

Park City Council
Mountain Accord Meeting
Park City Council Chambers
October 31, 2014

Note: This meeting was originally supposed to be a joint meeting between Park City Council and the Summit County Council. Due to a noticing error, the Park City Council and Summit County Council met separately for approximately the first 80 minutes. A revised agenda was posted and the second part of the meeting and these notes include both the Park City Council portion of the meeting and the part both Councils were present.

Present: Tim Henney, Andy Beerman, Liza Simpson, Dick Peek, Cindy Matsumoto, and Mayor Jack Thomas

Staff: Ann Ober, Kent Cashel, Mark Harrington, Diane Foster, Matt Dias

Motion: Council person Beerman moved that Park City Council meet for one hour, then meet jointly with the Summit County Council; Liza Simpson seconded.

Vote: Unanimous.

Ann announced the packet that was sent to meeting participants includes documents as follows:

1. Q and A document developed by Park City and Summit County separately. (Mountain Accord team has answered those questions)
2. Overarching metrics developed at the last Buki meeting to judge whether or not these things are good or bad for the Wasatch Back.
3. Information to determine what could be guaranteed or could measure the Mountain Accord process; what could give us data on to run through scenarios at a future date.
4. White paper transportation documents would be useful since a lot of the discussions have come to transportation-oriented issues.

Andy said they were meeting separately from the County Council first since in a week, he, Ann and Kent would be attending a charrette representing Park City and what our idealized scenario of all this is. When Council met two weeks ago, they had some deep concerns, but decided they wanted to continue to be involved. The system groups have since met and made recommendations, the transportation committee is recommending they move forward with a spectrum of options that range from A to D. A is using entirely existing infrastructure, but beefing up the bus systems, D is the grand loop. By looking at D, individual components will be examined. Vail is not in favor of a cross canyon connection. They seem to be lukewarm on light rail up Little Cottonwood, but they want to look at all

Liza asked Andy to explain what he meant by a cross canyon connection. Cindy asked if Vail was "out" of One Wasatch. He answered that currently, Vail is still

supportive of One Wasatch. But they are not supportive of a train coming through from the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City. When asked if they were supportive of aerial, Vail said yes, but there was some hedging. Jack said they were unclear about the aerial component of it. Cindy asked to clarify what aerial means because in the discussions she has been part of, aerial was not part of One Wasatch. She thought the aerial they were talking about in the Mountain Accord was a different aerial than the one involved with One Wasatch. Andy said he was using the term aerial as in a tram to transport people, not ski lifts that would be used in One Wasatch. He thinks Vail has competitive concerns since they now have the largest resort in the U.S. They were in favor of all other aspects of the grand loop excluding a train.

Andy continued by saying Summit County is also in favor of all other aspects except a tunnel or train through the mountain to Park City from the Cottonwoods. Because Summit County has had discussions with Vail, this meeting is to re-affirm whether the Park City Council wants to move forward keeping our options open and putting some conditions in place. He asked whether the City Council wanted to change their position. Ann said there was a unified voice that included Vail, members of the Park City Council, members of the County Council, and Steve Issowits representing Deer Valley, against opening Guardsman. Cindy said she was willing to stay in the talks about rail if there was a guarantee there would not be cars over Guardsman.

Jack said with regard to a meeting yesterday, there was some confusion when Nate (Rafferty) talked about meeting with Bob Wheaton. Nate said Bob had given him the right to speak for him with regard to Mountain Accord issues. He also said Bob Wheaton shared his opinion about the no train idea. Steve Issowits didn't have that same certainty. Andy said that according to Nathan Rafferty, Ski Utah's position has not changed . . . they would like both over snow connections and transportation connections. Interestingly, Bob Wheaton will be representing Nathan Rafferty at the charrette. Liza said that when the transportation group talks about a tram, they make a strong differentiation that that it is a transportation mode not a ski lift. It has to be ADA accessible. A ski pass is not required to ride on it, you just have to buy a ticket much like the Telluride Tram.

