



**PARK CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARING  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
April 25, 2022**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Lillian Lederer, City Planner; Alex Ananth, Senior City Planner; Jaron Ehlers, Planning Department

**OTHERS:** Mike Goar, John Sales, Kara Bowyer, Mike Lewis, Shaydar Edelman

---

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken, called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. and explained that this meeting was being held in Council Chambers due to the public interest in this application. She noted the ground rules for this meeting so that they could maintain order. She requested that each attendee remain respectful and allow everyone to voice his or her opinion.

She indicated that she would limit public comments to three minutes per speaker.

- 1. Park City Mountain Resort- Ski Operations Improvements- Parcels: PCA-S-98-PCMR-1, PCA-29-A, PCA-29-D, PCA-1003, SA-402-A, SA-253-B-2 – Administrative Conditional Use Permit – The Applicant Proposes to Upgrade the Existing Silverlode Lift and Install a New Chair (Chondola Lift) Under the Park City Mountain Resort Mountain Upgrade Plan. PL-22-05145.**

Planner Lillian Lederer reported that the application was for an Administrative Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) for the Park City Mountain Eagle and Silverlode Lift Upgrades. The applicant proposed replacing the Eagle and Eaglet ski lifts with a new lift and to upgrade the Silverlode lift in a Recreation and Open Space (“ROS”) Zone and Sensitive Lands Overlay Zone. Staff deemed the application complete on April 5, 2022, upon, submission of a Parking Mitigation Plan (“PMP”) by Park City Mountain Resort (“PCMR”). PCMR requested a continuation of this item from the date of the original public hearing on April 12, 2022, to submit a new PMP. Planner Lederer added that this meeting would include Planning Director review and possible final action on this application.

The Park City Mountain Resort Mountain Upgrade Plan (“MUP”) is a part of the 1998 Development Agreement (“DA”). The Mountain Upgrade Plan includes ski lift upgrades with a relative location and Comfortable Carrying Capacity (“CCC”) upgrades. The DA allows for ski lift upgrades within the Mountain Upgrade Plan to be reviewed and approved or rejected administratively if the upgrades align with the criteria of the Agreement.

The criteria for approval were as follows:

1. If the upgrades are consistent with the Mountain Upgrade Plan.
2. If the visual impacts are minimal and any visual issues are mitigated.

3. If ski run lights are consistent with Land Management Code (“LMC”) standards
4. If lift towers shall be treated to blend with the natural surroundings, including treating galvanized lift equipment to minimize reflectivity.
5. Vegetation management, revegetation, and erosion control techniques.
6. If the plan assures adequate parking or other assurances as provided in the PMP to mitigate the impact of any proposed expansion of lift capacities.

Planner Lederer reported that CCC is a measurement tool for the ski resort to understand its capacity to move skiers around the mountain. The Mountain Upgrade Plan allows for a maximum CCC of 13,700. The SE Group indicated that the Resort has a current CCC of 12,570; therefore, it is operating within its allowed CCC as outlined in the 1998 Mountain Upgrade Plan. She further noted that CCC is a number that describes the comfortable daily carrying capacity of the ski lifts at a ski area as expressed in a unit of skiers per day. This unit is measured so that different facets of the operation of a ski resort are easily comparable, such as lift, trail, restaurant, ski school, and staging capacities, which includes parking, transit, and skier walking distance. She presented the current CCCs for the Silverlode Lift and the Eagle Lift, along with what was proposed and approved in the DA.

Planner Lederer summarized prior approvals of ski lift upgrades for the Park City Mountain. She mentioned that the 2015 Planning Commission approved a CUP for the Quicksilver Gondola. This gondola had not been proposed within the MUP and, therefore, was not processed administratively. She added that in 2015, the Planning Department also approved an administrative CUP for the upgrades at King Con and Motherlode Lifts. Both of these upgrades were outlined and complied with the MUP and therefore, were reviewed administratively. Planner Lederer also reported that in 2008, the Planning Commission approved a CUP for the Crescent Lift, the location of which was not accounted for in the Mountain Upgrade Plan.

Planner Lederer explained that this application proposed upgrades at Eagle and Eaglet Lifts by combining the two into one ski lift. The proposed Eagle Lift would be upgraded from a three-person to a six-person lift, identified as the Chondola Lift in the Mountain Upgrade Plan. The new Eagle Lift is recorded in the MUP as a lift with up to a CCC of 1,230. She added that this lift would parallel the alignment of the original planned Chondola Lift, extend approximately half the length of the originally proposed line, add an additional 580 CCC, and would include an ‘unload-only’ mid-station for skiers to access other parts of the mountain. She stated that the Eagle and Eaglet Lifts would be dismantled.

Planner Lederer presented a map of the proposed upgrade and highlighted that there would be 35 feet between the base terminal and the Snow Park bundles in compliance with the LMC. She also provided a comparison of the proposed upgrade with the approved Chondola Lift and noted that the upgraded Eagle Lift would be approximately half the length of the Chondola Lift as proposed in the MUP.

Planner Lederer next described the proposed upgrades to the Silverlode Lift. She explained that this lift was identified as the New Prospector Lift in the MUP and would remain in a similar location with a slightly new alignment due to new towers. The Silverlode Lift would be upgraded from a six-person to an eight-person lift, resulting in an increase in the CCC from 1,650 to 1,820. She added that the MUP allowed for this lift to be upgraded to a CCC of 2,080; therefore, this proposed upgrade complied with the MUP. She presented a map of the proposed upgrade of Silverlode Lift.

Planner Lederer reported that the Resort has a current CCC of 12,570 and the MUP allows for a maximum CCC of 13,700. She reiterated that pursuant to the 1998 MUP, the Silverlode Life was allowed an upgrade to 2,080 CCC. It currently operates at 1,650 and is proposed to increase to 1,820. The MUP allowed for a CCC of up to 250 for Eagle Lift. Eagle Lift currently operates at 90 CCC and Eaglet at 50 for a total CCC of 140. Pursuant to the application, those two lifts would be eliminated and replaced by the MUP-approved Chondola Lift, referred to as the new Eagle Lift, which was approved at 1,230 CCC. The proposal would result in a CCC of 580. Additionally, she explained that the Three Kings Lift, which runs at a current CCC of 580, would be reduced to 260 due to the addition of the new Eagle Lift. Planner Lederer stated that the proposed upgrades would reduce usage and CCC on the Three Kings Lift, which would mitigate some of the new CCC resulting from these upgrades.

Planner Lederer reported that the proposed upgrades would increase the CCC by 290, or 2.3%, bringing the total CCC to 12,830, which is under the maximum allowed. Staff hired an outside consultant, Ecosign, to confirm the CCC estimates provided by the applicant. She reported that Ecosign determined the CCC to be in close compliance with the provided data. She noted that based on their LMC analysis, this proposal met the requirements for the ROS Zoning District. She added that while new tramway stations and ski lifts were conditional uses pursuant to the LMC, the Development Agreement provides that any ski lift upgrades consistent with the MUP would be reviewed as an administrative CUP.

Planner Lederer stated further that all setbacks for the ROS Zone are 25 feet, and this proposal complies with the required setbacks. The Maximum Building Height in the ROS Zone is 28 feet. Pursuant to the LMC, ski lifts or tramway towers may extend above this maximum zone height, subject to visual analysis and administrative approval by the Planning Director. She noted that most ski lift towers extend above 28 feet, and therefore the Planning Director determined that the towers may exceed the maximum height for the zone. She added that this proposal also met the requirements of the Sensitive Lands Overlay Zoning District. The applicant provided materials regarding Steep Slopes, Ridgeline Areas, Wetlands, Stream Corridors, Wildland Interface, and Wildlife Habitat areas, as required by the LMC. The proposed locations for the new Chondola Lift towers fall on very steep slopes. She noted that this is not an unusual condition for ski lifts and would be allowed for construction.

