

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SNYDERVILLE BASIN PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT WORK SESSION
MAY 30, 2012**

Present: Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Brooke Hontz, Jack Thomas, Nann Worel
Chuck Klingenstein, Annette Velarde, Martyn Kingston, Mike Franklin Colin Deford, Bassam Salem

Ex Officio: Gabe Epperson, Facilitator; Don Sargent, Thomas Eddington, Katie Cattan, Amir Cause, Charlie Brennan, Kirsten Whetstone, Kayla Sintz, Kimber Gabryszak, Diane Foster, Jennifer Strader, Patricia Abdullah

The Joint Work Session of the Park City Planning Commission and the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission was called to order at 6:06 p.m.

Don Sargent, Summit County Community Development Director, welcomed everyone to the Regional collaboration meeting. He noted that joint meetings provide an opportunity for both Commissions to collaborate on issues that affect their jurisdictions in Summit County and Park City.

Thomas Eddington, Park City Planning Director, reported that the last joint meeting was held in December 2012. Since Summit County and Park City were working through their General Plans, this was an ideal time to meet jointly and collaborate on major topics. Director Eddington asked the Planners from both jurisdictions to introduce themselves.

Mr. Eddington introduced Gabe Epperson with Envision Utah, who would facilitate the meeting this evening. Mr. Epperson has worked with various communities throughout Utah to see how those areas were working through their regional planning issues. He believed the County and Park City could build off some of the examples Mr. Epperson would present this evening.

Mr. Epperson stated that he has worked all over the State working with similar issues in places such as Tooele County, Washington County, all Wasatch Front Communities, Cache, Morgan County and Rich County. Mr. Epperson clarified that was not claiming to be an expert or offering an opinion on what Summit County and Park City should be doing as a region. His objective this evening was to share his experiences from other counties and areas.

Mr. Epperson would speak about two different projects. The first was what was happening along the Wasatch Front and the second was a case study of the Cache Valley regional planning work that was done. He thought both would set a context and stimulate ideas on some of the best practices that other regions were doing.

Mr. Epperson stated that growth was driving everything statewide and along the Wasatch Front. All the different issues to be addressed are within that context. He presented Wasatch Front and State projections. Approximately 75% growth was expected Statewide, and nearly 70% growth in the four major Wasatch Front Counties. This would have profound impacts on Summit County, Wasatch County and Tooele County. As the Wasatch Front grows the other areas take a lot of pressure as well. Mr. Epperson noted that the Wasatch Front alone expects to have 1.5 million residents by 2014, which has profound impacts on other quality of life indicators. For example, the miles that are driven annually is expected to double in the next 30 years from 50 million miles driven to 90 million

miles driven. Additional miles would create major impacts on air quality, which is already a current issue. It also impacts critical lands and agricultural lands. Mr. Epperson stated that over the next 30 years, 300 square miles of new development is projected in the four Counties along the Wasatch Front. Approximately 100 square miles of agricultural land will be developed and lost with the patterns of growth and development experienced over the last several decades.

Mr. Epperson remarked that growth was putting tremendous pressure on local governments and their resources. Residents, as part of the local government, have to pay taxes. A recent study by the University of Utah found that the cost of infrastructure to support the growth has gone from what had traditionally been a third of local government budgets to over 60%. Increases in property taxes and other funds are spent on growth related infrastructure costs.

Mr. Epperson stated that in an effort to find a better way to accommodate growth along the Wasatch Front, Envision Utah put together a regional vision called "The Wasatch Choice for 2040", as a strategy to grow and preserve the quality of life. He noted that this was done as a grass roots effort by thousands of Utahns. It was facilitated by Envision Utah through open houses, mapping, surveys, etc. Mr. Epperson outlined some of the benefits of the 2040 Vision. They looked at infrastructure costs regionally and found that if they followed this vision they would save almost 20% on the cost of infrastructure for local government, which was approximately 4.5 billion dollars. In addition, they found that it would enhance mobility and economic growth. By growing differently they can reduce traffic and congestion by almost 20%. Mr. Epperson explained how they analyzed 15-20 transportation systems for the projected growth. The conclusion was that no set of transportation systems would reduce traffic congestion with the expected growth. However, one way to reduce traffic congestion impacts was to change land use and development patterns strategically.

