



**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, UTAH 84060**

May 15, 2025

The Council of Park City, Summit County, Utah, met in open meeting on May 15, 2025, at 2:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Council Member Dickey moved to close the meeting to discuss property and litigation at 2:00 p.m. Council Member Ciraco seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

CLOSED SESSION

Council Member Rubell moved to adjourn from Closed Meeting at 4:25 p.m. Council Member Dickey seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

WORK SESSION

FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion:

Amy Villarreal and Darien Holznagel, Human Resources Department, presented this item. Villarreal reviewed the recommended COLA increase of 2.5%. Council Member Parigian asked how they got that percentage. Holznagel stated this was based on the CPI Index for the western United States.

Hans Jaspersen, Budget Department, indicated they would come back in August to review Planning, Building, and Engineering fees. They would also discuss cost recovery for the MARC and Ice Arena at that time, per the Council's request. Changes in the fee schedule for FY26 included water, irrigation, and stormwater rates. Council Member Rubell asserted the irrigation fees report indicated that they were going with three options. Jason Christensen, Water Manager, stated that was an error and they were going with the Council's preferred option as discussed previously.

Vaughn Robinson, Golf Manager, discussed Golf fees and stated some feedback from Council after receiving public comments at the last meeting where this was discussed

was to have a 10 play 9-hole punch pass and possibly giving the resident rate to associations during association play only. He noted the Council also discussed having a military rate. Council Member Parigian supported all those fee changes. Council Member Toly asked about offering the resident benefit to the workforce. Robinson stated currently they would fall in the green fee rate. He gave options for additional reduced rates for play at the end of the day if the Council desired, and noted the term “workforce” was hard to define. Council Member Ciraco asked who the employee punch pass was for, to which Robinson stated it was for City employees and fire district employees. Council Member Rubell supported keeping the fees simple. He stated the City did a lot for the greater Park City residents and he knew residents supported the golf course in other ways. He supported all the fees discussed in April but didn’t support additional changes. Council Member Dickey supported the fees and stated he would support seeing discounts for the workforce but thought it didn’t have to be implemented this year. He wanted to get through the season to see how the fees affected the greater Park City players and then the workforce could be addressed next year. Council Member Ciraco agreed the fees should be simple. Council Member Rubell suggested simplifying the punch passes to only offering the 5-punch pass. Jasperson clarified the Council wanted to go with the 5-punch pass only. It was indicated the punch passes carried over from year to year.

Jasperson referred to Ice and stated there were no fee changes. They looked at charging Wasatch County players the nonresident rate per the Council’s request and stated there would be a 1% revenue change. Council Member Rubell felt there needed to be consistency in rates. Since this didn’t change operations, he wanted to charge the non-resident fee to Wasatch County users. Amanda Angevine, Ice Arena Manager, indicated the ice arena’s programs were the bottom of the pyramid for ice sports, and then players could move on to clubs. They needed to attract people to have strong programs with enough players. Council Member Rubell stated residents complained about getting ice time, so he didn’t think City funds should be used to subsidize non-residents. Council Members Dickey and Toly supported Angevine’s recommendation. Council Member Ciraco stated the ice arena was a municipal operation, so he struggled with broadening the subsidy outside the City and county boundary. He would like to see if there was an impact, but he wanted to prioritize the people paying for it. He supported the fees for this year and continuing the conversation in aligning fees across all recreation assets. Council Member Rubell asked if resident golf fees should be extended to Summit County and Wasatch County. He didn’t think residents should pay for services for those who didn’t contribute to the tax base. Council Member Parigian supported the current fees and stated Wasatch County didn’t have an ice sheet. Council Members Toly and Dickey supported a future conversation. Mayor Worel asked that this be part of the August fee discussion.

Jasperson asked if Council supported the 2.5% COLA and the fee schedule as presented with the changes to Golf. The majority of Council affirmed with Council Member Rubell not in favor.

Fraud Risk Assessment Update:

Mindy Finlinson, Finance Manager, reviewed the City consistently scored “Low Risk” in the last four out of five years. Last year, the Council requested looking into the internal audit function. She issued an RFP for a pool of audit firms to perform the audit tasks. She proposed an “Agreed Upon Procedures (AUP)” review and “Cost of Service” study. Council Member Rubell asked if this was the midyear review requested by the Council. Finlinson stated this was coming back with the proposed AUP approach and asking Council to select what to look at. Council Member Rubell stated he approved of using the AUP and wanted a project that was not a Public Works project since those projects consistently ran well. He thought the City Manager should decide. Regarding the cost-of-service study, he suggested looking at the Water Department for cost-of-service benchmarking. The Council agreed to both the review and study. Matt Dias, City Manager, summarized the Council gave discretion on the AUP and approved Water benchmarking for the cost-of-service study. Finlinson stated they didn’t select a Transit project because those projects were audited due to federal funding.

REGULAR MEETING

I. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Status
Mayor Nann Worel Council Member Bill Ciraco Council Member Ryan Dickey Council Member Ed Parigian Council Member Jeremy Rubell Council Member Tana Toly Matt Dias, City Manager Margaret Plane, City Attorney Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder	Present
None	Excused

II. PRESENTATIONS

1. Consideration to Approve Resolution No. 08-2025, a Resolution Proclaiming June 2025, as Pride Month in Park City:

Virginia Solomon and Chris Campbell, Summit Pride Board Members, presented this item. Solomon was grateful for the City’s support considering the national landscape at this time. Campbell thanked the City for helping LGBTQ+ individuals feel a sense of community and stated edicts were now prohibiting transgender people from serving in the military and they were trying to isolate the LGBTQ+ community. Solomon noted the consequences of this discrimination, such as the Sundance Film Festival leaving Utah and tourism money lost in North Carolina.

Council Member Toly moved to approve Resolution No. 08-2025, a resolution proclaiming June 2025, as Pride Month in Park City. Council Member Dickey seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

2. Presentation of the 2025 Cindy Matsumoto Historic Preservation Award and Consideration to Approve Resolution No. 09-2025, a Resolution Proclaiming May 2025 as Historic Preservation Month in Park City:

Lola Beatlebrox, Historic Preservation Board, introduced Anna Nizhoni, a local artist who advocated for sacred lands. She stated 517 Park Avenue received the preservation award this year and noted Nizhoni created a piece of art recognizing this structure. Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner 1, explained the historic districts in the City and reviewed current preservation efforts.

Council Member Ciraco moved to approve Resolution No. 09-2025, a resolution proclaiming May 2025 as Historic Preservation Month in Park City. Council Member Toly seconded the motion

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

3. Park City - Summit County Arts and Culture Interim Report by Jocelyn Scudder, Arts Council Executive Director:

Chris Eggleton, Economic Development Director, Jocelyn Scudder, Park City and Summit County Arts Council, and Amanda Golden and Jasmine Metcalf, Design Local, were present for this item. Scudder reviewed the Arts Council began in 1986 and they filled the gap with the City or County not having an arts staff. She noted there was a big economic benefit for having arts in the community. They had artists who lived and created here and the Public Art Advisory Board (PAAB) contributed with great public art projects.