Andy said in their discussions, City Council had talked about conditioning their position relating to the concepts. He reiterated that Cindy said one of her conditions was no cars over Guardsman Road and the Bonanza Flats area. Andy said there were a couple of conditions the Park City and Summit County Council agree on. He recommended three conditions to be added if they support Concept D. Concept D could be rail, aerial, or bus, but in any case, it would be a cross canyon connection. Concept D does not promote access to Bonanza Flats. There would be no stops there and development would not be facilitated. Tim asked if Bonanza Flats could be protected from any development and preserved in

perpetuity. Dick asked how that could be accomplished. Tim said the tradeoff could be a connection over that area that is not vehicular. Andy said that idea has come up multiple times. There is a land preservation committee that is moving forward with recommendations from each of the committees. Andy said he didn't know if protecting and preserving Bonanza Flats could be conditioned. He did say that a strong recommendation could be made to consider it. Tim said that all conditions were hypothetical at this point, so for him, keeping Concept D in means not just not promoting development, it's taking development off the table. Dick said his concern with limiting development in Bonanza Flats is that it's in another jurisdiction. Tim said that's why he would say preserved in perpetuity. Dick agreed, but said he wasn't sure how to do that. Liza said the language could be that it preserves Bonanza Flats or reduces development. Andy said the group has not gotten into specific discussion as to what private lands should be purchased and preserved. Dick noted it affects transportation in the Marsac corridor. Andy said the condition could be worded to say what they don't want to happen. Liza said the original statement said, "does not promote or facilitate Bonanza Flats development". Andy said he would say "does not improve access".

Jack raised the same concerns about Bonanza Flats. He said what has made Park City unique is our connection to the airport, connection to Salt Lake City and the speed with which we can arrive in Park City. That relationship is fundamental; the speed of that transportation system is essential, especially in this day and age of shorter vacations and people wanting to get to and from their destination. Jack wondered who benefits from a connection from Salt Lake City and Park City. Who might also see a negative impact? He sees this as a connection for folks to funnel into Park City to take this train to the Cottonwood Canyon Resorts, creating more traffic and congestion. He feels it will also change the nature of town. He asked if any other Council members were concerned about that. Andy said Council could formulate some conditions to shape the connection. Jack wondered who would benefit from the connection. The resorts don't think it is to their advantage. Does it benefit the small businesses in Park City, does it benefit the ski resorts? He asked if it would change the dynamic of our community. Liza commented she doesn't think there is any way of knowing until an economic impact study and some information is received.

Dick said his concern is that this is a regional plan and takes away basic land use authority from the local jurisdictions. And with the Wasatch Front being the most densely populated area in Utah, it is relative to our supply of what folks want. There is unlimited demand in the Salt Lake Valley, so it would fundamentally change what Park City is. He is concerned about becoming a parking lot for the other major ski resorts on the Wasatch Front. Cindy said she does not see a benefit to the community of getting people from Sandy up to Park City twenty minutes faster. The only benefit she sees for the Park City community is preservation of a certain un-named property. And in the distant future, a rapid

train that come directly to Park City from the airport. Liza mentioned when the Transportation group talks about transportation, they are talking about two distinct cohorts of people using it. She wouldn't mind getting on a train that meandered around the Salt Lake Valley as long as she didn't have to schlep her luggage on and off the bus or train. Jack said in his experience in the planning industry, people are interested in getting to their destination quicker. Liza said her point is that the leisure traveler is different than the commuter. The leisure traveler will do what is easy and convenient and the commuter needs what is consistent and as quick as possible.

Andy said thirty years from now, he envisions a town not so reliant on automobiles. It will be all about connectivity. Mountain Accord is one mechanism that can be used to accomplish that vision. Jack agreed with the connectivity aspect. He said what he looks at is the nature of the issues in our community. Over the past few years, congestion and impacts issues, along with the frustration of navigating through them have been identified. He said he doesn't understand the nature of the train connection to another market, another region. There is substantial cost, billions of dollars. He continued that as soon as those connections are made, growth will accelerate in both places. Andy commented with climate change will come longer summers and summer business in Park City is made up of people from Utah. It is easier to get winter visitors out of their cars than summer visitors.

Andy noted that another condition Mountain Accord has already agreed to, but needs to be forwarded again, is a comprehensive economic impact study to see how this would impact our community. Dick said at an Open House he attended, Senator Neiderhauser approached him and said "you guys need a tunnel". He continued, saying Neiderhauser is very pro-transportation. That is why the Mountain Accord process could be affected because there are people at the state who would like to see a tunnel. Tim said he needed more information before making any decision. He asked Kent (Cashel) what he knows and what he needs to know about the connection to form an opinion and/or make a decision.

