



VALLEY MENTAL HEALTH
Summary of Funding and SC Match for 2012-13

	Federal Funds	State Funds	County Match	Other Funds*	Total Funds
Mental Health	\$ 384,668.00	\$ 414,903.00	\$ 61,170.00	\$ 239,000.00	\$ 1,099,741.00
Substance Abuse	\$ 260,178.00	\$ 231,883.00	\$ 40,221.00	\$ 40,100.00	\$ 572,382.00
Prevention Activities	\$ 98,691.00			\$ 13,000.00	\$ 111,691.00
DUI Fees** (varies, but pass-through only)		\$ 35,000.00			\$ 35,000.00
OVERALL FUNDING FOR VMH	\$ 743,537.00	\$ 681,786.00	\$ 101,391.00	\$ 292,100.00	\$ 1,818,814.00

* includes additional contracts, grants, private payer and commercial insurance

** percentage from each DUI issued in Summit County to be used for prevention

Population Served:

- Summit County Residents
- Three different groups
 - o Medicaid Enrolled (primarily Mental Health)
 - o Individuals who are unfunded that have no other means of paying for treatment
 - o Individuals who are underfunded, who may be able to pay a portion or have their insurance pay a portion

Total Clients Served 2011-2012

- Mental Health
 - o Adults – 1,765
 - o Children – 557
- Substance Abuse
 - o Women – 133
 - o Pregnant Women & Women With Dependent Children – 12
 - o Youth – 32
 - o Men – 276

Valley Mental Health provides mental health and substance abuse services to Salt Lake, Summit and Tooele County residents.

For help or questions about our services, please call 888-949-4VMH (4864) or visit www.vmh.com

August 15, 2012 - County Council Work Session – Review of Strategic Plan

During the July 25th work session, Council reviewed the **Immediate** Issues of the Strategic Plan.

Those issues are:

- 1) *Economic Diversification*
- 2) *Sustainability*
- 3) *Communications*
- 4) *Relationships with Utah Legislature*
- 5) *Workforce Housing*
- 6) *Summit County Identity – (East –West)*

The work session scheduled on August 15th is to continue the review the strategic issue plan for the next two years and long term. **This discussion will also include the addition of goals important to the Council and that may include a budgetary component.**

(Next two years)

- 1) *Align Governing Efforts: Consolidate governmental services to be more tactical and strategic rather than reactive. Consolidated agencies make it possible to develop, articulate, implement, and measure the results.*
- 2) *Manage Growth: Effective growth management includes designating appropriate growth areas in order to establish a level of certainty with respect to where growth will occur and promote community identity.*
- 3) *Technology: Strategic plan for acquisition and implementation of technologies.*
- 4) *Revenue Structure: Continue to examine all possible revenue sources to maximize the sustainability of services.*
- 5) *Promote and Expand Recreational Opportunities: Continue providing affordable, diverse and expansive recreational opportunities that promote good health and wellbeing throughout the County.*

(Long Term)

- 1) *Natural Resources: Continued focus on maintaining, developing, and managing our natural resources.*
- 2) *Agriculture: Support and maintaining an environment that supports agriculture.*
- 3) *Cultural Diversity: Meeting needs and creating unity for our population that is becoming more diverse*

2009 Council Strategic Issues

Outlined below are the 2009 council strategic issues then an accounting or explanation of where these issues are found in the 2011 planning effort.

IMMEDIATELY

- Bolster *economic development* and create a variety of initiatives including green energy, green agriculture, recreational open space, and a Summit County “brand” for locally produced products. *Found in the Economic Diversification and Managing Growth 2011 strategic issue statements.
- Develop and implement a state *governmental relations* program involving the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial branches of state government. *Found in the Relationships with the Utah Legislature and Governor 2011 strategic issue statement.
- Encourage and foster effective *growth* strategies in conjunction with the Council of Governments. *Found in the Managing Growth 2011 strategic issue statement.
- Promote exemplary *fiscal stewardship and accountability*. *An operational issues and also found in the county mission statement and in the Align Governing Efforts 2011 strategic issue statement.
- Develop a *capital facilities plan* to include highly efficient and sustainable infrastructure. *An operational issue.
- Develop effective *weed abatement and control strategies*. *An operational issue.
- Enforce existing *codes, ordinances, and policies* with consistency and fairness. *An operational issue.
- Foster excellence in *customer service and communication* between constituents and departments. *An operational issue and also found the Communications 2011 strategic issue statement.

OVER THE NEXT TWO YEARS:

- Continue to set local and regional *transit* goals that include public transit, connectivity, and non-motorized connections. *An operational issue.
- Promote and encourage *sustainability*. *Found in the Sustainability 2011 strategic issue statement.

LONG-TERM MEASURES:

- Improve *mental health programs* including more effective drug abuse treatment and Drug Court. *An operational issue.
- Explore and develop *greener waste management options*. *An operational issue.
- Maintain our ongoing legacy of *heritage and cultural assets*. *Found in the Summit County Identity and Cultural Diversity 2011 strategic issue statements.
- Pursue *housing and employment options* for the diverse community of residents. *Found in the Workforce Housing 2011 strategic issue statement.

Memo

Date: August 22, 2012
To: County Council
From: Kevin Callahan, Public Works Director
Subject: Notice of Annexation to Service Area # 6

Background

In September of 2011, the County Council gave direction to staff to consider applications for road acceptance and annexation to Service Area # 6 for private roads that meet basic county road standards. Staff has met with a number and explained the processes with a number of interested subdivisions on private roads. The first subdivision to submit a completed set of petitions for road acceptance and annexation to Service Area # 6 was the Jeremy Point Condominiums. Those petitions have now been certified as complete and accurate by the County Clerk. The number of certified petitions exceeded the 75% minimum threshold required by county procedure. 100% of the affected property owners signed petitions both for county road acceptance and annexation into Service Area # 6.

The next step in the process is for the posting of a Notice of Annexation at the County Courthouse, at the Jeremy Point subdivision, publishing the notice in the Park Record and on the Utah Public Notice website. We will also mail a copy of the notice to each affected property owner. Property owners then have a 20 day period within which to request a public hearing. The public hearing must be held in the Snyderville Basin on a weekday evening no earlier than 6 pm. A quorum of the County Council must be present at the public hearing.

Following a 20 day period without a request for a public hearing, the County Council may adopt a Resolution approving or denying the annexation. At that same time, the County Council may approve the road dedication plat identifying the dedicated county road and right-of-way.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Council approves the Notice of Annexation and directs the Chair to sign the Notice. Staff will then post and mail the Notice to the affected property owners.

NOTICE OF ANNEXATION

**REGARDING THE ANNEXATION OF THE JEREMY POINT
SUBDIVISION INTO SUMMIT COUNTY SERVICE AREA #6**

SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Board of Trustees (the "Board") of the Summit County Service Area #6 ("Service Area #6") will annex the Jeremy Point subdivision into Service Area #6, pursuant to Title 17B, Chapter 1, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, in order to provide road maintenance and snow removal services.

A duly certified Petition proposes to annex the Jeremy Point Subdivision, inclusive of all properties adjoining Jeremy Point Court Road into Service Area #6. The Jeremy Point Subdivision is located within the Jeremy Ranch neighborhood, Snyderville Basin, Summit County, Utah.

Service Area #6 may be funded through any or all of the following: (a) rates, fees and other charges collected for the use of Service Area facilities or the provision of Service Area services, (b) assessments that may be levied on properties located in one or more assessment areas created in the Service Area, (c) the issuance of bonds and other forms of indebtedness by the Service Area, and (d) property taxes levied by the Service Area pursuant to Utah law. The estimated average financial impact in property taxes upon a typical primary resident with a residential dwelling valued at approximately \$460,000.00 within the area proposed for annexation is approximately \$180.00 per year.

Property owners or registered voters within the area proposed for annexation may request a public hearing as provided in UCA §17B-1-413(2)(a)(ii)(B) within twenty (20) days of this Notice. Information concerning the proposed annexation may be obtained from the Summit County Public Works Director, (435) 336-3978.

DATED this ___ day of _____, 2012.

SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH

By: _____
David Ure
Chair

Memo

Date: August 13, 2012
To: County Council
From: Dan Compton, Library Director
Subject: Request for Annual Library Staff Development/Training Day

Background:

The Summit County Library implemented a new Strategic Plan in 2012. Part of the plan focuses on staff development and training. We have developed a new plan for staff to spend some time each week learning more about customer service, library software and policies, and the multitude of informational resources and formats we offer to the public. There are times when it would be extremely beneficial to have the entire staff in one place for combined training in these areas. The only possible way to do this now for an extended period of time would be to hold a staff development day on a Sunday or paid holiday. Without paying overtime, this could create many challenges for scheduling during the week of the staff development day.

I have discussed this predicament with other Library Directors around the state, and I have learned that many libraries in this area are able to close for one day each year to hold an annual staff development day. Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, Weber County, Provo City, and Tooele City are just a few. They have given me a lot of useful information to help plan, and some have even volunteered staff members to come speak on various topics that will help our employees succeed. Most of the libraries choose to close on a holiday that is not a paid holiday because many patrons believe the library is closed anyway. In addition to the benefit of training all employees at once, many Library Directors spoke of positive team-building experiences and improvement of morale as other reasons they continue to offer this opportunity each year.

Proposal:

I have presented this idea to our Summit County Library Board and they voted to approve Columbus Day each year for this purpose. I would like to seek the Council's approval to officially close our library branches each Columbus Day for the purpose of a coordinated Library Staff Development/Training Day.

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: BOB JASPER
FROM: MATT LEAVITT *ML*
SUBJECT: PROPERTY TAX INCREASES FOR MUNICIPAL SERVICES FUND AND SERVICE AREA #6
DATE: 8/16/2012
CC: BLAKE FRAZIER

Bob,

Now that the council has had its final public hearing regarding the proposed tax increases for the municipal services fund and service area #6, they need to adopt, by resolution, the final tax rates and budgets for those funds. I have included the form provided by the State for the Council Chair's signature. Please schedule this for the August 22, 2012 council meeting.

There is no need for discussion regarding the resolutions, but this does need to be an agenda item stating that they are adopting the resolutions. They need to be adopted as separate resolutions, and then signed. After they are signed they need to be returned to me in order to file them with the State as is required.

Let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,



Matt Leavitt

Attached:
Form PT-800 for municipal services fund
Form PT-800 for service area #6

Resolution 2012-19

Resolution Adopting Final Tax Rates and Budgets Report 800	Form PT-800 pt-800.xls Rev. 2/01
---	--

County: Summit Year: 2012

It is hereby resolved that the governing body of (entity name): Service Area # 6

approves the following property tax rate(s) and revenue(s) for the year: 2012

1 Fund/Budget Type	2 Revenue	3 Tax Rate
<u>Service Area</u>	<u>960,000</u>	<u>.000605</u>
Totals	<u>960,000</u>	<u>.000605</u>

This resolution is adopted after proper notice and hearing in accordance with UCA 59-2-919 and shall be forwarded to the County Auditor and the Tax Commission in accordance with UCA 59-2-913 and 29-2-920.

Signature of Governing Chair

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Title: _____

MINUTES

SUMMIT COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCIL
WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2012
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
COALVILLE, UTAH

PRESENT:

Claudia McMullin, *Council Vice Chair*
Sally Elliott, *Council Member*
John Hanrahan, *Council Member*
Chris Robinson, *Council Member*

Robert Jasper, *Manager*
Anita Lewis, *Assistant Manager*
Dave Thomas, *Deputy Attorney*
Kent Jones, *Clerk*
Annette Singleton, *Office Manager*
Karen McLaws, *Secretary*

In the absence of Chair David Ure, Vice Chair Claudia McMullin assumed the chair.

CLOSED SESSION

Council Member Hanrahan made a motion to convene in closed session for the purpose of discussing property acquisition. The motion was seconded by Council Member Robinson and passed unanimously, 4 to 0.

The Summit County Council met in closed session from 2:55 p.m. to 3:50 p.m. to discuss property acquisition. Those in attendance were:

Claudia McMullin, *Council Vice Chair*
Sally Elliott, *Council Member*
John Hanrahan, *Council Member*
Chris Robinson, *Council Member*

Anita Lewis, *Assistant Manager*
Dave Thomas, *Deputy Attorney*
Blake Frazier, *County Auditor*

Council Member Robinson made a motion to dismiss from closed session and to convene in work session. The motion was seconded by Council Member Elliot and passed unanimously, 4 to 0.

