plan, which was called Park City Forward. The plan provided the guiding principles for the City's transportation system. Director Neeley reviewed the transportation blueprint:

- Develop a Park Once community;
- Collaborate with regional partners on long-range transportation solutions;
- Identify, manage, and mitigate traffic during peak conditions;
- Expand on world-class biking and walking infrastructure;
- Proactively review and analyze disruptive transportation and transit ideas and innovation; and
- Continue to develop and improve the internal Park City transit system.

As a companion to Park City Forward, the Transportation Planning team developed a Short-Range Transit Plan. The plan focused on transit, strategies to improve ridership, and service for the community. The Short-Range Transit Plan was nearing completion and targeted one-to-five-year transit improvement projects. Director Neeley explained that the plan will :

- Evaluate current transit ridership and project future demand;
- Explore new transit programs, such as micro-transit and aerial transit;
- Contemplate route adjustments to provide faster and more direct transit service to major destinations;
- Consider growth and increased demand at both resort base areas.

Elements of the Short-Range Transit Plan were put in place as part of the Winter Operations Plan. A micro transit pilot was implemented, service was added to the Richardson Flat Park and Ride, and service was increased on critical routes. Planner Neeley noted that the response from the community had been positive so far and there was increased ridership. The City was also moving forward with several initiatives identified in the plan. Some of the short-term initiatives included the 224 Bus Rapid Transit Project, upgrading the most utilized bus stops, seeking Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") support for short-term transit solutions on SR-248, and advancing technological solutions. The latter could include traffic signal prioritization, dynamic parking strategies, and centralized communication platforms for the region.

Long-term initiatives included advancing SR-248 as a major transit corridor, looking at remote parking options, and considering the feeder streets (Bonanza Drive and Deer Valley Drive). Bonanza Drive was also included in the Bonanza District Small Area Plan, which would be launched shortly. Director Neeley reported that in 2025, UDOT would reconstruct a portion of Deer Valley Drive, between Park Avenue and the Marsac roundabout. Park City was working with UDOT to include bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic safety improvements in that project. There were two regional collaboration efforts underway as well. Mayor Nann Worel convened a Regional Working Group to discuss transportation solutions. Additionally, Summit County and the Mountainland Association of Governments ("MAG") formed a Wasatch Back Regional Planning organization that was focused on transportation. There was a lot taking place.

Engineer Robertson stated that the City supported the applicant's proposed circulation elements, specifically the SML. This was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to apply the elements of Park City Forward in that part of town. As mentioned previously, the SML provided greater seasonal flexibility for transit, especially during the peak traffic that was experienced during the winter season. The SML allowed transit to bypass the congestion that could develop along the loop. This helped transit gain critical time between bus stops. Any improvements in time would benefit the overall transit system. Additionally, the SML increased opportunities for active transportation users. The applicant would provide a wider multi-use trail adjacent to Deer Valley and the SML would provide additional ways to separate various users of the multi-use lane.

Planner Ananth reiterated that the Planning Commission needed to determine if they were ready to make a recommendation to the City Council or if additional time was needed. Policy feedback from the Commission regarding the degree of good cause for the right-of-way could be forwarded to the City Council with the Planning Commission's recommendation. Alternatively, the Planning Commission could request another Joint Meeting with the City Council to discuss Commission input with respect to good cause for the right-of-way vacation.

Deer Valley President and COO, Todd Bennett, introduced himself and reported that Deer Valley Land Use Attorney, Wade Budge; Vice Present of Resort Planning, Hannah Tyler; Director of Development at Alterra Mountain, Jake Romney; and Traffic Engineer from Fehr & Peers, John Nepstad, were present to share information with the Commission. Mr. Budge reported that the input received from the Commission and the public was taken into consideration as the various project details were updated and revised. The desire was for a recommendation to be forwarded to the City Council. Mr. Budge reminded the Commissioners that the application dealt with entitlements that were established back in the 1970s. Consistency was important as was incorporating the values the City had since added to its plans. Certain refinements were made to add those elements to the application.

Mr. Romney reported that the plan met standards and was tied to the transportation plans referenced earlier in the meeting. With the new signal to the Y-intersection and a signal at the Doe Pass/Deer Valley Drive East intersection, transit would be prioritized, and vehicular traffic would be metered through those sections. Solamere Drive was identified as an area with a Level of Service D. That was considered acceptable at the last Planning Commission Meeting due to the impact being on peak days from 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Currently, when someone arrives at Snow Park, there is only one arrival experience. An important part of mitigating traffic was having multiple arrival and departure points within the project.

Drop-offs were discussed. Mr. Romney stated that having multiple arrival points throughout the property meant that demand for the drop-off would be reduced. The drop-off would be much safer than it is currently, there would be direct access to Ski School, and the drop-off point would be closer. Additionally, the drop-off would also be on grade. Mr. Romney reported that the area for shuttles was added back in so there could be drop-offs and pickups there as well. One of the benefits was that walking distances would improve overall. The Carpenter and Silver Lake lifts would become approximately 100 feet closer than they were currently. Parking in the garage would also be closer because the lifts were being extended toward the village. Any grade changes would be handled by an escalator or elevator.