The Silverlode lift will not change location, and therefore, Ridgeline views would not be significantly impacted. She explained that while the new Eagle Lift will slightly change alignment, it will have a similar route to the existing lifts and the Ridgeline view would not be significantly impacted as compared to existing conditions. Planner Lederer reported that the proposed upgrades do not impact any Wetlands or Streams. Wildlife Habitat areas would not be significantly impacted due to the similar locations of the existing and proposed lifts and towers. She added that any vegetation removed would be mulched on-site or taken off-site to reduce fuel loading and prevent wildfires. The applicant would be required to replace any removed significant vegetation as required by the Sensitive Lands Overlay Zone.

Planner Lederer stated that the proposal met the requirements for an Administrative CUP. She noted that the internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system was mitigated through the proposed PMP. Additionally, LMC Section 15-4-18 requires that this application be reviewed under the Passenger Tramways and Ski Base Facilities requirements. This application complies with these requirements.

She turned to the criteria under the 1998 DA that allows Administrative review of this application. With regard to Criteria 1, consistency with the MUP, Planner Lederer reported that the Planning Director found that the Lift Upgrades complied with the 1998 MUP and were within the allowed CCC for the Park City side of the Resort. She referred back to the CCC data provided by the applicant and reiterated that the data fell within the allowed CCC.

Planner Lederer stated that the Planning Director found that the proposal satisfied Criteria 2, Visual Impacts, in that the visual impacts of the lifts were minimized and were not more impactful than the existing lifts being replaced and upgraded. She reported that with regards to Criteria 3, Lighting, the Planning Director found that there was no proposed lighting. Regarding Criteria 4, Lift Tower Materials, she stated that the Planning Director found that the Lift Towers would be treated to blend with the natural surroundings and would be similar to the existing tower at King Con and other towers. Additionally, the towers were proposed to be galvanized.

With regard to Criteria 5, Vegetation Management Plan, she stated that the Planning Director found that vegetation removal would be mitigated. The applicant submitted a PMP for Criteria 6 dated April 19, 2022, that states that Park City Mountain would implement paid parking with a regulated reservation system starting in the 2022-2023 ski season. The plan proposed to increase Average Vehicle Occupancy (“AVO”), carpool and transit use, and more effectively manage traffic and parking impacts. She reported that the Planning Director found that the PMP would mitigate the impacts of the Lift Upgrades. Planner Lederer stated that the Lift Upgrades comply with the 1998 MUP and are within the allowed CCC for the Park City side of the resort. She noted that the Conditions of Approval could be found in the Draft Action Letter. The Conditions of Approval address vegetation, trails, and open space mitigation as well as LMC requirements to ensure that the CCC would be recorded by the applicant for Planning Department review.

She presented the Conditions of Approval that address parking and PMP conditions to ensure that Planning Staff could work with the applicant to ensure that the proposed plan works and is efficient for the area. She noted that since the submission of the Staff Report, they reviewed additional information and have proposed further Conditions of Approval. She referenced Condition of Approval 17 that “The Applicant shall provide adequate residential neighborhood mitigation and designate a residential liaison to meet with the City regarding impacts and mitigation.” She read Proposed Condition of Approval 18 as follows: “The Applicant shall be responsible for effectively managing the parking reservation system with an onsite parking attendant presence with a turn away and tow policy for people without a reservation.”

Planner Lederer noted that modified Condition of Approval 15 should read as follows: “The Applicant shall meet with the Planning Director, and other relevant Staff, bi-annually, including prior to the beginning of the ski season and within 60 days of completion of the ski season to provide parking and traffic information demonstrating compliance with the Parking Mitigation Plan and a Communications Plan to ensure information dissemination to the public. The Applicant shall share relevant parking information with Staff, including parking lot occupancy rates and achievement of increased Average Vehicle Occupancy rates. The Planning Director may impose additional conditions or operational changes if the Parking Mitigation Plan results in an ongoing adverse impact or is not achieving a demonstrated increase Average Vehicle Occupancy.”

Planner Lederer reported that the Development Review Committee, Forestry Board, and the Planning Department reviewed this application and have not identified any issues with the

proposed Lift Upgrades. Notice was posted to the adjacent property owners ten days prior to Final Action, and they have public input from approximately 40 persons, compiled as Exhibit K, with an additional 13 comments since the submission deadline. She stated that the Planning Director could approve this Administrative CUP or deny the Administrative CUP and direct Staff to make Findings for the denial. The Planning Director may also request additional information and continue the item to a date certain. Finally, the Planning Director may defer the application to the Planning Commission for review as a CUP.

Planner Lederer reported that Staff recommended the Planning Director review the proposed plan to replace the Eagle and Eaglet Ski Lifts with a new Lift and to upgrade the Silverlode Ski Lift, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving an Administrative Conditional Use Permit based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval.

Director Milliken turned the time over to the applicant.

Mike Goar, Chief Operating Officer and Vice President for Park City Mountain Resort introduced John Sales, Director of Planning, Shaydar Edelman, Vice President of Mountain Operations, and Mike Lewis, Senior Director of Base Area Planning. He stated that they, along with their staff, have worked on this project for some time, and he thanked everyone for all of the work that has gone into this project. Mr. Goar addressed the upgrades and stressed that this was about the guest experience. They work hard to ensure that they are listening to their guests and responding to their comments. He noted that this year, they have heard a lot about lift lines in certain zones. Silverlode Lift experiences lines as well as the upload in the morning at the Base Area.

He indicated that these projects would significantly impact the wait times in a positive way. The projects also enable the Resort to more effectively and efficiently move skiers and riders around the mountain. He noted that skiers are either on the lifts, waiting to get on the lifts, or they are on the trails. PCMR's mountain capacity is such that they can adequately handle a lot of skiers, but they must have an efficient and modern lift system. He stated that the projects ensure that they can continue to do that.

Mr. Goar reported that their Company's greatest commodity and priority is working on the guest experience. They continually work to improve that, even though they have some work to do. He stressed that these lifts are fundamental and critical to making these changes and to ensure that going forward that they are providing the guest experience that all guests expect. He explained that they proposed to upgrade Silverlode from a six-pack to the first eight-pack lift. He stressed modern technology and a lift system that would efficiently and effectively move people. The upgrade would maintain the same alignment as currently exists and would move more skiers and riders in this busy area of the mountain. It would also help with overall circulation. Mr. Goar noted that they want to focus on increasing uphill capacity in the area adjacent to the gondola in Miner's Camp.

He expressed excitement about the Eagle Lift upgrade and stated that it was critical for a number of reasons. It would be a six-passenger lift with a slight adjustment in alignment and consistent with the Chondola or Lift A that was previously approved. Mr. Goar explained that both the Eagle and Eaglet Lifts would be removed. He noted that the location of the new Eagle Lift would be critical in that it would provide maximum, efficient circulation for skiers and riders exiting out of the Park City Mountain Village Base Area. The new Eagle Lift would be a mid-

station that would allow better access to the front portion of the mountain. He offered that the alignment would relieve pressure on Payday, Crescent, and Bonanza Lifts.