WORK SESSION

Vice Chair McMullin called the work session to order at 3:50 p.m.

- **Interview five applicants for the two vacancies on the Summit County Recreation, Arts and Parks Advisory Committee**

The Council Members interviewed applicants Jan Massimino (telephonically), Kirstie Rosenfield, and Ben Castro to fill vacancies on the Recreation, Arts, and Parks Advisory Committee. Questions included why the candidates want to serve on the committee, the advantages of appointing a candidate who has already served on the committee versus appointing a new applicant, whether the candidates have the time to serve on the committee, and what experience they would bring to the committee.

- **Council mail review**

Administration Office Manager Annette Singleton reported that the Council will meet with the Eastern Summit County Planning Commission on Thursday, July 12, at the Wanship Fire Station at 6:00 p.m. She reported that Ulrich & Associates has prepared the final audit report and will present it at the July 18 meeting. The senior luncheon at the County Fair will be Friday, August 10, at noon.

- **Presentation of gavel awards to past and present Chairs of the Summit County Council, Annette Singleton, Office Manager**

Ms. Singleton presented gavel awards to the past County Council chairpersons who have not previously received a gavel.

The Council took a break from 4:35 p.m. to 4:50 p.m.

- **Discussion with North Summit Recreation District regarding strategic plan**

Members of the North Summit Recreation District Board presented their plans for recreation in northern Summit County. Brandon Rees stated that they were unaware that acquisition of the land was contingent on the bond passing. He presented a draft proposal for purchasing the land and stated that, without land, they have nothing to build on.

Vice Chair McMullin asked about the cost of the land. Mr. Rees replied that it is approximately \$250,000. He confirmed for Council Member Robinson that the total acreage would be 11+ acres. Council Member Robinson noted that the land is sloped and would require cuts and fills and retaining in order to use it for playing fields.

Vice Chair McMullin asked what the District's top priority would be. Mr. Rees replied that the first priority would be to purchase land and to pay the fees for the bond election. They would try to obtain the funding for anything that might be built on the land through grants, sponsorships, and other funds. Vice Chair McMullin clarified that she was asking what features would be the biggest priority if they were able to acquire the land. Mr. Rees replied that the biggest draw would likely be the splash pad, but until they know whether they can get the land and what they have to work with, this is only a draft plan.

Council Member Elliott stated that there are various ways of providing for recreation in the County, and the County has always given a small amount of money for youth recreation that is not proportional to the population. She explained that South Summit does recreation for the entire school district and asked how closely the North Summit Recreation District has worked with the North Summit School District. She asked whether it would be possible to accomplish

this jointly. The Recreation Board Members replied that the School District has no money for recreation.

Vice Chair McMullin stated that it appears the next logical step would be the RAP Recreation cycle next year.

Council Member Hanrahan stated that he was disappointed in the lead-up to the recreation bond. The Council was told many times that there was overwhelming support for the bond, which turned out to be completely inaccurate. The question is what to do next and whether County taxpayers should pay for North Summit Recreation because the North Summit residents did not want to. He did not believe that makes sense. Mr. Rees stated that the feedback the District heard was that people would not use the facilities and that they should try to get grants and sponsorships, because people did not want their taxes increased. That is the avenue they would like to pursue. Council Member Elliott asked why other County residents should pay for recreation if local residents do not want to pay for it. Council Member Hanrahan noted that is different from the RAP tax money that is allocated to North Summit. There is money available for this from the RAP tax, which he believed would be a reasonable use of the RAP money, but the question is what would happen once they buy the land with taxpayer money. It did not sound like they would get support from the community for a bond, and he asked how they would cover the costs. Mr. Rees stated that they would not get grants and sponsorships immediately, but if they do not start someplace, they will never be able to get anything.

Council Member Robinson stated that he believed the RAP committee was wise in making the grant to purchase the property contingent on passage of the recreation bond. He believed the Recreation District should come up with a new plan and a budget for carrying out that plan and stated that he was disappointed at the level of detail the Recreation District had provided. Vice Chair McMullin stated that the District needs to scale back its plan and decide whether they will do anything more than what they are currently doing. If so, they need to let the Council know what they plan to do and how much it will cost, not just ask for \$250,000 for land and say they will figure out something from there. Council Member Robinson suggested that they make their case to the RAP committee, noting that it is not ideal to try to develop a park on sloped land. He explained that the Council makes a decision based on the RAP Committee's recommendation, and their recommendation was contingent on the Recreation District passing a bond. The bond did not pass, so the District may need to go back to the committee and ask to apply again with a different plan.

Assistant Manager Anita Lewis explained that nothing has been put in writing stating that the RAP grant was contingent on the bond passing, although it may have been discussed verbally. Jacki Vernon with the Recreation District Board noted that the RAP Recreation funds were originally supposed to be awarded before the bond election, so the RAP funds could not have been contingent on the recreation bond passing.

Council Member Robinson confirmed with Mr. Rees that the \$150,000 identified on the plan for salaries, engineering, financial, legal, feasibility, and other fees have already been incurred.

Marci Hansen, a member of the public, stated that Park City provides recreation on a city level, and South Summit does it in connection with the school district at a loss of \$1 million a year. She suggested that they take this back to the city level and let Henefer and Coalville run their youth programs rather than involve all of North Summit. People could choose to go to Henefer, Kamas, or Park City if they have a better program. Council Member Elliott stated that is a problem. Park City Municipal previously included all the children in the Snyderville Basin in their recreation programs, but there was no funding for it, and the taxpayers in Park City paid the bill for the entire County. Park City was no longer willing to do that, and they approached the County to ask for money to provide recreation for the children in the Snyderville Basin. That evolved through the years, and the County now gives a set amount to each recreation district that is not proportional to the number of children served. Coalville and Henefer have never seen a need to provide recreation for the children in their communities, because the County has always done it. Ms. Hansen claimed that Henefer was planning to start its own building and program until they gave the money to this program.

Coalville Mayor Duane Schmidt disagreed and explained that, if they tried to start a recreation program in Coalville or Henefer, they could never field a team. They need to include the whole area in order to get enough kids to have a league, which is the reason for the North Summit Recreation District. He stated that the surveys did say people would support a recreation center, but they are now in economic times where people are tired of being overtaxed, and that was loud and clear. He agreed that the Recreation District needs to step back and look at another plan.

Vice Chair McMullin explained that there is money in the RAP Recreation fund for North Summit, and the Recreation District can apply for RAP Recreation money. The RAP Recreation committee may fund some amenities, but they need more information by the Recreation District submitting a new application that is fully supported with documentation. There are funds available, but the Recreation District needs to scale back what it wants to do.

Council Member Robinson commented that it sounds like Ms. Hansen was suggesting that they disband the North Summit Recreation District and let the cities provide recreation services, but he did not believe that is the direction the Council wants to take. If the soft costs of \$50,000 for the recreation center have been expended, that should be authorized for the RAP Recreation Committee to disburse. He suggested that the Recreation District put together a business plan for what they want to do, and since the RAP Recreation money is already earmarked, he did not believe they should have to wait another cycle in order to receive funds. He did not want the District to purchase land and not be able to recreate on it because they do not have the money to build facilities, so they may need to focus on capital improvements on land the City has indicated they would give them.

Council Member Hanrahan noted that there may be a way to work with the School District on sharing facilities. Council Member Elliott agreed that she would like to see the Recreation District try to do that.

REGULAR MEETING

Vice Chair McMullin called the regular meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

- **Pledge of Allegiance**

CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE 2012 RAP TAX RECREATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Vice Chair McMullin confirmed with Assistant Manager Anita Lewis that the bond process has been completed, the money is available, and the Council is being asked to approve the RAP Recreation Committee recommendations using those funds. She asked Tim Douglas, Chair of the RAP Recreation Committee, if the \$400,000 recommendation for the North Summit Recreation District was contingent on the Recreation District Bond passing. Mr. Douglas replied that it was discussed but never put in writing. Since the application was for the project that was the subject of the bond, the committee felt that it should not be funded, if the bond did not pass. The Recreation District may have incurred some up-front costs, but the committee was not privy to that information, and they recommended that, if the bond did not pass, they would not fund the project. However, the committee is making a recommendation, and it is up to the County Council to make the determination. They may want to consider funding the up-front costs for the project to make the Recreation District whole. Vice Chair McMullin confirmed with Mr. Douglas that, at least with regard to the purchase of the property, the committee recommended that the funds not be granted if the bond did not pass.

Council Member Hanrahan noted that Council Member Robinson has suggested that they pay the soft costs of \$50,000 which have already been incurred, and that the Recreation District return to the committee at an ad hoc meeting with another application as soon as their application can be completed. Mr. Douglas agreed that would be acceptable and noted that North Summit has been put at somewhat of a disadvantage because their application was contingent upon something else, which results in a deficiency in the funding the Recreation District would receive. He verified with the Council that the \$250,000 for acquisition of the land was included in the RAP Recreation bond.

Council Member Robinson stated that he believed the North Summit Recreation District should be given a chance to come up with a plan to utilize the \$250,000 from the bond proceeds, and \$100,000 for other costs. If, for some reason, they do not submit an acceptable application, the Council will determine to proceed with the funds. He suggested that they authorize up to \$50,000 to cover the soft costs of the previous recreation center proposal, and if there are funds left, the Recreation District could use that money to come up with a new plan.

Council Member Robinson made a motion to approve the recommendations of the RAP Tax Recreation Committee with the exception of holding in abeyance the \$250,000 for capital projects and \$100,000 for salaries for the North Summit Recreation District but to authorize payment of \$50,000 to the North Summit Recreation District to cover the soft costs of the recreation center design and to allow the Recreation District to develop a new plan to reapply for RAP Recreation funding. The motion was seconded by Council Member Elliott and passed unanimously, 4 to 0.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF PROPOSED TAX RATES; BLAKE FRAZIER, AUDITOR

County Auditor Blake Frazier explained that the County proposed in the December budget hearing a tax increase in the Municipal Fund which will equate to \$26.84 on \$200,000 valuation for a primary residence. All other areas of the budget will go to the certified tax rates, which will include a slight increase in the General Fund and minor increases in Service Areas 6, 8, and 11 because of decreases in valuations. He noted that the State Assessing and Collecting levy went down 4 points.

Council Member Robinson asked about the process for approval of tax rates. Mr. Frazier replied that the Council will approve the proposed tax rates, which will be the final rates for everything except the Municipal levy. In August, between 10 and 30 days after disclosure notices go out, the Council will hold a truth in taxation hearing. Council Member Robinson asked how much money the increase would generate. Mr. Frazier replied that he believed it would be between \$700,000 and \$800,000.

Vice Chair McMullin verified with Mr. Frazier that the rate change was triggered by shifting the burden from the general public to those who receive the services.

Council Member Robinson recalled that they had also discussed raising the rate for Service Area 6 to cover that service area's costs. Mr. Frazier agreed to research that and return with that information before approving the tax rates.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE SUMMIT COUNTY FAIR STRATEGIC PLAN

Ms. Lewis explained that the Fair Board is requesting approval of the plan presented at last week's meeting.

Council Member Elliott commented that she does not believe the plan reflects the most modern thinking and that much more needs to be considered. She stated that Salt Lake County struggles to find a use for its fairgrounds, and it is somewhat of a loss leader. She believed Summit County is suffering from fairground envy after seeing what Wasatch County has done, but their demographic is completely different from Summit County's. She acknowledged that the County Fair is important to people who have been doing it all their lives, and they feel the fairgrounds are inadequate to do what they would like to do for one week of the year. She was not sure they had thought through what would be the best use for the entire County. She stated that she grew up living in rural communities and knows that county fairs are an important cultural part of people's lives, but she would hate to see the County limit itself by a strategic plan that does not include a comprehensive view of things that are emerging and new thinking in other jurisdictions. She believed this plan is too narrow for Summit County and that they could be more creative and find new and more exciting things to do that would be of greater benefit to people all over the County. She did not believe they had done enough work yet to be able to say this is a plan she wants to live with for the next three or four years.