Kent said he was lacking so many pieces of information, there was no way he could make a recommendation. Personally, he feels we should stay in the game and get the information. Tim asked the Mayor how he arrived at his decision about the connection? Jack said, he would call it common sense. Park City has a captive market. We're surrounded by mountains, we are a unique environment. We have the core values that we embrace and love that are fundamental to our community and the small-town nature of it. Having studied mass transit, including the Bay area rapid transit and other systems in Honolulu, he said that when you put in new nodes and connectivity with mass transit trains, you get dramatic concentric rings of growth are created, even in areas that are built out. He believes the changes coming our way changes our nature; changes us from a small town to more a connected component of a mountain urban system. Dick wondered if we should

create a solution, a system that fulfills the unlimited demand. He continued that Park city is a unique, relatively small environment and wondered if we should create a system for all anticipated demand for the 50-year program that will fundamentally ruin Park City. Liza asked if we should create a system that manages growth that is coming and direct it where we want it. Cindy commented there might not be room for growth within the city limits of Park City, but if there was a train connection here, it might encourage growth in the County that we wouldn't have any control over. Tim said Council is trying to manage growth, not create or facilitate additional growth. He said Park City can either let the growth happen to us or figure out how to manage it in a way that reduces congestion, gets people out of cars, and gives them alternate modes of transportation.

Jack said to him, it is intuitively obvious. He doesn't have the numbers or the data, but with big-picture thinking and big-picture schematics, you don't always get the numbers and the data. You have to make decision based on broader factors. Data is an important component of all decision-making, but we're talking about big schematic ideas, veins of connectivity and with each one of these veins and solutions, there are different ramifications. He can see it clearly. If the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City are connected, there will be more traffic. Park City does not have an economic relationship with these resorts. Our own resorts are not comfortable connecting with these Wasatch Front resorts. They feel they will lose skier days to it. He said that's pretty good data. If the local resorts have the perception that they will to lose business to the Cottonwood Canyons if there's a train here, that's a concern. Tim noted there is a dirt/gravel road that people consistently go up and down every day and that traffic is increasing. He thinks if that can be stopped and the land up there can be preserved, he is willing to consider the connection. Jack told Tim he was welcome to disagree with him.

Andy said what could be agreed upon is that forward steps are taken to get more data. Then it can be decided whether the data provides what is needed to make a decision. He wanted to move forward and segue to the third condition . . . that an effective local system is needed that would move people around without cars before enhancing the cross canyon connection, meaning Highways 224, 248 and I-80 should be addressed in some manner. Ultimately, a loop system connecting those roads that goes in in a timely manner.

Ann asked if talking about a regional solution meant they were talking about Highway 224, 248 and I-80: She continued with asking how much is enough? Jack asked if that condition accepts Concept D. Andy replied yes, these are conditions to moving forward and studying Concept D. Liza clarified studying it, not building it. Mark added not supporting it, but studying it. Dick wondered why they were studying the impacts since the majority of Council doesn't accept Concept D, the rail connection, but we're studying the impacts. He said he could use the outcome

of the study as a tool to decide. Liza agreed. Cindy said she was voting with the Mayor on this.

Liza commented the growth is coming whether Park City participates in the planning process or not. She continued that this could be the only chance to anticipate, mitigate, and channel the growth to where it's more appropriate. A gondola over the top from the Cottonwoods to Park City would add to the guest experience. She said she just doesn't know if it would be good for the community. She is not in favor of Guardsman remaining open to single occupancy vehicles or improved so that year-round traffic can utilize it. She feels the only hope Park City has as a community is managing the growth in partnership with some of these other entities. Andy said it appeared Park City was conflicted. We brought the Olympics here, widened Highway 224, renewed the Park Silly Sunday Market contract, and supercharged the town. If more people are not wanted in town, we should tell Vail we do not want to work with them on the redevelopment at the base of the mountain. Jack stated that just because he doesn't support the connection, does not mean he is anti-growth. The growth needs to be managed in an appropriate way. He is convinced a Park City/Cottonwood Canyon connection will accelerate growth.