Metcalf reviewed the study's progress so far in reaching master plan outcomes. Some challenges they found included funding, visibility, community engagement, target audience, and cost of living vs. artist support. Opportunities included expanding the arts, leveraging existing assets, integrating art into other sectors of the community, historical and cultural heritage, and collaborations and partnerships. Metcalf explained the pillars of the master plan: community building, accessibility and inclusivity, economic development, and sense of place. Their recommendations in the plan were to focus on funding and support, having spaces in different places, and having the arts in the everyday.

Metcalf benchmarked Summit County with other resort communities and often it ranked low in comparison. They would do further research to ensure they were comparing

similar situations. Scudder stated there would be specific objectives at the conclusion of the study related to Park City, and she would do regular check-ins to make sure the City was in line with the Arts Council's goals.

III. COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

Council Questions and Comments:

Council Member Toly attended the Wasatch Back Economic Summit this week and also spoke at the US Ski and Snowboard Conference. She attended the City's Spring Projects Open House as well.

Council Member Rubell indicated there was a problem in the community with regard to recycling. He stated the diversion rate was 12%, which was one third the average of other communities. He stated Recycle Utah would be moving in a year and there was the potential of needing to haul recycling far distances. He asked the Council to consider a new site for the recycling center, and work with the County on a possible location on the Gilmor property. He also asked if there was support for a capital investment of \$10 million for this purpose.

Mayor Worel indicated the City worked with Summit County on the Gilmor property and they offered Recycle Utah four acres to build a facility. Recycle Utah had not accepted that offer yet. She also stated the County, City, and Recycle Utah met on a regular basis and they were preparing a waste diversion proposal. Council Member Rubell stated he understood the site in question was not suitable for the community's growing needs. He hoped to move it forward in a collaborative way. The more pressing issue was funding. Council Members Ciraco and Parigian supported having a conversation. Council Member Toly supported this discussion and asked that it include Luke Cartin's update. Council Member Dickey supported this discussion and looked for a timeline. Matt Dias, City Manager, stated they were working with Summit County and Recycle Utah on an agreement. He would work with the Sustainability Director and return with an update. Council Member Rubell's concern was the time delay. Dias stated if a funding requirement was needed, a budget amendment could be made at any time. He reviewed that recycling services were provided by the County so he would return with an update in June. Council Member Toly asked for an overview of how the County's recycling process worked in the community at the next joint meeting on June 27th. Council Member Rubell wanted to keep those issues separate and indicated the community core service was different than what he wanted to discuss.

Council Member Parigian announced the Park City High Boys' Tennis Team was in the finals and he wished them luck. Mayor Worel thanked staff and the public for coming out to the Spring Projects Open House.

Staff Communications Reports:

1. EngineHouse, 1875 Homestake Road Project Update:

IV. PUBLIC INPUT (ANY MATTER OF CITY BUSINESS NOT SCHEDULED ON THE AGENDA)

Mayor Worel opened the meeting for any who wished to speak or submit comments on items not on the agenda.

Teri Orr, 84060, stated Bonanza Park was proposed as an Arts and Culture district 10 years ago, but now the majority of the space would be for affordable housing. She encouraged the Council to put the senior center in this space as well as senior apartments mixed in with housing for other ages. She envisioned having performing arts in this space as well. She thought affordable housing could be built where the current senior center and the Mawhinney lot were located.

Finnley Whitney 84098 read his eComment: "We are speaking on behalf of the students who decorated the PC hill with rainbow paper on the morning of May 7th. The idea for this peaceful display came in the months after the introduction of House Bill 77, which bans certain flags in government buildings. It was specifically created to target Utah's queer community and their allies. The idea to create a large pride flag was not to negatively target the high school, Park City School District, or the City itself, but rather, to promote allyship and raise awareness of the House Bill. We believe that promoting acceptance within and for the queer community is crucial to our livelihood and therefore only engaged in peaceful protesting and civil disobedience. Our activities were completely student-led and not sponsored by any club, teacher, or administrative member. Our funds came from students and donations from the PCHS's Gay Straight Alliance club, Encircle, and Summit Pride. Additionally, we always had a plan for cleaning the paper by the end of the day. The majority had been picked up before school got out due to wind concerns. Specifically, a group went up around 8 pm that night to pick up the rest of the paper and tape. Everything was disposed of correctly. Although we recognize that Park City is an inclusive and accepting space, we strongly encourage the City Council to do everything in its legal power to promote a safe space for the LGBTQ+ population and their allies. This could include such as adopting inclusive flags, which has been done in Salt Lake City, or funding a permanent pride-related display or mural."

Erin Ferguson eComment: "SPSW supports Park City's effort to obtain a WCPP grant, specifically to: "Prepare an application as the lead grant applicant for a non-construction project. This approach will help determine the design and location of the project, evaluate new technologies such as animal sensor activated warnings, and identify ways to promote education and outreach." SPSW would also like to offer our assistance in applying for the WCPP grant. SPSW has years of knowledge and experience regarding wildlife vehicle collisions in the area, specifically on SR224. This wealth of knowledge is the result of consulting with and working alongside experts in the field, resulting in valuable relationships accentuated by citizen science and the powers of observation to document and record important, pertinent data. The serious level of wildlife vehicle collisions, as well as the area of the highest number of wildlife vehicle

collisions in Summit County, has been thoroughly researched and documented. There were 48 wildlife vehicle collisions in 2024, double the 10-year annual average documented by BIO-WEST for UDOT Region 2 in 2021. This clearly indicates that the most effective and efficient wildlife mitigation measures are needed. With the current annual cost of wildlife vehicle collisions at \$2 million*, the implementation of evidence-based solutions will provide the needed economic and safety provisions for local residents, local workers, and visitors who travel SR 224 at the current level of 30,000 AADT. Every possible effort to reduce wildlife vehicle collisions on SR 224 is vitally needed. Therefore, in addition to supporting Park City's effort to acquire WCPP funding, SPSW would like to extend an invitation to Park City, Summit County, High Valley Transit, UDOT, and DWR to join us in our independent engineering assessment of SR 224 that will indicate the most viable and feasible solutions for the growing number of wildlife vehicle collisions along this corridor. It is already underway, and will provide meaningful results in a timely manner (Phase 1 schedule is attached). We have contracted with a renowned landscape architect to prepare this objective assessment of evidence based solutions for SR 224. The team is focusing on the areas with the highest number of wildlife vehicle collisions. (Rock Design Associates' team qualifications attached). Please note that we are not asking for money at this point; we are simply asking for Park City to collaborate on the independent assessment of the best evidence-based solutions for wildlife vehicle collisions for this roadway, those solutions and locations to be determined by the engineering team of experts (see attached). We have broad public support for this effort as the community has made this independent engineering assessment possible through their monetary donations. Save People Save Wildlife appreciates all of the work that staff and Council have put towards this effort. SPSW looks forward to working with all regional partners to address solutions for the safety of our wildlife and our motorists who travel SR 224. We await your response and will attend the May 15, 2025 meeting where, hopefully, we all may have an open dialogue on this matter of importance. Working together will guide us towards more fruitful results and a timely implementation of the most effective solutions.” (Attachments with this comment are attached to this document.)