Mr. Romney discussed the transit hub and arrival area. Deer Valley's goal was to reduce the need for single-occupancy vehicles. This would be done in many ways both prior to and during development of the village. The mobility hub was one of the main components and would make

future transit routes more frequent and be the most desirable way to access the resort. It would essentially become the new front door to Deer Valley. It was a place where someone could start and end the day. He reported that there would be a state-of-the-art transportation hub with room for six buses. The area would be covered to provide protection from the elements. In addition, it would be safer and there would be restrooms, lockers, and other amenities nearby. This component of the design is tied into the SML. Mr. Romney noted that there would also be a bus charging station installed as a way to advance sustainability goals. There would be a waiting area as well with real-time bus line data.

As for day skier arrivals, there would be a route to quickly enter the garage. Mr. Romney reported that there would be assisted parking technology to identify what levels have available parking spots. There would be 10-foot clear ceilings inside. It would be possible to exit easily onto Doe Pass Road and leave via Deer Valley Drive West or exit around the loop on Deer Valley Drive East. Additional information about parking was shared. Mr. Romney reported that they were no longer asking for a 20% parking reduction. The decision was made to follow the LMC. That meant there needed to be 2,262 parking stalls. This would be achieved through the four levels of parking on Lots 1 through 4, where there would be 1,340 spots. When Lot 5 was developed, there would be a three-level parking garage with 922 spots, achieving the necessary stalls.

The improvements to the multi-use path were discussed. Mr. Romney explained that there would be a path around the entire loop and across the new plaza. It would maintain recreation as it was currently experienced. Since the path across the plaza was also the emergency vehicle access, it would be kept clear of tables and chairs so both emergency vehicles and bicycles could move across. With the new paths, there were more options for pedestrian arrival access and year-round recreation than currently existed on the site. One of the questions that had been asked by the Commission previously had to do with a plan that did not include a right-of-way vacation. Mr. Romney confirmed that other options had been explored, but the current plan made the most sense. It connected everyone to a world-class resort through transit, biking, walking, a gondola, and a connected ski beach. The plan prioritized transit with the transit hub and the SML.

Mr. Bennett explained that everyone had worked hard to make sure the circulation functioned well and that transit was prioritized. There would be multiple arrival methods, the parking would be streamlined, and there would be thoughtfully located drop-off points. He explained that the Deer Valley team was available to answer any outstanding Commissioner questions.

Vice-Chair Hall was generally in favor of the SML. She noted that in the Staff Report, the City Engineer concluded that the 11-foot lanes were sufficient for the width of two buses and a delivery truck. She requested additional details about that conclusion. Engineer Robertson explained that 11-foot lanes are considered acceptable for collector roads. There had also been conversations with those involved in transit and drivers confirmed that the 11-foot-wide lanes would provide enough space for two buses to drive past one another with enough room for mirrors. With the SML, there would be opportunities for those vehicles to maneuver around more if necessary. Vice-Chair Hall asked what would happen if there was a lot of snow on the side of the roads. She wanted to understand if the flex lane would become a snow lane. This was denied.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked the applicant to discuss the future connection to Old Town. It was assumed that Commissioner Kenworthy was referencing the gondola. That was set up so it could become a mid-station and tie into Old Town if that was desired. That infrastructure could be put into place. Ms. Tyler explained that the former Mayor had bold ideas and wanted to bring a gondola network into town. Deer Valley did not necessarily intend to construct the gondola, but Deer Valley

could be part of that solution should the City choose to move forward with that approach. Engineer Robertson noted that he was not certain the alignment would be feasible.

Vice-Chair Hall requested additional information about the traffic signals. Engineer Robertson reported that the existing traffic warranted the placement of a signal. That was separate from the project-related traffic that would exist after development. Signals were typically placed to improve the safety and efficiency of an intersection. He had not looked at a roundabout in the location but believed the applicant had. When a roundabout is placed, there are a lot of rights-of-way. With a signal, the same level of service requirements were met but it took a lot less area to install. City Staff believed that was a better solution. Technically, there was enough space to have a roundabout, but if that was pursued, large retaining walls would be needed because there was a change in grade on the north side. The impacts on the area would be significant. Vice-Chair Hall wondered if there were any other proposed alternatives for the second signal. Engineer Robertson explained that there was an opportunity to have priority through that intersection.

Mr. Horton introduced himself and discussed the Y-intersection. He explained that whoever enters the roundabout first gets priority. The benefit of a signal was that if there was traffic on both Deer Valley East and Deer Valley West, the City would have the ability to control who received priority. That would not be possible with a roundabout. He noted that if there was an emergency vehicle or bus that needed to move through, the path could be cleared. Vice-Chair Hall asked if there were any other options to address the temporary peak times. Mr. Horton noted that having police on site was an option, but that could be expensive.