Mr. Epperson pointed out that the solutions were projected 30-40 years from now; and not what they were dealing with today. The issue is the quality of life they would leave to their kids and grandkids. Mr. Epperson stated that the main strategy is centers. If future growth could be focused in either historic centers or new centers near regional transportation infrastructure, public transit systems and regional roads, it would have a huge impact on improving main quality of life indicators. He noted that there were several types of historic and future regional centers. In looking forward at the expected growth, it is important to understand key demographic shifts. In 30 years the population will be fundamentally different. Two of the largest population segments are the baby boomers, who started retiring last year, and the millennial generation, who started to come of age this year. Both of those groups have different demands, needs and interests in the types of housing and the types of communities they want to live in. Mr. Epperson presented housing surveys and market and demand surveys which showed that one-third of the future households would prefer to live in new walkable developments. They want smaller homes, townhomes, condos and apartments, with access to transit, jobs and amenities. Currently they were far short of meeting those demands. The vision projects that 70% of the population would still be living in single family traditional neighborhoods.

Mr. Epperson presented conceptual examples showing different types of household and housing scenarios.

Mr. Epperson reported on a process they went through for Envision Cache Valley in an effort to address the growth in that area. He noted that the process involved a diverse group of stakeholders. The steering committee in Cache Valley represented the water district, agricultural interests, business owners, environmental groups, chambers of commerce, Utah State University and any other entity or group who would have a stake in implementing growth and development over the next several decades. Mr. Epperson stated that Cache Valley was projecting to double their population very rapidly.

The process for Cache Valley started with an initial set of public workshops and a baseline scenario of where they are today and where they are headed with current plans. He showed an aerial of Cache Valley with yellow dots representing current structures or current development. They looked at the population projections and combined that with the current to identify the baseline, which were shown in pink dots. The result added the footprint of three new Logan's; one in each decade. During the public workshops the discussion focused on whether there were other ways to grow that should be considered. People were asked to solve the problem rather than philosophize on whether or not growth should occur. People were asked about land conservation, areas where development was appropriate, and how to create great places to live over time. Another piece was transportation and how people would get around.

Mr. Epperson noted that information from the public workshops was used to develop a set of scenarios that the public and the stakeholders could work through to see how they played out. Mr. Epperson reviewed the different scenarios. Scenario A was the baseline scenario that represents recent growth patterns. Scenario B was development along the benches in that valley. Scenario C focused that growth in all of the existing towns. Scenario D placed as much growth as possible in or around Logan to maintain an urban core. An additional round of public workshops were held to share information and ask people which elements of the different scenarios they favored. They found that nearly 90% of the citizens that were involved said they wanted something different than what was currently happening in the baseline scenario. In addition, 90% preferred that a large portion of that future development be mixed use in the existing communities.

Mr. Epperson stated that the next step used in the process, both generally and in Cache Valley, was to distill all the input into a vision statement, vision principles, and an implementation plan. The steering committee, with public input, developed a statement that they felt captured the values of the communities. They wanted to keep the city a city, invest in their towns and centers for living, industry and culture, and keep the country areas country by protecting agricultural and natural lands. The identified principles and guidelines for moving forward included living close to work, shop and play, provide a variety of housing options that better meet market demand, mixed uses, and recycled land. Mr. Epperson stated that the desire was to focus investment in existing towns as opposed to developing new infrastructure that would add an additional tax burden for construction and maintenance. They also wanted to create diverse new neighborhoods within walking distance of services.

Mr. Epperson remarked that in addition to a vision statement, part of the process was to develop a series of maps that represent that vision. He presented slides of the different maps and explained

how each met the vision scenarios. He noted that these were aspirations and goals. They may not meet the targets but they were working towards them. Mr. Epperson pointed out that if they implement the vision scenario they would have a 40% reduction of developed land, which would conserve 21 square miles of farmland; 61% reduction of convergence of prime farm land to urbanized use; 27% reduction on residential water demand; 30% reduction of impervious surface; 10% reduction in vehicle miles traveled; over 100% increase in public transit; 20% reduction in emission, and 20% reduction in local infrastructure costs.

Mr. Epperson stated that this was a two-county process. Logan was actively involved and a key stakeholder. All the work was done in coordination with all the cities in Cache Valley; with Logan playing a very primary role.