Herve Lavenant eComment: “I am writing to express my strong support for the resolution proclaiming June 2025 as Pride Month in Park City and for the associated Pride Month activations proposed by Summit Pride. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) are fundamental values that enrich our community and strengthen the fabric of our society. Embracing DEI means recognizing and celebrating the unique differences that each individual brings, whether it be in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or any other aspect of identity. By fostering an inclusive environment, we not only honor the dignity and worth of every person but also create a community where everyone feels valued and respected. Catering to all citizens, not just the majority, is crucial for building a truly inclusive and equitable community. When we ensure that the needs and voices of all individuals are heard and addressed, we foster a sense of belonging and empowerment. This approach not only enhances social cohesion but also drives innovation and creativity, as diverse perspectives lead to more comprehensive and effective solutions. For Park City, where tourism plays a significant

role in the local economy, demonstrating a commitment to DEI is particularly important. Tourists belong to all communities and are increasingly seeking destinations that are not only beautiful and entertaining but also inclusive and welcoming to themselves - to all. By celebrating Pride Month and supporting the LGBTQ+ community, we send a clear message that Park City is a place where everyone is valued and respected. This can enhance our reputation as a forward-thinking and inclusive destination, attracting a diverse range of visitors and boosting our local economy. The LGBTQ+ community represents a significant and vibrant segment of our population altogether. According to recent studies, the LGBTQ+ community is a substantial and growing demographic, with considerable economic influence. By supporting Pride Month activations, we acknowledge the importance of this community and demonstrate our commitment to their rights and well-being. This not only fosters a sense of belonging among LGBTQ+ individuals but also attracts LGBTQ+ tourists, who are more likely to visit and support businesses in destinations that are openly inclusive. To be clear, today, 27% of GenZ and 16% of Millennials identify as LGBTQ+. Their overall economic share is dramatically increasing; being welcoming early is an economic proposition for our future. The proposed activities, including displaying Pride banners on City light poles on Main Street and installing transit decals with the theme "Ride with Pride," are wonderful initiatives that visibly demonstrate our commitment to DEI. These activations will not only celebrate the LGBTQ+ community but also send a powerful message of acceptance and support to all residents and visitors of Park City. Celebrating Pride Month is an opportunity to highlight the contributions of LGBTQ+ individuals and to reaffirm our dedication to creating a welcoming and inclusive community for everyone. It is a time to reflect on the progress we have made and to recognize the work that still lies ahead in the pursuit of equality and justice for all. I urge the City Council to support this resolution and the proposed activations. By doing so, we will take a meaningful step towards continuing to build a more inclusive and equitable Park City."

Mayor Worel closed the public input portion of the meeting.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Request to Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Agreement with Ineo Systrans USA Inc. in a Form Approved by the City Attorney's Office for the Purchase of Computer Aided Dispatching (CAD)/Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) System Not to Exceed \$1,200,000:

2. Request to Authorize the City Manager to Enter into Agreements in a Form Approved by the City Attorney's Office with: Asphalt Preservation for Type II Slurry Seals, Not to Exceed \$151,689.60; C&B Asphalt for Bike and Golf Cart Path Overlays Not to Exceed \$179,056.00; Morgan Asphalt for Rotomilling, Pavement Overlays, and Utility Adjustments Not to Exceed \$1,139,329.52; Asphalt Preservation for Crack Sealing Not to Exceed \$64,980.00:

3. Request to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Contract with Trevor Dahl and Garth Franklin in a Form Approved by the City Attorney's Office and Recommended by the Public Art Advisory Board (PAAB) for the Creation of Artistic Pool Fencing Panels for the PC MARC Pool Renovation:

Council Member Toly moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Council Member Dickey seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

VI. OLD BUSINESS

1. Consideration of a Request from Studio Crossing LLC to Waive \$1.6 Million in Impact and Development Permit Fees for the Voluntary Affordable Housing Portions of the Studio Crossings Project:

JJ Trussell, Deputy Building Official, and Justin Keyes and Gary Crandall, applicant, presented this item. Keyes stated the project was moving along at a fast pace and he anticipated a ribbon cutting ceremony in November. He reviewed their other projects and the history with this parcel of land. He indicated they were building voluntary affordable housing in this community and asserted this was a community where people would want to live. They planned multimodal paths around the development, parks and pocket parks, and a transit stop. Keyes indicated these amenities would make the project infeasible, but the applicant wanted this community for those who worked here and wanted to live in the City. He requested a fee waiver of \$1,913,012 million which was the maximum exemption for low-income housing. He referred to other affordable housing projects and the fee waivers given were higher costs per unit than this request.

Crandall stated IHC hospital reserved several apartments for their employees and they hoped to put a med spa in there. His plan included senior housing as well for those who wanted to downsize. They put a lot of effort and thought into this project and hoped for consideration.

Council Member Ciraco asked how much common space was in the project, to which Keyes stated it was close to 40% open space. Council Member Toly asked about the senior housing. Keyes stated the units were not reserved and there were no income requirements. They also adjusted the unit designs based on feedback from the seniors. Council Member Dickey stated there were talks about deeper affordable housing and asked what the outcome was. Keyes indicated they were going to build 208 units instead of 195 units and the additional studios would be reduced to 50% AMI.

Mayor Worel opened the public hearing.

John Kenworthy, 84060, thanked the Crandall family for being a community-first local family. The fee waiver was a \$9,000 per unit subsidy if the full waiver was supported. He stated these were superior units and he supported waiving the \$1.9 million in fees.

Mayor Worel closed the public hearing.

Trussell stated the \$1.6 million fee waiver represented the recommendation from the fee committee. The 1.9 million represented a waiver for 166 units. A waiver for the 208 units would be \$2.4 million. Council Member Parigian appreciated the developer lowering the AMI to 50%. Council Member Rubell stated the staff recommended a waiver and he supported that. He thought the Crandall's were a great partner to work with. He wanted developers to feel incentivized by the standards set.

Council Member Dickey thought consistency was key. This project was not built by a public or nonprofit entity and therefore did not comply with the policy for fee waivers. The purpose of the policy was to incentivize housing that would not otherwise be developed. This development had market rate housing and commercial. It incentivized housing and the project was moving forward with construction. He did not support giving a fee waiver. Council Member Toly appreciated that the developers worked with the seniors as well as lowering AMIs on a few units and adding public benefit, so she supported the \$1.6 million fee waiver.

Council Member Ciraco stated the City made affordable housing a priority and he reviewed the efforts thus far. He thought getting an additional 143 units on top of the housing obligation should be encouraged and the way to encourage that behavior was through fee waivers. He thought the amenities were critical too. He asserted \$1.9 million was justified because of the common space and he imagined other residents from the community would use that. He supported the \$1.9 million over the recommended amount because of the common space.

