PARK CITY
1884

# PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
# SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
# DECEMBER 4, 1997

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting at the Marsac Municipal Building, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, December 4, 1997.

## AGENDA

**Closed Session - Work Session Room - Main Level**

| | |
|---|---|
| 2:00 p.m. | Property acquisition |
| | Litigation |
| | Personnel |

**Work Session - City Council Chambers - Lower Level**

| | |
|---|---|
| 4:20 p.m. | Council questions and comments |
| 4:50 p.m. | Folio update |
| | Review of regular meeting |
| 5:00 p.m. | Sullivan Road access |
| 5:30 p.m. | Phone system |

**Regular Meeting - City Council Chambers - Lower Level**

6:00 p.m.

**I ROLL CALL**

**II PUBLIC INPUT**

**III COMMUNICATIONS FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Resolution recognizing the many accomplishments of the Park City High School Golf Team and the dedication of the coaches and local professionals contributing to the success of the Golf Team

**IV WORK SESSION NOTES AND MINUTES OF MEETING OF NOVEMBER 13, 1997 AND NOVEMBER 20, 1997**

## V CONSENT AGENDA

Resolution recognizing the many accomplishments of the Park City High School Golf Team and the dedication of the coaches and local professionals contributing to the success of the Golf Team

## VI NEW BUSINESS

1. Authorization to staff to enter into a contract with Siemens Business Communications Systems, Inc. for the purchase of a City-wide integrated telephone system not to exceed $325,000 and authorization to enter to a five-year maintenance contract

2. Resolution requiring conditional use review for limited vehicular access on Sullivan Road, the access drive for City Park

## VII ADJOURNMENT

Posted: 12/1/97

PARK CITY
1884

# PARK CITY WORK SESSION NOTES
# SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
# DECEMBER 4, 1997

Present: Mayor Brad Olch; Council members Hugh Daniels, Roger Harlan; Chuck Klingenstein; Shauna Kerr; and Paul Sincock

Toby Ross, City Manager; Frank Bell, Olympic Planning Director; Melissa Call, Special Event Coordinator; Thomas O' Finnegan, Legal Assistant; Pat Putt, Planning and Zoning Administrator; Meg Ryan, Planner; Mark Harrington, Assistant City Attorney; Beth Sunday, Technical Services Coordinator; Bob Stephens

Russ Bean, Siemens Communications

1. **Council questions and comments.** Paul Sincock felt that the attendance at the Old Town community meeting was good and the message was clear about concerns over speeding cars. Mr. Klingenstein stated that he attended the Historical Society meeting where there was discussion about losing sidewalk area because of the angle of the parking meters. The City Manager explained that some are angled because of certain locations on Main Street to avoid damage to cars and the meters. He advised that each meter will be looked at again and the meter by the museum probably can be moved a few inches into the street. Chuck Klingenstein felt that streets, drainage and infrastructure in Old Town will be addressed in the near future as it is still an issue in the area. He felt that further neighborhood meetings in the Historic District need to be held to prioritize these significant improvements.

Hugh Daniels reported that the Utah Sports Advisory Committee met. Shelley Thomas will be the Senior Vice-President of Communications of SLOC to handle state and local government, media, and art and culture relations. Members also met John Fowler, the new state Olympic coordinator. SLOC indicated that it will pay for *requested* services. He continued that currently the estimates are two million tickets over 17 days, roughly 100,000 people a day at five venues, and 40,000 people a night at five venues. Mr. Daniels continued that it is planned to use 900 buses, most of which will come from out of state. It is estimated that the Olympic license plates will generate between $1.5 to $6 million and this money is earmarked for youth programs throughout the state. Roger Harlan brought up the possibility of the 2002 Olympics being very well attended because of the location of prior games. Hugh Daniels added that there is a legislative term bill from Senator Howell's Office that would require a constitutional amendment. He commented that there was discussion about the staff submitting expenses on the Olympics and the Oquirrah Park Fitness Center. He thanked Pace Erickson for repairing the Ten O'Clock Whistle and the replacement of flags. Mr. Daniels pointed out that the reports from Frank Bell were excellent and he felt that the parking meters blend in well on Main Street.

Ms. Kerr asked that the word "*historic*" be added to the vision statement of the City Council. There was discussion about the new parking signs in the Historic Core which will be installed in a few weeks. She noted that she received a complaint about a delivery truck on Main Street and truck drivers indicated that they weren't aware of an ordinance. Ms. Kerr suggested that delivery truck companies be notified and that there be notice to people about garbage pick-up when holidays fall on a Thursday because there is always confusion. She complimented the Park City Mountain Resort for a great World Cup event. Roger Harlan felt the snow removal brochure was excellent and the Christmas decorating at the entryway is well done. Paul Sincock congratulated the Park City Mountain Resort for its commitment to the arts. It is committed to displaying public art in the plaza, to purchase at least one piece of local art every year to be added to a collection, and to build an arts center in the area to be used for art classes and other events for visitors and locals. This center would also house the Arts Council at some point. He believed this to be a great community benefit.

