

PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
June 8, 2011

PRESENT: Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Julia Pettit, Mick Savage, Thomas Eddington, Katie Cattan, Matt Cassel, Polly Samuels McLean

WORK SESSION ITEMS

Transportation Plan – Information Update

City Engineer, Matt Cassel, introduced Matt Rifkin and Andrea Olson from InterPlan, the consultants who completed the draft Park City traffic and transportation master plan. Mr. Cassel noted that the objective this evening was to review and discuss three elements of the plan with the Planning Commission and incorporate any concerns or suggestions into the master plan. The next step would be a work session with the City Council and ultimate adoption by the City Council. The three elements presented were the transportation goals, the road cross sections, and the power of the model.

Mr. Cassel noted that the appendix contained objectives and the intent of the goals was to create a report card. Each year the City would revisit the goals and use the objectives to measure progress and the effectiveness of each goal. This would help them track on a yearly basis whether they were advancing, if one of the goals was not working, or whether a set goal could not be met. Mr. Cassel remarked that the goals were set to be a complete street philosophy. They looked at all modes of movement; pedestrian, transit, cars, and bicycles in an effort to make the car less important in Park City. The goals reflect the objective to encourage people to use other modes of transportation to move around the City.

Mr. Cassel presented the draft road cross sections. The guiding principles used for the cross sections were complete streets. The design or reconstruction of a road includes the elements of walk, pedestrian, cars, bicycles and transit. The problem is lack of space to accommodate most of the elements. Mr. Cassel noted that each cross section has a prioritization list to determine which element goes first if there is not enough space for all the elements. For example, parking in Old Town is such a key concern that it is the highest prioritized element. If it comes to a choice between parking or sidewalks in Old Town, the sidewalk could be the first element eliminated.

Commissioner Pettit noted that some road improvements in Old Town have tried to incorporate parking and sidewalks. In some cases sidewalks still get used for parking or they are not used as much during the winter if they are not cleared from snow. Commissioner Pettit felt an alternative to consider would be to have residents of Old Town park their vehicles in another location instead of in front of their houses. This would help minimize the amount of cars on the street that impedes safe walking or a snow removal problem. Commissioner Pettit encouraged the City to think pro-actively about other ways to address vehicle problems in Old Town.

Mr. Cassel stated that early in the process, parking in Old Town was considered a piece of the puzzle. It is impossible to manipulate parking without fully understanding the parking inventory and the number of people who want to use it. Mr. Cassel remarked that parking in Old Town is an element that needs to be done by itself after the primary study. Due to the cost, the budget prohibited doing both at the same time. Commissioner Pettit was pleased to know that it was being

considered as part of the process.

Matt Rifkin, representing InterPlan, stated that another piece of the study was the travel model. When the Planning Commission approves a new development they will be able to see how much traffic it would generate on the road system and what it looks like. Mr. Rifkin presented samples to demonstrate how the model would work in different situations. He explained that there are two parts to the model. The first was a spread sheet with numbers based on assumptions, estimates and other collected data from various entities and agencies. The second piece of the model was a traffic simulation, which showed cars driving on the road. Mr. Rifkin noted that the simulation was done twice. One was for the peak/peak condition, which is Christmas week. He noted that the highest day in 2010 was during Sundance. He stated that another period modeled was 5:00 p.m. on a day during mud season at the beginning of summer. Those numbers were average and it took less time to get through an intersection.

Mr. Rifkin showed the Empire Avenue/Park Avenue intersection during crowded Christmas week conditions, based on existing traffic data. Mr. Rifkin stated that a primary value of the model is the ability to look at the impacts of a new development. Using the Empire/Park Avenue intersection, Mr. Rifkin presented a model scenario for the year 2020, assuming that nothing new is built in Park City. The growth would be external from Summit and Wasatch Counties, Salt Lake County, and steady growth was projected for Park City Mountain Resort.

Mr. Rifkin noted that the model was color coded. The green cars were HOV with two or more people, the orange cars were single occupant vehicles. Transit was also routed into the model.

Chair Wintzer referred to the que from the intersection back to the Yarrow and assumed it would take two to three light changes to get through the intersection. Mr. Rifkin had not collected that specific data, but he assumed Chair Wintzer was correct. Under those circumstances, the level of service would be a bad F. Commissioner Pettit clarified that the assumptions were based on no growth within Park City. Mr. Rifkin replied that this was correct; however, it assumed external growth from various counties and ski resorts.

