

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
MAY 11, 2011**

PRESENT: Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Julia Pettit, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Thomas Eddington, Francisco Astorga, Mark Harrington

WORK SESSION ITEMS

Fiscal 2012 Capital Improvement Program – Project Plan Update

Director Eddington reported that each year the Planning Commission reviews the Capital Improvement Project Plan. The Staff report contained a list of projects that was prepared by the City Engineer. The City has a ranking system with criteria for ranking the Capital Improvement Projects. The criteria includes objectives, funding, necessity, investment, and cost/benefit analysis. A CIP committee reviews, analyzes and prioritizes the projects.

Commissioner Pettit asked if the projects were listed in priority. Director Eddington replied that the projects were not in priority order; however they were grouped by equal standing in terms of points.

Commissioner Pettit asked about Hillside Avenue. Director Eddington stated that it was only on the list because they were finishing bonding and final landscaping. Once that is completed, it will be removed from the projects list. He noted that the same situation applied to the Museum expansion. That project was also nearing completion and would be removed from the list.

Commissioner Pettit was pleased to see the Crescent Tramway Trail on the project list. This has been an issue for her since those projects were developed and the pathway was never returned. Director Eddington stated that the City may also look at RDA funding for that project, as well as CIP funding. The City is prepared to do that project as soon as possible.

Chair Wintzer felt the City had fallen behind on enforcing completion of projects when it involves crossing City property. He noted that the Crescent Tram walkway has been closed for years and a similar situation occurred in his neighborhood in the past. Chair Wintzer stated that if the City allows someone to go on City property, they should be required to post a bond and follow a specified time schedule. The City should have the ability to enforce it.

Director Eddington noted that the CIP committee and others recognized this same concern, which is why Crescent Tram was back on the list.

Commissioner Savage stated that if the Planning Commission is asked to review the Capital Improvement Projects list for consistency with the General Plan, they should be given a comprehensive presentation with information that outlines the projects and the framework for how specific projects would be considered to be consistent or inconsistent with the General Plan. He pointed out that the Planning Commission was given a list of projects without any sense of the magnitude of the projects, how they are impacted by the ranking system, the status, the initiation dates and completion dates. Commissioner Savage felt it would also be appropriate to see what projects did not make the list and why. He was also interested in knowing who was on the CIP committee.

Director Eddington stated that he would meet with the City Engineer, Matt Cassel to provide a

detailed comprehensive overview. He pointed out that the listed projects were weighed against the General Plan and the City Council visioning goals. Director Eddington noted that most of the CIP are primarily infrastructure projects.

Commissioner Savage commented on the number of eroding places on the pathway that goes along the raging creek that on the side of town going down Deer Valley Drive. He did not see that pathway included on the list and assumed that for whatever reason it had not made the cut. Director Eddington explained that the City has a separate fund for most of the trails maintenance and they also have a contract with Mountainland Trails to help maintain the trails.

Commissioner Pettit agreed with Commissioner Savage that it would be beneficial to have more information in the context of the General Plan to help evaluate some of the projects that are designed to meet the General Plan.

Rocky Mountain Power Master Plan – Project Plan Update

Director Eddington introduced Chad Ambrose, Park City's representative from Rocky Mountain Power. Booklets had been provided to the Planning Commission and Mr. Ambrose presented an overview of the impetus for the plan and how it evolved.

Mr. Ambrose stated that he had attended a previous Planning Commission meeting where he provided a high level review of the Master Plan that was still in process at the time. He noted that Director Eddington was a key player in the development of the plan. Mr. Ambrose remarked that this plan was one of the best products that had ever come from Rocky Mountain Power. He credited all the task force members for its success. Mr. Ambrose noted that the task force was comprised of elected officials, staff members from cities and counties, concerned citizens and many others. Everyone contributed time and effort to put together a program that would help Rocky Mountain Power and all the communities they serve to develop a master plan for the next 20 years.

Mr. Ambrose stated that the goal of the master plan is to highlight three main components identified by the task force. The task force developed a set of criteria for siting facilities to serve the future needs of their customers. The three criteria categories were General Considerations, Criteria for Substations and Criteria for Transmission Lines.

Mr. Ambrose pointed out that the plan does not address distribution voltage, which is the voltage typically found in homes or businesses. It addresses larger scale transmission and substations necessary to service a growing population over the next 20 years.

Mr. Ambrose remarked that another key element in the plan was a map developed by the task force that identifies potential locations for transmission lines and substations. He believed the map was a way to begin discussions with the communities. Mr. Ambrose felt the effort by the Task Force would greatly improve relationships between Rocky Mountain Power and the cities and counties as they move forward to permit a new facility. The plan should provide a glimpse of what the future might look like in terms of power delivery.