Mr. Epperson remarked that an implementation process was set up with the steering committee, local elected officials, planning commissions, and others. Forums were set up to talk about ways to implement the vision and what actions different agencies could take to achieve it. Mr. Epperson presented images that illustrated some of the strategies. He noted that the Cache Valley report was available online and he recommended that this group review it. Mr. Epperson reviewed the tangible outcomes and results of implementing this type of process that would not be possible otherwise.

Mr. Epperson outlined the agenda for the remainder of the meeting. Both Summit County and Park City Planning Departments would share slides regarding planning work that has already been done. Following that, the participants would be divided into groups to address specific issues. They would then come back together to discuss some of their thoughts.

Thomas Eddington from Park City and Adryan Slaughter from Summit County presented slides that went back and forth from balanced growth to the preferred growth strategy that Summit County had worked on. Mr. Eddington echoed Mr. Epperson's comment that growth is coming. Utah is one of the fastest growing states and the mountain region will be the fastest growing region in the Country. For that reason, they will see tremendous changes for the Summit County area over the next 40-60 years. Growth is coming and it is important to plan for it. They need to look at which areas should be protected and where growth should be funneled.

Mr. Slaughter pointed out that they continue to see a fear of sprawl and density. At some point they need to address where growth happens if they do not want sprawl and/or density.

Mr. Eddington stated that as Park City looked at the balanced growth study, one of the primary objectives was to stay true to the vision of Park City, which was sense of community, natural setting, small town and historic character. That the vision was no too different from what Summit County wants and it was similar to what Mr. Epperson had demonstrated for Cache Valley. Mr. Eddington presented the growth trends and noted that growth in Park City would be a little slower because it is more built out than Summit County/Snyderville Basin.

Katie Cattan with the Park City Planning Department, pointed out that Park City has brought in many homes and opportunities; however, the cost is so high that they were not gaining a primary

residential population. It creates a harsh affordable housing situation in Park City and puts a greater pressure on Summit County. It is important for the City and the County to work together on that issue. Mr. Eddington remarked that housing was only one of the many challenges for Park City and the County.

Mr. Sargent noted that information from years and years of public input from neighborhood meetings and the preferred growth concept study mirrored Mr. Eddington's presentation in terms of identifying areas where growth should occur. It is now a matter of the Planning Commissions trying to decide how to make that happen. Mr. Sargent believed a key question was whether they should look at new growth or just reorganize the existing density that would be allowed per zoning.

Mr. Eddington presented a slide illustrating what a sending and receiving zone would look like and how density could be clustered in a receiving area. Mr. Eddington noted that collaboration and inter-jurisdictional opportunities were key elements, as well as keeping the regulatory market clear and helping to expedite planning and development for those who follow what the General Plans and Codes recommend. It is important to figure out the gives and gets as they work through development in the future, recognizing that there are going to be gives on the City and County side as they prepare for this growth. As they plan for the future they need to understand how to balance the gives and gets, some of which were identified in the balanced growth study. Mr. Eddington stated that most of the discussion points are regulatory in nature, but in the end, the main point is about preserving the magic of Summit County and Park City. The formula is using quantitative analysis to preserve the qualitative way of life they all appreciate.

Kimber Gabryszak with the Summit County Planning Department, remarked that the words "sprawl" and "density" have a negative connotation for the public. People do not realize that both cannot be avoided in development. If it's not dense it's sprawling and if it's not sprawling it's dense.

Commissioner Kingston understood that the major difference between the TDR and the "as is" was simply a shift of freeing up the space off Highway 40 and condensing growth at the junction of 248. Otherwise the maps seemed very similar. Mr. Eddington replied that the maps were similar. He noted that the area north of I-80 maintains more density as the purple dots are taken from areas along Old Ranch Loop Road. He pointed out a clustering of the purple dots with the TDRs, as opposed to not having them.

Commissioner Klingenstein noted that the information Mr. Eddington presented came from a City financed study and the County had not yet provided input. It was a concept of possibilities to illustrate available choices as opposed to continuing with the status quo. Mr. Eddington concurred that it was one alternative and one scenario and recommendation. The possibilities were many and they would be asked for input on other scenarios when they break into smaller groups. Mr. Epperson remarked that there were many tools. The alternative concept showed the impact that one tool could have. Additional tools could have greater impact.

Mr. Epperson requested that the participants break into three discussion groups. The agenda outlined the following topics for discussion: 1) Preferred Growth Areas; 2) Kimball Junction –

additional growth potential; 3) Route 40 – future growth or preservation; 4) Bonanza Park – redevelopment potential - vertical density; 5) Use of Transfer Development Rights (within jurisdiction or inter-jurisdictional).