Commissioner Savage questioned why external growth would cause such significant increase in traffic coming into Park City at 5:00 p.m. Mr. Rifkin pointed out that 5:00 p.m. during the ski season is a peak time. One explanation is that many people come to Utah on vacation, stay in Salt Lake, ski at other resorts, and only come to Park City for the night life. Commissioner Savage asked if the model factored in anticipated increase in skier days. Mr. Rifkin replied that Park City and Deer Valley grew based on the trend. He could model a scenario that shows no growth in skier days in Park City. As they make decisions in the future, they could hold everything constant and only look at one specific scenario. Mr. Rifkin remarked that background growth is a major issue and sometimes it's difficult to have as much control over traffic as you would like.

Commissioner Savage asked about the number of model locations. Mr. Rifkin replied that it was a complete city-wide model.

Chair Wintzer asked if it would be complicated to add specific items to the model. Mr. Rifkin stated that items could be added, however, the length of time to do it would depend on the amount of

detail requested.

Commissioner Pettit understood that the model was a ten year projection. Given the price of oil and the efforts to create public transportation options, she asked if those types of assumptions could be built in to see how policy considerations might impact traffic flows if certain methods were adopted to reduce car traffic. Mr. Rufkin replied that things such as gas prices are more difficult and are not inherently built into the model. He offered suggestions that would be easy to include in the model as a way to study options to reduce traffic. Mr. Rufkin pointed out that the model is a prediction tool and it is not 100% accurate. It is a formalized method and they do not get the same answer every time. However, it provides a better starting point than what currently exists.

Commissioner Savage asked Mr. Cassel asked about ownership of the plan and whether the City would have rights to the model in future years separate from InterPlan. Mr. Cassel stated that the City owns the model. It does not own the software but they can obtain rights to the software if necessary. He pointed out that no one within the City has the ability to run the model. It is a standard system and any transportation engineer could run it.

Director Eddington explained that the model is VISSIM and the City could hire any consultant that uses VISSIM to change the model. Mr. Rifkin remarked that InterPlan tried to document the model so it could be used by others.

Commissioner Pettit was excited to have the opportunity to test the model in a future development. Mr. Cassel noted that the model would be used on the SR224 Corridor Study to try different scenarios and alternatives for the corridor.

Chair Wintzer requested that Mr. Cassel work with Director Eddington to make sure the Planning Commission is made aware of projects that affect traffic where the model would be useful.

General Plan – Information Update and Discussion

Planner Cattan handed out copies of a Comprehensive Plan Timeline prepared for the General Plan. She noted that positions were restructured in the Planning Department and she was tasked with managing the General Plan and to make sure they meet a deadline of April 15, 2012 for the final product. Planner Cattan stated that over the past few weeks the Staff organized the individual elements of the General Plan and last week they began with housing.

Planner Cattan reviewed the Gant chart. The Planning Department schedule was revised and they have committed 20% of Staff time to work on the General Plan. The Staff works on the General Plan every Friday. Planner Cattan stated that she and Director Eddington created scopes for individual planners for a more organized method of assigning tasks. An internal resource committee was established to brainstorm ideas with project managers and planners. The committee members are Matt Cassel, Phyllis Robinson, Michael Kovacs, and Craig Sanchez.

Planner Cattan stated that the Staff has been working on the General Plan layout, which was included as an exhibit in the Staff report. Requests for Proposals have been started and they should be published within the next couple of weeks. Planner Cattan remarked that the largest

piece of work related to the introduction and connection to visioning. It was broken down to the Core Values from visioning. The first one, which was small town, would include land use, housing, growth management, transportation and community facilities. Due to the amount of information, Planner Cattan assumed the Staff would spend five months on that specific element. The second core value is sense of community, which includes community character and community and economic development. That piece should take approximately four months. The core value of natural setting, which includes open space, environmental conservation, parks and recreation, and the core value of historic preservation would require a smaller amount of time. Planner Cattan remarked that the Core Values would be followed by a community scorecard.

Planner Cattan reported that the Staff would update the Planning Commission monthly on the General Plan progress. It would be very high level at the beginning because they were gathering information to hopefully have something more concrete to present in November or December. She reiterated that creation of the draft plan is ongoing; however the completion goal for a full draft report is April 15, 2012.