Commissioner Van Dine asked if signals were generally considered safer for pedestrians than roundabouts. This was confirmed. Chair Suesser had a question about the analysis submitted by Mr. Horton. It stated that he was not provided with enough detail about the drop-off and pick-up areas to properly analyze the adequacy of those locations. She asked him to elaborate. Mr. Horton explained that the level of detail provided for other areas was not provided for the drop-off and pick-up areas. As a result, he did not know exactly how many vehicles there would be. If there was more data, it would be easier to analyze and support the proposal. Chair Suesser wondered if he had been able to analyze the addition of the shuttle area. Mr. Horton denied this.

Vice-Chair Hall asked how far the SML flex lane would go. Engineer Robertson explained that it would go around the entirety of the loop. The bus would have priority around the loop but not for egress. Every opportunity to improve transit times would be recommended. Vice-Chair Hall wondered if there would be enough space for the SML lane to continue to the roundabout. This was denied. To do that, additional right-of-way would be needed.

Chair Suesser had additional questions related to the drop-off and pick-up area. In addition to shuttles and personal vehicles, there were also service vehicles and employee vehicles listed. She had concerns about the additional traffic created by employees and service vehicles in addition to all of the other pickups and drop-offs. Mr. Horton reported that WCG had not analyzed that. It was clarified that this would not be an area employees would use during peak hours. Chair Suesser asked the applicant whether a pickup and drop-off area was contemplated on Deer Valley Drive West so there could be two drop-off areas. Engineer Robertson clarified that on Deer Valley Drive West, the grades prohibited an effective drop-off and pick-up area.

Commissioner Sigg wondered if there was a mitigation plan for the drop-off area. He had questions about the flow and convenience. Additionally, he had questions related to Doe Pass Road. For instance, who would own the road and the width of the right-of-way. If a loop was being created, the

loop needed to flow effectively. If there was a chokepoint where the loop was not flowing effectively, this could create issues. The width of Doe Pass Road, the right-of-way, and how much throughflow existed were important to consider. Last, he asked what would happen with on-street parking on the loop road. Mr. Romney addressed some of the questions posed by Commissioner Sigg. He reported that on-street parking would be removed with the new parking structures. There would not be any on-street parking in the future. As far as circulation, he believed there would be behavioral changes at the drop-off.

Commissioner Sigg wondered how there would be behavioral changes. In his experience, behavioral change does not happen often. Most people focus on what works and is the most convenient. Behavioral changes could be difficult to implement. Mr. Nepstad explained that whatever saves time will drive behavior. Once visitors discover that it is faster to park and unload than it was to drop off and then park, that behavior would shift. Mr. Bennett explained that the experience proposed for the parking garage was something that was not there currently. The ease of use and amenities would alter the behaviors. He noted that the design made sure there were multiple ways to arrive. The plans accounted for visitors who want to drop off, those who want access to a locker or the village, and those who want transit. A lot of different elements were incorporated to ensure that many preferences were accounted for.

Chair Suesser asked what efforts Deer Valley had made to increase bus ridership in Park City. A lot of locals would be more willing to take the bus if it was more convenient and there were direct routes to Deer Valley. There were disincentives to drive but not enough incentives for transit. Mr. Bennett explained that one of the major incentives focused on multi-modal elements. That was not something that was required by Code. It was something being offered because it made the plan better and showed Deer Valley's commitment to creating value. He noted that there were a lot of comments during the open houses about more direct transit routes. Through that process, he learned that there were certain regulations related to funding. A route couldn't move from a private lot directly to a ski facility. There needs to be an intermediate stop. Park City Staff did a good job and made sure the experience was the best it could be. Deer Valley would continue to work with the City so the systems were effective.

Director Neeley reported that the current buses were purchased with federal funds, which prevented there from being a direct route from a location to a destination. The routes depended on where the funds came from. If the City or resort funded the bus, then direct service could be provided. Chair Suesser believed that could be a proposed alternative. She often hears from locals that it is not convenient to take the bus due to the transfers. Commissioner Sigg had a question related to federal funding. He wondered if the rules apply to the entire bus line or only for the buses that were purchased with federal funds. Director Neeley believed the rules applied for each bus purchased with the funds.

Chair Suesser did not believe ridership would increase significantly if the bus routes remained the same. She encouraged the City and Deer Valley to provide more direct routes and make ridership convenient. Vice-Chair Hall supported the comments shared by Chair Suesser. She noted that micro transit is currently being explored and may be part of the solution.