The participants reconvened as one group following their small group discussions. A spokesperson for each group summarized the key points that were discussed.

Commissioner Klingenstein spoke for the first group and outlined bullet points of their discussion. The first was fixed infill provisions and the idea to create more incentives infill. Most population growth is in the Basin and not on the East side. They were looking at the entire County and more focus needed to be on Snyderville. There is a strong desire for more activity from the East side, but so far they have been resistant. In terms of Park City, the question was how to diversify the population of Park City proper since they were losing young families rapidly. Everyone in the group agreed that they needed to start going vertical in the current existing density nodes. Due to traffic lights and other impediments, US40 and SR248 would likely become Park City's front door. It is important to rethink the entire transportation demand management before the Urban Solutions for SR224 from Kimball's Junction to the Canyons go into place. They discussed going denser in existing nodes and future nodes of development, such as Quinn's Junction and Silver Creek Junction. They also talked about a coalition where all municipalities look at the region, get a dialogue going and maybe do a better job. As an example, when the TDR study was done, the East side was adamant about not wanting growth, but did they really understand the alternatives.

Commissioner Kingston spoke for the next group, which started by looking at the growth projections. They realized that they do not have to receive all the growth that is projected, and they certainly do not have to move quickly to alter land use zoning to receive growth to 2050. It is important to tie existing inventory and zoning with the projections before deciding where growth should go. They also wanted to look at the quality of the relationship of the existing inventory in the Basin and in Park City, keeping TDRs in mind. They talked about approximately 3,000 lots in both areas, taking into account the redevelopment of Bonanza. Throwing out rough numbers, they assumed that possibly 20,000 people were already satisfied by the existing distribution inventory that is already zoned. Commissioner Kingston remarked that the intent was to raise awareness and not to forget that they have history and the existing inventory, and to think hard about those relationships. The group also talked about quality versus quantity. People fear density because they moved here and live here for quality and lifestyle. The public's fears might be allayed by quality planning and quality relationships between jurisdictions, applicants and developers; particularly if they could project the quality of growth as well as the scale and the quantity. Also important are the Park City jurisdictional conflicts and the fact that the document for the consultants was for Park City and not the region. It is more about how people experience the space and land use, and not the political jurisdictions and client relationships, which clearly colors the document. As public entities they serve the public and the public does not know where Park City ends and Snyderville begins. Mr. Kingston stated that the group also talked about the idea of the TDR. With the help of staff they looked at why transferring one unit of development to three units somewhere else potentially creates a problem for the public or residents living in the "somewhere else". In order to create financial incentives to vacate one unit, they have to promise three units somewhere else, and that creates problems in negotiating deals. They talked about looking at certain land that

is not heavily invested with governmental or planning rights. Rezoning land gives financial incentives that make it more difficult to transfer rights in the second scenario from the first scenario. It is important to anticipate and plan ahead to avoid elevating the cost of transferring rights from one place to another. In terms of where to put growth, they all came to similar conclusions about Silver Creek, I-80/US40, Bonanza and areas near the East Canyon campus. This group was more resistant to revisiting the question of permitting elevation.

Planner Katie Cattan spoke for the last group. The initial conversation started off with the inventory question. It would be helpful to see on the map the current inventories and how they were laid out in units per acre to understand where growth should be directed. The group talked about intersections and the connection between transportation, land use, greater communities, and aesthetic experience. They talked a lot about the wildlife corridor along US40 and how it connects to the open space. One area of possibly expanding new growth would be along the nodes and on/off ramps for US 40, with a buffer in between to continue the green space across. The group identified Kimball Junction for infill and discussed height. The ideas were to fill in the parking lots and go vertical over Smiths and that area, and place cars underneath the buildings. Ideas for US40 were to keep development near the on/off ramp and in the existing neighborhoods, and to clean up the Quinn's Junction area and possible development across the street. Planner Cattan noted that the map showed the green space for Round Valley. Currently, the issue is to make sure that green space connects across and protects the wildlife. She thought they could go as far as talking about a wildlife overpass in that area in the future. Vertical height could go in Bonanza Park and in the Snow Creek Plaza area to create more potential for growth in the location of The Market. The group favored the idea of going regional for TDRs.