Planner Cattan commented on the intent to create a community task force. However, that task force would not be created until they have actual Chapters to present for input. She anticipated that would occur in late August. Director Eddington noted that the timing also ties into possibly receiving RFP documentation and analysis. Planner Cattan stated that the community task force would include members from the resorts and other areas of the community. The task force first meeting would be an overview of the direction they are taking with the General Plan. The intent is to hear feedback and to see if the Staff has missed any elements. Planner Cattan reported that the Transportation Master Plan also involved a community member task force.

Commissioner Savage asked when the task force members would be identified and their commitment to participate secured. Planner Cattan expected to send out invitations in July. The Staff had started a list of potential members, but the list needed to be refined to keep the task force from being too large. Director Eddington noted that at the last meeting the Planning Commission suggested additional groups who should be involved. The goal is to consolidate the list and contact people to see if they have an interest in participating.

Commissioner Pettit recalled that the list includes for profit and non-profit organizations in the community that would provide input on the General Plan as it relates to the scope of what they do within their organization. Director Eddington replied that this was correct.

Commissioner Savage stated that development of the new General Plan presents an opportunity to change the nature of how Park City as a corporation engages with the citizens of Park City. He believed the task force was a strong step in that direction. Commissioner Savage suggested the possibility of expanding the task force to include four or five citizens from Park City who are not affiliated with a specific organization. This could be done through an open house where the Staff presents the plan and asks for interested participation. People could then apply and a committee could choose from those applications. He thought it was important to engage the broad based community. Commissioner Savage thought the citizens selected should be ones who actively participated in Visioning.

Commissioner Pettit asked if the task force would be reviewing all of the elements of the General

Plan or if they would only provide input on items relevant to their specific interest. Planner Cattan stated that as the General Plan progresses, the task force would be given drafts as they occur. Director Eddington clarified that the task force would review all the elements because they would not be catering to any one group.

Commissioner Pettit referred to Commissioner Savage's comment about using the task force as an opportunity to engage the broader community. She assumed the monthly updates would be part of the Staff report and noticed on the agenda. Commissioner Pettit suggested that the Planning Commission incorporate public comment into the time allocated for the General Plan. Director Eddington agreed, noting that the Staff would also provide updates on the website in an effort to keep the community involved.

Commissioner Hontz concurred that a community task force is imperative for having a great General Plan. However, she has been involved in many general plans and the downfall of each one that failed was caused by pieces that were not controlled. As much as she favors involving the community, it is important to rein it in and make sure the process is clear and directed to be successful. Planner Cattan pointed out that once the draft is completed on April 15, 2012 it will be extensively reviewed by the Planning Commission and the City Council. At that point the Staff would like to hear public feedback on the finished product. Planner Cattan remarked that the Staff was using all the input from visioning and the public outreach meetings to prepare the General Plan document. For that reason, she felt they already had important public input. Director Eddington explained that the task force process would be limited. He believed the intended process would address Commissioner Hontz's concern about keeping control.

Chair Wintzer noted that the current General Plan lists the names of people who were on the previous public task force. He suggested that Planner Cattan contact some of those people for their comments on how it worked and what was right or wrong with the process. Planner Cattan stated that the next item on the chart was creation of the draft comprehensive plan for presentation for departmental review. The housing element would be given to Phyllis Robinson to evaluate the draft. She pointed out that in addition to the community, the General Plan is being drafted with the help of other departments within the City. Sustainability and Public Works would have a significant role in the transportation element.

Planner Cattan stated that revisions to the draft would be ongoing. The Staff hopes to be able to compile the draft and include all illustrations from January through April 2012. Planner Cattan remarked that the timeline was reasonable, but it would be a challenge.

Commissioner Pettit requested that the artwork and illustrations include photographs taken by the community as part of the visioning process. Planner Cattan replied that the disc of photos would be included. Chair Wintzer stressed the importance of having more pictures and graphs and less verbiage. Planner Cattan replied that the Staff had talked about using graphics for 50% of the General Plan.

Commissioner Hontz referred to the General Plan elements assigned to each Planning Commissioner. Since Dick Peek was no longer on the Planning Commission, she requested that her element be changed to Land Use and Growth and suggested that one of the two new

Commissioners could fulfill Historic Preservation and Economic Development.

Commissioner Pettit stated that she was tasked with Environment/Conservation and Sustainable Development. However, if one of the new Commissioners had a preference for taking on that element, she would be interested in changing to Community Character and Historic Preservation.