Mr. Goar stated that they have received feedback from guests, the majority of which has revealed excitement for the Lift Upgrades. He commented that the projects have received a lot of interest and there has been support from long-time residents, business owners, and those who are most familiar with the mountain. They have also heard concerns from neighbors. He reported that in November, Mr. Edelman met with one of the closest adjacent property owners, Snow Flower, and walked the site with Snow Flower representatives. Mr. Goar reported that Mr. Edelman also attended a Homeowners Association ("HOA") meeting and presented the overall concept of the upgrades as well as the terminal locations. Mr. Goar noted that the locations of the terminals were staked, and those stakes remained in place for view until snow-making operations began in the fall/early winter.

They continued their discussions with Snow Flower's General Manager and HOA Board. As a result, PCMR offered some additional changes and confirmations to address the residents' concerns. Mr. Goar stated that PCMR suggested moving the bottom terminal an additional five feet from the property line which would result in a 30-foot setback from the resort's property line. He added that there was also an additional 10 feet on the Snow Flower side of the property. Mr. Goar stated that they also offered to mitigate privacy concerns with a mix of increased landscaping and/or privacy fences and gate combinations along the property line while maintaining the necessary clearances for the lift. He felt that these should address the residents' concerns and would make these upgrades an improvement to their mountain experience.

He also addressed comments regarding the sound of the lift. He reported that they measured noise levels at 25 feet at the King Con Lift, which is similar to the new Eagle Lift. The measurement was 53 decibels at 25 feet away, which is below the Noise Ordinance standards, and noted that there would be a total of 40 feet to the Snow Flower building. He suggested that 50 decibels is the approximate sound of a moderate rainfall, 60 decibels is the volume of normal conversation, and a vacuum cleaner is approximately 80 decibels. Mr. Goar stressed that the new lift would be quiet, with the drive mechanism located at the top station in order to minimize noise in the Base Areas and adjacent property owners.

With regard to tower heights, Mr. Goar stated that the towers would be between 40 to 62 feet and meet the requirements of normal installation of similar lifts. He added that the King Con Lift, which received Administrative approval in 2015, has several towers at approximately 55 feet, with one tower at 60 feet. Mr. Goar added that the lifts were designed to look like the other lift infrastructure within the Resort and the towers would have the same design, color, and signage as all other lifts on the mountain. They were also designed as a muted, galvanized towers to decrease reflective visibility.

Mr. Goar next addressed parking and stated that they worked with the City and looked at many different options in terms of traffic mitigation. They have been asked by all of the stakeholders to consider something that would be transformative and impactful beyond the status quo. Mr. Goar expressed excitement and felt that their proposal would be transformational for the City and the guests. He acknowledged that it would involve work in terms of the adjustment of behavior, but once implemented, the benefits would be tremendous. He stressed that the community, the out-of-town guests and employees would all benefit.

Mr. Goar stated that paid parking has been proven to reduce parking demand and increase vehicle occupancy. In addition, the use of reservations would spread out arrival times. He stressed that the parking reservation system was the most important element of the PMP. The PMP has components of free parking, paid parking and carpooling, and transit incentives. All of these elements would make this work to effect real change in traffic and parking in the community and at the resort.

Director Milliken commented that Staff was excited to see the paid parking reservation system. She referenced the additions to the Conditions of Approval; in particular the enforcement of the paid parking reservation system presented by Planner Lederer and requested the applicant's feedback. Mr. Goar felt that enforcement was important to the success of the system and saw nothing in that Condition of Approval that would be problematic. He indicated that they would expect enforcement and felt it was a requirement for this plan to work.

Director Milliken also mentioned that Staff felt that going to a paid parking system would potentially put more pressure on the neighborhoods by virtue of people parking in the neighborhoods to avoid parking. As a result, one of the added Conditions of Approval was to create a neighborhood parking liaison from Vail for the neighborhoods to address any concerns and develop solutions. Mr. Goar stated that they would commit to that Condition of Approval, and he has already identified a liaison.

Director Milliken opened the matter up for public comment. Comments were taken first from those attending in person.

*Terri Whitney* has been with Snow Flower since 1980. She recently retired but is working closely with the HOA to help keep the history of Snow Flower intact. She indicated that she is also an owner. Over the past 40 years, they have had a great relationship with PCMR and have worked together on issues that impact them both. She added that a majority of the owners were generally in favor of replacing the Eagle Lift with a high-speed six-pack, and more importantly, the location of the landing on the top of the mountain. She believed that this would help distribute traffic more efficiently at the top of the ridge and allow skiing on both the front and backside of the mountain. Ms. Whitney reported that the Snow Flower HOA is concerned about the location of the lift base and the proximity to Building Two. She acknowledged that the applicant offered an additional five feet, and now that she understands that it would increase the distance to 40 feet felt that this might provide more of a buffer. She thanked Director Milliken and Planner Lederer for taking the time to visit the site.

*Mike Mangano* was present representing the Snow Flower homeowners in Buildings One and Two, known as HOA 1. He explained that there are two separate HOAs at Snow Flower. He supported the new Eagle Lift and felt it would be good for everyone, however, there are issues with its position because there are six condominiums that will be blocked by the Lift. He appreciated the efforts of Vail but stated that the culture of Vail Corporate appears to be different than the culture of Park City. He mentioned that in Colorado, Vail is building employee housing on property they own. The problem is that they are building it on the habitat of the Big Horn sheep. With respect to the placement of the Eagle Lift at Snow Flower, the HOA is trying to understand the placement but is only receiving one-word answers. The HOA does not understand why the Lift could not be moved.

Mr. Mangano suggested moving the lift up and out but was told that this would present grading problems, which were not explained. He felt that with the new equipment out there, grading

should not be an issue. He added that they were also concerned about the fact that they would not be able to use Sidewalk 1 because it would be dangerous with the new Lift. There would also be a visual problem with the lines that would look into every deck and window as it goes up. He stressed that they want to be able to understand this proposal. Mr. Mangano stated that there are 82 units at Snow Flower. His unit does not face the slope side and they purposely selected the quiet side to avoid the noise one would expect at a ski resort. He commented that they are getting to the point where they can no longer refer to Old Town because it is becoming New Vail.

*Nancy Lazenby* commented on Vail's dedication to transformable parking and traffic. She appreciated their efforts but was disappointed that Vail's plan would cost the community and the locals money and become a profit center for Vail. She suggested something that would benefit the community, the locals, and the tourists rather than cost them. She raised the notion of a parking structure at I-80 or I-40 with shuttles to the Resort rather than creating paid parking at the Resort. She felt that to be transformable, there needs to be another piece to this PMP to improve parking and traffic that would not cost the skier and the locals.

*Meeche White* was with the National Ability Center ("NAC") and felt positive about the PMP because it would motivate people to change their behavior. It would also greatly ease the traffic congestion because not everyone would be rushing to the mountain at 8:30 a.m. to get a parking space. In terms of the NAC, the location of the Lifts would help them significantly. All of the other lifts are uphill for the NAC, so the new Eagle Lift would be of great benefit to them.

*Jennifer Booth* identified herself as the General Manager of Snow Flower Condominiums and was present representing both HOAs. She stated that both HOAs stand in support of the Lift Upgrades, but as PCMR's closest neighbor, they had concerns that stemmed primarily from Eagle Lift's proximity to Building Two. She noted that while PCMR agreed to move the lift an additional five feet to make the distance from Building Two to the Lift 40 feet, the HOAs still have concerns about noise, privacy, reduced ski hill access for owners, and guests, trespassing, and increased traffic. She added that the new Lift will also significantly impair the view for many slope-side Building Two owners.

