

NOTES

In Attendance

Michael	Barille	PC RAB
Andy	Beerman	PCMC City Council
Mike	Boyle	PCSD
Andy	Cusimano	SBSRD Board Liaison
Heinrich	Deters	PCMC
Ken	Fisher	PCMC
Rena	Jordan	SBSRD
Catherine	Kahlow	SBSRD Board
Todd	Klarich	PCSD
David	Kottler	SBSRD Board
Justine	Isleib	SBSRD
Jon	Pistey	PCMC
Will	Pratt	SBSRD
Bob	Radke	SBSRD
Matt	Strader	SBSRD
Marilyn	Stinson	SBSRD Board
Meg	Steele	PC RAB
Mark	Vlasic	Landmark Design
Lisa	Benson	Landmark Design

Absent

Jay	Burke	SBSRD Board
Jason	Glidden	PCMC
Brian	Guyer	SBSRD Board
Brian	Hanton	SBSRD
Jim	Magruder	SBSRD Board
Scott	McClelland	SBSRD Board
VJ	Pettit	SBSRD Board Liaison
Patrick	Putt	SBSRD Board Liaison
Liza	Simpson	PCMC City Council
Megan	Suhadolc	SBSRD
Mike	Werner	PCSD
Jonathan	Weidenhamer	PCMC

Summary: Committee

The preliminary results of the public input meetings were presented. Comments are being taken through the end of the day on Wednesday, May 8th, and then the comments will be summarized and analyzed. The majority of comments up to this point were stating support for specific facilities or services, but there is also feedback on the criteria and process.

Schedule

The project schedule was reviewed. The next committee meeting will be held on Monday, May 20th from 6-8pm at Basin Recreation. The next public meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 29th in the evening, which will focus on the revised matrix/evaluation criteria and the general direction of the strategic action plan. The location is still to be determined. There was some discussion on shifting the project schedule, but it was determined that the May 29th public meeting date was critical to maintain in order to capture public input before the schools let out for the summer. There may be some flexibility in pushing back the final due date for the Strategic Action Plan to allow more time for development of the final product.

General

Landmark Design reviewed the matrix that was presented at the public input sessions, as well as the evaluation criteria, and the following comments or questions were raised.

- Look at 'available privately' and 'available regionally' to determine if these duplicate the same idea – make sure we aren't double-counting.
- Cost recovery (revenue vs. expense) should be a new criteria.
- Weighting is a good idea. Scores should have bigger gaps.
- Does the green section on the matrix include both the demand study and the survey, or just the survey? Same for the yellow/tan section?
- Should the survey take a higher priority over the demand study, or vice versa?
- This process needs to blend the two, then look at what we can actually deliver on.
- Cost is a huge factor.
- Cost recovery as a criteria – tricky for certain facilities. For example, trails are important, but don't really have an option to recover maintenance costs.
- Costs of trails are lower than facilities (but not if you have to acquire land or easements.)
- How would you weight cost recovery?
- Public wants everything. Committee needs to weigh in on desires vs. whether a project is implementable.
- Should the measurement of willingness to pay for facilities through bonding be used as a criteria?
- Previous studies were a convergence of want and need and should be weighted more heavily, or added as additional criteria.
- Use negative scoring.
- Upper matrix with colors is more helpful than lower matrix on "Priorities Identified" board.
- Need to consider additional ideas and input provided by the public during these public input sessions. These new additions can go into the gray 'identified others' section since they are not in the survey or the demand study.
- Potential Visitor Days should be a new criteria.
- Needs vs. wants is critical. The survey should be weighted heavier because it represents the wishes of the people, and is statistically valid.
- Add criteria for the support expressed for a facility during the public input sessions. The survey is more statistically valid, but the desires expressed during the public input process do need to be acknowledged in the Strategic Action Plan somewhere, just maybe not in the matrix.

- So much money was invested on the survey and the demand study – those results need to be acknowledged. Adding an additional column for the survey is a good idea.
- Include new projects and apply criteria to them as well.
- How will this evaluation process be used in the future?
 - The Strategic Action Plan is not a document that will be set in stone
 - Need to have a Plan B to take care of low-hanging fruit which can be implemented using existing budgets.
 - Staff and SBSRD staff would take these criteria and apply them to new projects in the future
 - The results are valid only for a few years (approximately five years) as projects are implemented and new projects need to be added.
 - Is the role to create a tool or create a specific action plan?
 - Make sure the plan includes information on who participated in this process.
 - This system will provide a tool for evaluating and re-evaluating within a context.
 - This plan will be a living document that grounds the entities and decision makers in their thought processes.
 - The plan should be revisited annually, and it may be best to reconvene this committee to do that (re-prioritize every year.)
- Should costs include the cost of obtaining land? Right now it focuses just on the approximate facility costs because the land costs are unknown at this point.
- Should there be a low-hanging fruit (easily implementable) category or should it be a separate item in the strategic action plan, like a tiered system?
- Strategic Action Plan will show which projects are low-hanging fruit and which will need to be bonded for.
- SBSRD and PCMC are already working on low-hanging fruit based on the results of the survey and the demand study.
- Do you see the need for a discussion on location in the chart or in the plan?
 - Look at potential locations, existing available lands.
 - Maybe identify parcels for bigger facilities.
 - Don't pick exact locations, but identify potential locations. It's helpful to PCMC and SBSRD to have this information.
 - 'Program Needs' board identified locations where programs could possibly go using existing lands or facilities. Could do something like this for the projects in the matrix.
 - Include potential locations, but don't lock anything in.
- O&M – Does anyone have a budget for it? The facilities with high O&M costs also usually have the potential for at least partial cost recovery, and may also encourage additional tourism.
 - SBSRD contributes funds to help with O&M costs, but doesn't generally build the types of facilities that require a lot of O&M.
- 2006 SBSRD bond referendum failed because specific plans weren't outlined for the use of the funds. This plan will help with the bonding process.
- Bonding capacity/cost is important information to include for public consideration.
- Maybe the tax impact of funding each facility should be included on the matrix. A dollar amount per item may help the public focus priorities.
 - It isn't the role of this plan to determine costs – specific facility costs will come after this planning process as entities get ready to start the bonding process. The role of this plan

is to identify priorities. Then the voters will indicate their willingness to fund during the bonding process.

- Survey indicated the degree to which the public was willing to pay additional taxes to fund new facilities.
- May lose some support from the public if the facilities they wanted in the survey aren't implemented.
- Before the bonding process is started, SBSRD and Park City will test the willingness of the public to pay.
- Should cost even be included at all in the matrix, or should it come later in the planning process?
- Should the matrix represent pure want and need?
- Re-evaluate the project timeline. Is the process rushed?
 - It's important to keep the public meeting at the current May 29th date before school lets out.

Landmark will work with staff over the next two weeks to revise the matrix and get a revised version of to the committee prior to the next meeting. The draft final matrix (which includes revisions following the next public meeting) should be presented to the committee for discussion before it is finalized. Messaging for the format of the next public meeting needs to be more clear – whether there will be presentations or whether it will be strictly open house with people able to come anytime in the meeting window.