

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
AUGUST 11, 2010**

PRESENT: Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Richard Luskin, Dick Peek, Julia Pettit Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Thomas Eddington, Polly Samuels McLean, Matt Cassel

Site Visit to Park City Heights

The Planning Commission had a site visit to Park City Heights prior to the work session. All Commissioners attended except Commissioner Pettit.

WORK SESSION ITEMS

Public Involvement plan for transportation - Informational Update

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington, reported that the City had hired InterPlan Company, a Salt Lake City Transportation planning firm, to develop a traffic and transportation master plan for Park City that addresses transportation needs for the City to the year 2040.

Commissioner Strachan is the Planning Commission liaison participating in the transportation study.

Andrea Olsen, representing InterPlan, stated that in May InterPlan began working on developing a transportation plan. They have been working closely with a technical committee formed from various departments within Park City Municipal Corp, including Engineering, Planning and Transportation, who provide guidance on specific and technical aspects of the process. In addition, a stakeholder group was formed consisting of Park City residents representing various groups and organizations in the community. The stakeholders will be used as a sounding board to test ideas and achieve a better understanding of the values and priorities of the community.

Ms. Olsen noted that two public open houses would be scheduled where the public would be able to provide input. She also intended to meet with the Planning Commission and the City Council periodically to provide an update on the status and findings of the process.

Ms. Olsen stated that the transportation plan was a two-step process. The first part is collecting data. InterPlan has gathered land use and transportation data from Park City Staff. The second part is to build a traffic simulation from the results of that data. VISSIM is the modeling software. Ms. Olsen stated that InterPlan will be looking and analyzing a mix and match setup of different transportation network alternatives on various, future land use scenarios. They will continue to analyze the outcomes and continue to refine them.

In terms of public involvement, InterPlan has been working closely with City Staff and meeting on a monthly basis. The City Engineer, Matt Cassel, has been leading that effort and Director Eddington has also been very involved. Ms. Olsen remarked that they have already met with the stakeholder committee once and anticipate meeting a few more times throughout this process. Ms. Olsen explained that they did a key pad polling with the stakeholders that asked different questions in an effort to know the goals of the City in terms of transportation. She provided a slide showing some of the questions and the results. As well the desire to minimize vehicle delay and to mitigate traffic congestion in Park City, transit was a high priority. Park City has a successful transit system and there is a strong will to keep that system intact and to improve it.

Ms. Olsen believed the first question indicated that there were many facets to the answer. They also asked questions about sidewalks and trails and the answers reflected both sides of the perspective. Some thought there were already too many roads and others felt there were not enough. Ms. Olsen hoped to put together a future transportation network that addresses concerns across the spectrum. She believed the questions presented would give the Planning Commission an overview of what people are looking for. It was not a scientific study and the stakeholder group is small and not statistically represented. Ms. Olsen acknowledged that there were no easy answers because a number of perspectives need to be represented. She remarked that InterPlan has a lot of work to do in terms of figuring out how to best accommodate walkers, bikers, and vehicles in the City.

Ms. Olsen noted that the survey and more detailed responses were posted on her company's website. The address is www.interplanco.com/current-projects/parkcity. Chair Wintzer requested that Director Eddington email that website to the Commissioners.

Ms. Olsen stated that InterPlan is in the process of finalizing the models and calibrating them to make sure they will have good, accurate data. They are developing standard cross sections to determine where sidewalks and bike lanes should be located, the type of park strips, etc. Ms. Olsen stated that they were also working on refining goals and objectives for the process. Director Eddington pointed out that those goals were included in the General Plan open houses.

Ms. Olsen reported that a stakeholder committee meeting was scheduled for September 14th, which is the next public event. They also plan on holding a public open house in early October where they hope to present a draft model for comment. A second public open house would be held later in the process to present a more substantive plan.

Commissioner Luskin asked if the transportation planning and the model include sections on how to deal with the tremendous influx of vehicles and people during special events such as Sundance. Ms. Olsen stated that the technical committee that consists of City Staff and the Consulting Team decided that the model results should be for p.m. peak hours on an average day. It would also look at a peak day, such as Presidents Day weekend. It would not address the level of Sundance, but it will recognize that Park City has peak days where traffic is heavier.

Commissioner Savage asked if there was a mechanism to stress test the model with higher volumes from different sources. He used the Art Festival weekend as an example. Ms. Olsen replied that the travel demand model would not accommodate a stress test because traffic is actually an output. When they go to the visual simulation software, they can put in travel and the amount of traffic on a given road segment. The simulation would show how well the road could accommodate that traffic.

Commissioner Luskin asked if the transportation plan addressed parking issues. Ms. Olsen replied that it does not deal with parking issues per se. It addresses parking from the standpoint of parking lots being trip generators and cars getting to and from a parking space. However, it will not say whether or not the road can accommodate those vehicles.

Commissioner Peek stated that one example would be Park Avenue during a peak event. Cars are parked on both sides and buses are going both ways, which affects all forms of transportation. The street is choked down during the event, but during non-peak times, there is less street parking and better flow.

Commissioner Hontz pointed out that snow is the biggest factor in reducing the lanes of travel.

