



1
2 **Main Street Area Plan Minutes**

3 Date: Thursday, November 14, 2024

4 Time: 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

5 Location: City Hall - City Council Chambers (first floor)

6
7 **Attendance:** Emerson Oliveria (Zoom), Maren Mullin, Heleena Sederis, Randy Scott, Rob
8 Sergent, Jennifer Wesselhoff, Erik Daenitz, Tristan Cleveland (Zoom), Mitchell Reardon (Zoom),
9 Mark Morris, Brent Crowther, Tim Sanderson, Nann Worel, Ryan Dickey, Matt Lee, Chris
10 Eggleton, Alex Roy, Emma Prysunka, Becky Gutknecht (Zoom)

11
12 Community Engagement Summary

13 Tristan from Happy Cities opened the meeting with a summary of public feedback from the
14 recent community engagement event. He reported that over 200 people attended*, with 28
15 digital responses and 10 paper submissions collected through the Input Form made available to
16 all attendees. While the Input Form allowed all participants to voice their concerns, feedback on
17 the Input Form from all attendees was not required. He noted that the meeting's open format
18 contributed to its positive atmosphere.

19
20 **The attendance figure of 200 people mentioned in this meeting was a rough, qualitative*
21 *estimate based on immediate impressions following the event. The actual count was later found*
22 *to be 147.*

23
24 Tristan shared Input Form insights, highlighting transportation solutions that garnered the most
25 support. Popular ideas included a gondola from Main Street to Deer Valley (74% in favor), a
26 transit and hotel shuttle station in Old Town (74% in favor), and designated rideshare pickup and
27 drop-off zones (74% in favor). While many supported the gondola to Deer Valley, questions
28 remained about its route and funding. A gondola to PCMR, however, received less enthusiasm
29 (52% in favor).

30
31 Valet parking on Swede Alley was supported by 37% of respondents, with additional comments
32 suggesting valet services directly in front of restaurants on Main Street. Tristan proposed further
33 discussion on this topic.

34
35 Opinions about the post office were evenly divided. Half supported retaining the original
36 heritage building, while the other half preferred demolishing the building to create a larger
37 public square. Respondents were roughly evenly split in which they preferred. Tristan stated
38 that the committee would need to decide on its future use.

39
40 Development projects [on Swede Alley] received strong public support, provided they did not
41 obstruct existing buildings. However, parking solutions were a contentious issue. Some
42 comments called for maintaining parking to benefit businesses, while at least one suggested
43 replacing all public spaces with parking, demonstrating the range in opinions regarding parking
44 solutions.

45
46 Business owners expressed concerns about how visitors would access Main Street. Tristan
47 emphasized the importance of developing parking solutions for high-value consumers, local

48 residents, and the workforce. He also stressed the need for effective transit options to ensure
49 easy access to the area.

50

51 The Brew Lot design received mixed feedback. Some respondents supported dedicating half the
52 space to a building with amenities, while others favored a skating rink. There was also interest in
53 a gondola, though concerns were raised about how it would be funded and what the alignment
54 would be. Business owners emphasized the importance of getting the Brew Pub Lot design
55 right, suggesting it should include features that draw people further up the street.

56 There was a strong emphasis on the need for an effective construction mitigation plan, with
57 businesses voicing concerns about the potential impact of prolonged street closures. Clear and
58 practical solutions were strongly encouraged. Additionally, relocating the garbage sorting facility
59 was recommended to improve access to the green space.

60

61 One suggestion for developments on Marsac included incorporating townhomes to create a
62 sense of belonging within the community. Workforce-related concerns were also raised,
63 including how late childcare services would operate, how street closures would affect
64 employees, and the availability of workforce housing at the park-and-ride facility. Participants
65 stressed the importance of providing viable transportation options for the workforce, including
66 overnight solutions and adequate parking for employees.

67

68 Concerns were also expressed about redeveloping the Sandridge lots, as many residents rely on
69 these spaces for parking during the winter months when street parking is unavailable due to
70 accumulated snow constricting the streets.

71

72 Mitchell from Happy Cities highlighted the valuable questions and ideas that emerged,
73 emphasizing the need for further effort to address them thoroughly. He remarked that the
74 conversations with Park City residents were both positive and engaging.