Commissioner Jack Thomas asked if Envision Utah supports TDRs on a regional level. Mr. Epperson replied that Envision Utah supports it as one tool that can help achieve what a community envisions. When working with a community, they identify their values and vision and offer five or six tools to accomplish that vision. Different tools are used on a case by case basis and it should be market based and voluntary.

Mr. Epperson noted that each of the groups had raised good points. However, the fundamental question was whether there was a consensual vision about where growth should occur and what areas should be preserved; or if the City and County plans were too contradictory. Mr. Epperson asked if the group was ready for implementation or if they needed time for more planning work.

Commissioner Salem felt that Mr. Kingston's group had addressed his point of obligation to the community. He believed the natural question was an inventory of what is already entitled but has not been developed, and the location of those entitled areas. Commissioner Salem pointed out that density is not artificially created. It has to be already vested or there needs to be agreement that increasing density would be in the best interest of the community. He believed the real issue regarding density was "wanting" it in the community rather than "having to", and to what extent. Commissioner Salem believed that the fundamental connection between the Basin and Park City was too tight to ignore. A lot of the needs of one stem from the other and you cannot treat them as completely separate. There needs to be some type of value exchange between the two entities. Commissioner Salem stated that if they want to think regional and one big community, they need to

plan regionally and have one process that applies to everyone instead of the three separate pockets of Park City, the Basin and Eastern Summit County. He believed they should act as one County because they impact each other.

Commissioner Thomas remarked that part of the problem is that Planning Commissions do not control the money in the community. Therefore, a question for the City and County Councils and the public is whether money should be spent on serious professional planning. They are all concerned citizens, but they are not planners. They are a group of individuals with ideas. They all have a passionate interest, but they keep making the same mistakes and they never move forward with a plan. Commissioner Thomas thought it would be in the best interest of the community to hire professional planners.

Mr. Epperson stated that as someone coming in from the outside, he could see evidence of some plans that were done. If they were to put forth a new planning effort, he wanted to know what they would do different to avoid repeating what was done in the past.

Commissioner Hontz stated that she took part in a County/City financed consultant based study for Quinn's Junction. A lot of hard work and effort went into developing outcomes that were based on key parameters set by the Councils and the Planning Commissions. In the end, both the City and County did not want to follow what the study proposed and nothing was implemented. For her personally it was a huge frustration because they agreed on the parameters upfront and everyone was supposed to have buy-in. Those involved in the study did the work and made tough calls about the same issues being discussed today. She believed the study was rejected because the City and the County had to do different things to accomplish the goals. Commissioner Hontz was not opposed to hiring a professional planner as long as the City and the County are willing to implement the outcome. To another point, Commissioner Hontz thought they already knew what was entitled and where that development would occur, and it was time to accept it. In addition to making decisions on sprawl or density, they have to decide what they want. If they do not want density or sprawl or height, then the jurisdictional entity needs to buy the land.

Mr. Epperson referred to the baseline projections and noted that someone had paid money for consultants to go through and look at what the entitlements were, which lots have already been platted with the current zoning, and where that development would occur. He was not involved with that process but it appeared the work had already been done. He suggested that it was time to study the projections to better understand it. They cannot predict exactly what will happen because someone could request a rezone; but the baseline has been examined, as reflected in the dot maps.

Based on Mr. Epperson's comment, Commissioner Salem wanted someone in the room to tell him how many units were currently approved but had not yet been developed. Commissioner Klingenstein replied that the total inventory was 9,000 units of approved density. Commissioner Salem asked if 9,000 inventory was the appropriate level; and whether they would be comfortable as a community doubling that to 18,000 or dropping it down to 4,000. He thought it was important to clearly delineate whether they were building above the "as is" threshold. Commissioner Kingston thought they would need to talk with the other jurisdictions because Park City and Eastern Summit County have their own inventory. It is a regional issue that goes beyond Snyderville Basin. In

addition to knowing the numbers, another question is the cost to shift the movement if there is a better place for development. Mr. Epperson thought it was more important to have a nuance understanding of the projections.

Commissioner Klingenstein commented on the frustration the Snyderville Planning Commissioners expressed over the past month when looking at future growth maps to try to understand what they have. The information was available, but it was not presented by Staff in a cohesive format so they could know what they were dealing with. They were working on the General Plan and they were behind the City in that process. Understanding that the workload gets in the way, he had suggested bringing in a consultant team to move things forward.