Council Member Robinson stated that the issue is what specific instruction the Council wants to give to get a better plan if they do not like this one. Just voting no means there would be no strategic plan, and if they have concrete feedback, they should provide it to the preparers.

Ms. Lewis explained that there has been no plan at all for the fair up to this point. This is a first step in looking forward and creating a plan showing where they want to go.

Vice Chair McMullin stated that she has no problem with the plan, and she thought the Fair Board had done an amazing job of preparing a plan which is light years ahead of where they were.

Council Member Elliott stated that, realizing there has been no plan in place, a 1970's plan is better than no plan at all, but she believed the thinking is way behind the times, and they need to look at other jurisdictions to see what kinds of creative things other areas are doing. Because county fairs are associated with agriculture, they need to look at new agricultural concepts and new ways people think about local food and eating locally. She believed they need to reach out to see how the fair can interact with people who are involved in food production or in production of anything in Summit County that needs to be showcased.

Council Member Robinson made a motion to approve the 2012 strategic plan for the Summit County Fair. The motion was seconded by Council Member Hanrahan.

Council Member Hanrahan verified with Ms. Lewis that the strategic plan received a unanimous consensus from the Fair Board. He noted that the population numbers are incorrect in the plan and need to be corrected.

Council Member Hanrahan amended the motion to add a condition that the population numbers are to be corrected. Council Member Robinson accepted the amendment to the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 4 to 0.

Council Member Elliott stated that she voted yes with the promise that the Fair Board would be constantly rethinking where they are going.

Mayor Schmidt requested that the Council keep the fair in Coalville, because it is part of their economics and their heritage. He noted that when Coalville City dedicated the fairgrounds to the County, there was a stipulation that, if the fair ever moved out of Coalville City, that property would revert back to the City.

Vice Chair McMullin stated that she does not know whether the entire Fair Board feels the same as Dirk Rockhill and Mayor Schmidt about keeping the fair in Coalville or whether there was a division of opinion about that, and she would like to have that information. Ms. Lewis stated that she believed the Fair Board was unanimous in wanting the fair to stay in Coalville.

Council Member Elliott requested that the Fair Board consider the needs and wishes of the entire County, not just the needs and wishes of North Summit. She did not believe there is any statutory reason why the fair must be located in Coalville, and she was not certain that would serve the largest number of people in the County. She asked that they consider fairness to everyone in the County as they look at alternative locations.

PUBLIC INPUT

Vice Chair McMullin opened the public comment.

Raymond Richins stated that the fencelines on his property are wrong, so he has had his property surveyed. In addition to having to pay for the surveyor, he has now learned that he has to pay a \$500 planning fee for a lot line adjustment plus a \$40 incidental fee. He believed the fees are ridiculous, because this is not a subdivision, just adjusting boundaries to where the fence line has been for 50 years.

Council Member Robinson explained that, in order to do a boundary line adjustment, staff must study what the surveyor provides and the legal description of the property, perform administrative functions, and check with surrounding land owners. The County wants as closely as possible to have applicants pay for the costs of review, and the fee pays for the staff's time to process the application.

Mr. Richins stated that his neighbor agrees with adjusting the lot line, but according to the surveyor, he has to take it to the Planning Department. In a neighboring county the fee is \$400 less, and he has a hard time paying that much money for the lot line adjustment.

Council Member Robinson explained that the County has to be involved to legally approve the change in boundary, and they need to cover the costs of the administrative work to do that.

Vice Chair McMullin closed the public input.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF PROPOSED TAX RATES; BLAKE FRAZIER, AUDITOR – (Continued)

Mr. Frazier stated that they did discuss increasing taxes for Service Area 6 in December, and they will hold a truth in taxation hearing for that as well. That will generate approximately \$960,000 total and increase taxes \$11.77 on a \$200,000 primary home within the District.

Council Member Robinson made a motion to approve the proposed tax rates for 2012 for the General Fund, Assessing and Collecting, Municipal Fund, Service Areas 6 and 8, and Wildland Fire. The motion was seconded by Council Member Elliott and passed unanimously, 4 to 0.

APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES

JUNE 13, 2012

Council Member Elliott made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 13, 2012, County Council meeting as written. The motion was seconded by Council Member Robinson and passed unanimously, 4 to 0.

Community Development Director Don Sargent introduced Robert Taylor, the new Chief Building Official.

MANAGER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Jasper recalled that he had warned the Council that there would be bumps in implementing the new solid waste program, and he acknowledged that there have been. He stated that they are getting things sorted out and resolved and noted that representatives from the waste management company are present to answer questions.

Council Member McMullin asked why her trash was not picked up for two weeks when everyone around her had their trash picked up. A representative from Allied Waste Management explained that they anticipated there would be problems, because this was a significant change. Generally things are going pretty well, but there is still a lot to do.

Mr. Jasper explained that there have been discussions about subcontracting the recycling in Old Town to Curb It Recycling. He is all right with that concept, but he needs to approve it. One issue is moving away from the 18-gallon plastic totes. He hoped they would soon have a subcontract, because things are a little bit up in the air about handling recycling in Old Town.

Council Member Hanrahan noted that the Council Members have received e-mails from several people in Summit Park who are not happy with the Council's decision to change the recycling and trash containers. However, they have also heard from people in Silver Creek, Pinebrook, and Jeremy Ranch who think this is a wonderful new service, and they are very grateful for it.

Council Member Elliott agreed that most people have been very positive. She did note that a friend who lives in Hoytsville was very upset that they comingled his trash and recycling and asked for assurances that it would never happen again. The representative from Allied Waste explained that they knew there would be problems the first week and that the recyclables would probably be contaminated, but starting Monday they will not comingle the trash and recyclables. Council Member Elliott observed that people are very sensitive to that.

Council Member Robinson suggested that the media report that these growing pains were anticipated, and that during the first few weeks, the public should not be concerned if the recycle bin and trash bin are collected by the same truck. He asked that people be patient as the County works through some of the issues, because it is a big change. His only concern is whether the 96-gallon container for recyclables with bi-weekly collection will work. He believed people would have to be more creative about how to pack them into the container more strategically.

Council Member Hanrahan was excused from the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Jasper reported that the State Forester has issued rules about target shooting for a period of time, and the County is trying to work with the State Forester to ban target shooting.

Mr. Jasper explained that the Sheriff will have to augment his budget this year for overtime. With the Vice President in town, the Secret Service has dictated what they need in the way of deputies.

Mr. Jasper reported on UAC and noted that the Supreme Court's decision on health care reform states that they will not mandate states to expand money for Medicare and Medicaid. That has an impact on the County's plan to expand substance abuse and mental health issues. They also discussed air quality, and more monitors will be placed in Summit County to monitor ozone levels. They also discussed how to get natural gas filling stations in the County.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Council Member Elliott reported that she attended a Mountainlands Community Housing Trust meeting on Tuesday, July 10. They are on target, and all of their financial reports are in order. They dedicated a Habitat for Humanity house on Marsac Avenue.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING UTAH SAGE GROUSE CONSERVATION STRATEGY

Mr. Jasper reported that a plan has been developed that includes Summit, Rich, and Wasatch Counties, and now the State is doing a plan.

Kathleen Clarke, Director of Public Land Policy Coordination for the Governor's Office, explained that they have spent the last five or six months trying to develop a strategy they can agree on to submit to BLM, the Forest Service, Division of Wildlife Services, NRCS, and State partners and stakeholders. She stated that, for the most part, it is going well, and they have received some wonderful recommendations. Mr. Jasper noted that Ms. Clarke is the former director of the BLM.

Ms. Clarke reviewed the history of the Fish and Wildlife decisions regarding the listing of sage grouse as an endangered species. In 2010, Fish and Wildlife determined that sage grouse were warranted for listing under the Endangered Species Act, but that did not rise to the priority of listing at that time, so it was called warranted but precluded. There is a tiered system for species to be listed, and sage grouse are about 7th or 8th on the tier, but at any time Fish and Wildlife could decide to make it tier 1 or 2. When the listing was appealed, the judge ruled that by 2015, Fish and Wildlife must take another look at this and either call sage grouse warranted and list it, or say it is not warranted and drop it. If the sage grouse is listed, there will be huge impacts from the Federal government that will affect anything that is determined to impact sage grouse habitat. Currently the bird is managed at the State level, and unless it is listed, the State will continue to manage it. The State is not excited about having the Federal government manage a one-size-fits-all regulation that is not flexible. Recognizing this threat, Governor Mead called a meeting in Wyoming last year and invited representatives from all the western states and the heads of Fish and Wildlife, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management. They made a pledge that they do not want to list this bird, but it is up to the States to address the threats to the bird so it will not come up as warranted for listing. One primary threat is fragmentation of agricultural lands that are turning into subdivisions, oil and gas fields, and recreation areas. The other primary threat is lack of regulatory control. The BLM has issued a list of guidelines and restrictions for public lands that are rather dramatic. For many states that is very onerous, and operators in the Uintah Basin would have to pack up and leave if they had to comply with them on an ongoing basis. A deal was cut at the meeting in Wyoming that the states would come up with a program to address the threats of fragmentation and lack of regulatory control to give some teeth to whatever

decisions are put in place, and Fish and Wildlife would not do a listing. She stated that she believes Fish and Wildlife does not want to list this bird.

Council Member Elliott stated that she strongly supports the states managing the problem and the Endangered Species Act. She stated that she sits on the Quality Growth Commission, and for two years in a row the Governor has not recommended funding for DWR projects to preserve land, including sage grouse land. If the Governor is serious about this, he needs to provide funding for it.

Ms. Clarke explained that the State is trying to pull together a framework that will avoid a listing. They are identifying a narrative that will define the umbrella and then look at each area that is identified as a sage grouse management area and how to deal with threats in each area. There will be a specific map and a plan that addresses the area. Ms. Clarke presented a map showing areas that are identified as sage grouse habitat and explained that threats would be dealt with by having a 5% disturbance cap on anything in the area. The State would turn to the counties to implement the plan, because the State does not have the regulatory authority to do so. She clarified that the 5% disturbance would be 5% in any 640 acres. They could determine the 5% for total acreage and make decisions on how to allocate that 5%. Some options for dealing with the 5% limit include improving the habitat area and getting sage grouse populated, which would offset the 5%. For instance, if they were to improve 1% of the habitat, the disturbance area would increase to 6%. Things such as pipelines that are put in and the land reclaimed would not count as a disturbance, and nothing that is already in place would count as a disturbance.

Council Member Robinson explained that when a species is listed, the Federal government has regulatory authority over the habitat, regardless of whether it is private or public land, which creates a huge impact on property rights. This is an attempt to come up with a solution where each county will oversee and regulate the sage grouse habitat. One question is whether Summit County wants its own set of rules rather than rules that might be put in place for adjacent counties. As a landowner who controls mineral or surface rights on 200,000 acres in this area, this would have a huge impact on his trying to develop mineral resources. One question is what would be considered a disturbance on the land, and details like that need to be addressed. He explained that the County will be asked to regulate activities on private property affected by this policy, which will drastically affect private landowners' ability to do things on their property. The County has been requested to provide written comments on the plan that has been written by Thursday or Friday of this week. Ms. Clarke explained that they have received so many comments that they will do a redlined version of everything they send out.

Sustainability Coordinator Ashley Koehler explained that she has a draft plan that is more tailored to Morgan and Summit County with specific actions. However, the State needs a plan that will help support this locally.

Council Member Robinson noted that what the State sent out last week has already changed, and he was not certain what the County should respond to.

Mr. Jasper commented that the County has been working to develop a plan, and he is willing to work with the State, but they may need more time. Ms. Clarke explained that BLM and the Forest Service have interim findings which are very stringent. If the State can agree to a plan, they will substitute the State's plan for the interim guidance immediately. The BLM is also

reviewing all of the resource management plans and revising them to show the protective overlays for the sage grouse, and they want the State plans to incorporate into those plan revisions. She stated that there is so much complexity, that they may have to take a little more time to let people look at it and make final comments. The power in the recommendations from this committee is that they have buy-off from Fish and Wildlife, BLM, and Forest Service, and they have committed to honor the State's plan. She stated that it is important to get it right, and she wants the recommendation that goes to the Governor to have vetted all the issues. She asked the County to do the best they can to provide input. She explained that the State plan will not be in concrete, and several months out, they could resolve some of the unintended consequences.