Council Member Toly moved to approve waiving \$1.6 million in impact and development permit fees for the voluntary affordable housing portions of the Studio Crossings Project. Council Member Parigian seconded the motion.

Council Member Rubell asked what the extra \$300,000 included. Trussell stated the committee figured the fee waiver based on the number of units. That number was the difference between the 185 contemplated units and the actual number of units of 208. Council Member Rubell asked if \$1.9 million would be the fee recommendation if the number was updated, to which Trussell affirmed.

RESULT: MOTION FAILED

AYES: Council Members Parigian and Toly

NAYS: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, and Rubell

Council Member Ciraco moved to approve the maximum fee waiver based on the calculation of 166 units in impact and development permit fees for the voluntary affordable housing portions of the Studio Crossings Project. Council Member Rubell seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

NAY: Council Member Dickey

2. Consideration to Approve Ordinance No. 2025-08, an Ordinance Amending the Municipal Code of Park City Title 15, Chapter 1, Sections 8, 18, and 21, Regarding Land Use Appeal Authorities:

Margaret Plane and Mark Harrington, City Attorney's Office, presented this item. Plane reviewed the Appeal Authority was reviewed when there was a vacancy on the board. Upon consideration by the Planning Commission, it was recommended this board be replaced by a law-trained hearing officer. In the proposed code, the hearing officer process would be recorded, and a written record would be retained. In addition, the public hearing requirement was removed. The code was drafted so multiple hearing officers could be appointed, and they would be randomly assigned to appeals. The Planning Commission recommended returning the Historic District Design Review (HDDR) appeals to the Historic Preservation Board. The Commission also recommended that the applicant would have standing. They recommended retaining the 300 feet as currently required, and adding in state law language, "the damage different in kind" as part of standing. Another recommendation was modifying the current LMC to say that you have to give public or written public comment, and be a property owner, business owner, or a resident. They also recommended shifting to an on-the-record review. They retained the statute that the Council would retain the final decision-making authority on land use matters.

Council Member Ciraco wanted the standing provision clarified, and asked if it was living within 300 feet or made public comment on the item, and that the individual was a business owner, resident, or property owner. Plane referenced Subsection D, Standing to Appeal, which was broken into three categories: You have to be a land use applicant; an adversely affected party, which meant someone other than the applicant who either lives 300 feet, from current code, or will suffer damage different in kind than the general community; and then the requirement to be a property owner, business owner, or resident who commented. Mayor Worel asked if an eComment in the public record would count as public comment, to which Harrington affirmed and clarified this was for the appeals hearing officer and not the district court.

Council Member Rubell asked if the applicant could go to district court if they didn't like the ruling of the appeals officer, to which Harrington stated they could if they met the state criteria. Council Member Rubell asked if the only other change was in regard to the HDDR appeals. Harrington indicated the state gave the City authority for some things to go straight to district court and those would not go to a hearing officer. Council

Member Rubell asked for an example of how the Council could get involved. Harrington stated that Council always had final settlement authority on behalf of the City. He noted that the recent change in state law was defined as certain type of settlement that needed to follow a new process; thus Council still had authority to settle land use matters, but if it was contrary to existing code, the Council first had to go to the Planning Commission to get a recommendation and hold a public hearing, a step that would now be eliminated by the consent agreement. Therefore, Council would need to approve the settlement in an open meeting. Council Member Rubell expressed concern with having a single person hearing the appeal, but noted the Council could balance that by having the final decision.

Council Member Parigian asked if HB368 required one hearing officer or if there could be more, to which Harrington stated the City had the ability to designate the number of its appeal body. He reviewed different types of appeals and who would hear those. Council Member Toly asked why the Planning Commission wanted the change in standing. Plane and Harrington discussed specific appeals where broader standing would have been beneficial.

Mayor Worel opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Worel closed the public hearing.

Council Member Dickey indicated he was comfortable with the amendments, and like others, struggled with standing but supported it.

Council Member Dickey moved to approve Ordinance No. 2025-08, an ordinance amending the Municipal Code of Park City Title 15, Chapter 1, Sections 8, 18, and 21, regarding Land Use Appeal Authorities. Council Member Toly seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED

AYES: Council Members Ciraco, Dickey, Parigian, Rubell, and Toly

3. Discuss Wildlife Crossings Pilot Program:

Julia Collins and Kate Swedburg, Transportation Planning Department, presented this item. Collins reviewed the history of wildlife/vehicle mitigations and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Wildlife Crossing Pilot program. She asked if Council supported working with UDOT to evaluate fencing alternatives along SR224, applying for a grant to evaluate program locations, technology, etc., and if staff should attend Save People Save Wildlife (SPSW) crossing project milestone meetings. Collins indicated the grant would require a 20% match, and noted UDOT was open to fencing along that corridor and they would work with Save People Save Wildlife.

Council Member Rubell asked what the City was doing to collaborate with Save People Save Wildlife. Collins stated the City had remained neutral but they were looking to engage with them on this project. Council Member Rubell asked if there were other opportunities to engage with them. Collins stated she could get back to Council on that.

Council Member Ciraco asked how this would look with the SR224 BRT project with the potentially widened road. He also asked how the City could work with High Valley Transit (HVT) on reducing wildlife/vehicle conflict. Collins stated the regional partners supported these proposals that Council was considering tonight. Council Member Toly asked what type of fencing would be used or what had been used in other areas. Collins stated there were a lot of things on the table and she was excited to collaborate with UDOT. The fencing would be located where the wildlife crossings were, mainly between mile post marker 3-6, which was from Payday to Canyons Resort Drive.

Council Members Toly, Dickey, and Parigian supported working with UDOT to evaluate fencing alternatives along SR224, applying for a grant to evaluate program locations, technology, etc., and having staff attend Save People Save Wildlife (SPSW) crossing project milestone meetings. Council Member Rubell was supportive and encouraged the City to work more closely with SPSW. Council Member Ciraco was also supportive and looked forward to having the City work with SPSW.

VII. WORK SESSION

1. 1800 Park Avenue Project Discussion:

Justin Keyes, representing the developer, requested continuing this item to a future date because this property received an offer to purchase. The purchase offer would keep the property as-is. He would return if the property did not sell. Mayor Worel asked for more advanced warning if an item was continued as a courtesy to staff. Council Member Rubell stated this area was being redeveloped and this project should be allowed to redevelop under the new code even if the new code was not yet approved. He thought this could be used as a case study regardless of the applicant's intent.