Frank Bell reminded Council of the meeting with SLOC on Monday evening. Mr. Bell referred to his report about the changes for the Film Festival and asked if Council would like to meet with event organizers. Roger Harlan brought up potential conflicts with parking at the school for film patrons when there is a basketball game. Melissa Call explained that lots will be divided to accommodate interests. Paul Sincock added that he appreciated Mr. Bell's reports this week. Chuck Klingenstein felt that the memo on the Film Festival addressed prior concerns and hoped that it wouldn't be necessary to meet after the event. The Mayor expressed he would like to meet with the Nicole Guilemet of Sundance.

2. **Folio update (Customer Service Award).** Hugh Daniels reported that Thomas O'Finnegan is this quarter's customer service excellence award winner and has had numerous nominations. He read a letter from Thomas Daley stating that Thomas O'Finnegan has made an effort to make the office run more efficiently and make the office a better place. Mr. Daley wrote that Mr. O'Finnegan's work is consistently excellent and his attitude and extra efforts have made the holidays more fun. Mr. O'Finnegan was presented with an award and a bouquet of flowers.

3. **Review of regular meeting.**

**Sullivan Road access.** Pat Putt explained that the resolution addresses limited additional access on Sullivan Road. He added that earlier this year, the City received applications on four projects. The area involved is the property adjacent to City Park between Sullivan Road and Park Avenue which runs from the 7-11 to the Mike Hale dealership. When the applications were submitted, it was clear that there were no provisions in the Land Management Code dealing with increased traffic on Sullivan Road, a vision for Park Avenue, and impacts to City Park. Sullivan Road is an artery through City Park; the southern end is platted Eastern Avenue and the northern end is a driveway, owned fee simple, through City Park. The area includes the RM, RC, ROS, HR-1, and HRC zones and none of these address how to deal with design, site plan, and densities for projects outside of City Park. He continued that because of this, staff has met with the Parks and Recreation Beautification Board who has reviewed this issue and the pending projects.

Through illustration of overheads, Mr. Putt described 1420 Park Avenue which is a subdivision to create three new lots, one of the lots would have an historic structure. The other two lots could accommodate single family, duplexes, or triplexes. This project is in the sketch plat process. The second project is a plat amendment involving the combination of 12 whole lots and two and a half lots into one large development parcel. There are two historic homes which would be retained and two units built with a total density of five units on the parcel. Mr. Putt added that the next project is 1312 Park Avenue which is a subdivision of metes and bounds pieces to three lots. One lot would have an historic structure and the other two would be for duplexes or triplexes; the proposal is for a total of seven units. The last is a request at 1328 Park Avenue is for an addition to the back and side of an historic structure. He explained that currently in the RM zone, there is no review for single family homes in the district and the addition could accommodate a garage and if access is from Park Avenue, it will have significant impacts on large conifers and additional landscaping. The resolution sets forth a conditional use process for any application involving new additional access onto Park Avenue and criteria to evaluate a project during the CUP process.

Mr. Putt reviewed the criteria, the first being utility considerations, which should be extended from Park Avenue and not Sullivan Road because of potential disturbance and construction impacts. Enhanced site plan considerations would include variations in the front yard setbacks, open space, and preservation of landscaping elements. A decrease in the potential density is a major issue. He continued that the third criteria is design review under the Historic District Guidelines so that Park Avenue would architecturally lead into the Historic District. Mr. Putt referred to incorporating pedestrian landscape improvements along Sullivan Road and Park Avenue, preserving existing pedestrian connections through Park Avenue to the Park, creating new pedestrian connections to the Park, providing landscape elements on both sides, and mitigating parking. It is important to preserve historic resources or buildings that add to the character of the streetscape. Mr. Putt invited questions from the Council.

Roger Harlan recalled that the Parks and Recreation Board were concerned about increased traffic on Sullivan Road and Mr. Putt explained that the resolution represents the best across-the-board attempt at a solution knowing that every site is different. He added that some properties are owned contiguously from Park Avenue to Sullivan Road, some may have legal access to Sullivan Road, while the City has allowed access to occur for others. The resolution doesn't address property ownership. The LMC provides for the Planning Commission deciding the point of access when there are options and this helps determine what the best location might be. In response to a question from Chuck Klingenstein about snow storage, Mr. Putt explained that this did not come up as a specific criteria. Mr. Klingenstein felt that anything to encourage storing snow on-site as opposed to on the City's right-of-way would be appropriate. In response to a comment from Mr. Klingenstein, Eric DeHaan agreed that Sullivan Road is not built to City standards and construction traffic may hasten the upgrade of Sullivan Road. Mr. Klingenstein stated that he has concerns about construction traffic on Sullivan Road and would like this to be considered in the resolution. Ms. Kerr questioned how construction mitigation could be accomplished. Mr. Klingenstein recognized that these are wish list items and each situation is specific. Paul Sincock asked if this resolution was noticed to property owners in the affected areas. Pat Putt noted that a notice did not go out to each and every property owner, but it has been advertised and posted according to the LMC and it has been discussed on the radio. There have been several public hearing noticed and advertised for the Planning Commission and all affected applicants are aware of the provisions of the resolution. He emphasized that the Planning Commission was reviewing the pending applications against this criteria.