Andy said European ski resorts put controls in place along with their physical boundaries that allowed them to keep their individual character and yet, get rid of cars. Liza said one of the positive things the BART system did in the Bay area is get people out of their cars. Cindy said she was concerned that if the concept is studied, it will happen. Andy asked for feedback from Kent and/or Diane as to what can be forced upon Park City by the State officials. Ann said there were significant restrictions to somebody coming in and doing this to us. One restriction is the original agreement that Council signed addressing how decisions are made in this process. The agreement says a consensus is necessary before something moves forward. Federal funding typically requires a community to agree to having something done in their town. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is going to pull a lot of that out. UTA does not have condemnation rights whereas UDOT does. UTA does not go into a community and build a rail system where the community does not want it. If we don't want this, it will not happen because local funding is required to match funding from the Feds.

Cindy said that if the majority of Council wants to stay in the game, one other condition must be that Park City maintains total control over alignment. Andy agreed. Dick re-phrased it as: local land use authority is maintained by the local jurisdiction. All agreed and Liza said she wanted to make one more point relating to the conspiracy theorists. If Neiderhauser does have a magic wand and could make the tunnel/train happen, it wouldn't make any difference whether Park City wanted and supported it or not. Staying in the process gives Park City the relationships and partnerships necessary to support our position. Jack believed

Park City should stay in the process. He asked if not being in favor of the link over or through the mountain takes us out of the process? Andy answered he was not sure what impacts that will have. It does send a message that Park City is not in favor of connectivity. Liza said she was concerned that if Park City gets too positional, we will get back to being viewed as elitists. Saying that we have concerns about the connection is entirely fair and expected. Our Mountain Accord partners are not operating in as robust a public discussion about concerns and fears as Park City. Park City just needs to be really clear that we support going forward with the process and getting more information, these are pieces of information we need and these are our concerns about that piece of option D. Jack said no one has been able to explain to him why that is an important connection.

Mark said he was sorry to interrupt a great dialogue, but asked the group to wrap it up out of courtesy to the County folks and respect for the timeline established at the beginning of the meeting.

Andy asked the group if they had additional conditions. Liza stated she was comfortable moving forward. Dick said he was, too. Andy said he thinks Park City should stay in. Jack said Park City should stay in without the link. Andy asked Jack if he was worried that by studying it, we will not be able to get out. Both he and Cindy said that was their concern. Andy said Park City should be up front at Mountain Accord meetings and say we have grave concerns, struggle with this connection, need a lot of study, and still may not support it. There was consensus that all had "grave concerns".

There was a brief break while the County Council joined the meeting.

County Council in attendance: Chris Robinson, Roger Armstrong, Claudia McMullin, Kim Carson, Bob Jasper

Jack asked the County Council to summarize their position.

Tim reminded both Councils December 8 was the date the two Councils were getting together for dinner.

Chris commented there was some wisdom in having the two councils meet separately prior to joint meeting joint so each body could clearly set their positions. He said the County Council focused all their discussion on transportation because that seems to be area of most concern. In choosing scenarios for Mountain Accord to include in Phase 2 analysis, The County Council is fine with:

- Studying Alternative A, expanded bus service;
- Support Concept C;
- Other systems or proposals that may be needed for the Cottonwood Canyons in order for them to grow and solve their problems;
- BUT not in favor of connecting the Cottonwood Canyons with Snyderville Basin by means of punching through the mountain or a road or Guardsman expansion;
- Not in favor of a tunnel for either a train or a car, or roadways that are improved to connect the Cottonwood Canyons with Park City.

The big philosophical question is whether it is in Summit County's or Park City's interest to make that connection. That seems to be the key element that would cause harm to the economy and the community and to Park City/Summit County brand. He invited Park City's Council to weigh in on the connection.

Kim added that all are in agreement they must stay involved in Mountain Accord discussions.

Jack noted there was a lot commonality between the two councils. The Park City Council has the same grave concerns about the connection through the Cottonwood Canyons. They didn't completely rule it out, but want to study the ramifications and impact of a possible connection through more data and information.

Chris asked if that meant advancing Concept D to Phase 2 and gathering more information through that process, or if Park City Council envisioned gathering more information and then giving the final nod to study it in the NEPA process.

Andy clarified the City Council's position going into the charrette is that they are willing to consider the forwarded options but they have some serious concerns and have five conditions under which they would agree to study them further. His

understanding is that there will be another charrette and depending on what information is received or how those conditions are met, Park City Council reserves the right to pull that off the table. At this point and for the purpose of next week, they are willing to consider that.