Vice-Chair Hall wondered why regular shuttles would go to the loading zone rather than the new front door mobility hub. Planner Ananth clarified that the mobility hub, as designed, was to support transit operations only. There was no desire to have other vehicles interfering there. She explained that there was sufficient room in the drop-off area. The idea of separating transit drop-offs from private vehicles and shuttles was something City Staff supported. Vice-Chair Hall pointed out that

the transit hub would be larger than the drop-off zone and also be more convenient. If it was the new front door, she felt shuttles should utilize it. Planner Ananth stated that there was no desire for buses to mix with other vehicles. Vice-Chair Hall asked if the bays were envisioned to only be for Park City Municipal buses. It was clarified that it was envisioned to be for both Park City Municipal buses and High Valley Transit.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed that time was the main factor in terms of the success or failure of transit. However, due to limitations that were in place, there were no direct routes to Deer Valley. He expressed concerns about parking and existing enforcement issues. There needed to be parking enforcement as many people would try to avoid paying by parking in nearby neighborhoods or driving two cars to the resort area but only parking one on the actual resort. This was not good for the neighbors or for people who lived nearby. He wondered if Deer Valley had a plan to address that. It was noted that Deer Valley would enforce on their own property. There could be discussions with the City about enforcement outside of the Deer Valley area. Commissioner Kenworthy stressed the importance of there being a partnership.

Chair Suesser noted that in the Staff Report, the City's long-term planning and traffic mitigation strategies pertained to additional and centralized parking infrastructure. It also specified that the plan supported and sought solutions such as off-site parking locations. She did not see those strategies incorporated into the Deer Valley Plan and wanted to understand why. Planner Ananth explained that the Staff Report discussed the City's plans to develop off-site parking. For instance, Richardson Flat, where transit service started with a 20-minute headway. The City was still looking at other options for additional off-site parking. Engineer Robertson explained that there would be continued discussions to determine where park and rides should be focused. The City was working with Summit County on this and UDOT was interested as well. Richardson Flat was the first location and there would be expansion. Planner Ananth pointed out that Deer Valley used Treasure Mountain Junior High School on occasion for overflow parking.

Vice-Chair Hall asked if the gondola was envisioned to run through the evening. This was confirmed. She wondered if night skiing was an option that might encourage visitors to delay their ski exit. The worst of the traffic was from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Mr. Bennett noted that Deer Valley was open to many creative solutions. Additional options could be explored to mitigate exit traffic. For instance, there could be programming, entertainment, or other activities in or around the Snow Park Base Village. It was noted that in the future, there would be more dining options and there would be a more dynamic experience.

Commissioner Sigg referenced the gondola operation hours. He wondered what the hours were specifically. It was clarified that the concept was to have a connection that could be used during evening time periods. However, the specific hours had not been determined. Commissioner Van Dine asked about the Deer Valley direct shuttles. She wanted to know if those covered the Solamere neighborhood. Ms. Tyler did not have the list of Homeowners Associations ("HOAs") that had opted in, but there were select HOAs that had chosen to pay for the service. Commissioner John Frontero asked about the percentage of HOAs that had opted in. Ms. Tyler did not have the exact number, but there were at least 15 HOAs currently participating.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked for additional information about the micro-transit plan. Director Neeley explained that micro transit was currently set up in zones. Some shuttles operate in Park Meadows that would take people from Park Meadows and drop them off at the nearest bus stop. If those people wanted to reach Deer Valley, that shuttle may take them to Old Town to take a bus to the resort. Micro transit offered first and last-mile transportation, which was often a missing piece.

There were fixed routes all over the City that brought people to major destinations, but there were small pockets where it was difficult to access those routes. That was where micro transit could come in handy, but there was a transfer involved. Commissioner Kenworthy wondered if there was a vehicle occupancy number that would allow the micro-transit shuttles into the bus lanes. Director Neeley stated that there was a desire to prioritize transit and incentivize people to use it. This was being done in several different ways.

Executive Director of High Valley Transit, Caroline Rodriguez introduced herself. She wanted to supplement the information shared about the micro-transit operations. Ms. Rodriguez explained that the Royal Street residents did receive a direct ride to the Deer Valley base. That was because parameters were set in the system where sometimes a fixed route trip could be prioritized. However, that was only if it made sense for the trip. For instance, if it was the most efficient way for the rider to get there and it was the most efficient use of the system-wide vehicles. In the case of Royal Street, it made the most sense for there to be a direct ride from Royal Street to their destination, because a fixed route connection was not convenient for them. That was how the micro-transit system addressed issues of efficiency and time spent traveling. The operators of the micro-transit system could set the parameters. This was to ensure there was efficiency.

Chair Suesser wondered how the applicant would address the driveway widths and turning radius issues that WCG pointed out in their report. The driveways on Doe Pass Road, the driveway across from Royal Street, and the driveway on Deer Valley Drive East all failed to meet the LMC requirements. In addition, the turning radius off of Deer Valley Drive East and on/off of Doe Pass Road was also deemed inadequate. It was noted that those radiuses had been reworked in the failing locations. Those exhibits could be shared with City Staff. As far as the width of Doe Pass Road, it was at least three lanes wide. In terms of the ownership of Doe Pass Road, Deer Valley was okay with owning and operating it or with the City owning and operating it.