Lorien Belton with Utah State University Extension noted that the document is quite general in nature, although there are some core concepts that are not as general. The plan is a core conceptual idea of the challenges that need to be addressed and some strategies for doing so. Ms. Clarke noted that the plan and the map were developed by the local working group, and if the Council has problems with it, they can make some suggestions about how to change it. If they agree with the concept, she hoped the Council would support it. She stated that after the plan is adopted, they will have to develop a strategy at the State level for how to fund it.

Council Member Robinson asked if all the landowners involved know what is going on and have bought into the plan. Rick Danvir with Deseret Land and Livestock Company replied that he was not certain that many of them know how big the problem has become. He stated that between 33% and 40% percent of the landowners have come to the point where they are being to look at this as an opportunity. He recalled that mule deer were previously considered a liability, and there came a point where they became an asset to the landowners, and they want more them, not less. He commented that the State will have to deal with the landowners, and his organization could help facilitate that. He believed if the State adopts a set of practices, the landowners would be willing to implement them. Council Member Robinson commented that he believed development on these lands would be primarily for recreational cabins or renewable energy, and this would have a big impact on that. Mr. Danvir stated that he believed there are no sage grouse in some of the areas on the map, and they need to get people on the ground to see where they are. He believed for a relatively small amount of money they could identify the portion of the County that the birds are actually using, and that can be done more effectively at the County level.

Council Member Robinson suggested that they circulate a draft and get comments to Ms. Belton or to Ms. Clarke. Ms. Clarke stated that, if there is any way they could get comments to her by Monday, she would have them to present to the group on July 17.

The County Council meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Council Chair, David Ure

County Clerk, Kent Jones

Summit County Restaurant Tax Advisory Committee

Interview Schedule

Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Richins Building Auditorium

2 vacancies; 2 interviews

5:30 PM Jodie Coleman (reapplying)

5:45 PM Peggy Marty

The two vacancies are a result of: 1) Jodie's first term expiring (NS area representative), and 2) Tonja Hanson's third and final term expiring (SS area representative)

See attached Member list.

**SUMMIT COUNTY RESTAURANT TAX ADVISORY COMMITTEE
EXPIRES JULY 31TH OF EACH YEAR**

NAME	EMAIL ADDRESS	ADDRESS	CONTACT NUMBERS	TERM EXPIRES	# of Terms
Monte Coates PC Chamber	info@southwestshop.com	PO Box 1162 Park City, UT 84060	W: 435-649-1612 C: 435-659-9760	2013	3
Jodie Rogers Citizen at large	jrogers@deervalley.com	PO Box 889 Park City, UT 84060	C: 435-962-0440 W: 435-645-6620	2013	1
John Burdick Rest. Owner	jrburdick4@aol.com	P.O. Box 1772 Park City, UT 84060	H: 435-640-2549	2013	1
Brooke Hontz Citizen at large	brooke@dalysummit.com	PO Box 2128 Park City, UT 84060	H:435-640-1941	2014	2
Jeff Ward Rest. Assoc	jeff@thesilverstarcafe.com	PO Box 682106 Park City, UT 84068	C: 435-901-3318	2014	1
Judi Schweikert Citizen at large	jdschweik@msn.com	2645 Little Kate Rd. Park City, UT 84060	H: 435-435-5338 C: 435-640-0049	2014	2
Jodie Coleman NS area	pineapplechomper@vahoo.com	PO Box 861 Coalville, UT 84017	C: 435-640-4481 H: 435-336-4486	2012	1
Tonja Hanson SS area	thanson@canyonsresort.com	71 Democrat Alley Kamas, UT 84036	W: 435-516-3417 C: 435-901-7663	2012	3
Jeanne Lehan Lodging Assoc	jlehan@deervalley.com	PO Box 539 Oakley, UT 84055	H: 435-615-2062 C: 435-640-4480	2012	2

Last updated March 8, 2012



Amir Caus
County Planner

STAFF REPORT

To: Summit County Council (SCC)
Report Date: Thursday, August 16, 2012
Meeting Date: Wednesday, August 22, 2012
Author: Amir Caus, County Planner
Presented By: Adryan Slaght, Principal Planner
Project Name & Type: Snyderville Basin Development Code Amendments – Trailhead Parking
Type of Item: Public Hearing, Legislative
Final Authority: N/A

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The applicant, Bonnie Park, representative for the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District (SBSRD), is requesting to amend sections 10-2-10, 10-4-10, 10-4-17, and 10-11-1 of the Snyderville Basin Development Code (Code) to address trailhead parking standards and definitions.

The Snyderville Basin Planning Commission (SBPC) has conducted numerous public input sessions and public hearing, taken public comment, discussed the amendments, and voted to forward a positive recommendation on the proposed Trailhead Amendments to the SCC with findings found in Section F of the Staff Report.

A. Community Review

A public hearing notice was published in the *Park Record*. Since the proposed changes do not affect any specific property owners, no postcards were sent out.

Yvonne Gray and Don Gray have attended numerous meetings expressing their concerns with a possibility of having trailheads next to their lot in Summit Park. Additionally, the Grays have created and forwarded a version of language that they would be content with (Exhibit E).

At the July 17, 2012 work session, Charlie Sturgis (Executive Director for Mountain Trails), Heinrich Deters (Park City Sustainability/Trails), and Colin Hilton (Chief Executive Officer of Utah Olympic Park) all spoke in favor of the proposed language and urged the SBPC to forward a positive recommendation to the SCC.

At the July 31, 2012 public hearing, Michael Watson and Max Greenhalgh spoke in favor of the proposed language and urged the SBPC to forward a positive recommendation to the SCC.

B. Background

In 2011, the SBSRD proposed new Code language to address the lack of current Code language regarding Trailheads and Trailhead Parking. Because these uses were not identified in the Snyderville Basin Development Code, they were not allowed by default.

During the summer of 2011, the SBPC reviewed the proposed amendments during multiple meetings. After several amendments were made to the amendments as proposed by the SBSRD, the SBPC forwarded a positive recommendation to the Summit County Council (SCC).

On September 14, 2011, the SCC approved code amendments that addressed Trailheads, Parks, and Trailhead Parking (Exhibit A).

After receiving two Trailhead applications, Staff and the SBSRD discovered that one of the unintended consequences of the recommended and approved amendments was that all regular parking requirements would be required to be met if a trailhead was to be installed. Because Trailheads and Trailhead Parking can vary in style, size, and location, the SBSRD is proposing additional amendments to address the concerns for future Trailhead planning.

C. Identification and Analysis of Issues

The SBPC held three work sessions working with Staff and the applicant to finalize the proposed language.

During the May 8, 2012 work session the SBPC directed Staff to bring back the item at a later date with a more clear definition and a better match with the Code.

During the June 12, 2012 work session the SBPC directed Staff to bring back the item at the June 26, 2012 SBPC meeting with *Trailhead, Designated, Major* and *Trailhead, Designated, Minor* options. The SBPC further stated that they wished to see a mechanism that would allow for public hearings for Trailhead, Minor if it is within 300 feet of a residential parcel.

During the June 12, 2012 Staff asked for input for additional amendments that move *Pedestrian Non-motorized Trail Systems* from Section 10-4-10-M into Section 10-4-17 as it would be more appropriate in this section. No negative comments were received. Staff has proposed additional amendments to the subject language for an up to date language.

Additional language has been added to Sections E.3 and F.2 of the newly proposed language to encourage natural landscaping and addresses future development requirements that are already in practice, but need to be codified. The proposed addition in Section F.2 is similar to the Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District which can be found in Section 10-4-6-C of the Code. Further, the Summit County Attorney's Office has made amendments to the proposed Section F.2 in order to meet the State Code requirements.

During the July 17, 2012 work session the SBPC directed Staff to bring back two different definitions for trailheads, one being *Trailhead, Designated, Minor* and the other

being *Trailhead, Designated, Major*. At the request of SBPC Staff brought back a “bare bones” definition of *Trailhead, Designated, Minor* to have a clear difference between the two uses and definitions. In addition to the two aforementioned uses, Staff has added amendments that would address some of the Planning Commissioner’s individual concerns including future expansions, “dead-end” parking, and public involvement. The most recent revisions as recommended by the SBPC may be found in Exhibits C and D.

After the July 17, 2012 work session Yvonne Gray and Don Gray recommended that Trailhead, Designated, Major be limited with a minimum of two acres however none of the existing trailheads that SBSRD owns, operates, and or manages are larger than two acres. Staff has broken down the existing and future trailheads within Snyderville Basin in the chart below.

Snyderville Basin Recreation Trailhead Parking Count

TRAILHEAD LOCATION	EXISTING SPACES
The Woods at Parley’s Lane	17
Gorgoza	11
East Canyon Creek	25
Bad Apple	20
Spring Creek	16
Promontory	46
Old Ranch Road	8
The Farm	23
Bear Hollow Drive	11
Summit Park	5
PROPOSED TRAILHEADS	PROPOSED SPACES
Highland Drive	30
Olympic Parkway	20

NOTE: Willow Creek Park trailhead is not accounted for in the chart above and is considered a community park parking which doubles as a trailhead. Willow Creek Park is the only area that is greater than two acres, however the acreage is actually derived from a community park and not the trailhead itself.

At the July 31, 2012 public hearing, the SBPC held little discussion and voted unanimously to forward a positive recommendation to the SCC to approve the proposed language as outlined in Exhibits B and C.

To clarify Section 10-4-17, “Parks, Trails, and Trailheads” the public and SCC should understand that these three types of recreation facilities are distinctly different as per the Recreation and Trails Master Plan. With respect to “Parks”, in the Recreation and Trails Master Plan last amended and restated in 2006, the minimum Community Park acreage standard is 20 acres. These are the large parks built and maintained by the SBSRD (e.g., Trailside Park, Ecker Hill Field Complex, Willow Creek Park, and a future park in the Silver Creek Village Center) designed to bring neighborhoods *together* as community

gathering places. By comparison, neighborhood parks are smaller areas that serve individual developments. The provision of Neighborhood Recreation facilities are not a requirement of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District, however they are mandatory for compliance with the Snyderville Basin General Plan and Development Code.

“Community-wide Trails” are defined in the Recreation and Trails Master Plan as follows: *“A trail shown, developed or proposed as part of the Community-wide Trails Corridor Exhibit to this [Recreation and Trails] Master Plan, as revised over time, and generally designed for intrinsic recreation and non-motorized transportation connections throughout the Snyderville Basin. Community trails must be open to the public.”*

By comparison, a “Neighborhood Trail” is defined as “A trail proposed or developed by a developer, neighborhood or homeowners association to serve the residents and guests within a development or neighborhood.”

Finally, the Recreation and Trails Master Plan defines a “Trailhead” as follows: *“Designated area(s) along the Community-wide trail corridor used to accommodate off street parking. Trailheads function as a point of staging, departure and return for trail users and generally incorporate trail map displays and directional signage. Where appropriate, support facilities such as resting places, restrooms and fountains may be provided.”* The Master Plan also states *“Trailheads are an important component of community trail system improvements. Trailheads in several locations throughout the Snyderville Basin are necessary to disperse users and their impacts throughout the system, thereby maximizing user experience.”* Neighborhood trailheads are stated as one of many types of recreation facilities that satisfy the definition of “neighborhood recreation” in the Master Plan, but neighborhood trailheads are not owned, managed or maintained by the Recreation District. The SBSRD does not typically develop or accept “Neighborhood Parks” because they are too expensive to own, operate, and/or maintain.

D. General Plan Consistency

Chapter 1, Section 1, “Quality and Character” of the Snyderville Basin General Plan states; *There must be a strong public realm, which should act as the connective tissue of our everyday world. This realm includes those pieces of terrain that occur between the private domains in our community. It exists in the form of streets, highways, public open spaces and gathering areas, trails, and public facilities and institutions. These features comprise an important part of our everyday life. The historic natural landscape of the Snyderville Basin must be integrated into the public realm and preserved for the common good.*

There are other numerous mentions of support for trails in the Snyderville Basin General Plan. The proposed amendments promote the concepts, ideals, and policies of the Snyderville Basin General Plan.