Liza read the five conditions:

1. Does not promote or facilitate development in Bonanza Flats;
2. Economic impact study needed;
3. Effective local system needs to be in place before the Guardsman connection is addressed;
4. Retain local land use authority;

Chris asked if that meant they reserved the right to "veto" a proposed concept that Park City objected to. He asked if Park City Council thinks they have that legal authority. Liza answered yes to both questions. Andy continued that it is City Council's belief that under the Mountain Accord charter, they have that right. Liza added "because we signed something with Mountain Accord that says this is a consensus-based decision-making process. Cindy said that saying they are willing to further study proposed concepts concerns her. She wonders if the concept will be forced upon them. She said City Council wanted to reiterate that it cannot be forced upon them. And also they would get some "gets" out of it (an improved transportation system, or preservation of land). She asked if the County was concerned about that.

Chris said that is one of the things they talked about.

Tim asked for clarification about the Summit County Council discussion regarding the connection between the Wasatch Front and Back through the Cottonwood Canyons. He noted only two transportation modes were mentioned; i.e., punching a hole through the mountain, a tunnel, and/or road. Chris said he might have gotten ahead of himself . . . his personal opinion is that an over-the-snow connection wouldn't be as damning. He said he didn't know if the rest of the County Council was opposed to connecting over the snow with a gondola or a chairlift.

Liza clarified that the Transportation Committee was not considering a chairlift as a mode of transportation, but that a gondola *is* a mode of transportation. You pay to ride it, you can board it in a wheelchair, and you don't have to buy a lift ticket to ride it.

Chris said the County Council had not discussed whether or not they were opposed to a gondola as a mode of transportation. Kim said the County Council hadn't discussed that. She did say that Claudia stated she might not be opposed to a gondola form of connection. Chris said he didn't have a problem with a gondola

either. Kim said for her, it would be related to other things the City Council has as conditions. What would the connection mean to the community?

Cindy asked again if the group was worried that if they study it, they will get it. Claudia answered with a resounding yes. Kim wondered if agreeing to study D would downplay the concerns indicated by the Councils and the conditions they want included in the discussion would be overlooked.

Chris asked if a federally funded transit project that benefits a broad region but is opposed by local governments can be forced through.

David Calas, UTA, answered that every transportation project is unique. He said he could not envision any scenario where it could be forced upon us. The Federal Transit Administration is not interested in funding projects without local support. Claudia asked if it could be forced through because the Mountain Accord is a collaborative effort. Could they take the position that because it's collaborative and the majority of the stakeholders want something, it overrides the local authorities' view. David said no . . . Mountain Accord is not an entity to the FTA, it's a group of people having a discussion. But when money is involved and contracts and agreements and grants, that goes to transit authorities and cities and counties.

Claudia asked David if he has ever known of a situation where a state stepped in and determined that the benefit to the state outweighs the detriment to the local authority and changes the rules to force something on the local jurisdiction. David answered the state has eminent domain authority, condemnation authority; UTA does not. The state does not build transit projects, local entities do. The cities control transit in the state of Utah. The state controls highways in the state of Utah. Claudia asked, hypothetically, if improving Highway 224 up and over Guardsman would be a state project. David couldn't answer that. Chris said that would be a UDOT project. David agreed. He continued his understanding is that Highway 224 is a UDOT road with county involvement so that decision would involve them, not UTA. David said his experience with UDOT indicates they are not interested in pushing things forward without local support.

Cindy said the Economy, Environmental and Recreational Committees were not in favor of a road with cars on it over Guardsman. There seems to be some commitment from the Mountain Accord people that they don't want Guardsman open to cars. Andy didn't think a connection could be easily forced upon Park City/Summit County. He did say that widening Highways 224 and 248 and opening Guardsman is more feasible than having a connection forced upon the community if the group doesn't come up with constructive solutions. Andy felt that doing nothing could be the bigger scare.

Chris asked Liza what the 5th condition was. She said the 5th condition is:

5. Park City Council has grave concerns about Concept D.

Jack said this grave concern is sounding like a conditional use. That if it can be mitigated, we're ok. He wanted to distinguish where the Council is and that philosophy. Jack asked if by saying we have grave concerns that means we're not sure we want this at all. Andy said it means we have grave concerns and we're agreeing to study it further.