Commissioner Sigg asked if it would be possible to establish micro transit routes that were ski resort only. Director Neeley believed that tied back to the earlier discussion about the types of buses being used. If there was a desire to run a resort-service-only micro transit vehicle, that was an option, but it needed to be funded. Chair Suesser wanted to know how much of the bus fleet in the City had been purchased with federal funds. Director Neeley informed her that it all had. Ms. Rodriguez believed it would be worth looking at the charter requirements again. She believed the charter requirement had little to do with the funds for the capital purchase of the vehicle and more to do with how the vehicle operated. She thought the requirement was that the vehicles could be used to provide park-and-ride-to-resort service if there was operational funding. The limiting factor was that the service needed to be open to the general public. Ms. Rodriguez suggested that her team meet with City Staff to reexamine the charter and funding requirements to make sure all information was current and correct. Director Neeley clarified that last spring, he had spoken to Utah Transit Authority ("UTA") to better understand the limitations. He was following the guidance provided to him by UTA at that time. However, it would be possible to have a conversation with Ms. Rodriguez and ensure all information was correct.

Vice-Chair Hall opened the public comment period.

Larry Dickerson pointed out that the applicant had not responded to the Commission's requests for alternatives. He felt it was appropriate to defer a decision until the requested data was received. Mr. Dickerson believed it would be possible to test out whatever plan was proposed using orange cones. This could indicate what the traffic flow would look like. The applicant could choose a busy month and see whether the planned design would work as intended. Mr. Dickerson informed the

Commission that the applicant had increased lift ticket prices for seniors and had also increased the locker prices. Some outstanding issues needed to be addressed. He reiterated that it was important to look at other alternatives and determine the existing rights.

Allison Keenan identified herself as one of the co-founders of Protect the Loop. LMC 15-6 set forth criteria to review MPDs, which included protecting residential neighborhoods from the impacts of non-residential uses using best practice methods and diligent code enforcement. Under code section 15-6-5, all MPDs must contain certain minimum requirements. According to the applicant, no variances were being requested, but certain minimum requirements of the LMC would not be met without granting a right-of-way vacation. As for setbacks, the minimum setback around the exterior boundary of an MPD needed to be 25 feet for parcels greater than two acres. The current building placements would not be possible without the right-of-way vacation.

Ms. Keenan noted that for open space, all MPDs needed to contain a minimum of 60% open space, but the current open space calculations of 63% were achieved only when the Snow Park Lodge parcel was combined with the Snow Park Village parcel and included the right-of-way vacation. For site planning, the LMC stated that the project needed to be designed to fit the site rather than the site being modified to fit the project. The current site for the MPD was 14.93 acres but the right-of-way vacation would increase the size of the site by 2.6 acres. She did not believe the plan was designed to fit the current project site and site modifications had been sought out.

Ms. Keenan reported that the site plan for an MPD needed to include transportation amenities, including drop-off areas for van and shuttle service. Based on the letter from Mr. Romney dated January 9, there were 10 shuttles every 15 minutes. The new drop-off area would be 63% of the current size based on the plans submitted. A drop-off area for shuttles had been added after the December 2022 Planning Commission Meeting, but it showed there was space for only three shuttles. Ms. Keenan noted that site planning should include safe pedestrian and bicycle travel to adjoining public sidewalks. There was no plan to move pedestrians and bicycles safely to Queen Esther or Solamere from the multi-use path. She stated that service and delivery areas should be kept separate from pedestrian areas, but the multi-use path went across a delivery area on Deer Valley Drive West. Mr. Keenan did not believe the application met the code requirements.

Ms. Keenan expressed concerns about traffic in the area. She reported that under LMC 15-6-6, all MPDs needed to address and mitigate traffic. Based on the November Transportation Analysis from Fehr & Peers, the additional trip generation could total 3,850 cars per day. Due to transit usage, paid parking, and internal capture rates, that number was reduced to 2,276 car trips per day. That was a reduction of 41%. The retail stores and restaurants could generate 1,193 car trips per day but that was reduced to 94. She did not feel that was realistic and believed the Fehr & Peers numbers were understated. Per the WCG report, many traffic situations required additional evaluation. Ms. Keenan pointed out that during a previous meeting, Staff had noted that the proposed circulation plan hindered emergency response access and response time. WCG suggested maintaining the existing loop to the base for emergency access. Under the current plan, there would be emergency access through a private gate and then across the plaza. She did not feel that was an acceptable suggestion. Ms. Keenan reiterated her belief that the application had not satisfied the requirements of the LMC.

Robert Boone stated that he was a full-time resident. He shared comments related to material harm. Under the code, there needed to be a finding of no material harm to residents or the community. Mr. Boone believed there were several material harms that would be a result of the proposed plan. There would be an increased risk because it would be difficult for emergency services to have

access. Additionally, vacating the right-of-way would cut off current access to significant portions of the existing loop, including access to the base of Deer Valley Resort. The proposed changes to the existing infrastructure and traffic system would cost the Fire Department and EMS service critical time when it mattered most. He felt that risk was unacceptable. He noted that traffic congestion in the area would cause additional accidents and injuries. This would result in higher costs to the City when it came to emergency services.

