



**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060**

April 28, 2025

The Council of Park City, Summit County, Utah, met in open meeting on April 28, 2025, at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

SPECIAL MEETING

I. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Status
Mayor Nann Worel Council Member Bill Ciraco Council Member Ryan Dickey Council Member Ed Parigian (arrived at 4:02 p.m.) Council Member Jeremy Rubell (via Zoom at 4:17 p.m.) Council Member Tana Toly Matt Dias, City Manager Margaret Plane, City Attorney Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder	Present
None	Excused

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Reconsider the Participation of Park City in the Utah Municipal Alternate Voting Method Pilot Project, also known as Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) for the 2025 Municipal Election:

Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder/Election Official, reviewed that at the last Council meeting the majority of Council supported revisiting the RCV participation in this year's election. She gave the new filing period for candidates if the Council returned to the traditional voting method and noted if the resolution to rescind RCV was approved tonight, she would need to send that to the Lt. Governor's Office by April 30.

Mayor Worel apologized to the residents and stated transparency had been important to her. She felt ambushed by Council Member Ciraco at the last meeting and noted he did not provide information regarding his concerns about RCV even when the City Recorder

requested it of him. The majority of Council opted not to bring in additional expertise as well. She thought the public deserved a process that was open and public.

Mayor Worel opened the meeting for public input.

Glenn Wright stated RCV made sense to run an election and one reason was reducing election costs. The Council gave people notice that they wouldn't have to decide on running for office until August and now that would change. He felt that was unfair. He asserted listening to the Utah County Clerk was a mistake because he was disavowed by the Lt. Governor and all of the other County Clerks in the state.

Peter Wright 84060 liked the notion of RCV for two reasons: time and money. The traditional voting method consumed more time and money. RCV had a shorter election cycle and it saved time and money. He also thought it would give voters more choices.

Alex Butwinski 84060 agreed with the mayor's comments and stated the staff report was very short so it didn't give the public what the concerns were. He felt RCV eliminated voter fatigue. He wondered what new data had arisen to change the decision. Studies that were referenced stated voters liked it. The Summit County Clerk was satisfied with RCTab software and how it worked.

Danny Glasser 84060 stated the method didn't concern him as much as changing the method that was chosen five weeks ago. It looked like the incumbents wanted to have the election method that would be more favorable to them.

Joe Davis 84060 didn't think the costs of participating in elections was the issue. His issue was exhausted votes - votes that weren't moved forward in the RCV round because of the way he filled out the form. He didn't think some votes should be worth more than others.

Aaron Davidson 84042 stated he was the Utah County Clerk and agreed with those people who spoke to this issue already. He didn't intend to cause this issue but he sent information to the Council that wasn't known beforehand. There was an anomaly in RCTab and there was a possibility that ballots could be counted that weren't supposed to be counted and that would make a difference in a close race. He noted RCTab was the only software approved to be used outside of Salt Lake County, and Salt Lake County used Dominion, which was proved to be accurate.

Courtney Morrison 84060 supported RCV as originally voted.

Mary Wright read the public eComment from her daughter, Katie Wright in support of RCV.

Stephen Parks 84060 believed the City Council making a decision and then calling a special meeting to go against that was not okay. He favored RCV and thought the City should try it.

Rory Murphy 84060 stated the optics on this issue were not good. He hadn't seen this much bad feeling between the Council before. There was enough chaos at the national level. He hoped the Council would listen to their conscience and do the right thing.

Jimmy May 84060 stated free, fair, and transparent elections were very important. RCV had a lot of failures. The promise of simplicity and choice failed around the country. One of the biggest problems was that RCV could generate different outcomes than traditional elections. He indicated RCV was tried and rejected all over the state of Utah and across the United States. He read a summary from the Wall Street Journal that voters rejected RCV in several states. He applauded the Council for discussing this topic again and requested they reject RCV.

Shari Noteware 84098 cheered for the best interests of Park City. She stated experts had touted the merits of RCV and read an article that said as much. She also noted the Summit County Clerk expressed confidence in RCTab. She thought Park City could lead by example. She supported the Council upholding RCV.

Diego Zegarra 84060 supported RCV and was honored and proud to be in the presence of the other commenters in support. He thought RCV supported moderates and promoted cost savings in elections.

Rosemary Blizzard 28504 stated she was an election administrator and she rejected the fact that RCTab was not reliable. She indicated RCTab was used across the country and it was analyzed after elections to make sure it was accurate.

John Kenworthy 84060 stated many people didn't understand RCV. Many of the Council referred to Heber using RCV, but 80% of Heber voters rejected RCV after using it twice. He also stated the national government was turned upside down due to not having a primary in one of the primaries.

Max Doilney 84060 stated he made a number of decisions where he wished he had a re-do. This was not an emergency and he didn't think the Council should have a re-do anytime they wanted. He didn't want to bring the MAGA brand of politics to the City. He stated he advocated for Council Member Parigian to be elected. He thought this was disgraceful to be here at an emergency meeting because this was not an emergency. He thought this would only help Council Member Rubell if he ran again.