75

76 Tristan noted strong overall support for public improvements along Main Street. Some residents
77 inquired about permanently pedestrianizing the street but appreciated the explanation of
78 maintaining flexibility for other uses. Public spaces such as Miners Park, 9th Street, and City Hall
79 Plaza received positive feedback. Overall, the response was encouraging, with residents
80 expressing that the project was heading in the right direction and should continue as planned.

81

82 Maren asked when the Input Form closed, and Mitchell responded that it closed yesterday
83 (Wednesday, Nov 13) at 10 A.M.

84

85 Mitchell clarified that the Input Form was meant to replace post-it notes and markers.

86

87 Erik added that the Input Form was not a statistically significant one and did not have a large
88 sample size [only 38 responses submitted]. It was not intended to be a 'scientific survey' but
89 rather a tool to provide guidance to the Committee and their final recommendation(s) to the
90 Council.

91

92 Erik emphasized that the goal of the engagement session was to ensure the public's voice
93 influenced the committee process. If the committee wishes to revise anything, they can provide
94 recommendations to the Council before the December meeting.

95

96 Erik suggested reviewing the key takeaways from the community engagement event. He agreed
97 that there was positive feedback on development, but a lot of the feedback questioned why
98 there was so much density. Much of the explanation provided was that the committee aimed to

99 maintain parking volumes and ensure proper placement of parking spots without losing any, to
100 support additional visitation and vibrancy. Underground parking, though expensive, was
101 necessary, and to accommodate that, the developer would need increased vertical height.
102 There are other design elements where some areas building height exceeds the zoning, while in
103 some areas, the vertical height will not be proposed.

104
105 Maren inquired whether the afternoon session revealed differing opinions. Erik responded that
106 it did not, but there was notable curiosity about whether the City would be funding these
107 developments—a complex issue. He clarified that this strategy aims to generate revenue for
108 public use by leveraging market-driven private development.

109
110 Erik also shared feedback received during the session. One perspective opposed any
111 redevelopment, advocating for no changes, while another provided specific suggestions
112 regarding the City Hall building. This individual proposed relocating all government functions
113 and repurposing the building as a park, events space, and community hub. Erik brought these
114 ideas to the committee for consideration.

115
116 Additionally, Erik noted that the Council is scheduled to discuss City Hall's future uses in a public
117 meeting in November, though the exact agenda details remain uncertain.

118
119 During the community engagement meeting, it was noted that several attendees expressed
120 opposition to relocating City Hall functions while reviewing the City Hall Plaza designs.

121
122 Ryan added that there had been discussions about potentially converting City Hall into a luxury
123 hotel, though alternative, more feasible sites were ultimately considered. He emphasized that
124 these are all valuable ideas, and the committee can recommend whether or not City Hall
125 remains for civic or government use.

126
127 Chris noted that a few people he spoke with supported relocating the administration building,
128 citing the 'City building occupies much of the parking spaces [in China Bridge], reducing
129 accessibility to Main Street'. He clarified that the concept being proposed involves a mixed-use
130 development, integrating office spaces alongside hotels and restaurants, with shared parking to
131 complement these uses [Parking for Office workers vacate when restaurants and hotels need
132 parking, so mixed-use can achieve complimentary parking uses].

133
134 He emphasized that office spaces in mixed-use developments typically help sustain consistent
135 activity and draw people to the street during the day. From the perspective of Main Street
136 businesses, it is important to evaluate and determine which future retail uses will best support
137 and enhance the area's environment and economic health. There are many ideas that can be
138 explored and discussed.

139
140 Mark from Voda participated in the public space session, where the Brew Pub Lot and City Hall
141 Plaza were the primary focus of discussions. There was considerable interest and curiosity about
142 the gondola, with many attendees eager to learn more. Overall, the conversations were
143 positive, with strong support for addressing the Brew Pub Lot.

144
145 Opinions on the Post Office varied. While many preferred to keep it in its current location,
146 others raised questions about its operations. Some advocated for restoring the historic section,
147 and a few suggested relocating the building across the street.

148

149 Matt shared notes from John Robertson, who was unable to attend. One suggestion was to
150 consider removing the post office to create an open plaza while preserving and relocating the
151 historic façade. Mark responded by emphasizing that visitors are drawn to Main Street for its
152 historic charm, and relocating the façade could maintain that appeal.