Council Member Ciraco thought the code amendments for the Bonanza Park Mixed Use Area (BPMX) would not allow hotels, so he wanted to keep the current hotels that were already there. Council Member Toly asked if hotels would be part of the BPMX district. Dias stated many things would be discussed. Council Member Toly asked if they could grandfather in hotels. Council Member Rubell asked if the tunnel could be part of the discussion with the prospective buyer. Keyes stated the hotel and nightly rental limitation killed many deals, so that should be considered in the code amendments. The other limitation was retail limited to 15,000 square feet. He offered to volunteer his time to discuss this further. Dias stated the potential next conversation on this would be June 5th. The Council agreed to the continuation.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder



BUDGET DISCUSSION

FY26 COLA & FEE SCHEDULE

PARK CITY

1881

— WORK SESSION PURPOSE —

In preparation for the FY26 Budget Adoption on June 12, we seek Council feedback on:

- A recommended 2.5% Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) for FY26
- The FY26 Fee Schedule



—FY26 COLA RECOMMENDATION—

Source	COLA
Heber City	2.80%
Summit County, UT	3.30%
Wasatch County, UT*	2.50%
Salt Lake City	4.00%
Federal Social Security	2.50%
Mountain West CPI	2.50%
Aspen, Summit County, Snowmass, CO	4-7%
<i>*Additionally, Wasatch County requested a 2.5% merit increase</i>	

HR and City Manager recommend a COLA increase of 2.5% for City Staff.

COLA	Approximate Cost (including taxes and benefits)
3%	\$1,106,400
2.75%	\$1,014,200
2.5%	\$922,000
2%	\$737,600
1.5%	\$553,200

FEE SCHEDULE TIMELINE

May 15

- Fee Overview

June 12

- Fee Schedule Adoption

August
14

- Construction & Development Fees
- Recreation & Ice Cost Recovery

FEE OVERVIEW

- Fees are usually tied directly to a particular service or use—those who use the service pay for it
- To fund regulation and compliance like permits, licenses, and inspections which helps to enforce laws and ensure safety
- When assessing fees, the City considers applicable laws and statutes, public policy goals, the full cost of providing services, and the impact to residents
- As the cost of services rises with inflation, departments seek to balance cost recovery with high-quality, affordable, and accessible services to City residents



FY26 CHANGES

Departments with changes include:

- Water & Stormwater
- Golf Course
- Ice Arena
- Parking
- Library
- Public Works



—WATER & STORMWATER—

- Most rates increased by 4.5%
- **Single-Family Residential** – From single-tier to three plans based on lot size—customers under 90th percentile will see bill decreases
- **Irrigation** – Introduced three rate plans based on lot size and irrigated area per meter
- **Irrigation Reconnection Fee** – New structure prevents winter disconnections—a monthly base rate assessed for up to six months
- **Stormwater** – Increased rate by 3% for inflation

GOLF FEE CHANGES

- New season pass for municipal residents
- New punch passes for non-municipal residents inside PCSD boundaries and golf association members
- Removed Utah Resident Rate
- Offer resident rates to members of the military and golf association members during league play



	FY25	FY26
18 Holes¹		
Green Fee (Non-resident)	\$70.00	\$90.00
Green Fee (Resident Rate)	\$45.00	\$45.00
Green Fee (Military Rate)		\$45.00
Green Fee (Utah Resident)	\$60.00	
Off-Season Green Fee (Non-resident)	\$40.00	\$50.00
Off-Season Green Fee (Resident Rate)	\$36.00	\$36.00
Off-Season Green Fee (Military Rate)		\$36.00
Advanced Booking	\$110.00	\$125.00
Passes²		
Resident Season Pass (New)		\$1,350.00
Corporate Season Pass	\$3,400.00	\$3,400.00
Jr. Season Pass	\$425.00	\$425.00
Resident 10-Punch Pass	\$400.00	\$400.00
Area 10-Punch Pass		\$600.00
Sr. 10-Punch Pass	\$500.00	\$600.00
Season Cart Pass	\$450.00	\$600.00
Employee Punch Pass	\$225.00	\$225.00
Employee Family Punch Pass	\$360.00	\$360.00

— GOLF FEES —

	FY25	FY26
Rental Fees		
Cart Fee 18 Holes	\$20.00	\$20.00
Cart Fee 9 Holes	\$10.00	\$10.00
Rental Clubs	\$60.00	\$70.00
Range Small Bucket	\$5.00	\$6.00
Range Large Bucket	\$10.00	\$12.00
Evening Rates		
Pre-Twilight	\$18.00	\$20.00
Twilight	\$12.00	\$15.00

¹ 9-Hole Green fees are 50% of 18-hole Green Fees

² A half-punch pass option (5 18-hole rounds or 10 nine-hole rounds) can be purchased for half the price of the full punch pass

ICE FEES & ANALYSIS

- All Wasatch and Summit County residents receive the resident rate
- Charging a non-resident rate to Wasatch County would have little impact on cost recovery (less than 1%)

	No Change to Residency Definition	Wasatch to Non-Res	Other Summit Non - Res	Combined Wasatch & Other Summit Non-Res
Revenues	\$1,104,117.00	\$1,108,036.00	\$1,107,311.00	\$1,111,215.00
Expenses	\$1,468,741.00	\$1,468,741.00	\$1,468,741.00	\$1,468,741.00
Cost Recovery (Goal 70%)	75.17%	75.44%	75.39%	75.66%
Cost Recovery % Increase	0.00%	0.35%	0.29%	0.64%
General Fund Subsidy	\$364,624.00	\$360,705.00	\$361,430.00	\$357,526.00

— OTHER FEE CHANGES —

Parking, Library, & Public Works Fees

- **Parking** – Added trailhead parking fees for Bonanza Flat, Empire Pass, and “Y” Lot
- **Library** – Removed interlibrary loan charge; added “dark days” fee for the Santy
- **Public Works** – Inflation adjustments for street materials & equipment



—SUMMER WORK SESSION—

An August work session is planned to discuss and seek Council direction on:

- Results of the comprehensive fee study for Planning, Building, and Engineering
- Recreation and Ice cost recovery analysis (including capital expenses)



COUNCIL DIRECTION

- Include a 2.5% COLA in the final FY26 Budget?
- Adopt the recommended changes to the FY26 Fee Schedule on June 12?





Fraud Risk Assessment Update

PARK CITY

1881

Background

As part of our Annual Fraud Risk Assessment review, Council directed staff to explore the formal internal audit function suggested by the State Auditor.

Typically, only the largest of the State's local governments can justify a full-time internal auditor. Most local governments can execute an effective internal audit program by contracting with an audit professional.

Proposed path forward:

- Agreed Upon Procedures Review
- Cost of Service Study



— Agreed Upon Procedures —

The intent of an AUP review is to assess internal controls, ensure compliance, and provide transparency.

Key Features:

- City defines scope.
- No Opinion or Assurance given. Factual findings reported.
- Used for targeted verification rather than a full audit.

Capital Project Candidates for AUP review:

- Main Street Waterline Project;
- Rossie Hill Utility and Road Construction;
- Marsac/City Hall Retaining Wall;
- Neighborhood Parks – Prospector; and
- Street Light LED Conversion Project.



— Cost of Service Study —

The intent of a COS study is to allocate costs fairly, help set rates that are aligned with the cost of providing service, provide support for rate changes or regulatory findings, and promote transparency and equity in pricing.