Ms. Booth reported that they already experience serious issues with skiers trespassing on Snow Flower property for parking and to access the lifts. She expressed concern that they will see substantially more instances of trespassing as skiers look for parking and easy access to the ski hill, particularly with Eagle Lift's CCC more than doubling and its placement just feet from Snow Flower's parking areas and property line. She noted that the owners were deeply concerned that the crowds seen at Payday and Silverlode over Christmas would move to Eagle Lift. Under the proposed layout, the staircase that provides access to the ski hill from Building Two would lead directly into the low clearance area of the Lift. She stated that they appreciated the agreement to move the lift five feet and hope that it would reduce the impact on ski hill access for Building Two owners.

Ms. Booth stated that the HOA recognized that some level of noise would be unavoidable and was hopeful that PCMR would be a considerate neighbor. The HOA has had several discussions with PCMR regarding its concerns, and greatly appreciates the mitigation efforts they have expressed thus far. She hoped this dialogue would continue. Ms. Booth remarked that the HOAs have a long history of friendship with PCMR, who has expressed a willingness to work with them on most of their concerns, including efforts to mitigate noise, traffic, and trespassing. The HOAs hope that this friendship continues to benefit both PCMR and Snow



Flower. Both HOAs still have serious concerns about the placement of the Lift, but Snow Flower HOA 2 stands in support of the Lift Upgrades. Snow Flower HOA 1 supports the Lift Upgrade in general but asked for a delay in the approval of the permit to explore options for moving the lift further from Building Two.

*Alex Spudinski* reported that he resides in Park Meadows and skis Park City 30 to 40 days per year. He did not question that the Lift Upgrades at the Base would improve the total skier experience as well as the guest experience. He reminded those present that they live in a resort and the guest experience is crucial to the community's success. He felt it would be a huge plus if they were able to improve the guest experience because it benefits local businesses. He has skied at Breckenridge and the carpool idea is excellent and works. As a result, he felt this was an important part of this proposal.

*Bill Suraco* indicated that he has only lived in Park City for a few years but has been visiting Snow Flower since 1987. He has worked at the Mid-Mountain Lodge for the past two ski seasons. He was willing to support Vail's efforts to improve the guest experience at PCMR, but he had a few concerns. He referenced the CCC and asked how the Lift Upgrades will impact on-mountain capacity, trail conditions and grooming, and off-season maintenance. He noted a substantial amount of brush on the King Con side of the mountain, which is, in part, an off-season maintenance issue. He felt the Planning Commission needed to have that conversation because if approved, more people would be on the mountain.

Mr. Suraco stated that the area of the mountain by Silverlode experienced a lot of trail congestion this season and part of the issue was not enough grooming. He felt this was a critical item that needed discussion. He was supportive of the reservation parking plan and felt that it would somewhat impact behavior. He referenced the tow away and turn around plan but felt that there also needed to be a Plan B. On any given weekend morning, there would likely be 200 to 300 cars showing up without a reservation because they would not know about the system. He asked about Plan B and whether they could use the lot at Richardson's Flat and a dedicated bus. Mr. Suraco stated that these are issues that should be discussed to make everything better for guests and residents.

*Mike Sweeney* helped bring skiing to Park City in 1962. Prior to that, in 1955, his father and mother took a trip to Aspen and came back when Park City was a ghost town due to the fact that the mining operations were ending. His father was able to convince the mining company to become a ski company. Mr. Sweeney read a short letter that was submitted and made part of the record. He stated that since they started Park City in the 1960s, Vail has done an excellent job at the base of the Town Lift. This year, they put snow in buckets to give skiers an extra three to four days. He felt that Vail has gone beyond what he considered reasonable in maintaining the mountain resort. He reported that he skied 35 times this year and on April 17 he made 25,000 vertical feet. He complimented Vail and stated that they care about Park City and will do the right thing.

He added that it takes time to communicate and get everyone on the same page. There are a lot of great ideas and he believed Park City will continue to improve each year. Mr. Sweeney and his brothers have done their part to create open space where they do not have to worry about anyone building anything on that mountain. They have created and will maintain conservation easements. The Town Lift will remain. He recognized that at the Caledonian, they are discussing the same issues. He considered this to be a wonderful asset that with time will continue to get better.

*Deb Rentfrow* identified herself as a resident of Park City and the co-founder of RRAD. They do not oppose the Lift Upgrades or improvements to the guest experience but feel that two of the Administrative criteria have not been met, namely consistency with the MUP and parking. She stated that the 1998 MUP and all subsequent amendments clearly show the Eagle and Eaglet Lifts as remaining in place. A new Chondola Lift was proposed with an origination below the existing Eagle and First Time Lifts. The new Chondola Lift offloads in the Meadows Assessment Terrain area of the Resort, offering completely different terrain access. She concluded that the proposed Lift Upgrade for the Eagle Lift was not consistent with the MUP.

Ms. Rentfrow added that the proposed PMP does not consider that more people might utilize drop-off and does not include any additional drop-off locations or facilitation for the safety of all visitors to the Resort. She expressed that the proposed PMP provides no factual support for dispersed arrival times for the ski industry. She explained that the PMP does not provide guest assurances of available parking. Ms. Rentfrow referenced the PMP that states: "Guests who arrive without reservations will be directed to another parking location such as The Canyons, the High School, or Park-and-Ride location." She identified several issues with this, including visitors wanting to drop off despite having no adequate drop-offs. Additionally, the High School lot is only available Saturday, Sunday, and school holidays which amount to approximately 26 days out of the season. She stressed that there were 23 times between Mondays and Fridays when the High School lot was unavailable this past season.

Additionally, Ms. Rentfrow stated that The Canyons lot filled up at least 23 times during the same period. She asked where these people would go, and offered that they might go to the library, the City Park, the residential streets, the Walgreens, the Fresh Market, and other locations. Ms. Rentfrow stated that based on the unplanned replacement of Eagle Lift and the inadequate PMP, Administrative approval should not be allowed. Instead, the Planning Commission should review this application. She added that assuming the Director intends to move forward with approval, she wished to highlight that there were at least 68 days where the PCMR lots overflowed. The PMP states that employees would park free of charge in the Silver King lot during non-peak periods. She offered that if you take the 26 holiday "peak" days, that means there are at least 42 more peak days that employees need to be parked elsewhere.

Ms. Rentfrow stated that to make any measurement and claim success, improvement, or failure, there must be a baseline. Accurate and specific records and data must be provided for the 2021-2022 season, or else any claims from a paid parking and reservation system and parking at the Munchkin lot cannot be validated. She stressed that it would be a grossly inaccurate statement to claim success next year if they do not have real data for this season. Guesswork should not be allowed, and if they do not have the data she submitted that this year should become the baseline and no victories claimed until 2024.

Ms. Rentfrow argued that there needs to be a consequence for the Resort, not the City and its' residents for failure to properly mitigate insufficient parking. She also referenced the 1998 DA and the continued dismissal of one of the Conditions of Approval included in that Agreement. Since the completion of the Marriot Mountainside in the early 2000s, the resort owner, which Vail assumed, has owed the City a minimum of 23 employee housing units available for occupancy prior to any future approval on any CUP. She questioned why they continued to let the Resort off the hook for this critical need in the community.