Paul Sincock asked if the resolution affects people's property rights. Mark Harrington explained that the Planning Commission was apprised of the legal ramifications and options including closing Sullivan Road altogether from vehicular access to improving it to a City street. He explained that people abutting platted Eastern Avenue (southern Sullivan Road) have the same property rights as any platted lot owner and can improve the street to City standards and develop the lot. The other portion of Sullivan Road is nothing more than a driveway equivalent, and there is no prescriptive right or platted rights on this portion. The City does not have to provide access as a matter of right. Mr. Harrington added that the City Council would be dealing with decisions as a property owner and not as a regulatory feature in the LMC. He added that this is not a City-wide regulation adopted by ordinance, it is a resolution establishing a process by which permitted access is granted on Sullivan Road. In response to a question from Chuck Klingenstein, Mr. Harrington explained that most owners have Park Avenue frontage, except for a couple of parcels that were never formally subdivided and consequently would not be vested in terms of access. Mr. Putt explained to Chuck Klingenstein that 1420 Park Avenue has proposed access off of Park Avenue.

**Phone system.** Beth Sunday explained that she is requesting authorization to enter into a contract for the purchase of a new telephone system. She introduced Russ Bean and Phil Chandler of Siemens Communications and explained that Council approved $350,000 during the budget process for this purchase.

The reasons for purchasing a new system is that the current system is out of capacity. Nine City buildings are served and there are two independent systems in City Hall which are at capacity. The same circumstance exists at the Library and Miners Hospital; Public Works and the Racquet Club are close to capacity. Ms. Sunday continued there is a desire to combine phone systems and manage it more efficiently. With regard to the decision-making process, last fall, a needs analysis was conducted and together with that wish list and engineering specifications for the internal network, a request for proposal was developed. The bid was sent out to 11 vendors and the City held a bidders conference to answer any questions about the bid and to clarify the specifications. Ms. Sunday indicated that there were 11 bids in response and a selection committee was formed.

A technical analysis was done and the bids were scored. The committee decided to select the top four scoring bids including Siemens Communications, Lucent Technology, and two Northern Telecom systems. There were then vendor presentations and the committee evaluated selection criteria and cost and checked at least four references for each vendor. The top two were narrowed to Lucent and Siemens and there were then site visits to Orem City Hall for Lucent and C. R. England for Siemens. Ms. Sunday referred to the rating system and the committee made a final recommendation for Council's consideration of Siemens Communications. She explained that there would be a centralized unit located at the Public Works building with five remote shelf units at other buildings. The system is very scalable and extremely secure. There will be a combination of fiber and leased lines to reach the other sites and the fiber between Public Works and Marsac is in operation. Other links will be installed as construction allows and in the interim lines would be leased from U S West. She clarified that the Racquet Club will continue to be a leased line situation and the Pro Shop will be running off the Golf Maintenance Shop system. Ports represent components such as modems or voice mail, and the main box is expandable to 5,760 ports which is ten times the capacity of the current telephone system. The shelf boxes accommodate 192 ports, and Ms. Sunday described the two jacks on the phone unit to expand the phone system without wiring.

It is also proposed to enter into a five year maintenance contract; first year maintenance is included in the price of the system. Ms. Sunday explained the response criteria and emphasized that most problems are repaired remotely. Maintenance has been discounted to $23,400 and if payments are made annually as opposed to monthly, will result in another 4% discount. In response to a question from Paul Sincock, Ms. Sunday explained that the vendor will arrange for training before the system is installed and follow-up after the installation. Two employees will attend system administration training for in-house service. Ms. Sunday explained that the system would be installed in all sites at once and discussed the hold-up in leasing lines from U S West. Russ Bean added that installation is about a four hour process and a cut-over would occur over a weekend. There was discussion about U S West not providing lines in a timely manner, and Rod Daughtee explained that staff will leverage the safety aspects of the City's emergency service to get a better response from U S West.

Hugh Daniels pointed out that on top of $325,000, there is a provision for 10% in potential additions and asked if there is a plan. Beth Sunday responded that she is receiving requests for additions to the original plan and would suggest $4,000 for administrator training and purchasing spare phones. There have been requests for cordless phones and speakers and the entire buffer may not be spent. Mr. Daniels asked if there is a method for evaluating changes and requests. Bob Stephens interjected that by policy, on a contract greater than $2,000, there is the ability to go 10% over that on change orders, without coming back for additional approval. It is staff's intention of staying at the $325,000 which would fall within the current purchasing policy. Mr. Daniels expressed his concern of spending money on additions just because departments may want something and asked again if there is a policy for evaluating requests. The City Manager stated that this is analogous to the computer requests where there is an informal evaluation process. Hugh Daniels asked what happens if Siemens doesn't perform, and Ms. Sunday advised that there is an escalation path for remedies and Siemens would be in breach of contract if it doesn't perform. Mr. Daniels explained that he has had poor experience with a number of phone companies on maintenance agreements. He has a huge concern that the City will not receive the response it needs and emphasized that he wants to protect the interests of the City.