Commissioner Klingenstein pointed out that they also need to consider legal issues in terms of whether the zoning is defensible. They need to be careful about property rights and surrounding rural zoning with suburban development. It is not always a choice of wanting or not wanting development, and he emphasized the problems that could arise if they do not come up with long-term solutions.

Commissioner Salem commented on the saying that the person who misses a meeting is the one assigned all the action items. He remarked that if they have multiple jurisdictions, each looking within their own perspective, the other jurisdiction is always the person missing from the meeting. It is natural that each jurisdiction would want the density outside of their jurisdiction and away from their neighborhoods. Commissioner Salem believed in planning regionally but taking into account that each piece is a separate center. They should all work together from a planning and interest perspective and balance those together as opposed to individually. Commissioner Salem applauded this meeting, and the fact that they were talking together. He wished that all planning could be conducted in this manner.

Commissioner Strachan stated that the best way to evolve that would be for the Basin and the City to have a General Plan. They each have their own General Plan and they are not too different. The values are almost identical and he did not believe it would be difficult to come up with an overarching plan. The difficulty would be communication between the two bodies so when a plan comes to issue with an application, both bodies enforce them consistently. This would only work if they have a plan that takes into account the interests of the community as a whole and a document they can enforce.

Commissioner Velarde thought it begged the question of why not just one body. Mr. Epperson stated that they do have shared values and the plans are trying to achieve the same thing. However, the problem is in how the two plans were drafted and created and how the different planning entities meet separately. He asked if anyone in the group did not think there should be better coordination between the two bodies.

Commissioner Strachan thought there should be better coordination but he did not think Mr. Epperson was right in saying that there were problems in the way the two general plans were drafted. Mr. Epperson clarified that he was implying that there was no coordination between the City and the County when each plan was drafted.

Commissioner Velarde pointed out that Park City was finishing up their General Plan re-write, and Snyderville was three years out from completing theirs. If they intend to coordinate the General Plans, then the County should work off of Park City's.

Based on their discussion, Mr. Epperson had written down two items in terms of the next steps. He believed there was some understanding of current entitlements and what is permitted or could be developed, but that issue needed to be better presented or understood. Secondly, there was agreement that planning efforts should be coordinated. He asked if the group was interested in meeting again, and if so, how frequently. The group definitely favored joint meetings more often.

Commissioner Hontz pointed out that when the two Planning Commissions met 18 months ago, they had the same two goals that Mr. Epperson outlined. She would have preferred more meetings in the last 18 months to accomplish those goals. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that issues are resolved within the City, but the two Commissions were still not communicating to answer the questions or resolve the issues.

Mr. Epperson clarified that the group was interested in scheduling another meeting in the near future to discussion Item 1. Mr. Kingston did not agree that Item 1 was the next step. The second item, coordinated planning efforts, should involve other stakeholders besides the Planning Commissioners. Before they start looking at an action schedule, he thought it would be worth hearing from a consultant on the models and best practices for actually integrating across the entire County, including Park City.

Mr. Epperson asked if it would be helpful if he invited a county-wide planner, a County Commissioner from Cache County, and a Council person from Logan to attend their next meeting and talk about how they coordinate and work together.

Commissioner Salem thought it would more helpful to hear from Mr. Epperson based on his experience in these types of situations where the political minds do not match the thinking of the neighborhood and community. Mr. Epperson stated that in order to move beyond that they need to create an entity that covers the jurisdictional extent that they want to plan for. For example, Cache Valley set up a Regional Council and agreed on the objective. In the Wasatch Front, he did a project on the Jordan River, which was 18 jurisdictions doing their own thing, and they agreed to set up a Jordan River Commission with one person staff. Mr. Epperson suggested that Park City and Snyderville could keep their regular individual meetings, but agree to meet jointly as a group two or three times a year to discuss coordinated planning.

Commissioner Velarde did not think two or three times a year was enough. She questioned why Park City and Snyderville Basin could not have one Planning Commission. Commissioner Klingenstein thought it was regulated by State legislation. Mr. Epperson stated that the Jordan River Commission had to set up an inter-local agreement under the State subdivision law to create the new entity. Regional Councils have to follow the same process.

