

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
MAY 22, 2013**

PRESENT: Nann Worel, Brooke Hontz, Stewart Gross, Jack Thomas, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Charlie Wintzer, Thomas Eddington, Mark Harrington, Matt Cassel

WORK SESSION ITEMS

FY 2014 Capital Improvement Project Plan – Discussion and Overview

City Engineer Matt Cassel requested that the Planning Commission review the Capital Improvement Plan that was presented to the City Council a week earlier. The Planning Commission is typically asked to review the CIP each year in May to determine whether it conforms to the General Plan. Mr. Cassel explained that the projects were listed in prioritization order with a brief description of each project.

Commissioner Hontz noted that the Commissioners were given two reports and the projects were listed in the same order in both. She was unable to determine if one was supposed to be prioritized and the other was listed alphabetically. Mr. Cassel replied that the projects were listed in numerical order on his report. Commissioner Hontz stated that hers were numerical but both reports were identical and she could not tell if the number represented the priority or just the number in the list. Mr. Cassel recognized that a mistake was made and the projects were not prioritized.

City Engineer Cassel explained that all the projects above the line were going to the City Council with a request for approval. Commissioner Savage assumed that the list was compiled based on budgetary guidelines. Mr. Cassel remarked that based on budgetary guidelines they had created an above the line, below the line list. The items above the line are presented to the City Council for consideration and approval. The City Council may try to move two or three items below the line to above the line and that is when negotiations occur.

Commissioner Savage understood that there was a requirement for the Planning Commission to provide consensus that the CIP list is consistent with the General Plan. City Attorney, Mark Harrington, explained that a State Statutory Provision says that all City parks, projects and buildings must be consistent with the General Plan. He noted that the Provision does not outline a procedural step and it does not articulate how that determination is made. It only means that the City cannot build anything unless it is consistent with the General Plan. He used the renovation of the Marsac Building as an example to explain the intent. City Attorney Harrington stated that beyond that Provision is there not a lot of specificity with regards to sewer and similar type projects. For more than ten years the CIP comes before the Planning Commission as a courtesy review so they can be proactive and identify anything that appears to be inconsistent or inaccurate. The Planning Commission review is not intended to result in an official determination or decision.

Commissioner Hontz thought the order of the list was important. City Engineer Cassel stated that the essential items would be bumped to the top and those were primarily equipment items and other things that the Planning Commission might not be interested in. He pointed out that regardless of the order, anything item above the line were the ones the City Council would be asked to consider for approval.

Chair Worel asked about the numbers that were missing. Mr. Cassel replied that those were

projects that existed but have already been completed.

Commissioner Savage requested that in the future, he would like the Planning Department to vet the list and identified anything that might be an issue as it relates to compliance with the General Plan before it comes to the Planning Commission. Mr. Cassel noted that the list would not make it to the Planning Department before coming to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Savage stated that when the Planning Commission is presented with a list that has 40 or 50 items and they are asked to review it for compliance with the General Plan, it is not reasonable to expect that the Commissioners could do much with it. He felt it was a catch-22 because they want the Planning Commission to identify something that may be an issue without some type of analysis to help them understand how the compliance should look. Commissioner Savage stated that the intimate understanding and knowledge of the construction of the General Plan and its attributes is the responsibility of the Planning Department, as well as the Planning Commission. Commissioner Savage encouraged Mr. Cassel to review the list with Director Eddington and try to identify any noteworthy items for the Planning Commission. He did not believe the current process was useful or meaningful.

Director Eddington believed that he and Mr. Cassel could work together to identify nine or ten items that the Planning Commission could discuss in more detail.

The Work Session was adjourned.