Director Eddington stated that Rocky Mountain Power launched this process with the idea of trying to eliminate confrontation that can sometimes occur when the Power Company begins work unexpectedly. Director Eddington believed the best result, other than the plan itself, was the relationship that was formed between Summit and Wasatch Counties and the cities. Transmission lines cross jurisdictional boundaries and it was helpful to get to know the other communities. It was also helpful to form a relationship with Rocky Mountain Power so they could all better understand the needs and concerns. Director Eddington thought the process was very effective.

Director Eddington stated that the Planning Commission would continue to be updated as the plan moves forward. He noted that the Planning Commission would be involved with substations in Bonanza Park. Also, as they develop the utilities element of the General Plan the Planning Commission would be looking at the siting criteria and future needs and incorporate that into City documents.

Commissioner Pettit stated that when Mr. Ambrose attended a previous meeting, she had asked a number of questions tied to renewable energy and ways to reduce energy consumption through energy efficiency and distributive generation projects. She understood from that meeting that Diane Foster and her team were part of the process and very capable of addressing similar issues. Commissioner Pettit commended the effort. It is important that communities have the opportunity to provide input on important subjects, particularly dealing with substations and transmission lines because people in the immediate vicinity are significantly impacted.

General Plan – Informational Update

Planner Francisco Astorga reported that the Staff was moving forward with the General Plan and proposed to use the visioning document, Vision Park City 2009, as the base for the General Plan Update. He commented on the two public outreach meetings that were held in July and the one in October, and explained the different exercises and activities each attendee participated in using a map of their specific neighborhood. Planner Astorga noted that 123 residents participated in a survey they were asked to fill out. The intent of the exercise was for residents to identify different uses in their neighbor, what they would like to see in their neighborhood or what they thought did not belong in their neighborhood.

The same exercise was done for the city in general and allowed the residents the opportunity to identify acceptable or unacceptable uses beyond their neighborhood but within the city or outside of the city. Planner Astorga noted that some of the results were identified on page 20 of the Staff report.

Planner Astorga stated that the Staff had spent time analyzing the data and putting it into a spread sheet as a guide to move forward with the General Plan update. Director Eddington noted that the analysis was available through a link on the Planning Department website. The Commissioner could also use that link as a way to check the Staff's progress on the General Plan. Director Eddington encouraged the Commissioners to visit the Planning Department if they have questions or ideas or would like to focus on a specific element of the General Plan.

Planner Astorga reported that the Staff was using accurate information from the 2010 Census to do an analysis based on population and house size.

Director Eddington stated that if the Commissioners have questions with regards to other documents relative to planning issues that might be on the central site but not on the Planning site, he suggested that they contact Patricia Abdullah for help in navigating those documents.

Director Eddington referred to a table on page 21 of the Staff report, which contained the goals and objectives for various topics that came from the Outreach sessions. He noted that the number of positive votes were identified in green and the negative votes were in red. The Staff had laid out the goals and the residents identified their preference using red or green stickers. The information has been quantified and the Staff would bring it to the Planning Commission for additional discussion.

Director Eddington noted that page 22 of the Staff report was the result of an exercise where residents were able to write their wish list for the future of Park City.

Director Eddington reported that the Planning Department would be setting up a Community Task Force and the Staff report listed various people and/or teams that would be important for that Task Force. He asked if the Planning Commission had additional recommendations. Commissioner Pettit suggested adding Summit Lands Conservancy, Mountain Trails, and Recycle Utah. Commissioner Savage added Park City Foundation, Sundance, and Canyon.

Director Eddington stated that the Planning Commission would have the opportunity to discuss the General Plan at the June 8th meeting.

Commissioner Savage remarked that the data collected from the Public Outreach only represents a small fraction of the population, and the same group always participates. He recommended that they think of ways to incorporate a greater degree of Outreach to achieve a more balanced perspective on the priorities of the community on a long term basis. Commissioner Savage thought they should consider the importance of the secondary home community in Park City. The revenue generated from second home owners and the viability of the community on a long term basis would be predicated on those owners being participants. Commissioner Savage did not have a specific recommendation, but encouraged the Staff and the Planning Commission to think of ways to incorporate a greater degree of engagement in the early days, so people know that a meaningful effort was made to try to facilitate participation in the process.

Director Eddington hoped to use the website to reach out to more people, particularly those who do not live in Park City. He looked forward to discussing other approaches with the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Pettit recalled that during the visioning process, there was a subcommittee that was specifically focused on doing interviews with second homeowners. Director Eddington could not remember a subcommittee, but he offered to look into it. Commissioner Pettit agreed that it was important to get feedback from second homeowners, however, a continual challenge for the community is finding ways to meaningfully engage the second homeowners.

Commissioner Strachan understood that a third party contractor was hired for that visioning

Work Session Notes
May 11, 2011
Page 5

process and they made inroads with the second homeowners. Director Eddington recalled that the recommendation from the consulting group was to utilize local residents to reach out because it provides a better opportunity to make a connection. He would find out exactly how that was done.

The Work Session was adjourned.