153

154 Additional notes from John Robertson's conversations with public engagement participants
155 included the following:

- 156 1) Are there opportunities to get shuttles closer to Upper Main or do they all have to drop
157 at Transit Center?
- 158 2) Can Main Street bump out areas be used for drop-off?
- 159 3) Potential drop off area at Brew Pub Lot
- 160 4) Specifics requested regarding Gondola Alignment
- 161 5) Clarification regarding allowed uses for the New road connecting Marsac to Swede Alley
162 – is this a driveway for delivery only or a road for car access to parking. Brent clarified
163 that it was intended as a road for car access to parking garages on Swede Alley.
- 164 6) There will be a need for additional analysis/solutions regarding on truck traffic
165 circulation (potentially focus delivery hours on Swede)

166

167 Ryan added to the discussion, noting that many participants, particularly long-time residents
168 and older community members, spoke about the unique social experience of visiting the post
169 office and seeing neighbors. He suggested that instead of retaining the post office solely for that
170 purpose, public spaces could be designed to foster similar community interactions.

171 Maren suggested that this could be a good opportunity to expand the Senior Center, and Mark
172 noted that he had received numerous comments related to the center.

173

174 Randy, a member of the Historic Preservation Board voiced concerns about relocating the
175 historic portion of the post office, calling it a "slippery slope." He stated that as a board
176 member, he could not support such a move and recommended finding a way to balance the
177 creation of public space with adapting and reusing the historic building by restoring it to its
178 original form.

179

180 Chris agreed and shared that he had similar conversations about preserving the building's
181 historic character and unique role as a gathering space in the district. He added that ideas could
182 be integrated into a larger plaza design, as the building's current functionality has somewhat
183 outlived its relevance in this space.

184

185 Chris mentioned that there are several complicated processes that need to be addressed before
186 any recommendations can be made. Mitchell noted that while many people expressed positive
187 feedback about the plans, there was also some skepticism about the feasibility of delivering the
188 project and what would be possible in Park City considering planning and zoning restrictions.

189

190 Maren inquired about the Main Street Redesign feedback . Brent explained that there was a
191 significant amount of discussion about the gondola, with strong opposition from some, while
192 others supported it. Many were in favor of the transit circulator concept, especially if it
193 connected to the transit plaza to avoid any disconnect between getting off the bus and
194 accessing the circulator to and from Main Street. There was also interest in adding a
195 roundabout at the south end of Main Street for greater flexibility. Jennifer asked if this could be
196 done on the Brew Pub Lot, as concepts have already been laid out for that.

197

198 Maren asked about the one-way versus two-way traffic debate. Brent mentioned that one
199 person expressed dislike for the one-way idea, but most others did not have strong opinions on

200 the matter. A business owner suggested adding more parking installations. Brent noted that
201 many in-depth discussions had taken place on this topic.

202

203 Erik shared that he had received feedback regarding the Heber and Main intersection, with a
204 focus on improving pedestrian safety. There was strong support for an all-way walk intersection
205 near the Kimball area.

206

207 Mitchell noted that a Input Form revealed that Park Ave south of Heber is often temporarily
208 converted to one-way due to snow conditions. Erik stated no changes to this right now.

209

210 Jennifer mentioned that many people felt they did not have enough time to provide feedback.
211 They wanted more time to absorb the information and then offer their input. She also pointed
212 out a perception that the proposed changes were geared more towards tourism and visitors
213 rather than residents, creating a sense of disconnection. Jennifer expressed her desire to
214 understand this disconnect, noting that the abundance of hotels seemed to contribute to this
215 feeling. She suggested that providing a clearer narrative about why the hotels are necessary—
216 such as supporting amenities, visitation volume, and traffic—could help address these concerns.

217

218 Helena shared that many people initially opposed the idea of more hotels but, after further
219 discussion, came to see the benefits and thought these ideas could be beneficial.

220

221 Maren asked if there was any concerns from business owners about this construction. Brent
222 heard some concerns, access through construction, impacts and duration.

223 Other projects were discussed such as regional Park n Ride ideas and rapid transit
224 improvements, which the Main Street Area Plan has some dependencies with, but staff was
225 directed by Council not to consider these projects within the Main Street Area Plan since they
226 are being contemplated separately. Erik noted the limitation regarding overlapping projects in
227 discussions at public engagement- business owners want the City to implement park n ride and
228 transit solution on 248. Matt added that he had the same interaction with emphasis on the park
229 n ride.

230 Ryan stated that right now Council direction was supporting the idea of the park n ride on 248
231 but did not have consensus on the specific location. At the the next Council meeting this will be
232 futher discussed.