E. Findings/Code Criteria and Discussion

Before an amendment to the Development Code can be approved, it must be reviewed in compliance with Section 10-7-3-C and meet the following criteria:

1. The amendment shall be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan.
The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan. The proposed amendment promotes utilization of trails in the community.
2. The amendment shall not permit the use of land that is not consistent with the uses of properties nearby.
The proposed amendments will not permit uses that are inconsistent with existing trail uses, as the amendments aim to address the trail parking needs for the community.
3. The amendment will not permit suitability of the properties affected by the proposed amendment for the uses to which they have been restricted.
The proposed amendments will comply with the existing uses.
4. The amendment will not permit the removal of the then existing restrictions which will unduly affect nearby property.
The proposed amendments will add and set standards for trailheads which did not exist previously. These standards would specifically reduce chances of potential negative impacts by reducing on-street parking in neighborhoods.
5. The amendment will not grant special favors or circumstances solely for one property owner or developer.
The amendments are being proposed by the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District for Basin trail users as a whole and the purpose is not to grant a special favor for one landowner or developer. Additionally, the proposed standards would be used in any future developments that are required to promote community benefits such as trails and trailheads.
6. The amendment will promote the public health, safety and welfare better than the existing regulations for which the amendment is intended to change.
The amendments will better serve the public in allowing access to all the trails and reducing on-street parking impacts.

F. Recommendation(s)/Alternatives

SBPC recommended that the SCC evaluate the proposed Code Amendments in accordance with the Snyderville Basin Development Code and the Snyderville Basin General Plan. SBPC further recommended that the SCC hold a public hearing to gather public comment, consider Staff's analysis and vote to approve the proposed amendments as referenced in Exhibits B and C with the findings below:

Findings:

1. The amendments are consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan.
2. The amendments will not permit the use of land that is not consistent with the uses of properties nearby.
3. The amendments will not permit suitability of the properties affected by the proposed amendment for the uses to which they have been restricted.
4. The amendments will not permit the removal of the then existing restrictions which will unduly affect nearby property.

5. The amendments will not grant special favors or circumstances solely for one property owner or developer.
6. The amendments will promote the public health, safety and welfare better than the existing regulations for which the amendment is intended to change.

Attachment(s):

Exhibit A – SBSRD Request Memo & Original Proposed Language

Exhibit B – 2011 Code Amendments as approved by the Summit County Council (Ordinance 764)

Exhibit C – Recommended Language with Changes Shown

Exhibit D – Recommended Language CLEAN

Exhibit E – Draft Ordinance 777

Exhibit F – Language proposed by Yvonne and Don Gray

*Exhibit G – Draft minutes from May 8, 2012, June 12, 2012, July 17, 2012, and July 31, 2012
SBPC public hearing*



STAFF MEMO

To: Snyderville Basin Planning Commission
From: Bonnie Park, Public Affairs Manager
Subject: Code Amendment to provide for Trailheads
Date: May 1, 2012

Summary Request

To reconsider the definition of "Trailhead Parking, Designated," Snyderville Basin Development Code 10-11-1.323, and set forth parameters of the process in the Code through which public trailhead parking and support facilities may be improved.

Background:

For many years references to trailheads have been cited in planning documents governing the Snyderville Basin that contemplate the need for trailheads to serve the Community-wide trail system.

The Snyderville Basin General Plan Policy 8.6 states: **Provide adequate regional and local trailheads with parking at appropriate location, maintaining harmony with neighborhood goals.**

The Snyderville Basin Recreation and Trails Master Plan is the "Recreation Element" of the Snyderville Basin General Plan. This "Recreation Element" was last amended and adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2006. Section 3.1.1.1. of the Master Plan states the following:

Community Trailheads. Trailheads are an important component of community trail system improvements. Trailheads in several locations throughout the Snyderville Basin are necessary to disperse users and their impacts throughout the system, thereby maximizing user experience.

In the District's Parks, Recreation and Trails Capital Facility Plan, April 2006, it states:

The District will identify the trailhead location that will serve each new trail segment, or consider the need for development of a new trailhead. One operational aspect of trailhead development is to reduce concentrated trail use, thereby maximizing user experience, minimizing user conflict, and reducing tread wear.

In a Recreation Facility Demand study completed by Zions Bank Public Finance for Park City Municipal and Basin Recreation in February, 2012, the following was reported:

Trailhead parking and support facilities such as map boards, dog waste stations, wildlife education and directional signage have generally lagged behind trail development, particularly in the Snyderville Basin. Designated trailheads that include sufficient parking based on the popularity of the system should be identified and improved to disperse users and fulfill the need for staging areas and support facilities system wide. Restrooms and water fountains, where feasible, contribute to an improved trail user experience and higher level of service for residents and visitors. Differing use patterns in summer and winter should be considered in the development of trailhead facilities. Experiential knowledge indicates peak demand periods often vary by season as winter trail grooming expands. As additional trail system development is fostered through the acquisition of recreational open space, designated access points to these expanded areas must be planned.

In May of 2010, the Basin Recreation District submitted a Development Code Amendment Application to address the definition of "Trailhead" and to specify the process under which Trailhead facilities would be approved in the Snyderville Basin.

On September 14, 2011, the Summit County Council approved ordinance No. 764, amending the Snyderville Basin Development Code, and providing this definition for Trailhead Parking:

10-11-1.323 Trailhead Parking, Designated: Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide public parking stalls.

Along with codifying the above definition, the Use Chart was amended to process trailhead parking as a CUP in the Rural Residential, Hillside Stewardship and Mountain Remote zones, and as an allowed use in all three commercial zones.

Discussion:

In Code section 10-4-9 (B) the objective is to provide only the amount of parking that is actually needed for a particular use or type of use approved in a development, and parking standards are set forth to be used by the County as guidelines for parking development. For example, one parking space per studio/efficiency dwelling unit, plus

one guest parking space for every five (5) units establishes a standardized way to calculate parking for that type of residential use.

It is difficult to set a “standard” trailhead parking requirement under section 10-4-9 of the code due to the variable nature of trailhead parking demand, its use and location. For this reason, we believe the number of parking spaces should be established as a part of the CUP review and approval, with consideration for:

- Popularity of the trail system at a given time of day, and/or day of the week;
- Popularity of the trail system, recognizing that parking demand may vary by season of year;
- Connectivity from one trailhead to the greater system;
- The number of other trailheads that support that system to disperse user access;
- Suitability of parking in the public road right-of-way if a trailhead is under-parked, especially with respect to winter snow removal activity.

On September 19th, 2011 the District submitted CUP applications for two trailhead projects in order to provide off-road parking for the winter grooming program at the end of Highland Drive (Silver Quinn Trailhead) for access to the popular Round Valley system where street parking had become an issue with the neighborhood, and along the Utah Olympic Parkway to serve the Nordic 5K loop completed in the fall of 2011 within the Kimball Junction open space.

Recreation District and County Planning staff recognized that processing trailheads as a “parking lot” whereby all parking requirements are to be met under Code section 10-4-9 created unintended consequences.

For example, in response to the Olympic Parkway Trailhead application, the planning staff requested the following:

All parking requirements should be met. Please review the parking requirements section of the Snyderville Basin Development Code (10-4-9) and include/summarize as many of those details as possible.

REQUIRED SETBACKS:

- (1) *Thirty (30) feet from road rights-of-way, except for a property access driveway;*
- (2) *Thirty (30) feet from side and rear property lines;*
- (3) *Ten (10) feet from the facade of a structure.*

The unintended consequences arise when the setback from the road and other parking lot design criteria push the trailhead parking further into adjacent open space, raising the following points for discussion:

- Do setbacks from the road make a trailhead more impactful to adjacent open space and, in some locations, more visible in the viewshed?
- How are setbacks from the open space itself to be determined?
- Is there a need for a through circulation pattern if a trailhead includes more than ten parking stalls?
- Does it make sense that 15% of the internal portion of the trailhead parking lot be landscaped, especially in areas adjacent to open space?

- Is there a need for snow storage areas to be equal to 10% of the uncovered parking lot surface area in areas adjacent to open space?

Rather than create the need to seek setback variances with the BOA for trailheads based on the design criteria under section 10-4-9, the District believes it makes more sense to establish design criteria specific to Trailheads under 10-4-17, and allow the CUP process to guide the final design in the HS, RR, and MR zones.

Therefore, it is suggested that the Planning Commission consider the merits of processing Trailheads according to amendments proposed in section 10-4-17 of the code, "Parks and Trails."

The Recreation District does not want to be at cross purposes with open space preservation in trying to plan for trailhead parking where trails exist in recreational open space or in conflict with neighborhoods in residential areas. Clear guidelines for process in the Code are needed to provide adequate trailhead parking and support facilities to serve the users of the expanding community-wide trail system. In addition, some homeowners associations will have a similar need for a defined process to provide trailheads to serve their own neighborhood trail systems.

Summary Recommendation:

In work session discussion consider how the nature of Trailheads may differ from the parking lot standards in section 10-4-9 of the Code and review proposed amendments to 10-4-17, 10-4-19 (K) and 10-11-1.323.

ATTACHMENTS FOLLOW (1)

10-4-17

10-4-18

10-4-19

10-4-17: PARKS AND TRAILS:

- A. Required: All development shall provide neighborhood park facilities in a manner that is sufficient to meet the specific recreational demands that will be generated by a development. In certain instances, cash in lieu of land and facilities may be permitted.
- B. Compliance with Standards: Neighborhood recreational land (parks), facilities and trails, when provided, shall be in compliance with applicable standards of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District.
- C. Maintenance: The long term care of neighborhood recreation lands (parks) and facilities shall be the responsibility of the developer or a homeowners'/property owners' association.
- D. Impacts Mitigated: A development shall mitigate its impacts on the community park and trail system of the Snyderville Basin in a manner consistent with this Title and the General Plan. (Ord. 323, 3-9-1998; amd. 2004 Code; Ord 328, 6-8-1998; amd 4-19-2006)
- E. Trailheads: The specific amount of parking required within "Trailhead Parking, Designated" shall be established as follows and subject to the design criteria identified in this section.
1. Within NC, CC, and SC zone districts, as determined by review of the proximity of new or existing development to the Community-wide trail system. New development includes expansion of existing commercial, office and industrial uses within these zones. Where suitable, other trail system support functions identified in 10-11-1.323 shall be allowed.
 2. Within a SPA plan, town or resort center joint parking opportunities shall be taken into consideration as a community benefit, with a provision for other trail system support functions identified in 10-11-1.323.
 3. Within the public road right-of-way in any zone district, as permitted through the Summit County Engineers Office.
 - i. Parking in the road right-of-way may be designed parallel to the curb or with a parking angle of up to 90 degrees.
 4. Within RR, HS and MR zone districts, the specific amount of parking required within an area designated as a Trailhead shall be established by the adopted CUP plan and subject to the following design criteria:
 - i. Trailhead parking setbacks shall be established as follows, or by the conditions set at the time of CUP approval:
 1. Setback to road right-of-way: 10 feet
 2. Setback to preserved open space: None

- 3. Setback to undeveloped off parcel: None
- 4. Setback to undeveloped lot of record: 10 feet
- 5. Set back to platted residential lot line: 15 feet
- ii. If Trailhead parking is provided for 20 vehicles or less, a through circulation pattern shall not be required.
- iii. The 15% landscape requirement is waived where trailhead parking is bordered on any side by recreational open space so that impact to the open space is minimized. Native, drought tolerant plants shall be specified in disturbed areas requiring re-vegetation.
- iv. Parking surfaces may be pervious or impervious as specified on the site plan and approved by the Summit County Engineer.
- v. Concrete blocks, boulders, wood posts and rope or other appropriate fencing will ensure that no part of a vehicle shall extend over or beyond a property line or into open space.
- vi. Fencing is appropriate in those areas it is determined that a need for established trailhead boundaries exists. Fencing shall be compatible with the surroundings. Railings constructed with pressure-treated lumber or recycled products that are natural in color are acceptable.
- vii. The privacy of those occupying adjacent sites may be protected through setbacks, buffering, screening or structural elements, and other design tactics specified in the CUP.
- viii. Restroom facilities. In certain instances due to the remote proximity of utility infrastructure to service trailheads, "green restrooms" and temporary facilities are an allowed use for reasons of public health, safety and welfare.
- ix. Where suitable, other trail system support functions identified in 10-11-1.323 shall be allowed as approved in the CUP.