Mr. Boone pointed out that the plan would result in a loss of public use of the existing loop. Many residents used the current loop and it provided immediate access to Snow Park. Even with the design of the drop-off area, that immediate access would be lost with the vacation of the right-of-way. Recreational activities would be significantly impacted as a result. Mr. Boone discussed skier trespassing on private easements. He explained that skiers would avoid the parking fees by parking in private neighborhoods, many of which had private easements for ski-in/ski-out access. That would impede access to residents in those neighborhoods, increase traffic, and increase both liability risks and insurance costs for the HOAs. In addition, this would increase the risk of vandalism, burglary, and other crimes in the neighborhood. Mr. Boone expressed concerns related to employee parking. Employees who currently park in Lot 3 would be unable to do so. There were many material harms that needed to be taken into consideration.

Laurel Barry was an owner at In The Trees and serves as Board President. In The Trees presented a letter in December 2022 and Mr. Budge responded to part of that letter. However, there were a few points that had not been addressed. For instance, the potential encroachment onto private property. The proposal was to widen the road and the sidewalks so there were three lanes and a wider sidewalk. In Exhibit B, the red lines showed the areas of the loop that would require more land to accomplish that goal. Ms. Barry wanted to know what studies had been done to determine the owners of the land. It was necessary to have that information before the Planning Commission made any decisions about the application.

Ms. Barry explained that In The Trees is also concerned about the turn onto Doe Pass Road. Currently, the ingress and egress were only off of Deer Valley Drive West going in the northbound direction. For In The Trees owners and guests to exit, they needed to take a right turn, go northbound on the Deer Valley loop west, and make a U-turn at the intersection of Royal and Deer Valley Drive West. Then they needed to go back down Deer Valley Drive West in the northbound direction. If residents were unable to do that, it would create material harm and make it difficult to access the properties. She asked that the traffic flow be addressed.

Bill Siraco referenced a comment made by Commission Sigg earlier in the meeting about changes in behavior. He shared an example of behavior changes with the Commission. For the past three seasons, he had been parking at the garage at Mountain Village at PCMR. He had not seen anyone there drop people off and then come back to park. The convenience of pulling into the parking garages at Deer Valley would likely change the existing visitor behaviors. Mr. Siraco noted that there had been questions about shuttle drop-off in the bus area. He noted that the bus service was timed while a shuttle drop-off was less scheduled. Adding more vehicles into that bus drop-off area could jeopardize the ability of the buses to stay on schedule. Both schedule and timing were very important for transit. As for the discussion about a federally funded transit system, the question was whether there could be a public/private partnership so the City operated buses could have direct routes. He asked that this option be explored further.

Deb Rentfrow applauded Ms. Keenan for the research she had done. Ms. Rentfrow noted that Commissioner Kenworthy had asked Engineer Robertson about specific traffic studies and the

response was that the information was not available to present. She believed that understanding the feasibility of direct bus routes, needed to be figured out before any sort of recommendation was forwarded to the City Council. Ms. Rentfrow understood why shuttle buses were being separated from the transit, but believed space for three shuttles was not enough. She also noted that in the applicant comment response, on Page 12, it stated that Deer Valley did not do any staging for their shuttles. This was surprising to her. It seemed that a location for the shuttles would need to be properly incorporated into the plan. In the study that discussed the Level of Service D at Solamere, it was reported that the issue was only from 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Based on the traffic levels she had seen in the current year, which was hard to believe.

Ms. Rentfrow discussed the drawing for snow storage. All of the snow storage was proposed to be piled next to the ingress and egress of the parking garage. The way it was drawn, a visitor would need to pull into the crosswalk to have a line of sight and depart safely. That was something that was already an issue at multiple locations in Park City. She asked that there be additional thought and focus to ensure that this did not occur at Deer Valley.

Maureen Murtaugh wanted everyone to consider the fact that micro transit could add to traffic at the drop-off area. She was encouraged that there would be multiple ways for people to access the resort but was concerned about micro transit since it could not use the bus lanes and could not use the bus drop off. That could result in the drop-off area being inadequate. There was an opportunity to expand the width of Doe Pass Road so not only buses could move through there, but there could be egress of cars from both sides of the loop for departure. It was important to think about the desired outcomes and create solutions that would achieve those outcomes.

Scott Martin explained that he was a full-time resident of Amber Daystar. He had some questions for the Commission. If there were three lanes of roadway, he wondered how much time the buses would save. He believed the study showed that it would be approximately 67 seconds. He also had a question about mode splits and asked how the traffic would be divided between Deer Valley Drive West and Deer Valley Drive East. After looking at the submitted plans, the majority of the traffic was being pressed onto Deer Valley Drive East and Deer Valley Drive North. He asked the Commission to look at the mode splits carefully. As far as the grades, it was possible to place garage entrances on the west side and continue the loop on the west side. Mr. Martin asked about the flex lane. He wondered who would enforce that lane to ensure that there were only buses. Concerns were expressed about the drop-off area design.