Staff indicated that there were no other reasonable alternatives with regard to not approving a contract. In response to a question from Hugh Daniels, Russ Bean estimated that the life of the system would be from 10 to 15 years and emphasized the scalability of the system. Siemens has provided Sandy City and Murray City with systems. Mr. Harlan asked why the City visited C. R. England when it could have observed two municipal systems. Ms. Sunday responded that C. R. England uses more advanced functions and other cities became a poor match as they were not using menuing or voice mail options, for instance. Russ Bean explained that the telecommunications industry has gone to a server architecture and as applications improve, the server can evolve as well. See regular meeting minutes.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott

* * * * * * * * * * *

STATE OF UTAH )
ss.
COUNTY OF SUMMIT )

**CERTIFICATE OF CLOSED SESSION**
**CITY COUNCIL OF PARK CITY, UTAH**

As presiding officer of the City Council of Park City, Utah, I hereby certify that the closed session meeting held by the City Council on DECEMBER 4, 1997, was held pursuant to Section 52-4-5(1)(a)(I) to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual.

DATED this 31 day of DECEMBER, 1997.

Bradley A. Olch

Mayor Bradley A. Olch

Subscribed and sworn before me this 31 day of DECEMBER 1997.

NOTARY PUBLIC
JANET M. SCOTT
445 Marsac Ave. P.O. Box 1480
Park City, Utah 84060
My Commission Expires
March 11, 2000
STATE OF UTAH

Janet M. Scott

Janet M. Scott, Notary Public

* * * * * * * * * * *

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

Prepared by Janet M. Scott

Janet M. Scott

Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

PARK CITY SUMMIT COUNTY UTAH
CORPORATE
Seal
MARCH 1, 1884

the Planning Commission on December 17. Phase 1 contains Chapter 7 which includes all of the zoning districts, which will precipitate discussion on this issue. He felt that the resolution will provide some predictability and direction for the staff, the Planning Commission, and the applicants. It clarifies what the staff is looking for with regard to a good contextual fit. Once the ground rules are laid out, it can be addressed in the LMC rewrite in a broader perspective. Hugh Daniels felt it important to address duplexes and triplexes in the resolution, encouraging smaller single family homes.

Lani Furr, Parks and Recreation Board member, stated that the board supports the resolution and are concerned about deterioration of Sullivan Road by construction traffic. The Mayor indicated that Council shared these concerns during work session. Mark Harrington pointed out to Council that there is still a permitted use option if access is off of Park Avenue and triplexes may be allowed. Pat Putt explained that the parking requirement for a triplex would be six spaces. Chuck Klingenstein expressed that he has a big concern about construction vehicles on the road and would like to encourage construction traffic on Park Avenue when possible. Pat Putt added that the conditional use process allows staff to look at projects on a case-by-case basis. Requiring construction traffic on Park Avenue may exacerbate congestion there and the Planning and Building Departments can determine the best staging and access for a project. Chuck Klingenstein asked if the open space element covers his snow storage concern. Pat Putt indicated that the resolution could be more specific. He suggested that it be fine-tuned, incorporating Council's comments and be brought back at next week's meeting. The Mayor requested a motion to continue. Paul Sincock, "I so move". Shauna Kerr seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

## VII ADJOURNMENT

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

* * * * * * * * * *

## MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 2 p.m. Members in attendance were Mayor Brad Olch, Hugh Daniels, Roger Harlan, Shauna Kerr, Chuck Klingenstein, and Paul Sincock. Staff present were Toby Ross, City Manager; Tom Bakaly, Finance Manager; and Jodi Hoffman, City Attorney during the property acquisition and litigation discussion. Jodi Hoffman was present for the personnel discussion. Shauna Kerr, "I move to close the meeting to discuss property acquisition, litigation, and personnel". Paul Sincock seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

The meeting opened at approximately 4:40 p.m.

Golf Team - Shauna Kerr, "I move approval". Chuck Klingenstein seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