Key Features:

- Functionalization – group costs based on function
- Classification – break down costs by how they behave (fixed, demand related, variable)
- Allocation – distribute costs based on volume

Departmental Candidates for COS Study:

- Golf Department
- Library Department
- Water Department
- IT Department



Council Direction

Would you like to move forward with both a AUP Review and COS Study?

Which capital project would you like to select to undergo an AUP review?

- Main Street Waterline Project;
- Rossie Hill Utility and Road Construction;
- Marsac/City Hall Retaining Wall;
- Neighborhood Parks – Prospector; and
- Street Light LED Conversion Project.

Which department would you like to select to undergo a COS study?

- Golf Department
- Library Department
- Water Department
- IT Department



An aerial photograph of a mountain town, likely Park City, Utah, covered in a thick layer of snow. The town's buildings, mostly multi-story structures with dark roofs, are densely packed in the lower half of the frame. The surrounding landscape is a vast, snow-covered mountain slope. The sky is a pale, overcast blue. The title text is centered in the upper half of the image, framed by two horizontal white lines.

Wildlife Crossings Pilot Program Grant



Wildlife Vehicle Overview

- Receive information on:
 - History of wildlife vehicle mitigations and other milestones on SR224
 - FHWA Wildlife Crossing Pilot Program (Federal Grant)
- Questions for Council
 - Does Council support working with UDOT to evaluate fencing alternatives along SR224?
 - Does Council support applying for a non-construction WCPP grant to evaluate project locations, new sensor technology, and other emerging tools to help reduce wildlife vehicle collisions?
 - Does Council support having a member of the Transportation Planning Department attend Save People Save Wildlife crossing project milestone meetings?

SR224 Wildlife Vehicle History

- 2019- UDOT reduces speed limit near McPolin barn to 45 mph
- January 2022 – UDOT releases SR-224 Wildlife-Vehicle Collision Study, identifying MPs 6.5-10.5 as a big game hotspot based on carcass collections and reported crashes.
- September 2022- Kimball Junction to Park City speed limit reduced to 45mph.
- Spring 2023– Save People-Save Wildlife works with PCMC and Summit County to install reflective silhouette sculptures.
- 2024 – UDOT indicates that they are not supportive of a wildlife crossing overpass at this time.
- January 2025– City council requests staff review and report on the Wildlife Crossings Pilot Program (WCPP).



FHWA Wildlife Crossings Pilot Program

- Application Window: May 1 – August 1, 2025
- Funding:
 - 20% non-federal match required
 - Up to **\$80M** for FY26
 - **60% (\$48M)** allocated for rural projects

Project Categories

- Construction:
 - Engineering, design, permitting, right of way acquisition, and other activities related to the construction of infrastructure improvements.
- **Non-construction:**
 - Planning, research, and educational activities that are not directly related to construction of infrastructure improvements.
- Merit Criteria:
 - **Primary:** Improve safety by reducing wildlife vehicle crashes and Improve habitat connectivity
 - **Secondary:** Must align with at least 3 of the following-
 - Leveraging investments, economic development and visitation opportunities, innovation, education and outreach, monitoring and research, or the survival of a species.



Council Feedback

- Questions for Council
 - Does Council support working with UDOT to evaluate fencing alternatives along SR224?
 - Does Council support applying for a non-construction WCPP grant to evaluate project locations, new sensor technology, and other emerging tools to help reduce wildlife vehicle collisions?
 - Does Council support having a member of the Transportation Planning Department attend Save People Save Wildlife crossing project milestone meetings?



(Francisco Kjolseth | The Salt Lake Tribune) Wildlife fencing helps direct deer to a pinch point to cross SR 73 in Eagle Mountain during the migration season on Tuesday, August 27, 2024.

An aerial photograph of a mountain town, likely Park City, Utah, covered in snow. The town is nestled in a valley, with snow-covered mountains in the background. The text "Thank you" is centered over the image, flanked by two horizontal white lines.

Thank you



May 15, 2025 Public eComments

Leigh Stokes eComment: "I am a brand new member of the Women's 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I signed up this year for the first time, before learning that the rates were going to change. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support."

Susan Thompson eComment: "I am a member of the Women's 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in {Section 8.5 Golf Fees} included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play. Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees and veterans. Provide a half-punch pass option {\$300.00 for 10 9-Hole rounds or 5 18-Hole rounds.) There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community."

Christine LaFrance O'Byrne eComment: "I am a member of the Women's 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support."

Denyse Seppanen eComment: "I am a member of the Women's 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to APPROVE the recommendations listed in Section 8.5 Golf Fees which are included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal resident rate to association golfers during league play. Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees and veterans. Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for ten 9-hole rounds or five 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support."

Emily Shirley eComment: "I am a member of the Women's 9 Hole Golf League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club (Muni). I am concerned about the green fees rate increase for members of our league who do not live in Park City proper (84060 zip code). I realize that there may be a need to increase green fees rates due to water use, planning for future infrastructure, maintenance, and other cost increases, but I strongly believe that all participants in our league should pay the same amount for green fees on league days. The Women's 9 Hole League has been in existence for over 25 years. Last year we had over 300 members. Two-thirds to 75% of our members live outside 84060. Only 4 of our 11 board members live in 84060. The Women's 9 Hole Golf League provides an opportunity for women to play golf in a supportive and inclusive environment. Our goals are to promote sportsmanship while participating in weekly games, encourage respect for the game of golf and to make positive contributions to our community. Please consider the monetary contributions that our members make to the Muni and nearby businesses: Last year, on our charity day, Rally for a Cure, our league raised over \$19,000. We partnered with Playing for Life Foundation to distribute all the funds to three local charities -- Peoples Health Clinic, Image Reborn and Huntsman Cancer Research Institute. The league also made donations to Peace House and the Park City Senior Center. Our \$50 yearly dues are primarily used for payouts for our weekly games, monthly competitions, and annual club championship. Last year our league winners spent over \$11,000 of their prize money in the pro shop. League members routinely support the Muni by scheduling lessons with the local golf pros. After playing on league day, many of our members go out to lunch or dinner locally, spending more time and money in Park City. We hold a Kick Off Party in May at a local restaurant and use local caterers for our club championship brunch. Our league is committed to continuing to support the Muni facility. For the reasons stated above, I strongly recommend that you consider keeping the green fees the same for all members on league days. Please help us to keep our league memberships healthy so that we can continue to support our beautiful municipal golf club and our community."

Wendy Kuhn eComment: "I am a member of the Women's 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support."

Kim McQueen eComment: "I am a member of the Women's 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to

active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.”

Paige Hillenmeyer eComment: “I am a member of the Women’s 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.”

Kay Lynn Stafford eComment: “I am a member of the Women’s 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in theKristen Hall leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.”

Lisa Gordon eComment: “I am a member of the Women’s 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.”

Carol Adami and Kathy McMahon eComment: “I am a member of the Women’s 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men

and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. It is only fair that all league members pay the same green fees. We appreciate your support.”

Kristen Hall and Helen Sherman eComment: “I am a member of the Women’s 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.”