Commissioner Savage had not been assigned an element and asked if he could be part of the community task force. Assistant City Attorney Polly Samuels McLean stated that they would first need to decide if the task force should have a liaison from the Planning Commission. Commissioner Savage was not opposed to taking on an element of the General Plan, but he was more interested in participating with the task force and preferred to pursue that first. Commissioner Hontz expressed a willingness to keep Community Character and Economic Development in addition to Land Use and Growth Management if necessary. Planner Cattan offered to look into the possibility of Commissioner Savage being a liaison on the task force.

Director Eddington presented slides of conceptual ideas for branding. There are four components to the General Plan and the Staff had discussed ways to layout the General Plan. Rather than lay it out element by element, the intent is to make the General Plan a story and tie it to visioning. The end result is four chapters that focus on the four core elements. Director Eddington stated that as a brand or title that identifies the General Plan, the Staff was currently suggesting "Beyond Altitude: Our Community Actualized". He explained the thinking behind the slogan. As they move forward with the four chapters based on the four core elements of visioning, the idea is to focus everything towards the goals, objectives and strategies and how to actualize or implement it. They are trying to keep the General Plan from becoming a proverbial shelf document.

Director Eddington and Planner Cattan reviewed the components for each Chapter as shown in the Staff report.

Commissioner Pettit noted that State law had certain required elements in the General Plan. She thought the Staff had included the statute required elements and tied them more to the general and broader components that came out of visioning. Director Eddington replied that this was correct. In earlier meetings on the General Plan, the Planning Commission recommended folding the elements together.

Planner Cattan pointed out that emphasis on recreation was a missing element that was crucial and unique to Park City. The Staff was making an effort to include the recreation component in the new General Plan because of its importance.

Commissioner Savage stated that in reading the Staff report, he was negatively impacted by the seeing the word "fluff" used many times. He cautioned the Staff about labeling anything "fluff" and encouraged them to think of using a different word. Commissioner Savage remarked that the concept of actualization is vague in its meaning and he felt the word "actualization" should be substantiated if they intend to use it for the General Plan. Planner Cattan explained that in relation to the General Plan, actualization means to "get it done" or "to implement". She noted that the facts would be stated at the beginning of the chapters. It then goes into the filter and how to utilize the filter of community vision, which sets the goals for the community. For each of the goals, the

Staff will begin to create measureable indicators. Planner Cattan remarked that actualization is implementing the goals into new projects and then measuring what is done later with the indicators. She preferred to keep actualization as the key word because it is more unique than implementation.

Commissioner Pettit understood that the LMC changes might be one mechanism utilized for the implementation of goals. The LMC is subservient to the General Plan. She assumed it would be part of the process in terms of action items once they recognize and understand the goals.

Planner Cattan reiterated that the Staff was putting out RFPs which they were still fine-tuning. She reviewed the different RFPs, which included human health and land use, primary versus secondary residences, artists, year-round economic generator study, local versus national chains, natural resource study, growth management study.

Commissioner Savage asked if the Chamber of Commerce was part of the community task force. He was told it was. Commissioner Savage asked if there was room in the process for marketing and branding consultation. Director Eddington believed the branding of Park City would come about as a result of the document. When people see the data and the analysis, he believed it would achieve the actual branding of Park City by saying ski resorts, Main Street, Bonanza Park, Chamber of Commerce, etc. Commissioner Savage cautioned the Staff to be careful about emphasizing the branding at the beginning of the document because people will react in a different way than what is intended.

Planner Cattan reported that she, Director Eddington and Chair Wintzer met with the University of Utah. It was a productive meeting and the Staff would be following up with ideas of professional studies. One or two interns could fulfill their professional studies by assisting the Staff with the General Plan. Director Eddington noted that the University has a new Professor who will focus on visual technology with regard to narrative document. There may be the opportunity to tie the Park City General Plan into a class project in the Fall. He and Planner Cattan would try to meet with that Professor when he arrives in July to discuss any opportunities.

Commissioner Pettit favored the idea of taking advantage of working with in-state local groups or resources to help a student, class or professor meet their goals, and at the same time allow the City to utilize Best Practices thinking. Planner Cattan believed an association with the University would be a long range relationship beyond the General Plan.

The work session was adjourned.

Work Session Notes
June 8, 2011
Page 8