## VI NEW BUSINESS

1. Authorization to staff to enter into a contract with Siemens Business Communications Systems, Inc. for the purchase of a City-wide integrated telephone system not to exceed $325,000 and authorization to enter to a five-year maintenance contract - There was discussion about the five year maintenance contract; the first year is included in the purchase price. It was clarified that there is a one year warranty on the equipment. Hugh Daniels requested that liquidated damages be clarified in the contract and would like further expenditures subject to Council approval. Jodi Hoffman explained that this Council does not have the power to financially bind future Councils. Paul Sincock complimented staff and the committee on their professional approach with this purchase. Hugh Daniels raised concerns about citizens being caught in voice mail "hell". Beth Sunday explained that part of the solution is training employees and the phones will be programmed so that an operator can be reached. Shauna Kerr, "I move approval of the contract to purchase a new phone system, including the maintenance agreement, as amended by Hugh Daniels". Paul Sincock seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Resolution requiring conditional use review for limited vehicular access on Sullivan Road, the access drive for City Park - The Mayor suggested that a committee be formed to take a comprehensive look at down-zoning some areas in town and felt this would be a good topic at the upcoming Council retreat. Shauna Kerr agreed and felt that this area is vulnerable because of the aging condo projects, which could easily be torn down. There is an opportunity to freshen the neighborhood if there is a clear vision and compatible zoning. Paul Sincock pointed out that there were good ideas from the recent charette. The Mayor added that the City has done a good job in the area with purchase of properties and the remodel of the Carl Winters Building. He emphasized that he is opposed to triplexes because of size and vehicular impacts. Shauna Kerr agreed and Hugh Daniels noted that he has similar concerns. He stated that with regard to the Park Avenue study, some things have been accomplished but things have changed. Mr. Daniels expressed concern about densities, especially triplexes, and historic homes surrounded by triplexes is inappropriate. Although this is a piecemeal approach, it is a start. In response to a question from Mr. Daniels, Pat Putt explained that the design of buildings fronting Sullivan should be pedestrian friendly and have interest. Mr. Daniels referred to the "decrease in potential density" in the resolution and felt that "potential" should be stricken. He added that it is his preference to have the least amount of traffic on Sullivan Road and concurred with the preservation of landscaping, maintaining pedestrian links, and would look to the Planning Commission to make good decisions. He doesn't want Sullivan Road to be the "easy way out" because it will cost the City in the long run. Mayor Olch suggested that instead of duplexes and triplexes that there be single family homes on newly created lots and Hugh Daniels agreed that triplexes and duplexes are out of scale for that part of town. Pat Putt stated that the broader policy decisions will be before Council soon, as Phase 1 of the LMC will be before

PARK CITY
1884

# PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
# SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
# DECEMBER 4, 1997

## I ROLL CALL

Mayor Brad Olch called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, December 4, 1997. Members in attendance were Brad Olch, Hugh Daniels, Roger Harlan, Shauna Kerr, Chuck Klingenstein, and Paul Sincock. Staff present were Toby Ross, City Manager; Mark Harrington, Assistant City Attorney; and Jodi Hoffman, City Attorney.

## II PUBLIC INPUT

The Mayor invited the public to comment on any matter of City business; hearing no comments, the public input session was closed.

## III COMMUNICATIONS FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

Resolution recognizing the many accomplishments of the Park City High School Golf Team and the dedication of the coaches and local professionals contributing to the success of the Golf Team - The Mayor publicly read the resolution and congratulated the many Team members in attendance.

## IV WORK SESSION NOTES AND MINUTES OF MEETING OF NOVEMBER 13, 1997 AND NOVEMBER 20, 1997

Roger Harlan corrected Page 2 of the November 20 Work Session Notes, Hugh Daniels corrected Page 5 of the Work Session Notes of November 13, and Pages 1, 4 and 11 of the Minutes of November 20, 1997. Chuck Klingenstein corrected Page 1 of the Work Session Notes of November 13. Hugh Daniels, "I move approval of the Work Session Notes and Minutes of the meetings of November 13 and November 20, 1997, as corrected". Chuck Klingenstein seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

## V CONSENT AGENDA

Resolution recognizing the many accomplishments of the Park City High School Golf Team and the dedication of the coaches and local professionals contributing to the success of the

**RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PARK CITY HIGH SCHOOL GOLF TEAM AND THE DEDICATION OF THE COACHES AND LOCAL PROFESSIONALS CONTRIBUTING TO THE SUCCESS OF THE GOLF TEAM**

WHEREAS, in 1997, the Park City High School Golf Team successfully defended its Region 10 Championship, as its four Seniors placed 3rd, 5th, 7th and 9th in the Region Medalist race through the season; and

WHEREAS, the Park City High School Golf Team claimed the 3A State Championship at the Carbon Country Club for a team total of 310, and set a new school record with a team score of 296 in a match at Roosevelt: and

WHEREAS, it is important to recognize the talent and commitment of all of the members of the Golf Team as follows:

Seniors - 3A Champions
Jason Crouch
Chris Morgan
Matt Stalsberg
Eric Sutterfield

Sophomores
Todd Francis
Travis Williams
Jeff Zamarin

Juniors
David Gonzales
Cramer Tolboe
Skyler Tritt

Freshman
Casey Crouch
Andy Cunningham
Dustin Simons

WHEREAS, without the dedication and guidance of Coach Paul Willard who resurrected the Team in 1984, and Coach Fred Marshall, who joined in 1990, bringing his excellent golf game and fund raising skills to the program, these fine young athletes would not have the opportunity to sharpen playing skills, appreciate the fine traditions of golf, and enjoy the camaraderie of team play; and

WHEREAS, it is also through the support of local professionals that the High School Golf Team has experienced such success. The present and past professionals of Park City, Park Meadows, and Jeremy Ranch all have a vested interest in youth programs and the community owes them a tremendous thank-you for all that they have contributed;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Council feel it appropriate to recognize the many achievements of the Park City Golf Team over the past 14 years and to individually congratulate its present players for an exciting performance this year. Based on the historic talent of the Golf Team, and the love of the Game by its Coaches and supporters, we look forward to continued success for many years to come.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 4th day of December, 1997.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

Mayor Bradley A. Olch

Attest:

Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

PARK CITY
1884

**DATE:** November 24, 1997
**DEPARTMENT:** Technical Services
**AUTHOR:** Bob Stephens, Beth Sunday, Rod Daughetee
**TITLE:** Purchase of City-wide Integrated Telephone System
**TYPE ITEM OF:** Award of Contract

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION**: The Telephone System Evaluation Committee recommends entering into a contract with Siemens Business Communications Systems, Inc. for the purchase of a City-wide integrated telephone system. Furthermore, staff asks City Council for direction to proceed on a 5-year maintenance agreement for the telephone system.

