

MINUTES

SNYDERVILLE BASIN PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2016
Sheldon Richins Building (Library)
1885 West Ute Boulevard,
Park City, UT

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Bea Peck, *Vice-Chair*
Mike Barnes
Canice Harte

Chuck Klingenstein
Greg Lawson

Regrets: Colin DeFord, Mike Franklin

STAFF PRESENT:

Peter Barnes– *Planning and Zoning Administrator* Jennifer Strader- *Senior Planner*
Ray Milliner- *Principal Planner* Katy Staley– *Secretary*
Patrick Putt– *Community Development Director*

The regular meeting of the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission was called to order at 6:07 PM.

REGULAR ITEMS

1. General Public Input Items

The general public input session was opened. There were no comments made and the public input session was closed.

2. Continued Public hearing and possible action regarding a proposed Plat Amendment to vacate a portion of Zermat Strasse Road and add it to Lot 5, Plat D; 130 Zermat Strasse; SU-D-5; John Troilo, applicant – *Jennifer Strader, Senior Planner*

Planner Jennifer Strader said this is a continued public hearing from the meeting held on January 12th, 2016. At that time, the Planning Commission continued the public hearing pending further information to be submitted by the applicant.

Planner Strader said per the request of the Planning Commission, a survey with the topography was submitted. A graphic was displayed that showed the existing lot line, which was outlined in dark red. The top yellow area showed the portion of the road that would be vacated if the request is granted. There is another yellow area on the right side. This area is currently within the boundaries of the lot, but the applicant is proposing to adjust the lot line at this location, so that additional right of way width is provided.

The second item requested by the Planning Commission was an aerial photo indicating the proposed driveway locations. The driveway is shown in red. It cuts through the gravel area. A question posed by the Commission at the earlier meeting was how the turnaround would continue to function based on the proposed driveway location. Planner Strader said that Staff talked to the Public Works Director and the County Engineer. The Public Works Director said the snow plow drivers don't typically use the turnaround for snow storage; however, it was used this year due to the amount of snow received. Director Derrick Radke remains neutral on this application. He said the turnaround does provide a public purpose, but the additional right of way that would be granted would also provide a public purpose. The County Engineer said he does support a lot entrance on the uphill side.

Planner Strader acknowledged that the proposed driveway, as shown on the plat, has not been approved. The driveway location will be evaluated when a building permit is submitted. Pictures of the snow storage in the turnaround area, submitted by a neighbor, were shown.

Planner Strader said as spoken about at the last meeting, the Commission needs to find good cause for the plat amendment. Neither the Public Works Director, nor the County Engineer has stated there is a need for the plat amendment. Staff cannot find a good cause to support the amendment because the lot can be built in its current configuration.

Planner Strader said the reason for the turnaround was most likely for emergency vehicle access. At the top of the road, there is an approximate 50 foot right of way. After the corner is turned, it narrows to about 30 feet.

Planner Strader said that Staff recommends they take public comment and forward a negative recommendation to the County Council for the right of way vacation. If the Commission chooses to forward a negative recommendation, the applicant will not move forward with the lot line adjustment. If the Planning Commission chooses to forward a positive recommendation, Staff will prepare findings of fact and conclusions of law according to the Commission's direction.

Commissioner Harte said it seems that currently the turnaround is being used for parking. He has seen cars and RVs stored there. The big question to him seems to be if the driveway will negate the ability to store snow. He doesn't think the vegetated piece is much of an issue, one way or the other. Snow can't be stored on it; it can't be used for a turnaround.

If the driveway is put there, it seems that it would automatically remove the ability for snow storage. The driveway seems to be the crux of the issue to him. He asked if the Commission's decision will affect the outcome of the driveway. Planner Strader said a location for a driveway has not been approved. The driveway location will not be determined until a building permit is submitted. Planner Strader said the County Engineer has said it makes sense to put the driveway on the uphill part of the lot, but it is unknown if that would be the actual location.

APPLICANT'S COMMENTS

The applicant, John Troilo, referred to the pictures of the snow storage. He acknowledged there is a significant amount of snow. Where the County is pushing most of the snow is not in the area that he is requesting to be vacated. Most of the snow is being located in the area that is the most removed from where he is proposing the driveway access.