Katie Wright 84060 supported RCV and she was disturbed the City Council called an emergency session to recall their vote. She hoped the Council could make decisions based on good discussions. She thought the discussion was that RCV was good for voters and they should think about the precedent they were setting by undoing a vote without a reason.

Megan McKenna 84060 supported RCV at a previous meeting and she agreed the decision to uphold RCV should be upheld. She was disappointed this decision became a partisan issue and that expert opinions were not allowed tonight.

Becca Gerber 84060 stated she was on the Council for eight years and she never saw a Council call a topic back for a revote so quickly. One thing she heard from the community was they wanted consistency and this was instability which led to distrust. This was not Utah County or Heber and she wanted Park City to continue making good decisions.

Jocelyn Scudder 84060 supported RCV and the alignment with the original vote. It was concerning to see this chaos when it wasn't an emergency.

Sarah Hall 84060 agreed with other community members that there was no reason to have this emergency meeting. There was no reason to have a revote after they had meaningful public process. She urged the Council not to rescind the prior vote.

Josh Daniels 84045 former Utah County Clerk and the first clerk who administered RCV in elections. He used RCTab and it worked fine. The current Utah County Clerk pointed out flaws in other states, but the RCV developers indicated the mistake was based on the rules applied specifically to Alaska. This tool was available in Summit County, and he thought there wouldn't be any problems. He referred to surveys after the 2019 election and stated that over 70% of RCV voters liked the voting method. He hoped the Council would consider the positive experiences people had.

Angela Moschetta 84060 stated she worked on many campaigns and supported RCV in large cities but not for Park City. She thought RCV would create confusion and could cause ballot errors. She felt this was an area where voter confidence was already low. She stated Council Member Dickey said rejecting RCV was an attempt to manipulate the election. Council Member Toly said there were two sides to every story. Moschetta indicated a nonprofit was going to have a slate of candidates this election as well. They were also supportive of RCV. People contemplating running for office were already preparing. She thought RCV would rig the selection at the mayoral and council levels. She thanked Council Member Parigian for standing against RCV and for Council Member Ciraco for correcting the course for a truly transparent process. Revisitation of issues was allowed, and this special meeting was democracy in action.

Jason Seegert 84060 stated he heard nothing to justify this meeting and encouraged the Council not to recall the RCV vote.

Gerry Hall 84060 indicated RCV resulted in better campaigns and candidates, and more representative results. He thought discussions on machine errors was with the MAGA group. He didn't think it was proper form to revisit the decision and felt this was the appearance of helping a political ally. Changing this decision would undermine the confidence in elections.

Maggie AbuHaidar 84060 supported RCV for the same reason as other commenters. As an attorney, she was concerned with the rising lack of trust in the government and the attacks on due process. The public engaged in a process that resulted in the approval of RCV. Now there was a special meeting held during the day when many couldn't attend to rescind the decision. She expected more from Park City.

Virginia Solomon 84098 echoed the comments in support of RCV and the concerns for calling this special meeting.

Katie Madsen eComment: "I am in support of Council's initial decision to use Ranked Choice Voting for the Council and Mayoral election. I think Ranked Choice Voting is the best system for selecting candidates that represent voters."

Peter Wright eComment: "I have been a Park City resident since 2006. I am in favor of Rank Choice Voting (RCV) as I believe it will accomplish 2 important things: making it easier for individuals to run for office by making running for office less expensive and less time consuming. And this easing of entry will encourage better candidates who cannot afford the cost and time burdens of running for office. This is a win, win for Park City. Clearly there is a lot of negative noise being created by opponents who may have an interest in the old voting process. They are suggesting faults with little if any evidence to support the criticisms. Change always comes with naysayers who are afraid of trying different approaches. Please don't let these overpower the potentially great benefits of reducing both the costs and the time involved in running for office. Better candidates equals better government!"

VJ Pettit eComment: "My Husband and I have lived in Park City for 32 years. We heartily support Ranked Choice Voting."

Mayor Worel closed the public input.

Council Member Dickey thanked those who showed up today with minimal notice. He didn't think this was about RCV but it was about elections. He reviewed all the Council meetings regarding this issue, and noted there was supposedly new information which warranted a special meeting. He thought that was irresponsible and instilled doubt in the City processes and in elections. He didn't know what the new information was and hoped to hear about it. He stated the Utah County Clerk was an election denier and he didn't want to follow Utah County or Heber. He thought this process was disrespectful to the City's voters.

Council Member Toly stated she had previously announced she was running for Council this year. She was shocked last week when the idea of overturning RCV was brought up and a special meeting was called with limited notice to the public. She supported using RCV six weeks ago and didn't want to overturn it today. She thought promises should be kept. She supported RCV because it didn't make everything an issue and she

wanted to continue the projects progressing in the City. Fairness mattered and she wanted to keep the commitment made to the community.