**DESCRIPTION**:

**A. Topic**: Purchase of City-wide integrated telephone system.

**B. Background**: The City currently uses seven separate telephone systems to provide telephone service to City offices. Three of these systems are at full capacity. In order to add users, the City would be required to add an eighth telephone system. Additionally, the current systems require increasing maintenance and some do not offer the basic functionality required by staff. The most recent of the seven systems was purchased in 1991 for the Marsac Building. Staff was advised two years ago by US West that our user base had exceeded capacity for key systems using US West's Centrex and we should move toward a scalable PBX environment. *Note: A key system is a small business telephone system suited for organizations under 100 people. It allows minimal programming. Centrex is a service offered by communications providers where features programming is done at the telephone company's central office.* In the Fall of 1996, staff contacted multiple telecommunications vendors for the purpose of determining an appropriate budget amount to be requested as part of the FY98 capital budget. Staff requested and City Council approved $350,000.

**C. Analysis**:
In Spring of 1997, staff met with each department to determine current and future requirements for a telephone system. Technical Services developed a Request for Proposal based on the needs analysis and technical research done by staff. The RFP was mailed to twelve vendors and was followed by a bidders' conference to address question and points of clarification. Eleven proposals were received.

A selection committee was formed to analyze and evaluate the proposals. This committee was made up of Stephani Nichols, City telephone administrator; Denise Payne, Leisure Services telephone administrator; Pam Evans, Public Works telephone administrator; Elizabeth Sunday, project manager; Rod Daughetee, technical evaluation; and Bob Stephens, management representative.

Rod Daughetee completed a technical evaluation of the 11 bids. The committee chose to reduce the pool to the top four bids based on the technical scores. These four vendors were then required to make a presentation to the selection committee. The committee evaluated the remaining criteria listed in the RFP. These criteria included: features/functionality, ease of use, cost, growth capabilities, system accountability, migration path, adaptability, asset protection record, enhancement record, system administration, service/repair, ability to meet project time frame, knowledge of product and applications, knowledge and ability with regards to system integration, experience with similar projects, ongoing maintenance program, longevity in industry, and product migration history. Vendor reference checks were also done at this time.

The committee selected two finalists - Siemens Communications and Lucent Technologies. Site visits were done for both vendors allowing the selection committee to see first hand the users' view of their phone systems. During this last step, staff fine tuned the equipment configuration and negotiations began on pricing.

Committee members rated the finalists on the following categories:

| **Category** | **Lucent** | **Siemens** |
|---|---|---|
| Cost | | X |
| Technical | | X |
| Growth/Expandability | | X |
| Service/Maintenance | | X |
| References | X | X |
| System Administration | | X |
| Features/Functionality | X | X |
| Staff Quality/Professionalism | | X |

Siemens finished first in six of the categories. There was a tie in the remaining two. The actual quotes were Siemens $296,082 versus Lucent $305,461.

Staff has requested $325,000 approval for a contract with Siemens. We anticipate that as the installation gets closer, there will be additions to the equipment order - adding spare phone sets, requests for upgrades from various users. Also, administrator training has been included in this cost.

Staff anticipates that the remaining funds budgeted will be used for additional cabling in various buildings and telephone line installation charges. The types of telephone lines used for a PBX versus a key system are different. Currently, every user has a dedicated line running to their phone. With a PBX, lines are pooled among the users. As a result, we will incur one-time installation charges on new lines. However, the monthly charges after that point will be lower.

**Maintenance**

Staff recommends purchasing annual maintenance for the telephone system that the City purchases. Siemens and Lucent offer annual or multi-year maintenance contracts. Staff is recommending the 5-year maintenance contract in order to take advantage of a multi-year discount. The first year's maintenance is included in the purchase price.

A comparison of maintenance contracts is as follows:

| | **Siemens** | **Lucent** |
|---|---|---|
| Yearly Maintenance | $27,947 | $34,476 |
| Yearly Maintenance Prepaid | $26,829 (4% discount) | $31,028 (10% discount) |
| Extended Contract for 5 Years | $24,593 (12% discount) | $27,581 (20% discount) |
| Extended contract prepaid each year | $23,475 (4% discount) | $27,581 |

Both Siemens and Lucent state that the maintenance agreement can be discontinued upon 30 days written notice even when done with the five year extended agreement. We could also place a statement in the contract stating "subject to funding by the City Council." The Lucent agreement would cost $4,106 more per year or $16,424 over the life of the five year extended agreement. The actual maintenance agreements are very similar regarding parts coverage and response time.

**D. Department Review**: See selection committee composition above. Reviewed by City Manager.

**ALTERNATIVES**:

A. Authorize staff to enter into a contract with Siemens for a telephone switch and peripherals in an amount not to exceed $325,000. Authorize staff to enter into a 5-year maintenance contract with Siemens.