Bill Watson reported that he lived in Solamere. On April 1, 2022, residents met with the applicant and members of City Staff. He believed the meeting went well, but there had not been any follow-up since. Residents wanted things to be built, but not as currently proposed.

Christine Feldman stated that she lived off of Queen Esther. Though she understood all of the different positions that had been expressed, as a resident, there were added difficulties. The existing circumstances were already difficult and she was afraid the situation would get worse. She was unable to leave her home around 3:30 p.m. because the traffic was so severe. Since the Deer Valley proposal would add more parking, the mountain would be busier. In terms of emergencies, there was one way out. She expressed concerns about safety and traffic.

Meredith Berkowitz was one of the owners of In The Trees and was also on the Board. She had owned her home in Deer Valley for over 20 years. It was a beautiful and tranquil place to live. She was excited about the Snow Park development and believed it would be a good thing for Park City overall. However, she had some concerns that she hoped could be addressed. Her biggest concern

was the egress and ingress from In The Trees. The circulation plan that had been shown indicated that In The Trees residents would need to cross almost 21 feet of lane. In addition, exiting from In The Trees meant residents would need to pull out to have proper sight lines because there was some elevation and grade there. Ms. Berkowitz pointed out that the circulation plan currently had the bus lane and vehicle lane merging at the point where there was ingress and egress from In The Trees. She felt the merger should be moved somewhere further back or forward to allow for proper ingress and egress.

Paul Lamdin explained that he was a full-time resident and was a member of The Oaks HOA. He endorsed the comments shared by Ms. Keenan. The information she shared about the right-of-way vacation was important. There were fundamental issues that had not been addressed.

Vice-Chair Hall closed the public comment period. She informed those present that additional comments could be shared via email. There would be many public hearings related to the CUPs and MPD. Additionally, there would be an opportunity to provide public comments if the right-of-way vacation went to City Council for consideration and discussion.

Chair Suesser agreed with Staff that the SML option was the best and most flexible option. She was ready to make a recommendation to the City Council about the overall Site, Circulation, and Parking plans. She did not need additional time to consider what had been proposed. Chair Suesser was also prepared to share policy feedback on the degree of good cause for the right-of-way vacation and to make a recommendation to Council on circulation.

Chair Suesser pointed out that the Council had requested the applicant work on alternative site and circulation plans and obtain recommendations from the Commission before returning to the Council. As was pointed out earlier in the meeting, the Commission did not see significant alternatives proposed. There were a few different variations of the same circulation plan. However, she did not believe another joint meeting with Council was needed to discuss the right-of-way vacation. If the Council wanted to hear directly from members of the Planning Commission, she offered to attend a future City Council meeting.

Chair Suesser agreed with the Staff recommendation to include a Condition of Approval on the access easement and the offer of dedication for Doe Pass Road, which would make Doe Pass Road the responsibility of Deer Valley. She wanted to add a Condition of Approval about the widening of Doe Pass Road. Chair Suesser believed a four-lane road was more appropriate. As the traffic consultant had pointed out, there were turn radius problems and driveway ingress and egress width problems. She agreed with the Staff recommendation to include a Condition of Approval that Deer Valley pay for the intersection signalization at the two locations, the Y-intersection and Deer Valley Drive East. However, she suggested that there be a Condition of Approval that Deer Valley negotiate an agreement with Deer Crest to reroute vehicles from Snow Park directly to and from US-40. This would help to mitigate the development impacts.

The issues that Chair Suesser saw with the circulation plan included the one drop-off area for shuttles and passenger cars. She agreed with the comments shared by residents. Separating the shuttles and passenger cars was preferable. The details given for the drop-off and pick-up area that had been provided by the applicant were insufficient. That was reiterated by the WCG consultant that analyzed the plan. Chair Suesser noted that there had been a dramatic increase in shuttle usage in town and she did not believe what had been proposed was adequate. She liked the suggestion from Vice-Chair Hall that the bus center be considered for shuttle use, but understood that there were six bus bays, and 23 buses per hour were contemplated.

Chair Suesser suggested that a second pick-up and drop-off area at the top of Deer Valley Drive West be explored. Deer Valley Drive West seemed to be underutilized. Chair Suesser also wanted to see Deer Valley, the City, and High Valley Transit look further into direct bus routes. She recommended that the bus circulation on Deer Valley Drive East be limited. She asked that a Condition of Approval reference a gondola. Though she hoped that Deer Valley would commit to a gondola, she wanted to make sure it was a definitive part of the plan and would be from Snow Park to Silver Lake, with year-round daily operation that ran from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Vice-Chair Hall agreed that the SML was the best option. She did not need further information for the right-of-way issue to move forward to City Council. Additionally, she did not believe that a joint meeting with City Council was necessary at the current time. Vice-Chair Hall had some questions based on the public comment period. Her understanding was that lower Deer Valley did not have street parking during the winter season, from November to April. This was confirmed. That section of Deer Valley did not have parking on the side of the road except for the few days when overflow parking was specifically allowed. Vice-Chair Hall did not believe different communities, such as Solamere, allowed street parking. Engineering Robertson explained that parking was permitted if the roads were public and there was adequate room.