233

234 Helena asked about the phasing of projects, particularly referencing the four-year water line
235 project, which has had a significant impact on businesses. She expressed a preference for
236 completing the Main Street project quickly, prioritizing it over other ongoing projects.

237

238 Ryan explained that this concern was part of the feedback delivered to the Council, noting that
239 there was a lot of content discussed that night. He pointed out that several factors influence the
240 phasing decisions.

241

242 Maren asked that the recommendation from this group be to delay construction [Main Street]
243 and move forward with the [Swede Alley] redevelopment first.

244

245 Erik mentioned that there was direction to suppress financial discussions for the time being. He
246 explained that if the City were to prioritize all public infrastructure projects upfront, it would
247 likely require the City to risk fronting the costs with its existing resources, which might be
248 feasible. However, this would mean that other projects would need to be delayed. In other
249 words, the Council's broader goals would have to slow down until the redevelopment moves

250 forward and some of the expenses can be recouped, but this would only be possible once the
251 redevelopment is operational.

252
253 Jennifer stated that she feels this is a mistake, noting that the idea of the City fronting hundreds
254 of millions in investment doesn't make sense to her.

255
256 Erik responded, explaining that part of the proposal involves getting private assets moving first,
257 which would create a funding source for public investments. He acknowledged that each
258 Council has the authority to make these decisions.

259
260 Ryan emphasized that the projects are all interconnected and work together as a cohesive plan.
261 He noted that construction feasibility plays a critical role in driving much of the process. Ryan
262 expressed a preference to avoid breaking the project into smaller phases, as excessive
263 segmentation could hinder progress.

264
265 Maren asked about the general sentiment toward a project like this and whether one-on-one
266 meetings would be necessary. Ryan explained that one-on-one discussions have already taken
267 place, and the plan was presented to stakeholders before it went public. While initial reactions
268 were enthusiastic, enthusiasm tends to decrease once the project reaches the public meeting
269 stage. Currently, the outlook remains positive.

270
271 Maren inquired if this would be a staff-recommended project. Erik clarified that it is up to the
272 committee to make the recommendation, with staff and consultants facilitating the process.
273 Ryan agreed, stating that the recommendation comes from the committee.

274
275 Maren also asked if staff supports the project. Chris responded that the Committee concept was
276 supported by Council as a response to discuss and meet the future needs of the Main Street
277 area, its residents, and businesses. He acknowledged there is momentum in favor of the
278 project. Chris assured that if the Council directs and supports the committee's recommendation,
279 his team will be energized to take on the project, recognizing that other projects are ongoing.
280 He emphasized that the timing is logical, and additional funding mechanisms can justify moving
281 forward.

282
283 Chris noted that while the project is complex—not only financially but also in terms of
284 determining next steps and ensuring feasibility for execution—the staff is prepared to support
285 it. He added that the redevelopment agency established for Main Street fulfilled its purpose
286 long ago, and the focus now needs to once again shift to this area. Moving forward, decisions
287 must balance the needs of businesses and residents, and staff is ready to assist in that process.

288
289 It was noted that the "invisible hand" of economic forces is shaped by major property
290 developers and long-time landowners on Main Street. If this influence is not addressed, it could
291 shift elsewhere, potentially leading to investments moving away from Main Street.

292
293 The macroeconomic factors influencing development and opportunities are vast and varied.
294 Compared to other investments and districts, such as Black Desert, the goals for Park City are
295 substantial. Chris emphasized that Park City is competing within its own region [Deer Valley
296 East, Canyons Village, Kimball Junction], and while people recognize that change is needed, the
297 uncertainty surrounding it makes many people feel cautious about the recommended changes.
298 The department's hope is that the next practical step is for the committee to finalize a
299 recommendation, which will be presented to the Council. This recommendation should identify

300 tasks that require more clarity and certainty regarding feasibility. These tasks fall into a few key
301 areas that will require time, energy, and a thoughtful, intentional approach to address.

302

303 Erik stated that if you can't present a positive vision, it becomes impossible to justify the
304 resources needed to address and develop the uncertainties.

305 Erik added that this project was conceived as an area plan, area plans rarely get to the detail of
306 where this plan is at.

307

308 Jennifer emphasized the need for the committee to provide clear direction on addressing the
309 feedback received, including Council input. She expressed surprise at the level of detail
310 discussed throughout the process.