B. Authorize staff to enter into contract with Siemens for the telephone system but not the maintenance contract.

C. Direct staff to enter into a contract for a telephone system and maintenance contract with Lucent.

D. Direct staff to enter into a contract for a telephone system but no maintenance contract with Lucent.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:**

Authorization to enter into a contract for a telephone switch will provide City offices with a seamless city-wide communications system. It will also address current capacity problems.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NOT TAKING THE RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Further study will lead to a delay in installation. Alternative methods such as cellular may be explored to provide telephone service where systems are at capacity.

**RECOMMENDATION**: Authorize staff to enter into contract with Siemens Communication to purchase and install city-wide telephone system for an amount not to exceed $325,000. Authorize staff to enter into 5-year maintenance contract for this telephone system.

PARK CITY

# CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

**DATE:** December 1, 1997
**DEPARTMENT:** Planning Department
**AUTHOR:** Megan B. Ryan
**TITLE:** Sullivan Road Review Criteria
**TYPE OF ITEM:** Legislative

## DESCRIPTION:

Resolution forwarded from the Planning Commission describing review criteria for development projects on Sullivan Road. See Location map for project area boundaries and Exhibit A for the Resolution.

## BACKGROUND:

Over six months of meetings and discussion have been held on this matter by two of your advisory bodies, the Parks and Recreation Beautification Board and the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission report that defines the issues, provides detailed background and outlines in depth the issues is included as Exhibit B. Please refer to that report for an in-depth look at the topic.

In summary, the issue regarding development in this area arose when four separate development applications were submitted for this area. The Community Development Department, in its preliminary review, realized that there were no clear criteria for requests to increase vehicular access to Sullivan Road available to the staff in any of our codes or master plans. Two issues became clear. There was no overall vision for Park Avenue and there was no vision for the area specifically abutting and impacting City Park.

The zoning for the area is piecemeal with over five different zones governing the area from the Park Station Condominiums to the Seven Eleven building. See Exhibit C, Zoning map. Different development parameters regulate different blocks and in some cases neighboring parcels have completely different zoning review criteria.

The Land Management Code (LMC) did not address the many issues of utilities, traffic, preservation and design for the area at large. A study of the entire Park Avenue area was done in 1993, the Lower Park Ave study (Exhibit D), but no final action or recommendations have been taken. In addition the Parks Master Plan, adopted in 1982, does not speak directly to the area behind the park and has not been updated for fifteen years.

**ANALYSIS:**

The staff determined that the Planning Commission, with input from the Parks and Recreation Board, should review the issues and adopt a set of review criteria prior to the Land Management Code revisions so that pending applications could be processed. The following meeting took place:

1. May 21, 1997 - Parks and Recreation Beautification Board meeting
2. July 11, 1997 – Parks and Recreation Board adopts Resolution
3. August 27, 1997 – Planning Commission holds work session with the Parks and Rec. Board
4. September 24, 1997 – Planning Commission holds a work session to discuss issue (Exhibit E)
5. October 22, 1997 – Planning Commission considers draft resolution
6. November 12, 1997 – Planning Commission forwards Resolution to City Council with a positive recommendation.

The Planning Commission focused solely on the area that abuts City Park but recognized during the process that the entire Park Avenue corridor needed to be reviewed. The Commissioners, in their final recommendation, asked the Council to consider adopting the Resolution and asked the Council to address additional zoning issues in the subsequent Land Management Code review criteria in the upcoming code revisions.

A synopsis of the recent applications in this area follows:

1. <u>1420 Park Avenue</u> – Subdivision application to create three new lots from one parcel. One lot will have an historic structure. Two lots will support duplexes or triplexes. **Status**: Sketch plat at Planning Commission level. Final plat will be heard before the City Council in the new year.
2. <u>1266 and 1274 Park Avenue</u> – Plat amendment application to combine twelve whole lots and two half lots into one development parcel. The property will be developed as one lot. On the lot the two historic homes on Park Avenue will be preserved and new units will be added to the Sullivan Road side of the parcel. **Status**: Positive recommendation made by Planning Commission on November 12,1997. City Council hearing scheduled for December 18,1997.
3. <u>1312 Park Avenue</u> – Subdivision application to create three lots from several metes and bounds parcels. One lot will have an historic structure. Two lots will support duplexes or triplexes.

4. 1328 Park Avenue – Addition to an historic structure. Submitted as a permitted use. No design review under this zone. Setbacks, height and maximum density only. **Status**: Issued, construction underway. Proposed driveway would access of off Park Avenue and eliminate a significant tree and historic streetscape. Staff is working with applicant to utilize Sullivan Drive access.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:**

The proposed Resolution would enact a conditional use review process for developments that propose access off of Sullivan Road. This review process would require a Planning Commission hearing and may lengthen the review process that currently exists. If other discretionary processes are required they could be processed simultaneously. An additional review period may force applicants to pursue access of Park Avenue. The current RM regulations, that regulate a portion of the subject area, provide the planner with no tools to review design, access, existing significant vegetation or historic preservation.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NOT TAKING RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

If the Council does not consider the proposed Resolution the applications will proceed under the current regulations. Design, circulation and impacts on City Park will not be addressed.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Option A – Approve Resolution as proposed and consider LMC changes for overall planning of the area.
Option B – Postpone any changes until a comprehensive plan is conducted for the area or the Lower Park Avenue master plan is adopted.
Option C – Postpone any changes until the LMC changes are brought forth.
Option D – Take no action and leave current regulations in place.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The staff recommends that the City Council discuss the attached Resolution, Exhibit B, conduct a public hearing and consider adopting the attached resolution.