*Clive Bush* advised that he was an Old Town resident. He echoed the comments of Ms. Rentfrow regarding the data. He stated that it was odd that they were complaining about Lift Upgrades since all skiers want to see new Lifts. But with the Lift Upgrades comes the responsibility of mitigating their impact. He did not think that the impact has been proven to work and there is a huge call for this matter to go before the Planning Commission. Mr. Bush addressed Criteria 6 and questioned whether the PMP would work. He felt that the PMP was oversimplified because it was being considered in isolation. He did not hear anyone mention "peak ski day." He added that the MUP specifically states that the parking shuttle accommodations must be sized for the capacity of a peak ski day. None of the information provided addresses this. He added further that the PMP talks about the CCC, not a "peak ski day." The MUP includes a 10% factor applied to the CCC to arrive at the maximum CCC. Arguably, this calculation was made 25 years ago, and he was incredulous that they were discussing statistics from that long ago.

Mr. Bush would assume that PCMR was more like a standard ski resort, which would use a peak ski day percentage of 25% above the CCC. When he applied the 25%, what was predicted to be a shortfall in the PMP would be a deficit of approximately 1,000 cars and 3,000 skiers. He stressed that this needed to be further evaluated and noted that this is something the Planning Commission had been trying to figure out for two years with the Base Development. To say that the impacts have been mitigated is a complete over-simplification. He stressed that there was an obligation to combine the figures from shifting the 195 cars offsite to the mitigation responsibility included in the MUP to address "peak ski days." This proposal has not determined the "peak ski day" number. Once it is determined, the question then becomes whether there would be enough services, as it is much more than just shifting AVO.

He added that this issue does not just arise on the weekends. He emphasized that there was an expectation in the community that there would be on-mountain improvements to improve the guest experience and added that the guest experience begins offsite. He reiterated that the "peak ski day" number should be included in the PMP. Mr. Bush offered that this is why this matter needed to go before the Planning Commission. Mr. Bush reiterated that the MUP provides that improvements should be built for Easter Sunday and address the "peak ski day" data. The applicant has not indicated that they would consider that information. He acknowledged that paid parking and reservations would improve the situation somewhat, but it is not enough.

He felt that this application could be bifurcated to approve the Silverlode Lift. The Eagle Lift is problematic, however, because it increases capacity. He mentioned that the 2015 upgrades and Finding of Fact No. 30 gave the City authority to require the resort to limit ticket sales if the PMP failed to adequately mitigate peak day parking requirements. Mr. Bush next addressed the temporary closure of lifts and the City Attorney's declaration that closure of less than one year deemed it "temporary." He stated that no metric supports this declaration, and they need to determine what a temporary lift closure is.

*Deborah Hickey* echoed the comments of Ms. Rentfrow and Mr. Bush. She believed that this proposal was a redesign of the Eagle Lift, not just a replacement. The significant impact on Snow Flower should not be remediated without the involvement of the Planning Commission. She felt for those who would be in close proximity to the new Lift that would have noise equivalent to the sound of rain all the time. She stated that the capacity and location of the Eagle Lift would be completely different and should be before the Planning Commission. Ms. Hickey added that the lift designs would be a cash cow for Vail to make money off of

parking. Many locals would like to visit the Resort without having to pay extra money to park. There should be discussion of developing a real transportation plan for the City, not just a parking plan that would affect the Base Area. Ms. Hickey felt that the entire City needed a transportation plan before they could say that charging for parking would remediate the problem. She noted that there must be access so that the people that could afford to pay \$25 a day would have options.

Ms. Hickey referenced the Base Development application and reiterated that a citywide transportation plan was necessary because these projects would negatively impact the neighborhoods and the community. She offered that the community should have access to parking at a discounted rate or for free since they are the taxpayers who pay for the free bus transportation system. With this plan, the community would be paying for the bus system and parking at the Base Area. She stressed that this was a lot for the locals to take on all of the responsibility for mitigating the transportation plan.

She also expressed concern about expanding to an eight-person chair lift. The quality of skiers would be challenged with this upgrade and accidents happen all the time even with a six-person lift. She recalled a day this past season when the lifts stopped at Deer Valley and each person had to be taken down off the chair lift before nightfall as an emergency decision. She did not know how that could be done with an eight-person lift and questioned whether there would be the appropriate staff available should that occur. She stressed the importance of safety.

Ms. Hickey wondered how the local user groups would be affected by the PMP and specifically mentioned the NAC, youth and collegiate ski programs, and the cowboys who bring horses in for the Snow Flower Resort. She has not heard how the local community would be accommodated. The paid parking system is not the answer to mitigate the traffic issues in Town. The user experience begins on the way to the resort and when a user leaves the resort.

*Mickey Gallivan* represented Silver King Mining Company. He applauded PCMR and Vail Corporation for this investment and their ongoing investment in the on-mountain experience and capacity. Silver King Mining Company recently renewed a lease of the Scott's Bowl area that had been closed for four years. PCMR, Vail Corp., and Mr. Goar went out of their way to bring this back into the ski experience. He added that much of their investment is public, and much is not public and noted that increasing the on-mountain experience is something that should be recognized and supported at every level.

*Eric Moxham* stated that because The Canyons is in dire need of lift capacity upgrades due to age and related maintenance and safety concerns, he did not oppose the proposed Silverlode upgrade. His comments were directed to the proposed Eagle Lift Upgrades. He commented on the environmental impact, which was a requirement of the CUP review. He noted that pursuant to the application, the Lift Upgrades would result in 5.5 acres of tree clearing, excavation, and related environmental impact. He was not sure this made sense from an environmental impact and cost perspective when the Resort could minimize both impacts by following the existing routing for the Eagle and Eaglet Lifts and extending it to the same proposed termination point.

Mr. Moxham disagreed that these Lift Upgrades would not impact ridgeline views, and summer hiking and biking trails. This has not been addressed in the application. He next addressed the proposed Mid-Station location on the new Eagle Lift. He believed that the new Mid-Station location next to the termination point of the Three Kings Lift was nonsensical unless Vail and the

resort have longer-term redevelopment plans for the directly adjacent slopes that would most likely be different from the current freestyle park and alpine racing runs.

Mr. Moxham felt that the placement of the Mid-Station next to the Three Kings termination point would be detrimental to the guests as well as local and national athletes. For guests, it would reduce the options and ease of accessibility for both King Con and Silver Star Lifts. He proffered that the proposed routing was a precursor to the potential removal of the Three Kings Lift and Three Kings Park. He referenced the Ecosign report commissioned by the City.

For the local alpine and freestyle athletes, Mr. Moxham opined that the proposed Mid-Station location would impact training efficiency and the status as a premier training and competition venue, including for any future Olympic events. The location would impede access to the alpine training and competition venues, noting that this was a venue for the Giant Slalom competition in the 2002 Winter Olympics, and ongoing FIS and U.S. Ski and Snowboard sanctioned events. He added that this location would dump significantly more skiers at the top of Three Kings Lift and could result in a dangerous situation where beginner skiers would use The Park much more frequently. For both skiers and snowboarders, training efficiency is paramount for skill progression and resulting performance in competitions. Based on all of these issues, Mr. Moxham suggested that this application go before the Planning Commission for proper review.

*Angela Moschetta* reported that she is a resident of Old Town. She thanked the Director for allowing her to speak as long as she needs to and for letting others provide their informed and reasonable analyses with which she agreed. She hated the fact that residents were constantly being put in the position to bring levels of legitimacy and scrutiny that they look to Staff and leadership for. She addressed Director Milliken directly and apologized for any offense caused by her candid comments and criticism. She stated that it was deeply offensive that the residents pay taxes to hire a competent City Manager and Staff and have been required in recent years to spend millions more of their own dollars and time to thwart egregious actions by ruthless developers and resort owners because the City Manager and Staff are failing in their support for public process and application of Code.