10-4-18: ADA ACCESS:

All buildings intended for public use shall be accessible to the disabled, as per the requirements of the International Building Code and the Americans With Disabilities Act, as amended. (Ord. 323, 3-9-1998; amd. 2004 Code)

10-4-19: SPECIAL SITE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS:

The criteria in this Section serve the public interest by requiring that the design of developments in the Snyderville Basin be compatible with the natural, rural characteristics of their setting and with the image of the area which helps to support its resort economy. The design policies also help to reduce the potential for land use conflicts by encouraging the protection of privacy and of scenic views.

- A. **Integration of Development:** Development in the Snyderville Basin shall be integrated in a manner that is consistent with the General Plan to promote more

10-6-2
 10-6-3
 10-6-4

- E. Utilities, including water and sewerage service;
- F. Roads or road improvements, both public and private;
- G. School bus turnaround, shelters and related features;
- H. Required street and intersection lighting;
- I. All road identification and traffic control devices;
- J. Curbing and gutters, and sidewalks, if required by the County Manager;
- K. Trails and Trailheads;
- L. Parking and loading areas;
- M. Recreational facilities, including parks and/or other amenities represented by the applicant; and
- N. All community benefits proposed by the applicant in exchange for density incentives through an approved SPA plan. (Ord. 323, 3-9-1998)

10-6-3: PHASING:

For site plan improvements, installation may be phased in accord with an approved phasing plan submitted with the application for a building permit and approved by the County Manager. In subdivisions, a separate final plat or site plan shall be filed on each phase of the development. (Ord. 323, 3-9-1998)

10-6-4: FINANCING:

Installation of the improvements required in a development or development phase may be guaranteed by:

- A. Installation of all required and represented improvements with an approved improvement agreement, as provided in Section 10-6-8 of this Chapter, prior to the filing of a final plat or final site plan; or
- B. Provision of security for installation of improvements as provided in Section 10-6-8 of this Chapter. (Ord. 323, 3-9-1998)

maintain the aesthetics of Summit County. A flush wall mount antenna that is painted the same color as the background and located on a building where the telecommunications equipment is located inside the building would be one example of stealth design. Other examples of stealth design include, but are not limited to, roof mount antennas, utility pole antennas, light or flag poles, artificial rocks or trees.

- 10-11-1.319 **Temporary Use:** A use intended for a limited duration
- 10-11-1.320 **Timeshare Development:** An enterprise that has as its primary purpose the offering of a timeshare interest. "Timeshare interest" means a right to occupy accommodations during three or more separate time periods over a period of at least three years, including renewal options, whether or not coupled with an estate in land, and including what is commonly known as a "timeshare estate," which is a small undivided fractional fee interest in real property by which the purchaser does not receive any right to use accommodations except as provided by contract, declaration, or other instrument defining a legal right.
- 10-11-1.321 **Total Permissible Dwelling Units or Square Footage:** The total density or intensity of a project computed pursuant to the provisions of this Title.
- 10-11-1.322 **Trails, Neighborhood:** A trail proposed by or developed by a developer, neighborhood or homeowners association to serve the residents and guests within a development or neighborhood.
- 10-11-1.323: **Trailhead Parking, Designated:** Designated point of access to the Community-wide or neighborhood trail systems intended to provide public parking stalls and may include information kiosks, directional signage, restrooms, dog waste stations, trash and recycling receptacles, bike racks, hitching posts, pavilions, benches, water fountains, play features, pump parks, public art, and other design elements intended to enhance the trail user experience, subject to design guidelines in section 10-4-17.
- 10-11-1.324: **Trails, Community-wide:** A trail, developed or proposed as part of the Basin-wide Trails Corridor Exhibit of the Recreation and Trails Master Plan, as revised over time, and generally designed for intrinsic recreation and non-motorized transportation connections between neighborhoods, public facilities, commercial centers and to the back-country. Community trails must be open to the public. Parking areas shall be designated at trailheads along the Community wide trail system to disperse users and fulfill the need for staging areas and support facilities system wide in accordance

SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
ORDINANCE NO. 764

AMENDING THE SNYDERVILLE BASIN DEVELOPMENT CODE

WHEREAS, the current Snyderville Basin Development Code was adopted in 2004; and

WHEREAS, in May, 2010, the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District applied for an amendment to update and clarify the approval process for trailhead parking; and

WHEREAS, Staff recommended the inclusion of additional amendments pertaining to parking lots; and

WHEREAS, the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission held public hearings on June 8, 2010, and July 13, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission recommended the amended sections of the Snyderville Basin Development Code on July 13, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Summit County Council held a public hearing on August 24, 2011 and September 7, 2011, also including amendments pertaining to Parks and Park and Rides; and

WHEREAS, the Summit County Council continued the decision to September 14, 2011, and voted to approve the amendments.

NOW THEREFORE, the Legislative Body of the County of Summit, the State of Utah, hereby ordains the following:

Section 1. SNYDERVILLE BASIN DEVELOPMENT CODE

The Snyderville Basin Development Code is amended as depicted in Exhibit A.

Section 2. Effective Date

This Ordinance shall take effect fifteen (15) days after the date of its publication.

APPROVE, ADOPTED, AND PASSED and ordered published by the Summit County Council, this 14th day of September, 2011.

SUMMIT COUNTY COUNCIL
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH

By: Christopher F. Robinson
Christopher Robinson, Chair

Councilor Hanrahan voted	<u> aye </u>
Councilor McMullin voted	<u> aye </u>
Councilor Elliott voted	<u>absent</u>
Councilor Ure voted	<u> aye </u>
Councilor Robinson voted	<u> aye </u>

EXHIBIT A

~~10-11-1.217 Parks, Community: A park and recreation area under the management and control of a public agency and open to the public.~~

~~10-11-1.218 Parks, Neighborhood: A park and recreation area under the management and control of a public agency and open to the public.~~

10-11-1.217 Park and Ride: A hard-surfaced area, including the driving area, other than a road or public right-of-way, located adjacent to an arterial or collector road, to be used primarily for commuters and other public to park and transfer to a public transport system, carpool, or other mode of transportation.

10-11-1.218 Parks: A park and recreation area under the management and control of a public agency and open to the public, or under the management and control of a neighborhood or commercial owners association that may or may not be open to the public.

~~10-11-1.219 Parking Area: A hard-surfaced area, including the driving area, other than a road or public right of way, to be used for storage, temporarily, of operable passenger automobiles and commercial vehicles, and available to the public, whether for compensation, free, or as an accommodation to clients or customers.~~

~~10-11-1.323 Trails, Community-wide: A trail, developed or proposed as part of the Basin-wide Trails Corridor Exhibit of the Recreation and Trails Master Plan, as revised over time, and generally designed for intrinsic recreation and non-motorized transportation connections between neighborhoods. Community trails must be open to the public.~~

10-11-1.323 Trailhead Parking, Designated: Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide public parking stalls.

Note - all definitions from here to the end of the definition section will increase in number by one.

10-11-1.324 Trails, Community-wide: A trail, developed or proposed as part of the Basin-wide Trails Corridor Exhibit of the Recreation and Trails Master Plan, as revised over time, and generally designed for intrinsic recreation and non-motorized transportation connections between neighborhoods, public facilities, commercial centers and to the back-country. Community trails must be open to the public. Parking areas shall be designated at trailheads along the Community wide trail system to disperse users and fulfill the need for staging areas and support facilities system wide in accordance with the Snyderville Basin Recreation and Trails Master as amended.

10-2-10 Use Chart

Note - only these sections will change, and the remainder of the Use Chart will remain the same.

USE	RR	HS	MR	CC	SC	NC	Additional Reference
Park and Ride	C	C	C	L	L	L	
Parks	C	C	C	A	A	A	
Parks constructed by SBSRD in accordance with the General Plan	L	L	L	L	L	L	Section 10-4-17
Trailhead Parking, Designated	C	C	C	A	A	A	
Trails, Community-wide	A	A	A	A	A	A	

SECTION 10-4-17 CHANGES

10-4-17: PARKS, ~~AND TRAILS~~, AND TRAILHEADS:

- A. Required: All development shall provide neighborhood park facilities in a manner that is sufficient to meet the specific recreational demands that will be generated by a development. In certain instances, cash in lieu of land and facilities may be permitted.
- B. Compliance with Standards: Neighborhood recreational land (parks), facilities and trails, when provided, shall be in compliance with applicable standards of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District.
- C. Maintenance: The long term care of neighborhood recreation lands (parks) and facilities shall be the responsibility of the developer or a homeowners'/property owners' association.
- D. Impacts Mitigated: A development shall mitigate its impacts on the community park and trail system of the Snyderville Basin in a manner consistent with this Title and the General Plan. (Ord. 323, 3-9-1998; amd. 2004 Code)

E. Trailheads: The specific amount of parking required within "Trailhead Parking, Designated," shall be established by the adopted Conditional Use Permit or Low Impact Permit and subject to the following standards:

1. Trailhead parking setbacks:

a. Ten (10) feet from the edge of a public or private right-of-way.

b. Side and Rear Setbacks: Ten (10) feet from the side and rear property lines.

c. Ten (10) feet from the façade of a structure.

d. Adjacent to preserved open space: No setbacks required.

2. If trailhead parking is provided for 20 vehicles or less, a through circulation pattern shall not be required.

3. At least 15% of the internal portion of the trailhead shall be landscaped using natural landscape elements, unless the trailhead is adjacent to preserved open space, in which case the landscape requirement shall be waived.

4. Parking in the road right-of-way may be permitted with approval from the Summit County Engineering Department, in which case the setbacks and

landscaping requirements would not be applicable. Parking may be designed parallel to the curb or with a parking angle of up to 90 degrees.

- a. Parking surfaces may be pervious or impervious as specified on the site plan and approved by the Summit County Engineering Department.
- b. Concrete blocks, boulders, wood posts and rope or other appropriate fencing shall be installed to ensure that no part of a vehicle shall extend over or beyond a property line or into preserved open space.
- c. If fencing is found to be appropriate to enclose the boundaries of the established trailhead, it shall be compatible with the surrounding environment.
- d. All Trailhead, Designated, Major parking shall be designed with a through circulation pattern, unless there is suitable turnaround space at the end of the parking area. While in certain instances on street parking will be permitted, public roads shall not be used as part of a parking lot circulation pattern or require ingress and egress from the lot to a road by forward motion of the vehicle.

F. Pedestrian Non-motorized Trail Systems:

1. Pedestrian walkways or non-motorized trails shall be provided within a development as recommended by the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District and or Summit County Engineering Department to serve the needs generated by the development.
2. In the event a community wide trail as identified on the Master Trails Plan adopted by the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District, is located on a development parcel, the County may pursuant to the provisions of Utah Code Ann. §17-27a-507, require as part of the development approval that the proportional share of the community-wide trail system running through their site be provided by the developer as a condition of approval. . The proportional share may be provided by deed, easements or rights-of-way for the community-wide public trail system managed by the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District. When new development applications require community benefits in exchange for increased density as a condition of approval, trail dedication and/or construction will qualify in the criteria to be considered. Trail construction shall be consistent with the design guidelines of the Snyderville Basin Recreation District and the Snyderville Basin Trails Master Plan and Communitywide Trail System Development Standards.
3. Developments shall connect an internal trail system to community-wide

trail systems where possible. The space dedicated in trails may be included in the calculation of the open space, as otherwise provided in this Title.

10-11-1 DEFINITION CHANGES

~~10-11-1.323: **Trailhead Parking, Designated:** Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide public parking stalls.~~

10-11-1.323: **Trailhead, Designated, Minor:** Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide public parking stalls and may include information kiosks, signage, dog waste stations, trash and recycling receptacles.

10-11-1.324: **Trailhead, Designated, Major:** Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide public parking stalls and may include information kiosks, directional signage, restrooms, dog waste stations, trash and recycling receptacles, bike racks, hitching posts, pavilions less than, benches, water fountains, and public art.