Cindy asked if it was Concept B that the County said they could live with. Chris corrected her . . . he said it was Concept C they could support with whatever else is necessary for the Cottonwood Canyons to meet their needs except the punch through. Liza said the Transportation System group forwarded all the recommendations to the Executive Committee hoping they would study all of them. Andy stated Concept B is Wasatch Front-centric. It doesn't address our problems aggressively. Concept C is Wasatch Back-centric and addresses our problems aggressively, but doesn't deal with some of their challenges. Concept D allows for both to be examined and we're going to look at each piece as the individual parts and determine what may be effective. It gives us the maximum flexibility. It has the ultimate in connectivity if that's what we decide we want, but we haven't made that decision yet.

Chris said Summit County Council's fear is that by selecting D the door is opening for things we don't want. Andy said the majority of the Park City Council doesn't feel they are exposed if they study it further. He said the conditions hem it in significantly, but there is no guarantee. Chris said there is no assurance that the Executive Committee won't want to study Concept D further regardless of the recommendation they get from the Transportation Committee. Liza commented she doesn't think there's a downside to presenting different opinions. Jack said what the two Councils have in common is the grave concern about the component between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City. If under the right circumstances and further study these concerns can be relieved, there might be some interest. Liza said that sounds like a conditional use permit. Jack agreed. She reiterated a point that was made earlier that both she and Tim said they did not have enough information to make that call.

Cindy said she thinks Concept D was formulated with future Olympics in mind. If that is the case, she feels it can be forced upon the community regardless.

Roger clarified that what the Transportation Systems committee walked into their Wednesday meeting there was a slide on screen that said we want you to vote to forward to the Executive Committee either A or D. He said that in choosing these two extremes, it would force the Executive Committee to study *all* the concepts.

Chris said the only option that gives both the Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back what they need is Concept D. He said they need to let it be known Summit County is opposed to the connection, but other facets consider both sides of the mountain.

Roger said that opening up another major transportation corridor from here to the Front moves more bodies through the community. He wondered what the benefit is to Park City of having that cut through. In his mind this implicates growth, a downside to him. What he is trying to determine is what the benefit is. What he thinks is going to happen is that Concept D is going to get forwarded since there is not enough time to gather and analyze data by the time a decision is made in January or February. He believes D will be forwarded for a NEPA process.

Chris said the benefit may be that that's what has to be given up to get the transportation solution, the part of D that we like. The second part is there may be more visitation overall because of the heft of it, but the question is . . . what's our goal? Do we want to promote that kind of visitation? Not only will the connection bleed some of our skier population to the Cottonwood Canyons, but Park City will see more visitation from the Wasatch front as well. More visitation to Park City means not only more dollars for the economy, but more traffic and more congestion.

Liza thinks there are possible economic and environmental benefits to getting people out of their cars. Cindy said one of the benefits is that there would be a stronger local, who would get people out of their cars and there would be a stronger connection to Salt Lake and we might be able to preserve some surrounding open space. She wondered if this is enough. Can it be configured so we don't get all the negatives.

Dick said his concern is that the Salt Lake Valley has an unlimited supply of demand. Park City and Summit County have a limited supply. If we open the conduit so the two can meet and fill that demand, we're going to get fundamentally ruined as Park City and Summit County. What we have now is a relatively restricted experience that people want. Opening that conduit so that we can fully fill that demand will make the experience less restricted. He has more than a grave concern about option D . . . his is a fatal concern.

Kim thinks the two Councils have given Andy and Chris enough information and they know their direction. She suggested that moving forward both Councils support these two as they attend Mountain Accord meetings.

Chris said there was language on the Retreat agenda about taking pauses during the retreat to caucus with their people. Kim noted that Wasatch Front staff members were invited to attend the meetings, but staff from the Wasatch Back was not invited. Andy said his understanding of the purpose for the retreat was to get a

smaller group together to address the complicated issues by proxy. And then take back what the proposal is back to the larger groups.

Jack asked Andy and Chris to get clarification on whether Park City/Summit County committee members and staff could attend the retreat and let them know.

Jack opened the meeting to public input. Mary Wintzer addressed the group to say she is more in alignment with what the County recommendations were. She felt Cindy's comments relating to the Olympics were very valid. She said the Park City area has always been very independent and as a citizen, she would like to see the County and City Council make a strong statement and say no, this is not what we're about. This does not benefit our area.

Sara Werbelow feels that connectivity is inevitable over the next decade. She does get a sense that this whole process is being fast-tracked. She feels the connectivity is the wave of the future, but wants to understand what that benefit is and if it is quantifiable and what this new pie looks like and if there is defensible, substantive research that says what the economic benefit is for our community.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.