Ms. Moschetta stated that it was clear that the community has an overwhelming desire to change as evidenced by one of the most lopsided elections in Park City's history. Demand for truth and transparency was inarguable. She added that while the community waits patiently for evidence of change inside City Hall, the new mayor, and Council Members are stymied to deliver the transparency and clarity they seek because the ills are institutionalized. She added that the institutionalized arrogance, incompetence, and penchant for uninformed decision-making in a vacuum and subversion of the open and engaging public process persists, as they are here today. At a recent meeting, a member of the public suggested that Planning Staff was in the pocket of developers. She did not agree that there was that type of transactional corruption in Park City but understood why it could seem that way.

She stated that in PEG's clumsy process through Planning alone, there was a lot of evidence of this. City Planner, Alexandra Ananth, has inserted and removed over and over again the recommendations for reductions in parking that never came with an ounce of legitimate survey or data support. She submitted that the Planning Department, the City Manager, and the previous administration rooted on a case for reduced parking in a "Transit First" plan that was never researched or properly developed, and a plan that PEG, PCMR, and Vail wish to lean on today.

Ms. Moschetta averred that it took a County Transportation Director to attend a Park City Planning Commission meeting and confirm that the "Transit First" plan was and is still a fraud. She stated that it would be easier to make a case for the perpetual incompetence of the City Manager and Staff and attach that incompetence to dollar amounts that have cost the community than it would be to validate Criteria 6 in the Draft Letter. She stated that Criteria 6 states that at all times, developers shall assure that it has adequate parking or has implemented such other assurances as provided in the PMP. The applicant submitted a PMP stating that it would implement paid parking with a regulated reservation system starting next season. Additionally, this plan proposed to increase AVO, carpool, and transit use and more effectively manage traffic and parking impacts. She stated that the Planning Director found that the PMP mitigates the impact of the Lift Upgrades.

Ms. Moschetta argued that there was absolutely nothing in the Staff Report and Packet or any prior Staff Report or Packet that suggests that Vail's plan would increase the AVO. The only certainty about the proposed paid parking plan is that it would harm locals who have lived here a long time, and do not have endless dollars or time at lunch to waste on buses because there is no plan for any kind of rapid transit bus. She stated that she was not opposed to paid parking; in fact, she welcomes it, but only with adequately and reasonably located satellite parking lots that connect to rapid direct resort transit. In addition, she submitted that the paid parking has zero community benefit and stands only to benefit Vail, who will pocket millions from parking fees. This plan would also be disastrous for The Canyons, as well as locals and in-town workers who would create reverse traffic at various times of the day by pursuing free parking.

Ms. Moschetta stated that the Director has complained that Staff is overworked and they have confirmed that they are "green". She did not fault inexperienced Staff; rather, she blamed leadership and specifically mentioned Director Milliken, City Manager Matt Dias, and everyone else who fails to grasp big pictures and unintended consequences. She mentioned another Administrative CUP that no one was notified of that resulted in millions of dollars of retaining walls and relocated sewer lines on Twisted Branch Road. She stated that even the Planning Commissioners questioned how this occurred without any Planning Commission review or public process. She claimed that Director Milliken awarded a luxury developer a permit to start a controversial project as a way to pass the buck on the safety issues around Twisted Branch Road, a relocated a trailhead, and some glitzy new bathroom facilities. In fact, they have more luxury condominiums, a bare minimum on affordable housing, and safety issues that might end up worse.

Ms. Moschetta referenced Tom Clyde's column in *The Park Record* and shared the following quotes: "The City Code says if any land, structure or use is changed to create more off-street parking demand, the owner must provide such additional off-street parking and required electric vehicle charging station infrastructure in installation for new use. The Code says required parking must be onsite unless the Planning Commission allows such parking on adjacent or nearby deed-restricted lots. Some of this will have been addressed back in the 90s when the initial approval for the hotel project was granted. The Agreement may supersede some or all of the Code, so just waiving it doesn't seem reasonable. Times change and the 1990s Agreement did not anticipate two million Epic Passes. Lots full at sunrise are a problem that needs to be solved no matter what the 30-year-old Agreement says."

Ms. Moschetta believed Director Milliken was outside her authority, as was anyone else who would allow her to make one more decision that would bear such a catastrophic impact on the community and serve only to benefit the Resort. She concluded by stating that Lift Upgrades are necessary, as an upgrade to Vail's ability to staff and manage its resorts. Until Vail and PCMR prove they can manage PCMR and The Canyons as they currently exist, which includes opening all-terrain, maintaining snow, facilitating safe and efficient drop-off and pick-up, and walking back the disaster of the poorly managed discount pass program, inadequate wages and incompetent staff, no one should give them one more chance to screw over Park City and line their pockets.

She stated that it was time for Director Milliken to do her duty to the taxpayers and refuse this institutionalized failure and send this application to the Planning Commission where it belongs. If the Director approves this CUP, she and others would have no choice but to pursue action against the Director, the City Manager, and Park City Municipal for breach of professional obligation.

*Michael Kaplan* distinguished Vail as a corporation and local management. He felt that the local PCMR staff has done a very good job, but Vail has not been a good partner for the City or many of the communities across the nation. It started when they tried to hijack the name Park City. Vail seems to cherry-pick schemes to increase their bottom line, and in this case, it is lift capacity without a commensurate increase in parking. The problems and costs created by this would be dumped back on the City and by extension the taxpayers.

Mr. Kaplan stated that Vail is several parking spots short of what is required, and they have not been completely honest about how they use the satellite parking in their calculations. The City is not obligated to help Vail meet its CCC and MUP development obligations. If Vail creates paid parking at the Base, another profit center, at the minimum they should be required to put that money toward the City's transportation and offsite parking expenses. He stated that Vail is happy to sell passes and ski tickets while dumping their parking and transportation obligations back on the community. He urged the Director to keep this process as transparent as possible and remand this matter back to the City Council or the Planning Commission so that the public can have their say in the process.

*Mark Stemler* reported that he owns properties on Main Street and has been in town for a number of years. He is pro-business and pro-ski. He stated that moving people on the mountain is one thing; parking them is another. The only mitigation that works is the correct amount of parking, which is to be determined. He suggested that the applicant was doing the best they can and are getting blindsided because prior administrations have never valued parking. The paid parking and reservation system could make the situation worse with people poaching. He offered that using the resources they have now to give PCMR time to move ahead and suggested upgrading the least used portal, which is on Main Street. The Town Lift was put in many years ago and is now decrepit and goes nowhere. If Vail would commit to installing a high-speed quad in 18 months, it would be a great help because people would not be dropping in at the Base or forced out to The Canyons. Many who drive to the Resort would no longer have to drive. He pointed to Snowbird and Alta, which are skier-only resorts. He felt the solution was getting the Town Portal to service both resorts and have simultaneous lifts. Mr. Stemler agreed that this decision was too big to be made by the Director. He added that it is difficult for Staff who have worked for prior administrations that were overwhelmingly defeated.

Director Milliken then turned to the public comment by those appearing virtually.

*Thomas Jacobson* reported that there have been a lot of changes to the Resort over the years, and they were dealing with a problem with success. For years, Park City was trying to put itself on the map, so it advertised internationally as having the greatest snow on earth. This marketing was very successful, and the City has been a victim of its own success over the last several years, especially with regard to issues such as traffic. Mr. Jacobson believed that what is being proposed with this application should not be confused with some of the other issues. The applicant has taken a very important initiative to move skiers around the hill better, more efficiently and in a way that leaves a good image of the town. The Lift Upgrades are a way to catch up with what has been the promotion and success of the marketing efforts over the years.