Kathy Roll eComment: “On behalf of the Board of the PCGC 9 Hole League, I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). The men’s and women’s leagues believe that all league members should pay the same price for green fees on league days. There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.”

Angela Battaglia eComment: ““I am a member of the Women’s 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club and a 34-year resident of Park City. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.”

Jerrie Cunningham eComment: “I am a member of the Women’s 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our

leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.

Response by Council Member Ciraco: Thank you for submitting your comments to the City Council. When folks show up to Park City Municipal Council meetings to make "public comment" there are two instructions. 1.) Please state your name for the record, 2.) Please tell us what your zip code is? Could you please let us know where you live - just a zip code is ok! As a Council we represent the taxpayers of Park City Municipal Corporation. Unfortunately that boundary ends at White Pine Canyon Rd. (St. Mary's Church) on S.R. 224, at Hwy 40 and SR 248 and at Deer Valley to our south. Our fiduciary duty is to our taxpayers. The golf course is a Park City Municipal Corp asset that is not self sufficient when you include capital expenditures to maintain the course. We are lucky that we have this course and we feel fortunate to be able to open it to the general public, but the residents of Park City that patronize it should get a benefit that is not subsidized by every non golf playing taxpayer. Clearly what all of the public comment points to is staggering lack of a County owned course in the Snyderville Basin. I would happily advocate with you for a County developed course there. Perhaps the County can be convinced to put it near Utah Olympic Park in lieu of putting a cemetery there?

Response by Cunningham: Bill, Thank you for your response. Just to clarify, it is my and other's understanding that the Park City Golf Course is an Enterprise Fund and they pay for all of their own improvements. In addition they cut a check yearly to Park City for at least \$100,000. It is sad and seems to be very short sighted for the Park City Municipal Council to create a division in the community which will most likely create further divisions both ways. In the long run it has shown to be financially detrimental to communities where this has been done in the past. My zip code is 84098 which is a Park City address, but as you point out not a Park city Municipal zip code. In addition I'm not sure if your remark referring to Snyderville Basin developing it's own county-based golf course and I quote "I would happily advocate with you for a County developed golf course near Utah Olympic Park in lieu of putting a cemetery there" was a sarcastic remark or not.

Response by Council Member Ciraco: Jerrie, I am not sure I understand. Why would the prospect of the county having a golf course somewhere in the Snyderville Basin be seen as sarcastic? Clearly as you state with 650 members in the golf league, and with emails from two weeks ago indicating that 75% of the members come from outside of the City limits. Data like this suggests that there is strong demand for a course in the unincorporated areas of the county. Not only was it not sarcastic, I wholeheartedly endorse it."

Allison Ellner eComment: "I am a Park City full time resident. Because I don't live in Park City proper as defined by 84060 I am being penalized at our municipal golf course. The new price for 84098 residents for the 9 hole league is a ridiculous increase. I could understand \$5 but double? Honestly, it's only 9 NINE holes.. and it's a municipal course.... Is this how you want to alienate your citizens and voters? Why do you want to

punish LOCAL residents? By the way, if it hasn't occurred to you your increase feels ALIENATING, UNFAIR and just plain WRONG."

Carolyn Krytzer eComment: "I'm member of the Women's 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I'm writing to request that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are more than 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support."

Barbara Larsen eComment: "I am a full-time resident of Jeremy Ranch and an active participant in the Ladies 9-Hole League at Park City Municipal Golf Course. While I understand that periodic pricing adjustments are necessary, I am concerned about the impact on residents like myself who live and work in Summit County but reside just outside the 84060 ZIP code. I respectfully ask that you consider alternative pricing structures that don't disadvantage full-time local residents. One potential solution could be implementing a tiered system where out-of-state visitors pay a higher "guest" rate, similar to the fee structure at private courses like Jeremy Ranch or Park Meadows. This would allow Park City Municipal to generate additional revenue without penalizing Summit County residents who contribute to the local economy and help keep our community thriving year-round."

Irene Tendler eComment: "I am a retired teacher living and renting in the 84098 zip code. Sadly the cost of living here since COVID has gotten way out of hand but I do understand that Park City is now a top resort town. I am very aware that the golf course needs improvement, continual maintenance in addition to the expense of water. As an older resident, my sport activities have now become less death-defying. That leaves me with hiking and golfing during the warm weather. I currently belong to the Women's 9-hole golf league and the PCMSC golf league. It was lovely playing 9 holes twice a week at last season's golf fees without breaking my budget during retirement. I am hoping that you will support keeping the golf fees at last year's prices for those of us participating in the organized golf leagues even though we don't live in the 84060 zip code."

Julie Schleck eComment: "I am a member of the Women's 9 Hole League at the Park City Municipal Golf Club. I am writing to ask that you vote to approve the recommendations listed in (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow-Up and Fee Discussion: Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to association golfers during league play; Offer the Park City Municipal Resident rate to active military service members, retirees, and veterans; Provide a half-punch pass option (\$300 for 10 9-hole rounds or 5 18-hole rounds). There are over 650 men and women who actively play in the leagues at the Park City Golf Club. Our leagues are

committed to supporting the Park City Golf Club and our community. We appreciate your support.”

Hayden Williams eComment: “I am a member and have been since moving here 30 years ago, of the Park City Municiple Golf Club. I am writing to ask you to approve the recommendations listed in the (Section 8.5 Golf Fees) included in Exhibit A: FY26 Budget Follow Up and Fee Discussion: offer the PCMR rate to association golfers during league play; of that rate to active military service members and veterans; Provide a half - punch pass option (300\$for 10 9 hole rounds or 5 18 hole rounds). We appreciate your support.”

PARK CITY CONNECTIVITY

Phase 1 Schedule

PROJECT KICK-OFF

Winter 2024

ANALYSIS, PLANNING & DESIGN

Spring/Summer 2025

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

July 2025

PHASE 1 REPORT

Late Summer 2025

ROCK
DESIGN
ASSOCIATES



PARK CITY CONNECTIVITY

SR 224 ASSESSMENT

ROCK DESIGN ASSOCIATES TEAM

**ROCK
DESIGN
ASSOCIATES**



PARK CITY CONNECTIVITY

Executive Summary

Planning & Partnerships

Rock Design Associates LLC is collaborating with the local nonprofit organization Save People Save Wildlife to assess the site conditions, ecology, hydrology, habitat, plant communities and wildlife connectivity along SR 224, between mile markers 7 and 9. This initiative aims to promote ecological conservation while mitigating wildlife-vehicle collisions and enhancing public safety.

To support this endeavor, RDA has assembled a multidisciplinary team of experts specializing in wildlife biology, civil and hydraulic engineering, and structural design. In partnership with Save People Save Wildlife, the team will undertake a comprehensive review of existing datasets related to species migration patterns, native biodiversity, and documented wildlife-vehicle interactions.

The assessment will also include an in-depth analysis of publicly accessible planning documents, including transportation improvement proposals, environmental and hydrological studies, historical records, and land use designations. This review will help identify potential synergies or conflicts with the proposed corridor improvements and ensure alignment with broader conservation and infrastructure goals.