10-2-10 USE CHART CHANGES

USE	RR	HS	MR	CC	SC	NC	Additional Reference
Trailhead Parking, Designated	C	C	C	A	A	A	

<u>USE</u>	<u>RR</u>	<u>HS</u>	<u>MR</u>	<u>CC</u>	<u>SC</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>Additional Reference</u>
<u>Trailhead, Designated, Minor (up to 10 parking stalls)</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	
<u>Trailhead, Designated, within 300 feet of a residential parcel</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	
<u>Trailhead, Designated, Major (more than 10 parking stalls)</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	

A - Allowed
 L – Low Impact Permit
 C – Conditional Use Permit

SECTION 10-4-10(M) CHANGES— MOVED TO SECTION 10-4-17 WITH REVISIONS
AS ADVISED BY THE ATTORNEY’S OFFICE

~~Pedestrian Non-motorized Trail Systems~~

- ~~1. Pedestrian walkways or non-motorized trails shall be provided as recommended by the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District and or Summit County Engineering Department.~~
- ~~2. Developments shall provide portions of the communitywide trails system running through their site. Trail construction shall be consistent with the design guidelines of the Snyderville Basin Recreation District and the Snyderville Basin Trails Master Plan and Communitywide Trail System Development Standards.~~
- ~~3. Developments shall connect an internal trail system to communitywide trail systems where possible. The space dedicated in trails may be included in the calculation of the open space, as otherwise provided in this Title.~~

10-4-17: PARKS, TRAILS, AND TRAILHEADS:

- A. Required: All development shall provide neighborhood park facilities in a manner that is sufficient to meet the specific recreational demands that will be generated by a development. In certain instances, cash in lieu of land and facilities may be permitted.
- B. Compliance with Standards: Neighborhood recreational land (parks), facilities and trails, when provided, shall be in compliance with applicable standards of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District.
- C. Maintenance: The long term care of neighborhood recreation lands (parks) and facilities shall be the responsibility of the developer or a homeowners'/property owners' association.
- D. Impacts Mitigated: A development shall mitigate its impacts on the community park and trail system of the Snyderville Basin in a manner consistent with this Title and the General Plan. (Ord. 323, 3-9-1998; amd. 2004 Code)
- E. Trailheads: The specific amount of parking required within "Trailhead Parking, Designated," shall be established by the adopted Conditional Use Permit or Low Impact Permit and subject to the following standards:
 - 1. Trailhead parking setbacks:
 - a. Ten (10) feet from the edge of a public or private right-of-way.
 - b. Side and Rear Setbacks: Ten (10) feet from the side and rear property lines.
 - c. Ten (10) feet from the façade of a structure.
 - d. Adjacent to preserved open space: No setbacks required.
 - 2. If trailhead parking is provided for 20 vehicles or less, a through circulation pattern shall not be required.
 - 3. At least 15% of the internal portion of the trailhead shall be landscaped using natural landscape elements, unless the trailhead is adjacent to preserved open space, in which case the landscape requirement shall be waived.
 - 4. Parking in the road right-of-way may be permitted with approval from the Summit County Engineering Department, in which case the setbacks and landscaping requirements would not be applicable. Parking may be designed parallel to the curb or with a parking angle of up to 90 degrees.

- a. Parking surfaces may be pervious or impervious as specified on the site plan and approved by the Summit County Engineering Department.
- b. Concrete blocks, boulders, wood posts and rope or other appropriate fencing shall be installed to ensure that no part of a vehicle shall extend over or beyond a property line or into preserved open space.
- c. If fencing is found to be appropriate to enclose the boundaries of the established trailhead, it shall be compatible with the surrounding environment.
- d. All Trailhead, Designated, Major parking shall be designed with a through circulation pattern, unless there is suitable turnaround space at the end of the parking area. While in certain instances on street parking will be permitted, public roads shall not be used as part of a parking lot circulation pattern or require ingress and egress from the lot to a road by forward motion of the vehicle.

F. Pedestrian Non-motorized Trail Systems:

1. Pedestrian walkways or non-motorized trails shall be provided within a development as recommended by the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District and or Summit County Engineering Department to serve the needs generated by the development.
2. In the event a community wide trail as identified on the Master Trails Plan adopted by the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District, is located on a development parcel, the County may pursuant to the provisions of Utah Code Ann. §17-27a-507, require as part of the development approval that the proportional share of the community-wide trail system running through their site be provided by the developer as a condition of approval. . The proportional share may be provided by deed, easements or rights-of-way for the community-wide public trail system managed by the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District. When new development applications require community benefits in exchange for increased density as a condition of approval, trail dedication and/or construction will qualify in the criteria to be considered. Trail construction shall be consistent with the design guidelines of the Snyderville Basin Recreation District and the Snyderville Basin Trails Master Plan and Communitywide Trail System Development Standards.
3. Developments shall connect an internal trail system to community-wide trail systems where possible. The space dedicated in trails may be included in the calculation of the open space, as otherwise provided in this

Title.

10-11-1 DEFINITIONS

10-11-1.323: **Trailhead, Designated, Minor:** Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide public parking stalls and may include information kiosks, signage, dog waste stations, trash and recycling receptacles,

10-11-1.324: **Trailhead, Designated, Major:** Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide public parking stalls and may include information kiosks, directional signage, restrooms, dog waste stations, trash and recycling receptacles, bike racks, hitching posts, pavilions less than, benches, water fountains, and public art.

USE CHART

USE	RR	HS	MR	CC	SC	NC	Additional Reference
Trailhead, Designated, Minor (up to 10 parking stalls)	L	L	L	A	A	A	
Trailhead, Designated, within 300 feet of a residential parcel	C	C	C	A	A	A	
Trailhead, Designated, Major (more than 10 parking stalls)	C	C	C	A	A	A	

A - Allowed

L – Low Impact Permit

C – Conditional Use Permit

SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
ORDINANCE # 777

AMENDING SECTIONS 10-4-17 (PARKS & TRAILS), 10-4-10 (TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE AND ACCESS DESIGN), 10-2-10 (USE TABLE), AND 10-11-1 (DEFINITIONS) OF THE SNYDERVILLE BASIN DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR THE ADDITION OF “TRAILHEAD” DESIGN STANDARDS

WHEREAS, the current Snyderville Basin Development Code was adopted in 2004; and

WHEREAS, in April 2012, the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District applied for an amendment to update and clarify the approval process for trailhead parking; and

WHEREAS, Staff recommended the inclusion of additional amendments pertaining to parking lots; and

WHEREAS, the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission conducted meetings on May 8, 2012, June 12, 2012, July 17, 2012, and July 31, 2012 in an effort to define the trailhead design standards, trailhead definitions, and chart of allowed uses; and

WHEREAS, The Summit County Council has conducted a public hearing to consider the merits of the proposed amendments;

NOW THEREFORE, the Legislative Body of Summit County, Utah, hereby ordains the following:

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO SECTIONS SECTIONS 10-4-17 (PARKS & TRAILS), 10-4-10 (TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE AND ACCESS DESIGN), 10-2-10 (USE TABLE), AND 10-11-1 (DEFINITIONS) OF THE SNYDERVILLE BASIN DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR THE ADDITION OF “TRAILHEAD” DESIGN STANDARDS (attached as Exhibits B and C of the Staff Report dated August 16, 2012):

The Summit County Council, acting in its legislative capacity, hereby approves the proposed amendments to Sections 10-4-17 (Parks and Trails), 10-4-10 (Transportation Infrastructure and Access Design), 10-2-10 (Use Table), and 10-11-1 (Definitions) of the Snyderville Basin Development Code.

SECTION 2. EFFECTIVE DATE:

This Ordinance shall take effect fifteen (15) days after the date of its publication.

APPROVED, ADOPTED, AND PASSED and ordered published by the Summit County Council, this 22ND day of August, 2012.

SUMMIT COUNTY COUNCIL
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH

By: _____
David Ure, Council Chair

Council Member Elliott voted _____
Council Member Robinson voted _____
Council Member McMullin voted _____
Council Member Ure voted _____
Council Member Hanrahan voted _____

ATTEST:

County Clerk, Summit County, Utah

10-11-1.323: Trailhead Parking, Designated: Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide public parking stalls and may include information kiosks, directional signage, restrooms, dog waste stations, trash and recycling receptacles, bike racks, hitching posts, pavilions less than 600 sq. ft., benches, water fountains, and public art.

MAJOR VS. MINOR DEFINITIONS:

Trailhead Designated, Minor: Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide up to ten (10) public parking stalls, information kiosks, ~~trailhead directional~~ signage and dog waste stations, and trash and recycling receptacles on lots of any size.

Trailhead Designated, Major: Designated point of access to the Community-wide trail system intended to provide more than ten (10) public parking stalls and which may include, or which includes structures beyond those included in Trailhead Designated, Minor on lots totaling no less than two acres.

Comment [z1]: Two-acres is a practical design minimum for including structures beyond those included in Minor trailheads.

USE CHART:

USE	RR	HS	MR	CC	SC	NC	Additional Reference
Trailhead, Designated, Minor	L	L	L	L	L	L	
Trailhead, Designated, Major or any Trailhead within 300 feet of a residential parcel	C	C	C	C	C	C	

road, draw the entrance more toward the center of the building, and bring down the scale of the building. He also suggested that they hip the big gable over the main structure to help the scale of the building and work with the height of the wainscot. He recalled that someone referred to a wind consideration on the bus shelters and stated that he had not seen anything defining how they would protect someone from a horizontal snowstorm. The consultant explained that they contemplate a glass panel on the back side of the canopy and are talking about whether to put panels on the sides. Planner Slaght explained that they also talked about berming on the west side to break up the wind as it comes from the west.

Planner Slaght asked if the Planning Commissioners would prefer to see something other than a farmer's market proposed for the plaza space. Vice Chair Taylor stated that the Planning Commissioners seem to be pleased with a public space that is contiguous.

Commissioner Kingston asked when the public would get to see this. Planner Slaght replied that the next time it comes to the Planning Commission the public will be invited to give input.

2. **Discussion to amend the Snyderville Basin Development Code to clarify parking requirements at public trailheads; Bonnie Park, representative for Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District – Amir Caus, County Planner**

County Planner Amir Caus presented the staff report and explained that the Recreation District is requesting input from the Planning Commission on proposed amendments to the Development Code regarding the definition of trailhead parking. In 2011, the Recreation District proposed amendments that identified trailheads and trailhead parking, which were previously not identified in the Code and by default were not allowed. Final language was adopted in September 2011, but an unintended consequence was parking requirements, and the applicants are asking for additional amendments to address their concerns. He clarified that the memorandum is from Planning Staff, and the exhibits are from the applicants. The document entitled Staff Memo is actually from the Recreation District staff, not Planning Staff.

Bonnie Park, representing the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District, explained that they discovered when the Summit Park open space land was purchased that they did not have a process in place to have trailheads processed and approved. They are looking at this as a problem-solving effort to determine how to best process trailheads, knowing that there are unique constraints wherever they are placed. When they went through the process last year, a condition was included allowing a maximum of 10 parking stalls on any trailhead. However, they already had trailheads in place with more than 10 parking stalls. They realized that many trailheads, by virtue of their popularity, need to have adequate parking. She explained that they have acquired trailheads over time through the development approval process. However, they are all illegal, non-conforming uses, because nothing in the Code provided for them. She prevented photographs and provided background on various trailheads that have been previously developed in the Snyderville Basin. She also provided examples of trailhead sites where they have been unable to obtain a permit. She commented that they have an amazing trail system, and trailhead parking goes along with having an amazing trail system. She noted that they have written some suggested Code language and are looking for a clear definition for trailheads and, rather than processing them as parking lots, they would like to include language in the parks and trails language in the Code to address trailhead development.

Vice Chair Taylor asked if members of the public would like to address the Planning Commission on this issue. Commissioner Franklin noted that the Planning Commission bylaws state that no public input is to be taken in work sessions. Vice Chair Taylor stated that Commissioner Franklin's objection has been duly noted, but he would defer to the published agenda which states that public comment may or may not be taken since that is the information provided to the public.