Commissioner Velarde asked if the City and the County agreed that a larger body was necessary to

begin coordinated planning for the two entities, whether that could be done legally. She was told that it would be appropriate and legal for Park City and Snyderville Basin to form a sub-committee that meets on a regular basis. Commissioner Kingston pointed out that it was not as simple as having the two Planning Commissions meet jointly. If they set up a schedule to meet and share information on a regular basis, it also involves the public and coordination between the two Planning Departments. Mr. Epperson agreed. They would need to identify items or issues they wanted to informally discuss, as well as the expectations of how that arrangement would work.

Commissioner Klingenstein stated that in the 1990's there was an interlocal agreement between Summit County and Park City that dealt with land use issues. It did not establish a formal board but it established a relationship and meetings between Staff. Commissioner Klingenstein was unsure whether the Interlocal Act that Mr. Epperson mentioned allows jurisdictions to give up their planning authority, but it does allow for coordination and interlocal cooperation.

Commissioner Salem pointed out that they were talking about a population from two jurisdictions that share schools, playgrounds and recreation areas and it is becoming more evident that Park City needs the Basin and the Basin needs Park City. Mr. Epperson stated that if they choose to assign a staff person to coordinate efforts, there is no reason why that person could not invite a planner from Wasatch County or from other agencies involved in regional issues.

Commissioner Strachan recommended another joint meeting in the near future because both Planning Commissions would have to make recommendations to their respective Councils. If they were committed to collaborating and assigning a staff member, they need to have a convincing presentation for the Councils that outline the Staff member's scope of employment and what they propose to pay that person.

Commissioner Deford thought Snyderville needed a sustainability person who could help them catch up with Park City. He noted that currently the General Plan did not address sustainability. Commissioner Velarde was certain that one person could do both. Mr. Epperson stated that they should craft the job description based on what they want from that individual. If sustainability is important, it should be targeted in the job description.

Commissioner Velarde could see no reason to reinvent the wheel if Snyderville could use Park City's General Plan as their template.

Mr. Epperson asked if the group felt they had identified visioning and shared values for the direction the two communities wanted to go and were ready to move forward; or whether they needed additional visioning work prior to the next step.

Commissioner Velarde stated that although it was done separately, both entities had done significant visioning work that runs parallel to each other. They may need another meeting to work on some things, but she thought the visioning was complete.

Commissioner Salem thought it would be beneficial to brainstorm how collaboration would work and how interests could be more closely aligned.

Mr. Epperson believed they had narrowed the discussion in terms of the issues that need to be resolved or discussed in more detail. He thought it made sense for the Staff to work together and come up with two or three options to discuss at the next meeting.

Commissioner Hontz was prepared to make that proposal this evening. She would like to meet as soon as possible and definitely within the next two months. At the next meeting she would like to see a presentation based on the visioning that was done in the County and in the City so they could compare the visions and identify the similarities and differences. That would help this group achieve their own consensus on what the vision says about the community as a County and City blended together.

Mr. Epperson summarized that for the next meeting they need to focus on understanding what has been done in each jurisdiction; and then determine the right model going forward to coordinate the implementation of that vision or whether additional visioning needs to be done.

Commissioner Kingston did not think the vision discussion was critical. They were given one tool for inter-jurisdictional collaboration and he would like to have a meeting on best practices. He thought it would be more beneficial to search through America to see what other jurisdictions in this type of situation have done to see if they can duplicate some of that structure.

Mr. Epperson remarked that the two ideas were not contradictory and it was not a matter of having one or the other. The next meeting needed to accomplish two things. One was understanding the planning work that has already been done in both the City and the County. The second addressed logistics in terms of the model or alternatives to achieve better coordination.

Commissioner Deford thought another key issue was money and the ability to pay for it.

Mr. Sargent noted that the Planning Staff from both entities typically meet twice a year for Staff collaboration. They discussed both General Plans at their last meeting to understand the similarities and differences. He thought they could do a better job of collaboration at the staff level.

Mr. Sargent stated that he and Mr. Eddington could bring their teams together more frequently to discuss in more detail what is going on in their respective jurisdictions. They would try to come up with something that could be presented to both Planning Commissions for feedback on how to address some of the concerns.

Mr. Eddington suggested that the Staff could work on the entitlement issues, as well as the model and alternatives and report back at a joint meeting in two months. A meeting was tentatively scheduled for the first week in August.

The meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Planning Commission
Joint Work Session with Snyderville Basin
May 30, 2012
Page 13