He felt there was no reason not to approve these items. Some of the other issues discussed today are community issues, not just PCMR issues. He noted that they refused to allow the Utah Department of Transportation to make improvements to Route 248, so now the community suffers every morning and especially during ski season. Transit has been discussed, yet they allowed two bus companies to run up the same road with empty buses and no plan as to how to fill them. He stated that the community has a lot of challenges ahead, but one thing they can do to help is to allow the Lift Upgrades, which will facilitate the better movement of skiers on the hill and better attitudes toward guests.

With regard to the mitigation issues and parking, it is well known that paid parking has become the stalwart of the ski industry. He suggested that this was not the time or place to decide how to use the proceeds of the paid parking, but more importantly, realize that paid parking has slowed down the traffic issues in the ski industry. The community must solve the issues of traffic and they will want Vail and any other stakeholder to be part of the solution. Mr. Jacobson reiterated that he strongly supported the right of PCMR to build these lifts and improve the flow of people on the mountain.

*Susan Bremer-Rossow* indicated that she is an owner at Snow Flower and wanted the Director to see the face of someone whose home is going to lose its view and would lose access to the hill as a result of the Lift. She stated that she will go from having a quiet, peaceful home to a lift built 35 feet from her living room window and the associated noise. She stated that this will erode her property value and everyone else in Snow Flower. She expressed concerns about the environmental impact and added that Vail Corporation has not been a great neighbor. Snow Flower has lived with the runoff from the half-pipe and there is not a lot of evidence that this project will be done well or take Snow Flower into consideration.

Ms. Bremer-Rossow wants improvements on the mountain but does not want her property values eroded and does not want anyone's income eroded. She recommended that the lift be moved away from Snow Flower as 35 feet is not enough. She asked if anyone would want that noise in his or her home. The Lifts must be moved far enough away so that the noise is mitigated. She also expressed concerns about the parking and echoed the comments of prior speakers. She begged the Director to take into consideration the placement of the Eagle Lift next to Snow Flower Two building.

*Robert Winn, M.D.* reported that he is the Medical Director for PCMR, The Canyons, and Deer Valley. He is a long-time resident of the City. He supported the application and stated that he is one of the few business owners who want to be less busy. Anything that can happen on Resort property that decreases congestion will result in fewer injuries.



*Patricia Braun* stated that her family owned property at Snow Flower before it was constructed. She echoed the prior statements regarding the impact of placing the lift close to Snow Flower. She added that if there were not a real plan for remediation for the one road going into Snow Flower, there would be incredible traffic jams and safety hazards. It would also negatively impact the owners' privacy on the property and quiet enjoyment.

*Lynn Morgan* reported that her family has owned property in Snow Flower and paid taxes for over 40 years. The Lift Upgrades will greatly increase the number of people at the edge of the Snow Flower property. She suggested that flexibility be included in the placement of the fencing and other needs to protect the property from the non-Snow Flower traffic. She added that Snow Flower's most marketable feature is ski-in/ski-out accessibility, which must be maintained to allow the rentals and homeowners continued access to the ski slope. She asked about PCMR's plans for fencing for security and gate access for ski-in/ski-out. She also referenced the extra expense for the homeowners.

She also raised the issue of restrooms and the environmental impact of putting more people at the base of the hill for the new Eagle Lift. If there is no fencing, people will walk through Snow Flower looking for restroom facilities. Additional issues include housing for extra staffing and employee parking. She noted that last year no one manned the lift tickets at the base of the hill. She appreciated her taking their concerns into consideration and protecting Snow Flower's property values and access.

There were no further comments either in person or virtually. Director Milliken closed the public comment period.

Director Milliken provided a summation and noted that the comments were appreciated and valued. She recognized that one of the main concerns was the location of the new Eagle Lift, which is near the Snow Flower Condominiums. Additionally, there were issues regarding restrooms and who will be paying for any type of barrier mitigation between Snow Flower and the new lift. Noise was also a concern expressed by the public. She recalled concerns about the safety of an eight-person lift, and one of the commenters asked for a definition of a "peak day" and what mitigation was planned for a "peak day." There were a number of comments about the impacts on the locals and the cost to the locals of having to pay for parking. Director Milliken noted that drop-offs were of concern. Environmental impacts, ridgeline, and hiking/biking impacts were also raised, as were the potential impacts to the professional athletes and events. She asked the applicant to address some of these concerns.

Mr. Goar addressed the location of the Lift and reiterated that in November, they contacted Snow Flower to discuss the placement of the Lift. At that time, they did not receive some of the concerns expressed at this meeting. They staked the Lift to show where it would be located and since that time, Vail has offered to move it. He noted that they also offered to discuss with Snow Flower other mitigations, including fencing and landscaping. He commented that if the HOA felt these mitigations would be helpful they were willing to look at placement and the type of mitigation that might work best for them. He commented that he previously shared some of the noise measurements taken for a similar lift, and stated that it would be quiet, as it works opposite the drive terminal. They would be happy to continue conversations on this issue.

With respect to the safety of the 8-person lift, Mr. Goar was unsure of the basis of that concern as these lifts operate all over the world. Lifts have evolved over the years as technology has

increased capacities. He stressed that safety is a consideration and an important issue, but he has no concerns about the safety of an 8-person lift and the Resort's ability to operate it safely. Mr. Goar stated that for the paid parking system they would be looking to put the net proceeds from paid parking into transit and infrastructure. The idea would be to further leverage that to enhance transit in particular.

Drop-offs could flex during the peak periods, and he noted that it would not be difficult to create additional drop-off areas in the mornings and then manage those in the afternoon for pick-up. Part of the business they are in is how to get guests conveniently and safely to the Resort, and drop-off is a significant component of that. He stressed that it is important that they have a plan that works and there is no question that going forward, it will work very well.

Mr. Goar addressed the comments about capacity and trail densities and stated that the design work for Park City Mountain was done in-house and with consultants. SE Group is one of the world's foremost mountain planners. In addition, the City engaged Ecosign, which is another well-known worldwide mountain planner. He emphasized that two of the biggest mountain planning firms in the world have been involved in this project and expressed a great deal of confidence that the planning and design were appropriate. He added that the group they have worked with on the paid parking and reservation system has a lot of experience with this across the country in mountain towns and communities. He felt they have the very best in terms of the partnership and they continue to work with the City to ensure that the plan will work in the very best way.

Mr. Sales added that with regard to restrooms, the resort has existing temporary restrooms every year in the First Time parking lot but could evaluate the number of restrooms as the season goes along. He also addressed the questions regarding "peak day." Mr. Sales clarified that the 13,700 CCC is based on the maximum capacity for the resort as provided in the MUP. The "peak days" were 10 to 25 percent, but typically they look at the maximum of 25%. He explained that the parking was based on the CCC of 13,700. There would be flex days for "peak days" which could go 25% above the 13,700. He stated that there would be days when it will be a little more crowded, but it is an industry-standard that is built into every Master Plan and CCC calculation. Mr. Sales noted that they are not at the maximum CCC and are within the 25% range on the business that they do today.