311

312 Ryan advised presenting the broader vision to the Council in December. Maren suggested
313 compiling a statement or letter for the Council, along with the plan, and having all committee
314 members sign it. Many members agreed, and Matt added that this could be included in the staff
315 report.

316

317 Ryan encouraged committee members to attend the Council meeting, emphasizing the
318 importance of their presence. Chris agreed, noting that having members attend demonstrates a
319 meaningful and impactful commitment to the project.

320

321 Matt noted two key meetings in December. The first, on December 12, will include the outreach
322 summary and incorporate the committee member statement into the staff communication
323 report. The second, on December 19, will involve a vote. Both meetings will provide
324 opportunities for public comment [only December 19th has a public hearing, December 12
325 doesn't have schedule public input]. Matt agreed that it would be beneficial and impactful to
326 encourage those who attended the community engagement sessions to also attend the
327 December 19th Council meeting.

328

329 Maren inquired about the Input Form results. Erik explained that a narrative-based report
330 summarizing the feedback would be created and recirculated to the committee. Matt agreed
331 that this would be valuable for drafting the staff report and requested that an email be sent
332 summarizing key notes, discussions, and any additional feedback from committee members to
333 assist in the process.

334

335 Erik asked the committee members to identify any points they wanted to be removed, revised,
336 or refined in the plans.

337

338 Jennifer began by suggesting that projects should be categorized based on values. She
339 emphasized the importance of maintaining the authenticity of Historic Main Street, calling it the
340 "gem of Summit County." She questioned what would define Main Street as historic if drastic
341 changes, such as removing the Post Office or repurposing the civic uses of the City Hall
342 building—both historic structures—were made.

343

344 Maren mentioned the museum and the Egyptian Theater as examples of historic icons that
345 would remain. Jennifer countered that if two prominent historic buildings on Main Street were
346 moved or repurposed, it raised questions about what should be preserved and prioritized. She
347 expressed concern about the possibility of turning City Hall into a hotel, suggesting that a hotel
348 could be placed elsewhere. Jennifer concluded by questioning whether the proposed changes
349 align with the values of keeping Historic Main Street truly historic.

350 Jennifer expressed concern about how to balance preserving the historic essence of the Post
351 Office while still moving forward with the larger vision outlined in the plan. She wondered how
352 the committee could ensure that the historic character of such iconic buildings is maintained,
353 even as new developments and changes are introduced to the area.

354

355 Rob stated that the question of what history is being preserved is complex. Is it the physical
356 materials, like brick or wood, or is it the essence of the town as a vibrant, working community
357 where families come together? He raised the concern that we should focus on preserving
358 spaces that serve the community in meaningful ways—like galleries for learning, transportation
359 for ease of access, and public spaces for family fun. Ultimately, the value lies not only in
360 preserving the physical structures but also in maintaining the spirit of what makes the town a
361 place where people can gather, learn, and enjoy.

362

363 Erik also discussed the importance of addressing transit improvements as part of the broader
364 project. He noted that there is a systemic need for these improvements, and the Council's
365 request is focused on understanding the capacity needs for the project. According to Erik, they
366 already have the answers and the capacity is sufficient.

367

368 Ryan added that the key to the park-and-ride system's success will be efficiency, quality, and
369 frequency—ensuring that the service can effectively transport customers to Main Street. These
370 elements will be crucial in supporting the overall goals of improving both the infrastructure and
371 the vibrancy of the area.

372

373 Tim added that while there is a lot of focus on how the park-and-ride system will look, the
374 frequency of the service is actually more important. He emphasized that ensuring a high
375 frequency of service is key to its effectiveness. To address this, he mentioned that efforts are
376 being made to study the 248 corridor, likely as part of understanding how to best improve
377 transit flow and ensure that the park-and-ride system operates efficiently.

378

379 When asked who oversees all the projects, it was clarified that the City Manager has overall
380 oversight, but different departments are delegated to manage specific projects. Matt
381 emphasized that there is a significant amount of coordination among these projects, especially
382 considering the various discussions and departments involved. He highlighted the importance of
383 making sure the public understands the level of coordination and effort required to manage all
384 these moving pieces effectively.

385

386

387 It was noted that there is difficulty in making declarative statements and going on record with
388 the details that the committee members want, as there is a risk that the response could be
389 negative both for the committee and the community if any details are miscommunicated or
390 misunderstood. Maren clarified that the concerns could be addressed and clarified in the
391 statement. Helena agreed with this approach, acknowledging that the statement could include
392 these details while managing potential risks of miscommunication.

393

394 Erik asked the committee if there was any other feedback they wanted to discuss. Randy
395 responded, mentioning that there had been a response regarding the Miners Hospital. He noted
396 that while there were no game-changing elements, the community expressed a lot of optimism
397 about the project.

398

399 Erik provided a summary of the key points for the project, stating that the committee has
400 gathered sufficient information to move forward with a positive vision. He highlighted several
401 elements for further investigation and discussion, including:

402

- 403 • Hotels with an integrated transit center by Flagpole and Marsac.
- 404 • Mixed-use development and replacing parking at China Bridge.
- 405 • Public space concepts that will require more feasibility work.
- 406 • Investigating roadway reconfigurations.
- 407 • Civic use for City Hall, with no proposal to redevelop City Hall into a hotel.
- 408 • Adaptive reuse of the Post Office.

409

410 Erik also clarified that the Sandridge concept alone would not fulfill the city's housing
411 obligations and that the city should explore other methods for developers to meet their housing
412 requirements. This would include options already available under existing code, but the
413 Sandridge concept would remain as a consideration.

414

415 Finally, Erik noted that there was one negative comment from a resident who suggested the
416 Sandridge lot Post could be repurposed as an amenitized bus stop.

417

418 Ryan raised concerns about transportation elements, including the roundabout, transit
419 circulator, and the disconnection between Swede Alley and Main Street. Brent noted that the
420 transit circulator plan initially involved a loop going up Main Street and down Swede Alley but
421 later switched to a bi-directional system. The current idea emphasizes keeping the circulator
422 mostly on Main Street but can potentially add a with a short spur to the transit center.

423

424 Tim suggested that if Swede Alley were to have a transportation option, it would require a
425 separate shuttle system, as Main Street's specific needs call for a dedicated connector to
426 provide quick access and reduce walking. Brent added that the focus should be on providing
427 service for areas like upper Main and the south end, accommodating individuals who might
428 struggle with the uphill walk. Tim also recalled that there used to be a transit stop at Heber and
429 Main, which could be revisited as part of the solution.

430

431 Erik mentioned that the only request not yet discussed was Tana's request to investigate
432 underground powerlines near District Y. He acknowledged that he's not fully informed on this
433 topic. Jennifer sought clarification, trying to visualize where this might apply, asking if it was
434 primarily on the Swede Alley side. Erik confirmed that it was in that general area. Maren
435 inquired if this would be part of the Marsac and Swede Alley redesign, to which Erik clarified
436 that it would be addressed during redevelopment.

437

438 Jennifer emphasized the importance of sequencing and phasing in the projects, particularly
439 given the Council's decision to remove the discussion on financing tools. Erik highlighted the
440 potential of combining private investment to fund public investments as a way to move forward.

441

442 Maren then asked Mayor Nann for any additional comments. Mayor Nann shared that the
443 feedback she received indicated that the amount of information was overwhelming for some,
444 and she wanted to provide thoughtful input. She expressed satisfaction with the turnout and
445 mentioned that many attendees left with different impressions.

446

447 Summary of adjustments to the Main Street Area Plan recommended by the Committee are as
448 follows:

449

- 450 ▪ Cover page to letter/report signed by committee, coordinate with Rob.
- 451 ▪ Roundabout concept south end of Swede and Main Street.
- 452 ▪ Transit circulator, add route that passes or connects to transit center, consider a route on
- 453 Swede area that actually passes through the development and doesn't need to stay in
- 454 mixed traffic on Swede.
- 455 ▪ Maintain civic use of City Hall (more of an affirmative statement for civic use, not in favor
- 456 of privatizing historic public building).
- 457 ▪ Support for undergrounding power lines as and when construction permits, not
- 458 specifically targeting residential neighborhoods.
- 459 ▪ Add transit stop at Heber and Main, helps facilitate close access to Main for southbound
- 460 routes on Park Ave.
- 461 ▪ Add exhibit for Brew Pub gondola alignment
- 462 ▪ Remove full Post Office demolition, move forward with adaptive reuse concept only.

463

464

465 Matt Lee, Economic Development Project Manager | 435.731.6375 | matthew.lee@parkcity.org