Chair Wintzer stated that it has been proven many times and very well that any traffic can fit a traffic model in Park City. He emphasized the need to consider that the road conditions in Park City are completely different in winter than in summer and that tourists do not understand the City or move about easily. Chair Wintzer pointed out that most traffic studies do not reflect the conditions and limitations of Park City roads.

Commissioner Savage asked if those parameters could be played with in the model. Ms. Olsen replied that it would be accounted for in the traffic simulation model. However, it is not as explicit as parked cars or snow on the shoulders. The model has friction factors which make cars run closer together and typically slows them down. She noted that they could accommodate the perception that cars are not able to move as quickly.

Commissioner Peek asked if the transportation report would reveal all the parameters like the friction factors. Ms. Olsen stated that InterPlan could figure out a way to provide that type of information. She did not think it would be in the body of the transportation plan and suggested that it could be identified in the appendixes or technical documentation. Ms. Olsen clarified that even though the study is being done at this time of year, all the results are geared toward winter conditions.

Commissioner Savage asked Ms. Olsen to talk about what their deliverable would be when they are finished with the project. Ms. Olsen stated that it would be a transportation plan and the goals and objectives outlined would be incorporated directly into the General Plan. Ms. Olsen remarked that the intent is to make it as user friendly as possible.

Commissioner Luskin stated his preference to see an alternative model where Main Street would be a walking street that is closed to traffic. Ms. Olsen stated that once the plan is ready to deliver, they will have looked at a number of different alternatives. The plan document would outline the alternatives considered and the positives and negatives of each one. She anticipated that at the end of the process the recommended transportation network will be a hybrid of all the different alternatives. Ms. Olsen encouraged the Planning Commission to view the survey that was done with the stakeholder committee, because some of the questions asked were out of the box ideas.

Chair Wintzer stated that in all the projects that had a traffic study, the City never picked a level of service that they feel is acceptable. From this process, he would like guidance as a Planning Commissioner in terms of an acceptable level of service specific to Park City.

City Engineer, Matt Cassel, stated that the intent of the master plan is to recognize the current level of service, an acceptable level of service, and a benchmark for the future. Mr. Cassel remarked that the previous traffic studies are being looked at by InterPlan. Something they recognized was that the plans were so localized that they did not provide a sense of how the transportation network

of the City as a whole is affected by individual projects. The InterPlan study will address that issue to see how the City is affected.

Commissioner Savage asked if the modeling software allows for a progressive study. Ms. Olsen replied that in addition to a transportation plan, there is a tool that becomes the property of the City where they can plug in traffic generation by a new development to see the impacts. Mr. Cassel stated that one goal is that every developer would be using the same model so they can see how the development affects the City as a whole.

Director Eddington stated that they are currently working on future land use scenarios and a build out analysis. They are looking at additional UEs and square footage in different parts of the City to anticipate what development could occur in 2020 or beyond.

Commissioner Savage understood that the main intent for this process is to end up with a modeling simulation that is dynamic enough to accommodate the inevitable changes that would occur over time. Ms. Olsen replied that this was correct.

Commissioner Pettit referred to the product InterPlan had delivered to Summit County with a one page map. She commented on previous discussion about identifying transportation corridors as they look at a transportation plan from a holistic perspective, particularly, as it relates to key areas in town ripe for development. Commissioner Pettit was unsure if InterPlan was thinking of incorporating that product into the City plan, but in her opinion, it is something they need to think about as they look at some of these pockets of town. If there is a potential for road realignment in order to take advantage of better traffic flow, they need to have those tools available.

Director Eddington stated that another aspect of this plan is looking at various street classifications and function. Part of the plan is to look at the old 1984 plan to see where it is accurate or may not be accurate in today's market, because that will identify where the corridors are located.

Chair Wintzer asked if the September 14th meeting was open to the public. Ms. Olsen replied that it is a stakeholder committee. It would not be advertised to the public, but the Planning Commission was welcome to attend. Chair Wintzer requested a reminder email with the time and place so the Commissioners could attend.

Commissioner Peek asked if the survey asked whether a user was retired, commuted, etc. Ms. Olsen explained that the survey was only of the stakeholder group of 15 or 16 people. The general public has not been surveyed. Commissioner Peek assumed that everyone who took the survey works locally. Ms. Olsen answered yes. The survey did not include commuters, tourists or second home owners.

Commissioner Strachan encouraged the Commissioners to check the survey results online. He thought they would be surprised at the answers. Commissioner Pettit had a difficult time believing that a 15 person survey was a statistically significant result to measure the full community sentiment. Mr. Cassel stated that the goal was not to measure the entire community. The purpose was to get a feel for what the stakeholder committee sees as important issues. For instance, if the push is not for green, they would expect to see more of a push towards more and wider roads.

Commissioner Pettit questioned whether this stakeholder group was the right group, particularly if they are the ones driving the parameters. Commissioner Strachan was comfortable that the stakeholder group was appropriate because it represents a cross section.

Commissioner Savage stated that he was less concerned with what the 15 member panel had said, and more interested in how managers and bosses in Park City feel about the level of utilization of transit, whether it was pushing the limits, if it was too much, not enough. He was interested in knowing how well it was embraced by the community. Director Eddington would ask Kent Cashell from Public Works to attend a Planning Commission meeting to address that question. Director Eddington agreed with Commissioner Strachan that the answers and priorities resulting from the stakeholder survey were quite surprising and very interesting.

The work session was adjourned.