Vice-Chair Hall noted that the Commission would discuss the MPD in further detail at a later time and the City would have annual meetings to address parking. If there was street parking within the neighborhoods, she suggested that there be a resident parking pass implemented to protect the neighborhoods. Vice-Chair Hall asked about the section with the flags. A map of the area was shared. The area where the flags were located would go away once it was developed. The Commission discussed access from the In The Trees neighborhood and the grade in the area.

Commissioner Van Dine agreed with the comments shared by Chair Suesser and Vice-Chair Hall. She approved of the current circulation pattern as it moved forward with the right-of-way, but agreed that there were a lot of small adjustments that needed to be addressed during later stages. Commissioner Van Dine felt comfortable making a recommendation and did not believe that another joint meeting with the City Council was necessary at the current time.

Commissioner Kenworthy was ready to make a recommendation to the City Council. He pointed out that the applicant did not want to present other iterations of the Doe Pass option. As a result, he felt it was time to move it forward to the City Council for consideration. Commissioner Kenworthy was supportive of the SML but was concerned about the comments shared by Ms. Murtaugh. She stated that a one-size-fits-all approach did not necessarily make sense in this instance. He agreed and suggested that AVOs with eight or more be permitted into the bus drop-off areas. Commissioner Kenworthy discussed US-40. He did not think other ideas that had been suggested were realistic and stressed that Highway 40 was the answer.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked someone to speak to eminent domain. He wanted to understand whether any land that was needed for the loop would be taken. Engineer Robertson explained that to create the 12-foot multi-use path, two areas would require negotiations and discussions with HOAs. If it was not possible to obtain that 12 feet, the issue would need to be addressed at that time. With the SML, there would be more flexibility. He did not think eminent domain was something that would be entertained by the Council. Commissioner Kenworthy shared additional comments about Highway 40 and expressed concerns about growth.

Commissioner Frontero felt comfortable making a recommendation to City Council and did not feel that an additional joint meeting was necessary. The SML seemed to be the best of the three options presented. For the plan to work, there needed to be direct buses. If funding was a solution to this issue, then there needed to be discussions about how to address those funding needs. Commissioner Frontero noted that there was a lot of support for the HOA shuttles, but some HOAs were not using them because of the costs. A lot of issues could be solved if funding was addressed. He stressed the importance of focusing on adequate funding.

Commissioner Sigg thanked the applicant for putting forward a smart traffic plan and circulation plan. Everyone agreed that it would enhance the base of Deer Valley and the community, but the overall traffic situation needed to be addressed. He was not convinced that paid parking would drive transportation. People would always look for a way to get around paid parking lots. He believed in the SML but stated that partners needed to contribute towards transportation initiatives. Commissioner Sigg noted that there were still unresolved issues related to the right-of-way vacation and road widening. It was difficult for him to forward a recommendation until those issues were better understood. Additionally, he wanted to know what the capital contribution toward the transportation initiatives was. The idea of the development was great, but he felt there were still some issues that needed to be addressed.

Vice-Chair Hall believed there was consensus that the SML was the preferred option. It did not appear that there needed to be a further discussion related to the right-of-way issue. Planner Ananth noted that she had written down the Commissioners' comments. The Meeting Minutes would be available to the Council for review as well. Any additional Commissioner comments could be forwarded to the City Council. Vice-Chair Hall explained that she had many more notes and comments, but felt the appropriate time to address those comments was after the right-of-way had a determination. The details of the MPD and CUP could be discussed in the future.

Chair Suesser agreed with the comment shared by Commissioner Sigg. She believed there should be some sort of contribution towards the overall transit mitigation strategies. There also needed to be more collection lots within the City boundaries and she asked that this be explored. Commissioner Kenworthy felt the same way. If there were collection lots, that would increase AVO. It could be possible to increase the AVO and lower the vehicle load on Deer Valley Drive. He asked that the Police Department and Fire Department fully review the proposal. Chair Suesser added that she liked the idea of micro transit and the last-mile connections. However, she pointed out that carshares put a lot of cars on the roads. What Park City needed was more bus ridership. Making buses more convenient was essential for overall success.

Vice-Chair Hall asked when the application would move forward to City Council. Planner Ananth explained that there was not a definite date set for the City Council. She hoped there would be a discussion in February 2023 so the Planning Commission discussions could continue in March.

3. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Kenworthy moved to adjourn. Commissioner Sigg seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:27 p.m.