With respect to environmental impacts, Mr. Sales acknowledged that there will be impacts in the sense of clearing Gamble and Aspen trees for the new Lift alignment. He stated that they typically do not use heavy machinery to do that; rather, they go in with crews to clear those trees so that there is limited impact. He added that there are certain tramway clearances for the lift line itself. He explained that they designed this Lift to go to the top because there are times during the season when King Con pod is not open yet. This alignment would allow earlier access to the top while minimizing lift lines.

Mr. Sales also mentioned limitations in lift manufacturing in terms of the degrees of angles that can be built. He expressed that this would be a much more efficient lift alignment and would have far less impact than the Chondola Lift. He emphasized Vail's long history with re-vegetation. With regard to bike trails, Mr. Sales reported that they were working with Park City to keep as much accessibility to trails as possible. They were working on some realignment for the next year while recognizing that access to many of the trails was a big concern to the community. He felt that with regards to Armstrong they could mitigate them and keep them open as much as possible. Mr. Sales reported that they have been working with the

professional ski organizations and acknowledged that access is critical. They are looking at access and actually extending some of the race venues.

Director Milliken reminded those present that they were looking only at the Lift Upgrades application. She acknowledged that there would be other effects within the community and the tendency would be to evaluate this application with the hope that it would solve all of the issues. She was focused on the application as reviewed with the Land Management Code and the criteria to ensure that it is aligned with the MUP and with parking. She felt that there was an opportunity with applications like this to make improvements in a system that all could admit is not working as well as it could. They have limited capacity at the Base in terms of parking, and until the Base Development comes into play, they have to work with what they have at hand.

Director Milliken appreciated the evaluation of different options, including the 90 stalls added for employees at the Munchkin lot and the use of the High School lot on weekends next season. Paid parking is proven mitigation all over the world. She noted that her background is in Planning and Architecture, and while it can be painful for residents, paid parking has results. The applicant's consultant opined that it would result in an 11% decrease in parking coming to the area. She commented that the City has a robust transit system that is free. She acknowledged that it does not serve everyone, but it does help mitigate the parking. As a City, they are looking for a modal shift and hoping to have more people use public transit and other alternative modes.

Director Milliken stated that this would not solve everything, but they have to start implementing things and then evaluate it as it goes. If they do nothing, they would be in the same situation as exists today and no one is happy with the situation today. She referenced Vail's comments that the net proceeds from the paid parking would go towards transportation and transit. This is not currently a Condition of Approval, and she would like to add that as a Condition.

Director Milliken addressed the public comment that this was her sole decision. She stated that Park City is a municipality and there are many different departments and personnel involved in this application in some way, shape, or form. They relied on Planner Ananth's expertise in processing the Base Mountain applications and her knowledge of the different Development Agreements. Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward is also very knowledgeable about all planning-related matters in Park City. She added that they also discussed this application with the Engineering Department and Building Department. The application also went before the Forestry Board. To say that she alone is making this decision is disingenuous. She stressed that they are a municipality and a team, and they rely on the team when making significant decisions like this. Director Milliken added that the Legal Department is always consulted when they make these types of decisions.

Director Milliken called for a break to consult with Staff.

Director Milliken announced that they made adjustments to the Conditions of Approval based on the discussions during this meeting to include items mentioned by the applicant and items identified by Staff and the public.

The first adjustment was to Condition of Approval #4 which required the applicant to submit a vegetation removal and replacement plan with their Building Permit, subject to the Planning Director's approval. They added the term "landscape" to that so that it would read, "landscape vegetation removal and replacement plan." They also added language that "the plan shall

address plant screening landscaping and/or installation of a privacy gate fence at the Snow Flower property line at the cost of the applicant.” They also added to this Condition that “an additional five feet shall be added to the 25-foot setback, resulting in a 30-foot setback from the Snow Flower property line.” Director Milliken noted that the applicant nodded in agreement with the proposed changes.

They formally added Condition of Approval #15, which Director Milliken read as follows:

“The applicant shall meet with the Planning Director and other relevant Staff bi-annually, including prior to the beginning of the ski season and within 60 days of completion of the ski season to provide parking and traffic information demonstrating compliance with the Parking Mitigation Plan and a Communications Plan to ensure information disseminated to the public. The applicant shall share relevant parking information with Staff, including parking lot occupancy rates and achievement of increased Average Vehicle Occupancy rates. The Planning Director may impose additional conditions or operational changes if the Parking Mitigation Plan results in ongoing adverse impacts or is not achieving a demonstrated increase in Average Vehicle Occupancy.”

Mr. Goar expressed concern over what could fall in the category of “additional conditions or operational changes.” He requested an opportunity to review Condition of Approval 15.

Director Milliken then referenced Condition of Approval #17 that “the applicant shall provide adequate residential neighborhood mitigation and designate a residential liaison to meet with the City regarding impacts and mitigation.” Mr. Goar agreed to this Condition.

Director Milliken read Condition of Approval #18 as follows:

“The applicant shall be responsible for effectively managing the parking reservation system with an on-site parking attendant presence with a turn away and tow policy for people without a reservation.” Mr. Goar was agreeable to this Condition.”

Director Milliken read Condition of Approval #19 as follows:

“The applicant shall use the net proceeds generated from paid parking at the Mountain Village Base Area of Park City Mountain to re-invest in transportation, transit, and/or parking measures in and around the resort area. As part of the bi-annual review meeting process, the applicant shall provide an accounting regarding the net proceeds and proposed measures in which to invest the funds. The applicant shall provide independent verification and audit confirmation that such funds were expended consistent with the Parking Mitigation Plan and/or the City’s documented transit and infrastructure goals with each bi-annual review.”

There were questions from the public about the setback which was understood to be 40 feet. Director Milliken explained that there is a 10-foot distance from Building B to the property line; therefore, there would be 40 feet from Building B to the lift.

There was a short break to allow the applicant to review the amended Conditions of Approval.

Director Milliken reported that the applicant returned so that they could resume the hearing. Mr. Goar reported that they were agreeable to all of the Conditions of Approval up to Condition

of Approval #19. Director Milliken confirmed that Conditions of Approval 1 through 18 were agreeable to the applicant. She read Condition of Approval #19, as amended, as follows:

“The applicant shall use the net proceeds generated from paid parking at the Mountain Village Base Area of Park City Mountain to re-invest in transportation, transit, traffic mitigation, and/or parking measures to support guest access to the resort and traffic mitigation in and around the resort. As part of the bi-annual review meeting process, the applicant shall provide an accounting regarding the net proceeds and will review the resort’s expenditures on these measures, including, if requested by the City, verification of the expenditures by an independent third party. The applicant shall discuss in good faith any proposed expenditures by the City that advance the City’s infrastructure goals at each bi-annual review. If funded, such proposals will be documented pursuant to an amendment to the Parking Mitigation Plan processed as part of the bi-annual review.”

Mr. Goar confirmed that the applicant accepted that Condition of Approval.

Director Milliken confirmed on behalf of the City that they reviewed this amended Condition and accepted it as well.

Director Milliken stated that the application met the six criteria, including alignment with the Mountain Upgrade Plan and with the parking mitigation, which were the two outstanding criteria that needed additional Conditions of Approval. With the approval of the 19 Conditions of Approval, including mitigation for the proximity to Snow Flower Condominiums, they were in a good place in terms of processing this application. She noted that if additional distance could be added between the Lift and Snow Flower that would be welcomed.

Based on all of the provided information, including the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval 1 – 19, Director Milliken saw no reason not to approve this application for Lift Upgrades to the Park City Mountain Resort.

She announced that the public hearing was concluded, and the meeting adjourned at approximately 3:50 p.m.