**EXHIBITS**

**Location Map**
**Exhibit A – November 12 Planning Commission Resolution**
**Exhibit B – Planning Commission Report 10/24/97 (includes Park and Recreation Beautification Resolution 7/11/97 and excerpts from the Park Master Plan)**
**Exhibit C - Zoning map of Park Avenue**
**Exhibit D - Lower Park Avenue Study 1993**
**Exhibit E –Minutes from 10/24/97 Planning Commission meeting**

# EXHIBIT A

Resolution 97 -

## A RESOLUTION REQUIRING CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW FOR LIMITED VEHICULAR ACCESS ON SULLIVAN ROAD – THE ACCESS DRIVE FOR CITY PARK

WHEREAS, the Municipal Code of Park City "(MCPC") authorizes the Planning Commission ("Commission") to advise City staff and the City Council on planning policy; and

WHEREAS, Sullivan Road ("Driveway") is not a platted public right-of-way and it is the sole driveway access to City Park from both Park Avenue and Deer Valley Drive; and

WHEREAS, Eastern Avenue is a platted public right-of–way and currently overlaps as a portion of the City Park Driveway; and

WHEREAS, the Commission held a meeting on September 24, 1997 to discuss this issue with the Community Development, Engineering and Legal Departments and members of the Park, Recreation and Beautification Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, the existing vehicular access to the Driveway has been permitted by the City and the preceding owner(s); and

WHEREAS, this policy statement is not an evaluation of any particular request for access, but a general position regarding the incompatibility of increased vehicular access and pedestrian safety;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to forward this recommendation to the City Council on November 12, 1997 regarding limited vehicular traffic on Sullivan Road and Eastern Ave.;

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it resolved by the Council as follows:

**SECTION 1. Limited Access on Sullivan Road and contiguous Park Avenue parcels.** The City hereby declares that only limited vehicular access be allowed on the Driveway subject to Planning Commission approval of a Conditional Use Permit, (CUP). "Limited vehicular access" shall include, but not be limited to:

1. additional curb cuts for adjoining residential or commercial projects
2. paving or otherwise improving existing access,
3. increased vehicular connections through to Park Avenue,
4. and any other City action that otherwise increases vehicular traffic on the Driveway.

**SECTION 2. Objectives and Performance criteria for Conditional Use Review for limited access**. Limited access shall be permitted only when a project has additional positive elements furthering reasonable planning objectives, such as increased open space or historic preservation.

These additional positive elements must be established by an applicant through review under the Conditional Use Process as outlined in Chapter 1.13 of the Land Management Code. The following additional review criteria shall be included for review of projects along Sullivan Road and Eastern Avenue:

**Mandatory Elements:**

1. Utility Considerations. Plans that have utility extensions from Park Avenue and which provide the least disturbance to the City Park and the public as a whole.

2. Enhanced Site Plan Considerations. Each individual parcel in this area is unique in its configuration, vegetation cover and layout. The following elements will need to be considered on a site by site basis, but in general will be considered to be positive elements of any site plan. These review criteria apply to both Sullivan and Park Avenue streetfronts:

- Variation in front yard and building setbacks in order to orient porches and windows onto street fronts. Increased front yard setbacks are generally preferred.
- Provision of open space and/or preservation of significant landscape elements.
- The decrease in potential density on site by utilizing the components outlined above.

3. Design Review under the Historic District Standards. Use of the Historic District design review process will strengthen the character, continuity and integration of multifamily and single family structures along Park Ave., Sullivan Road and Eastern Ave.

4. Incorporation of Pedestrian and Landscape improvements along Park Ave., Sullivan Road, and Eastern Ave. Plans that save, preserve or enhance pedestrian connections and landscape elements along the streetscape, within the development site, and between Park Ave. and Sullivan Road, will be considered as positive elements of any site plan.

5. Parking Mitigation. Plans that keep the front yard setbacks clear of parking and minimize parking impacts near intensive uses on Sullivan Road will be considered as positive elements of any site plan.

6. Preservation of Historic Structures and Landscape features. This area consists of many historic homes and historic preservation has been a high priority of the City Council. When applicable, maintenance, preservation and rehabilitation of any existing historic structure and its corresponding landscaped streetscape elements will be considered as positive elements of any site plan.

**SECTION 3. EFFECTIVE DATE**. This resolution shall take effect upon publication
**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 4th day of December 1997.

**City Council of Park City**

____________________

Brad Olch, Mayor

Approved as to form:

Mark Harrington, Asst. City Attorney

Attest:

Janet M. Scott, City Recorder