Don Gray stated that he lives in Summit Park next to a trailhead, and he has struggled for a couple of years to figure out why they are always here answering requests for more changes to the Code. On October 7, the County Council explicitly agreed that the trailhead parking on the right-of-way was an appropriate use in the Rural Residential, Hillside Stewardship, and Mountain Remote Zones. He asked why that does not apply to other zones. If this were put into

place for the trailhead he lives next to, it would be devastating to everything they have tried to stop. He explained that it is a very small trailhead, and the parking spaces are on the right-of-way. That was approved by the Council last year, so he did not understand why there is a need for an amendment. In this one instance they are looking at a 10-foot setback, which would change things quite a bit. He also did not understand why a definition was approved by the Council only seven months ago, and now they are trying to get a new definition that includes everything for a community park, up to pavilions. He stated that they have been dealing with the parking issue for a while, and it does not make sense why they would be interested in approving a definition of trailhead parking to include everything that a community park would have.

Yvonne Gray clarified that the current parking works very well, and they love living next to the trail. The problem was when they made parking stalls inside the acre lot, and all the cars were suddenly her neighbors. She stated that this is an old issue they have already been through, and she wanted to be sure there is no misunderstanding about the parking as it currently exists.

Commissioner Klingenstein commented that when he read the definition, it looked like they were throwing in everything but the kitchen sink. If they want to create a park, there should be a process for a park that is differentiated from a trailhead. He could understand having restrooms and a kiosk, but play features, pump parks, and public art seem to cross into the realm of a park. He suggested that they tighten up the definition to a trailhead and its attendant needs which, because of the Conditional Use Permit (CUP), will vary by site. If he were living next door to a parking lot, it would get to management issues and screening issues. He confirmed with Ms. Park that the CUP process would allow them to determine whether the parking area would be a pervious or impervious surface. He noted that trailhead parking is allowed in the commercial zones, but there are some residential uses in those zones. He believed it should be a conditional use in all zones, because they are looking for more mixed use in some commercial zones. He noted that the Recreation District's capital facilities plan refers to very specific things that go with trailhead parking and suggested that they stick with the capital facilities plan. Ms. Park explained that they are currently doing a survey which will lead to revising their capital facilities

plan. Their intention was to get something that is more clearly defined and thought they would suggest everything that could go into trailhead parking, but that could be tightened up.

Commissioner DeFord stated that he believed the CUP process would work, and he would want to get public input on the CUP as the trailheads come in case by case. He commented that one size does not fit all on trailheads, and it needs to be a process where each one is looked at independently based on site considerations rather than being compared with other trailhead parking areas. He questioned how they could write language that states the trailhead parking would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Kingston commented that the issue is standardization and customization of the process. He would not want most trailheads to become parks. He believed this might be worked out with Staff and that they could suggest some language for the Commission to review. He did not believe they should standardize one-size-fits-all language, because the situations are so different, and neighboring situations are different.

Commissioner Franklin believed they should look at setbacks, because he did not believe they are mentioned in the Code. He wanted to be sure they meet the setback requirements.

Vice Chair Taylor summarized that they are looking for a clear definition of a trailhead, are not in favor of processing applications as a park and trail but more specifically as a CUP that may simply be a parking lot without other improvements, and are interested in a case-by-case analysis to identify the appropriateness to both need and usage.

Ms. Park clarified that the setback was not intended for trailheads that are improved in the road right-of-way, and she wanted to be sure that is not misinterpreted. Parking in the road right-of-way is permitted through the Summit County Engineer's Office. She explained that one reason for putting this under the parks and trails section of the Code is that the Recreation District Board intends to more fully integrate the recreation and trails master plan into the General Plan so the Planning Commission is more familiar with the Recreation District's plans and objectives.

Vice Chair Taylor explained that he is not concerned about providing a setback to the open space associated with trailhead parking. He believed setbacks from open space would be a negative, because it would require the Recreation District to come up with a bigger piece of property to honor the setbacks. He believed setbacks would be appropriate adjacent to residential property.

3. **Bylaws Amendments Review and Discussion** – *Don Sargent, Community Development Director*

Director Sargent explained that the draft includes input received from several Commissioners at the meeting held in March and additional input from Commissioner DeFord. He requested that Commissioners comment on how they would like to proceed.

Commissioner Franklin noted that the Procedures section is very clear that work session items are items to be discussed with no public comment or action taken. Currently, there is no provision for public comment during work session, and if these are their bylaws, they need to operate within that structure. They can amend the bylaws, but he personally would not support it, because he agrees with what the bylaws say.

Commissioner Velarde noted that the primary purpose of the Planning Commission is to serve the public interest, and she believed they should be willing to hear what the public has to say at every opportunity when they show as long as it is managed in terms of time. She could not imagine why they would not want to do that.

Commissioner Franklin agreed but stated that there comes a point, especially where this Planning Commission generally gets between 10 and 50 people who want to comment, that it bogs down the process, and they are not capable of getting the job done. The procedure is to have a work session, and the Planning Commission needs to be cohesive, figure out what direction they want to head, what the process should look like, and provide input to Staff. Then they go to a public hearing or input session at a later date.

1. **All service provider requirements shall be met prior to recordation of the amended Final Plat and Final Site Plan.**
2. **Prior to final recordation, the Summit County Attorney's Office shall review and approve the amended condominium plat and final site plan notes and review the Amended and Restated Declaration of Condominium for consistency with the conditions of approval and terms of the Canyons Development Agreement.**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Franklin and passed unanimously, 5 to 0.

WORK SESSION

1. **Snyderville Basin Recreation District proposed trailhead language discussion – Amir Caus, County Planner**

Planner Caus recalled that the Planning Commission reviewed the proposed language on May 8, 2012, and directed Staff to clarify and prepare language that more closely matches the Development Code. Staff and the Recreation District are requesting input from the Planning Commission regarding the revised language.

Bonnie Park with the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District provided photographs of existing trailheads and features at those trailheads so the Planning Commission would better understand their intention for the trailhead language. She explained that the Recreation District recently received the results of a community-wide recreation survey they presented to the Park City Council which explains how the community uses trails, and she briefly reviewed the survey results. She acknowledged that the survey does not indicate how users who are visiting the area use the trails.

Commissioner Franklin commented that he struggles over the size of the easement, because this is not a one-size-fits-all situation. He was unsure how much a pavilion would be used.

Commissioner Kingston stated that he believes this is an important issue where much more work needs to be done. He did not believe the community is ready to move full steam ahead with trailhead development, and he believed they need to try to frame the issues carefully and fully. Right now they are getting one angle on public interest as defined by the Recreation District. He agrees with their objective of trying to establish a process, but in looking at the long list of things that might go into a trailhead development, he suggested that they look at how to get additional information. He would not want to create policy before knowing more about who uses the trails, how they are used, what the neighbors of the trailheads think, and alternative best practices for developing trailhead design. He believed there are conflicts of interest and would not want to jump in too quickly and definitively.

Commissioner Klingenstein noted that the County is slowly starting to grapple with the management of parks, open space, trails, and people, and with success comes challenges. He was pleased that they are moving ahead with trailheads, but the question is how to manage impacts. He explained that, if they do not create a place for people to go, they will find a place anyway. He believed the CUP process is appropriate overall and liked the tightening up of the trailhead parking language. He wanted to be very clear that they are talking about a trailhead and not a park. He expressed concern that they are bogging down the process and believed they might want to consider some sort of Low Impact Permit (LIP) that Staff could approve on a minor trailhead, such as a trailhead with 10 parking spaces or less, an information kiosk, directional signs, dog waste, trash, and recycling. Every time an application comes to the Planning Commission it requires Staff time, a staff report, and Planning Commission time, and he did not believe they need to review every application that goes to the Planning Department. He believed they were headed in a good direction overall.

Commissioner Velarde stated that she is somewhere in the middle after hearing the comments this evening. She suggested that they include language similar to what was included in the sign ordinance and review the language in a year. She asked how many trailheads are scheduled for development in the next 12 months. Ms. Park replied that there are two that are clearly planned

right now. Commissioner Velarde suggested that the Recreation District bring every trailhead to the Planning Commission in the next 12 months for review so they could understand the consequences of the language. The second year they could then change to an LIP process, because the Planning Commission may have a higher comfort level with the process by then.

Ms. Jordan explained that one reason for their concerns about trailheads is that some neighborhoods are heavily impacted in the winter months due to lack of trailheads, and the Recreation District bears the brunt of that lack of provision for a trailhead. She stated that they are driven to get clarity of the process, because people park illegally. She explained that their goal is to mitigate impact, not create a greater impact.

Chair Taylor invited public comment.

Yvonne Gray asked if there is a public hearing process with an LIP. She expressed concern that Staff would decide what to do with a trailhead, and the public would not have input. She noted that many of the trailheads shown in the pictures presented by Ms. Park are not near homes, and where there is a kiosk, the setting is more park-like. When people purchased homes in those neighborhoods, they knew that was what they were getting.

Don Gray stated that they had conversations with the County Council last year about an LIP process, and their concern is that the public would not be involved in making the decisions and that Staff would actually write the plan and approve it themselves. He did not believe that makes sense, especially when they are talking about all of the trailhead components. He stated that their concern from the beginning has been continued attempts to change the Code to make it possible to do something in one place that does not fit in another. He emphasized that one size does not fit all, and there is not enough square footage in the Summit Park trailhead to put in everything that is proposed. He did not believe it makes sense for language to include things that are elements of a park.

Planner Caus suggested that, if the Planning Commission chooses to create major and minor trailheads and there is a residence within 300 feet, the permit would be noticed for a public hearing or a CUP process.

Commissioner Kingston commented that there appear to be three ways of dealing with trailhead development—an encroachment process, the LIP process, and the CUP process. Because trailheads present unique planning and land use concerns, he believed they should address the issue of future intent over time. He requested that Staff develop language for encroachment, LIP, and CUP processes as three potential ways to deal with trailhead applications with the intent of looking at public input. Planner Caus explained that the LIP and CUP processes are addressed in the use chart in the Code, but encroachment permits are an engineering process, not a Code process. Commissioner Kingston asked if Staff is opposed to having a separate section in the Code for trailheads. Planner Caus replied that for consistency with the Code, trailheads belong in the parks and trails section of the Code. He suggested that it could be entitled Parks, Trails, and Trailheads. Commissioner Kingston stated that he believed it would be important for the public's benefit for the definition of a trailhead to be different from the definition of a park. He does not see that in the proposed language, and he has heard the goal expressed by many that each trailhead is unique, which may make it difficult to standardize Code. Ms. Park explained that, just as parks are approved through the CUP process, there is significant public input, and plans are changed as a CUP moves through the public hearing process. She noted that the Planning Commission would have a lot of control through the CUP process, and in the commercial zones it is not a matter of the District improving the trailheads without the participation of the developer.

Commissioner Klingenstein commented that the suggestions made by Commissioner Kingston are good, and many of them will probably be resolved when they make amendments to the Development Code, but right now they cannot rewrite the Code. He explained that they need a more user-friendly Code, because now people have to jump all over the place to find things in the Code. He suggested that the title of this section be Parks, Trailheads, and Trails.

Planner Caus confirmed with Chair Taylor that he would like to see language for major and minor trailheads and include public noticing language if the trailhead is within 300 feet of residences. Commissioner Klingenstein stated that the language needs to be very tight and limited to amenities that are appropriate for a trailhead.

2. **Bylaws Amendments Review and Discussion** – *Don Sargent, Community Development Director*

Community Development Director Don Sargent reported that Commissioner Kingston sent him an e-mail with some good suggestions for the bylaws. He suggested that, since he was late getting the information to the Planning Commissioners for review, they take an opportunity to review the information at a subsequent meeting.

3. **General Plan discussion** – *Adryan Slaght, Principal Planner*

Planner Slaght confirmed that the joint meeting with the County Council will be Monday, June 25, at 6:00 p.m. at a location to be determined. Staff will summarize the information about the public input obtained so far in the General Plan update efforts so everyone understands it.

Commissioner Kingston asked if the purpose of the meeting is to summarize the revision processes up to this point for the General Plan. Planner Slaght explained that Staff could provide that information on either June 25 or June 26, but they felt it would be helpful to have it for the June 25 meeting, because there will be a discussion about how to move forward with the General Plan. Commissioner Kingston asked if the Planning Commission will be going to the Council with a proposal for how to move forward. Planner Slaght explained that Staff will put together an agenda with a few discussion topics.

Commissioner Velarde stated that she came out of the joint meeting with the Park City Planning Commission with thoughts and ideas about what to do to proceed and get the General Plan and Code revisions completed by the end of this year. Planner Slaght confirmed that the General