RDA is committed to fostering a coalition of local stakeholders to provide strategic input and community-based insights. The purpose of this effort is to identify multifaceted opportunities for enhancing driver safety, restoring fragmented habitats to near pre-development conditions, and galvanizing community engagement in long-term environmental stewardship.

Firm Profile

Rock Design Associates LLC

Rock Design Associates LLC was established with the foundational commitment that we will deliver beautiful, dynamic, innovative, and responsible design strategies for our clients. We do this by providing an exceptional level of service and a personal accessibility for all our clients. It is through this commitment and accessibility that we are driven to provide a work product of the highest quality and to maintain our goal of consistently exceeding our client's expectations.

Our approach to landscape architecture, environmental planning, ecology, and design deliberately weaves science with art. Infusing simple beauty with pragmatism and purpose while retaining the elements of wonder, whimsy, and imagination that serve to inspire others. This platform requires a robust, intentional, and deep collaboration within our own practice as well as with our clients, our colleagues, and our consultants. We find that it is through this inclusive spirit that the most remarkable ideas are born from the most unlikely of places.

With a broad range of public and private clients our projects are imagined with a deep understanding and appreciation of each site's heritage, a respect for the natural environment, and a recognition of the social context in which they exist. We are also uniquely aware that time is a key driver of any good design. We understand and appreciate that our work is elevated by the enduring commitment of those who steward and maintain these creations now and into the future.

ROCK
DESIGN
ASSOCIATES



UT-224

PARK CITY CONNECTIVITY



Rendering of the Wallis Annenberg Wildlife Crossing
Source: Rock Design Associates



Robert Rock is the President & CEO Rock Design Associates LLC. With over twenty years of professional experience working at every scale of project management on projects distributed across the continental United States. Rock's upbringing on a rural Iowa family farm instilled in him a deep connection to the land and a sense of resourcefulness, frugality, and pragmatism that permeates every facet of his work. It is also foundational of his skill as a communicator across a wide range of audiences. Throughout his career, Rock has focused on the artful integration of infrastructure and ecology. In 2010, while at MVVA, Rock led the winning team in the ARC International Wildlife Crossing Competition, a globally recognized event that cemented Rock's reputation as an expert in innovative design for wildlife connectivity. Since 2019, Rock has led the design of the Wallis Annenberg Wildlife Crossing in Agoura Hills, California and has enjoyed a deep collaboration with Caltrans District 7 on the documentation, and construction oversight for the crossing and over 13 acres of supporting landscape. In addition to the coordination of an extensive internal and external team, the project involves an ambitious collaboration between five core project partners including the National Wildlife Federation, the Mountains Recreation Conservation Authority, the National Park Service, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains.

ROCK
DESIGN
ASSOCIATES

PARK CITY CONNECTIVITY



Rendering of the West End Bridge Connectors
Source: Merritt Chase LLC



Terrie Brightman, RLA is a landscape architect and project manager with over two decades of experience leading the design and delivery of transformative public realm projects. Her work spans from conceptual visioning through construction administration, with a focus on large-scale, technically complex, and ecologically responsive landscapes that enhance connectivity and accessibility in urban environments.

Terrie is currently managing design coordination for the Wallis Annenberg Wildlife Crossing, the largest urban wildlife crossing in the world. This precedent-setting project, located in Southern California, addresses habitat fragmentation and reconnects critical ecosystems across a major transportation corridor.

Her previous work includes the West End Bridge Connectors in Pittsburgh, a multifaceted active transportation project that will create safe and inclusive crossings over the Ohio River for pedestrians and cyclists. In New York City, she contributed to the realization of Waterline Square and Hunts Point Landing, both of which reimaged underutilized urban infrastructure to deliver accessible, environmentally beneficial public spaces that support community life and ecological function.

Terrie's projects are recognized not only for their technical rigor and design quality, but also for their positive environmental and social impact. Her insights have been featured in *The Architect's Newspaper* and *Metropolis POV*.

ROCK
DESIGN
ASSOCIATES

PARK CITY CONNECTIVITY



Photo of South Tahoe Wildlife Connectivity Assessment
Source: Rock Design Associates



Dr. Anthony Clevenger is a senior research scientist at the Western Transportation Institute, Montana State University. His research the last 22 years has focused on developing science-based solutions to the increasing problem of expanding road systems and the conservation of landscapes and animal populations. He has published his results in leading international scientific journals (over 70 articles) and co-authored three books. Dr. Clevenger has expertise in directing road ecology research, having served as Principal Investigator on projects planning, designing and evaluating the use of wildlife fencing and crossing structures worldwide. In working on these projects, he has gained insight into the needs of land managers and transportation practitioners responsible for environmentally sustainable transportation systems.

PARK CITY CONNECTIVITY



Photo of Waterloo Greenway and Waller Creek Corridor Restoration
Source: Michael Van Valkenburg Associates, Inc.



Craig Taylor, PE is a hydraulics and restoration specialist. He has over 15 years of professional experience in restoration design, physical hydraulics, sediment transport, and stormwater modeling. Craig is also an instructor at the University of Virginia's Landscape Architecture graduate program where he teaches stream restoration.

Craig thrives in collaborative, multi-disciplinary teams that are taking on environmental restoration and stormwater projects. Craig has conducted extensive research into hydraulics and has served as a technical leader on over two dozen environmental restoration and investigation projects, including the Waller Creek Corridor Restoration (Austin, TX), the Lower Don Lands Waterfront Redevelopment (Toronto, ON), the Trinity River Restoration (Dallas, TX), the Lake of the Little Creek Topeka Shiner Passage design (Eagleville, MO). Highlights of his skills and expertise in this area include physical and numerical modeling, channel morphology, scour assessment, armoring design, ecological flow regimes, storm sewer networks, and riparian restoration.

PARK CITY CONNECTIVITY



Photo of Land Bridges at the Gathering Place for Tulsa
Source: Roads & Bridges Magazine



Ryan Woodward, PE brings 23 years of experience in the design of bridges and managing complex infrastructure projects. He specializes in signature structures that are buildable and budget-conscious, and his projects have included the design of cable-stayed bridges, suspension bridges, and arch bridges. In total, he has been involved in the design of 21 pedestrian bridges, including the IHT Bollinger Canyon Road Overcrossing in San Ramon, CA and Streicker Bridge at Princeton University, the first of many collaborations with Robert Rock.

Previously, Ryan served as Engineer of Record for the Gathering Place for Tulsa. Skirting the Arkansas River, the creation of a 66.5-acre park involved significant infrastructure work, including 11 new bridges valued at \$58.5M. The place-making project required careful conceptual planning and a meticulous design development phase to satisfy all stakeholders, delivering award-winning work within budget. The project has been featured in numerous publications, named one of the ten best roads in North America (Roads & Bridges, 2018), and one of the World's Greatest Places (Time Magazine, 2019).

COWI