Council Member Rubell corrected the record. On March 13th he voiced that he was open to RCV. It was also stated the vote was unanimous and he pointed out that one Council member voted no on it every time it came up. He stated there was a defined process for special meetings. There was an impending deadline for this notification, and an elected official raised a concern. The Council was open to discussing anything that a Council member wanted to discuss. This issue was important, but the Council wasn't following an out of the ordinary process. The deadline to notify the Lt. Governor was in two days, and that was the time sensitivity of the matter. He stated RCV was inconclusive according to the studies. They didn't need experts to come today, because they had already heard from the experts. He referred to RCV studies from Utah Valley University and indicated there were varying opinions. The Council didn't get new information, but the state was not extending the RCV pilot program so this would be a one-time change in the vote method. Council Member Rubell referred to the proportional RCV voting method and indicated he supported that for our multi-seat election, but it was not an option in this state. He added that this meeting was fully transparent, and stated he didn't feel comfortable moving forward with RCV just because it was different. He also noted that the RCV presenter last September indicated that RCV favored the incumbent since there was less campaign time.

Council Member Parigian stated there was no right or wrong way to hold an election, but he was concerned about elections for Park City. He was against RCV, but not because of how it worked. He felt the City had civil elections and he thought the argument for making campaigning easier was wrong. He thought candidates needed to work hard to meet the residents and put in the effort needed, as that time spent would reflect on the time needed once a candidate was elected to office. If the candidate did not have the time to put into a campaign, then it wasn't the right time for them to run for office.

Council Member Ciraco indicated he had been thinking about RCV ever since the resolution was passed last month. He stated this special meeting was called with short notice because of the May 1st deadline to rescind the RCV decision. He asserted this was not partisan politics, but he was there tonight because he felt he had made a mistake. He noted this was not an issue with computer tabulation, but rather he felt there was not an overwhelming reason to change the voting method, especially since this was the last year of the RCV pilot program. Municipal elections were nonpartisan. He noted the UVU study of RCV was a study of public opinion, not on the merits of RCV. It was especially difficult for the senior population. He did not support using RCV for this election.

Council Member Dickey thought the reason for this meeting was because new information was received, but he didn't hear any new information. He was disappointed in the process.

Council Member Ciraco moved to approve Resolution 07-2025, a resolution rescinding a request for inclusion of Park City, Utah in the Municipal Alternate Voting Methods Pilot Project, also known as Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) for the 2025 Municipal Election. Council Member Rubell seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Parigian, and Rubell

NAYS: Council Members Dickey and Toly

2. Discuss the Irrigation Water Rate Structure Alternative:

Clint McAfee and Jason Christensen, Public Utilities Department, presented this item. McAfee reviewed the last time this item was discussed the Council chose Alternative One for single-family residential water rates. They were here to discuss irrigation water rates and asserted the irrigation usage had been trending down over the past few years. The Water Department calculated 180 irrigation accounts: 133 with multifamily, 40 commercial, and 7 single family. He noted 84 properties had a single account and 31 properties had multiple accounts.

McAfee reviewed the calculation for the irrigation allocation based on the City code's limits on grass for new developments. Council Member Rubell thanked McAfee for being so thorough in this research. McAfee displayed two alternatives. Alternative One: base rate was \$100/acre, Tier 2 would start at 75% allocated volume, Tier 3 would start at 100% allocated volume, and that would result in a \$300,000 revenue reduction. Alternative Two: Base rate \$150/acre, Tier 2 would start at 100% allocated volume, Tier 3 would start at 110% allocated volume, and that would result in a \$300,000 revenue reduction. McAfee gave examples of how these alternatives would affect customers. He noted the Water Department had already reduced its budget by \$650,000 to accommodate both the residential water adjustments and irrigation water adjustments.

Council Member Rubell favored Alternative Two since it was less severe on users. He noted the City had programs for customers to turn their grass to other things. Council Member Ciraco supported Alternative Two as well. He indicated the better the community did at conservation, the lower the revenue would be. Alternative Two would give the City more flexibility if there was a year of extreme drought. Council Member Parigian asked if a property with multiple meters would be combined for calculating purposes, to which McAfee affirmed. Council Member Parigian had no preference between the alternatives.

Council Member Dickey supported Alternative Two and stated it was a smart approach. Council Member Toly supported Alternative Two and asked if this would be implemented for FY26. Christensen stated there was a lag between the meter read and the bill, so this would go out with the July bill. He stated there would be code changes for implementation as well so he would bring those amendments back to the Council. Mayor Worel summarized majority of the Council favored Alternative Two. McAfee stated this would be part of the FY26 fee schedule.

Council Member Toly moved to close the meeting to discuss litigation at 6:00 p.m.
Council Member Dickey seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

CLOSED SESSION

Council Member Toly moved to adjourn from Closed Meeting at 6:25 p.m. Council Member Ciraco seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

IV. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder