

LOWER PARK AVENUE															
PROJECT LIST															
DESIGN WORKSHOP															
DECEMBER 31, 2009															
Rating Criteria: Rating of project in producing desired results in the Park City community (for the public or private sector)															
Range in Cost: Ballpark ranges for cost of projects / improvements															
1	No effect in creating desired results				\$	\$1 - \$100,000									
2	Effect on Park City not measurable				\$S	\$100,000 - \$500,000									
3	Limited influence on Park City				\$SS	\$500,000 - \$1 million									
4	Substantial influence / benefit to Park City				\$SSS	\$1 million - \$5 million									
5	Extremely substantial influence / benefit to Park City				\$SSSS	\$5 million +									
PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION ON PROJECT LIST BY CITY STAFF															
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	Type of Project (City-Owned "CO" or Public-Private Partnership "PP")	Range in Cost	Project Timeframe (Short Term, Mid Term, Long Term)	INCREASE IN DESTINATION VISITORS	IMPROVE OVERALL COMPETITIVENESS OF PARK CITY	STIMULATE PRIVATE INVESTMENT (Multiplier Effect)	IMPROVE THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE	PRODUCES LONG TERM BENEFITS (as opposed to Short Term)	PHYSICAL FEASIBILITY	POLITICAL FEASIBILITY	FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY	FINANCIAL RETURN	TOTAL (XX / 45)	INTANGIBLE RETURN
PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT															
1	Redevelopment of parking lots surrounding PCMR into mix of residential / commercial uses - with underground parking	PP	\$SSSS	Mid Term	5: Many visitors will choose to visit Park City and stay longer due to the wider variety of retail and other uses available at and around the PCMR.	5: Enhancing the area around PCMR will help Park City compete with resorts such as Vail that have carefully integrated retail and residential with ski resort base areas.	5: Private investors will likely take advantage of momentum created by the redevelopment around PCMR to launch their own ventures or improvements to their existing properties.	5: The redevelopment of the parking lots will improve the experience for visitors to PCMR.	5: Completion of a successful redevelopment around the base of PCMR would produce significant long term benefits to Park City in terms of direct and indirect development.	4: Given the gentle topography and the absence of existing structures, redevelopment of the parking lots around PCMR is fairly feasible.	3: Would likely meet with acceptance from the business community but with concern from members of the community opposed to increased development.	4: Likely feasible, given potential synergies with PCMR, the new Marriott, and other surrounding developments.	5: Very Significant Financial Return on Investment	41	👍👍👍👍
2	New Conference Center & Parking Structure around the base of PCMR	PP	\$SSS	Mid Term	5: Would help to attract new visitors to Park City for conferences and provide an additional visitor market.	5: Would help Park City compete with new conference facilities in comparable ski resort towns in the West.	5: Would likely result in private investment (in the form of construction of hotel beds or retail resulting from conference center operations).	3: Would provide an additional venue at which Park City could stage events for visitors.	5: Helps to increase overall visitation numbers and the number of hot beds in the community, thereby producing long term benefits.	4: Relatively few physical impediments to construction.	3: Assuming the project is financially feasible, this project should gain acceptance from local residents. However, potential opposition from residents opposed to new growth.	3: The conference center itself may only be marginally profitable. However, the project should spur additional hotel and residential construction at the base of PCMR and therefore result in overall financial feasibility.	4: Significant Financial Return on Investment	37	👍👍👍👍
3	Physical connection from PCMR to Main Street via Treasure Hill (people mover, gondola, funicular, etc.)	PP	\$SSSS	Long Term	3: Linking these two resort assets may or may not increase the overall appeal to destination visitors. Uncertain at this point.	4: Improving access from PCMR to Main Street would enhance the overall competitiveness of Park City versus comparable ski resort towns.	5: The gondola connection may stimulate additional private sector investment in projects around the base of PCMR.	4: Would provide a more attractive transportation link from PCMR to Treasure Hill.	3: Would help to link PCMR to Treasure Hill in the short term. Long term benefits to the greater community are less evident.	3: Construction of the physical connection would need to contend with topography of the site.	3: Would likely meet with acceptance from local residents, with the potential exception of residents living close to PCMR or Treasure Hill, who may oppose the gondola due to increased noise and traffic.	2: Installation of a people mover would be very expensive. Direct impact on visitor numbers is less certain.	3: Moderate Financial Return on Investment	30	👍👍👍👍
TRANSIT, TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION & WALKABILITY															
4	Major Improvements to Empire / Lowell Circulation & transit operations around PCMR (including improvements to roads, circulation and intersections, acquisition of ROW, and installation of a new transit hub)	PP	\$SSSS	Short Term	4: Improves overall transportation conditions around the PCMR area and, therefore, would enhance the overall appeal of the town to destination visitors.	5: Improved traffic flow would improve the visitor experience and therefore enhance Park City's competitive position.	4: May stimulate private investment around the base of PCMR.	5: Improved traffic flow would improve the visitor experience in Park City.	5: Enhancing the performance of intersections in this area would help to solve some of the community's largest transportation issues and produce long term benefits to the community.	3: Intersection improvements (such as additional lanes or turning movements) may require acquisition of additional right of way.	5: Initiatives to improve transportation functionality in the community will likely meet with acceptance from local residents.	5: Likely feasible, given potential synergies with potential redevelopment efforts around PCMR.	4: Significant Financial Return on Investment	40	👍👍👍👍
5	Intersection improvements (to intersections of SR 224 & SR 248, Bonanza Drive & Deer Valley Drive, and Park Ave & Deer Valley Drive)	PP	\$SSSS	Mid Term	4: Improved traffic flow through these intersections would improve the visitor experience and therefore enhance increased visitation.	5: Improved traffic flow would improve the visitor experience and therefore enhance Park City's competitive position.	4: May stimulate private investment in the Bonanza Park area and facilitate greater investment around the base of PCMR.	5: Improved traffic flow would improve the visitor experience in Park City.	5: Enhancing the performance of these intersections would help to solve some of the community's largest transportation issues and produce long term benefits to the community.	3: Intersection improvements (such as additional lanes or turning movements) may require acquisition of additional right of way.	5: Initiatives to improve transportation functionality in the community will likely meet with acceptance from local residents.	5: Likely feasible, given potential synergies with potential redevelopment efforts around PCMR and in the Bonanza Park area.	4: Significant Financial Return on Investment	40	👍👍👍👍
6	Minor Improvements to Empire / Lowell circulation around PCMR (including signage, striping, improvement of transit efficiency, minor capital improvements, and operational changes such as charging for parking)	CO	\$S	Short Term	4: Improves overall transportation conditions around the PCMR area and, therefore, would enhance the overall appeal of the town to destination visitors.	3: Improved traffic flow would improve the visitor experience and therefore enhance Park City's competitive position. However, these improvements would have less of an impact compared to major improvements to roads and circulation.	3: This investment would improve the functionality of transportation in the local area but may not stimulate significant new private investment.	5: Improved traffic flow and enhanced transportation conditions would improve the visitor experience in Park City.	4: These improvements would enhance transportation performance in this part of the community, but would have less long term impact as compared to more significant investments in roads and circulation in the area.	4: Minor improvements would not require additional right of way and would be fairly straight-forward from an engineering perspective.	5: Initiatives to improve transportation functionality in the community will likely meet with acceptance from local residents. Minor improvements that would require relatively limited funding would garner significant support.	5: Likely feasible, given potential synergies with potential redevelopment efforts around PCMR.	3: Moderate Financial Return on Investment	36	👍👍👍👍
7	Coordinated Signage Plan for (including smart messaging system) for the area within the RDA, designed to improve the load-in / load-out experience and streamline parking and circulation	CO	\$S	Short Term	4: Improves overall transportation conditions around the PCMR area and, therefore, would enhance the overall appeal of the town to destination visitors.	4: Improved traffic flow (resulting from improved signage) and greater ease of wayfinding would improve the visitor experience and therefore enhance Park City's competitive position.	2: This investment would improve the functionality of transportation in the local area but would not stimulate significant new private investment.	4: Improved signage and wayfinding would improve the experience of the average visitor to Park City.	5: Improving the load-in, load-out experience would produce significant long term benefits for the community and PCMR.	5: These improvements would not require additional right of way and would be fairly straight-forward from an engineering perspective.	5: Initiatives to improve signage in the RDA will likely meet with acceptance from local residents. Minor improvements that would require relatively limited funding would garner significant support.	3: This initiative would enhance the overall competitive position of Park City, but spending on signage may not produce directly tangible financial returns.	3: Moderate Financial Return on Investment	35	👍👍👍👍
8	Transit - Identification of corridors and acquisition of easements and ROW for future mass transit lines (Trolley, Bus Rapid Transit, or Light Rail)	PP	\$SSSS	Long Term	4: Improves overall transportation conditions in Park City and the overall appeal of the town to destination visitors.	4: Improving transportation facilities would improve the overall appeal and competitiveness of Park City.	4: Should stimulate additional investment around transit stops, but have less direct impact on development at the resorts.	4: Improving congestion and transportation conditions should increase the enjoyment of Park City for visitors.	5: Would help solve the long-term transportation issues facing Park City and Summit County.	1: Would require significant physical planning and engineering studies.	2: Would likely gain acceptance from members of the community in favor of enhancing transit but resistance from some property owners along potential routes. It may also encounter opposition from residents opposed to additional growth in Park City.	1: Uncertain. Feasibility would depend on the ability to secure funding from state and federal sources for new transit lines serving Park City.	3: Moderate Financial Return on Investment	28	👍👍👍👍
9	Walkability - Expand bike/ped trail system to the remainder of the Lower Park Avenue district and connect to Bonanza Park (Spine System). Address bus stops and pedestrian crossings at SR 224	CO	\$SSS - Funded by walkability bonds.	Mid Term	3: Enhances the overall quality of life for Lower Park Avenue residents, but would likely have minimal impacts on decisions to visit Park City, as opposed to other amenities.	2: This project would improve quality of life, but would have a minimal impact in increasing the overall competitiveness of Park City.	1: It is unlikely that a completed bike/ped system would materially attract additional investment in Park City.	4: This project would remove inconveniences to cyclists and pedestrians and therefore would improve the visitor experience.	4: Would improve the quality of life in Park City and the pool of amenities for visitors over both the short term and long term.	4: This project would not encounter significant physical impediments.	5: Local residents would welcome additional bike and pedestrian amenities.	1: Financial feasibility is uncertain without the identification of additional monies for maintenance and long term operations.	3: Moderate Financial Return on Investment	27	👍👍👍👍

LOWER PARK AVENUE															
PROJECT LIST															
DESIGN WORKSHOP															
DECEMBER 31, 2009															
Rating Criteria: Rating of project in producing desired results in the Park City community (for the public or private sector)										Range in Cost: Ballpark ranges for cost of projects / improvements					
1	No effect in creating desired results				\$	\$1 - \$100,000									
2	Effect on Park City not measurable				\$S	\$100,000 - \$500,000									
3	Limited influence on Park City				\$SS	\$500,000 - \$1 million									
4	Substantial influence / benefit to Park City				\$SSS	\$1 million - \$5 million									
5	Extremely substantial influence / benefit to Park City				\$SSSS	\$5 million +									
PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION ON PROJECT LIST BY CITY STAFF															
PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	Type of Project (City-Owned "CO" or Public-Private Partnership "PP")	Range in Cost	Project Timeframe (Short Term, Mid Term, Long Term)	INCREASE IN DESTINATION VISITORS	IMPROVE OVERALL COMPETITIVENESS OF PARK CITY	STIMULATE PRIVATE INVESTMENT (Multiplier Effect)	IMPROVE THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE	PRODUCES LONG TERM BENEFITS (as opposed to Short Term)	PHYSICAL FEASIBILITY	POLITICAL FEASIBILITY	FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY	FINANCIAL RETURN	TOTAL (XX / 48)	INTANGIBLE RETURN
COMMUNITY & NEIGHBORHOOD REDEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT															
10	Neighborhood Mixed-use redevelopment between City Park and PCMR including housing opportunities (affordable, senior housing, seasonal)	PP	SSSS	Short Term	4: An improved connection from PCMR to the Town Park would appeal to visitors to the ski resort. 5: Would improve the ability of the community to retain workers and thereby effectively compete with other resort destinations. The mixed-use redevelopment would add another attraction for visitors to the community.	5: Would improve the ability of the community to retain workers and thereby effectively compete with other resort destinations. The mixed-use redevelopment would add another attraction for visitors to the community.	5: Would likely stimulate spin-off residential growth along the corridor between PCMR and the Town Park amenity.	5: Would provide an improved link between PCMR and the City Park amenity.	5: Would help to improve the overall quality of life in Park City over the long term.	3: Grade issues may present problems in construction.	3: May encounter resistance from residents opposed to any new growth in the community.	4: The project should spur additional residential construction near PCMR and the Town Park and therefore result in overall financial feasibility.	3: Moderate Financial Return on Investment 	37	
11	Use of City-owned land to create physical connection and housing opportunities (affordable, senior housing, seasonal) in area stretching from City Park to PCMR	CO	SSSS	Short Term	4: An improved connection from PCMR to the City Park would appeal to visitors to the ski resort. 4: Improving the ability of Park City to provide affordable housing and attract service workers would improve the competitiveness of local businesses and the resorts.	4: Creation of housing on city-owned land would likely stimulate additional residential growth in the surrounding neighborhood.	5: This improvement would help to improve linkages between PCMR and the City Park, but potential positive effects on the visitor experience would be limited without the creation of a more complete mixed-use environment.	4: Would help to improve the overall quality of life in Park City over the long term.	4: The City-owned properties face relatively few challenges to construction from a physical perspective.	3: Building additional affordable, senior, and seasonal housing would likely meet with support from local residents. However, construction of additional residences may encounter resistance from neighbors in the immediate neighborhood.	4: This investment would produce a significant return to the city in terms of new housing constructed in the community.	2: Minimal Financial Return on Investment 	32		
12	Redevelopment of Bonanza Park (Rite Aid and areas to the east) into a mixed-use district - including potential parking lot or mass transit hub.	PP	SSSS	Long Term	4: Creation of an additional mixed-use district should enhance overall visitation rates. 4: Should enhance the overall competitiveness of Park City and increase the tax base.	4: Private investors will likely take advantage of momentum created by the redevelopment in the Bonanza Park area to launch their own ventures or improvements to their existing properties.	4: Given its strategic location near SR 248 and SR 224, redevelopment here would likely improve the overall experience for visitors to the Park City and Deer Valley areas.	5: Completion of a successful mixed-use district in Bonanza Park would produce significant long term benefits to Park City in terms of direct and indirect development.	1: The presence of existing buildings complicates the ability to redevelop this site.	2: Would likely meet with acceptance from the business community but with suspicion from members of the community opposed to increased development.	3: Likely feasible, given potential synergies with PCMR, the new Marriott, and other surrounding developments.	4: Significant Financial Return on Investment 	31		
13	Installation of public art throughout the Lower Park Avenue district	CO	\$S	Short Term	2: This project would enhance the overall quality of life for Lower Park Avenue residents, but would likely have minimal impacts on decisions to visit Park City, as opposed to other amenities. 2: This project would improve quality of life, but would have minimal impacts in increasing the competitiveness of Park City.	1: It is unlikely that a completed public art program would materially attract additional investment to Park City.	4: This project would improve the aesthetic quality of the community, which in turn would improve the overall visitor experience.	4: Would improve the quality of life in Park City and the pool of amenities for visitors over both the short term and long term.	5: This project would not encounter significant physical impediments.	5: Local residents would welcome an expansion of public art offerings.	1: Financial feasibility is uncertain without the identification of additional monies for maintenance and long term operations.	2: Minimal Financial Return on Investment 	26		
14	Renewable Energy Generation Opportunities: Including constructing PV, small-scale wind, geothermal and biomass projects around projects and improvements within the RDA	PP	SSS	Short Term	1: These improvements would benefit the overall quality of life in Park City, but would have limited impact on the number of destination visitors in the community. 1: These improvements will have a modest impact on the overall competitive position of Park City.	2: May help stimulate or enhance private investment in the RDA. For example, tax credits for renewable energy may enhance the overall viability of a project.	1: Would have relatively limited impact on the visitor experience.	5: These environmental enhancements would benefit the citizens of the community over the long term.	5: These environmental improvements could easily be integrated into the community.	5: Environmental initiatives would meet with acceptance from the community.	2: These environmental projects may produce limited financial returns, at least in the short term.	2: Minimal Financial Return on Investment 	24		
15	Streetscape improvements on Park Avenue (bushes, crosswalks, traffic calming devices, and enhancements to physical connections to Main Street and Bonanza Park).	CO	SSSS	Short Term	1: These improvements will benefit the overall pedestrian environment in the Lower Park Ave neighborhood, but will benefit local residents living in the Lower Park Ave area more than destination visitors (who are more likely to stay at a resort property). 1: These improvements will have a modest impact on the overall competitive position of Park City.	2: May stimulate private investment along Park Avenue, but will have less impact on larger redevelopment areas such as around PCMR.	2: Would improve the experience for visitors passing through this district but will have less impact on the overall appeal or feel of Park City.	3: Completion of streetscape improvements will produce long term benefits.	4: This improvement will require relatively limited earthwork and should not require purchase of additional right of way.	5: The community identified these improvements in the 1993 study, and will likely embrace them going forward.	1: These improvements will require significant public investment that may not translate into additional tax revenue. They will benefit local residents but may not produce additional sales or property tax receipts.	3: Moderate Financial Return on Investment 	22		