Commissioner Klingenstein said he drove past this area just a couple of hours ago. The wall of snow seemed to cover this entire area. Although the largest pile of snow was towards one end, the entire space was being used.

Mr. Troilo said it seems like a function of safety to put the driveway in the upper part of the lot. The lower part of the lot would require excavating through a slope of greater than 30 degrees. It would probably involve retaining walls, which would inhibit the site lines exiting the driveway. Additionally, there is a very narrow right of way on the lower location. There is a confluence of six driveways in this area. Traffic has to come down two blind corners to a highly congested area. The safest place would be the uphill side of the lot. He is only asking for an access through the wall of snow. The turnaround would not be his personal property.

Mr. Troilo said he is also asking the Commission to consider the benefit of his willingness to pull the lot line back on the lower part of the area to provide a wider right of way. This would increase safety and provide snow storage at this location. It would benefit everyone in the area. He added that Brian Atwood, of the Snyderville Water Reclamation District, is asking for a 10-foot utility easement for the sewer district, which he is willing to grant if the County allows this to go through. He encouraged the Commission to view the entirety of the possible benefits of this action.

Mr. Troilo said there is a possibility that the driveway could be put in this location under the current conditions. This is pointed out in the Conclusions of Law #3. Scott Adams of the Park City Fire District has expressed concern over the fire hazard of this vegetated area.

Vice-Chair Peck asked if there is a letter from Fire Chief Adams verifying that concern. Mr. Troilo said he walked the property with Fire Chief Adams who thought it would be beneficial to have this self-maintained. Planner Strader said there was an email from the Park City Fire District in the previous packet. She read the email. Fire Chief Adams said snow storage would impede the Fire District's access to this site. The Fire District is now recommending a favorable recommendation to vacate the portion of the road. It would have no adverse effect to the Fire District's vehicles.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Commissioner Harte said that Fire Chief Adams doesn't express a concern about the vegetation on the lot in the email. **Commissioner Lawson** said looking at Conclusions of

Law #3, which states the driveway can be constructed on the uphill side of the lot without the road vacation. If this is possible, what would be the purpose of the road vacation?

Mr. Troilo said the purpose of the vacation is because the constraints of the lot limit the scope of the house's construction. He hasn't brought that up because that is of no concern to the Planning Commission. He said he purchased the lot with the understanding that it is buildable. When doing his due diligence, it was suggested by the building department to consider this process. As a result, he took this one step further to have a combined effort by the Engineering Department, the Fire District, Public Works, and the Planning Department. This is the plan that was developed. It involves widening a right of way down the street. He asked the Commission look at what has been achieved through this collaborative effort.

Commissioner Barnes said he wished Attorney Brackin was in attendance to give her opinion if this would set precedence or not. Mr. Troilo said in the spirit of a collaborative effort, he also involved the County Manager. The original meeting which was to be held in October involved his input. Mr. Troilo said he walked the property with the County Manager. The County Manager was not quick to say he would not give approval to vacate the road. If he did, there would be some conditions. The property would have to be surveyed and the value appraised. The offer would come to his office as a real estate transaction. The sale of this property is at the County Manager's discretion.

Commissioner Klingenstein said the information Mr. Troilo provided has been helpful. He can understand why this action would be valuable to the landowner. But he is struggling if there is good cause. What is the public purpose of this action? In a normal process, Mr. Troilo would have a lot to build on and could go through the BOA process. But, the fact remains, he has a lot that works.

Commissioner Harte said although he isn't advocating approval, there are three things that may be good cause. One would be the sewer setback. There would be a quid-pro-quo, where the applicant would be giving a sewer easement. **Vice-Chair Peck** asked if the sewer easement already exists. Planner Strader said the sewer is in the public right of way. By

vacating the public right of way, it would be on personal property. The sewer district said Mr. Troilo would have to provide the easement.

Vice-Chair Peck said the County already has the sewer easement. If they grant the vacation of the road, the applicant is saying that he will let them maintain the easement that they already have. She doesn't think this qualifies as good cause. **Commissioner Harte** said there is also the exchange of property that is being offered. The third possible good cause would be the driveway alignment and the possible effect it has on the neighborhood.

Commissioner Klingenstein said they can't make a decision on a driveway alignment because that won't happen until it comes time for a building permit. He said he is still struggling with good cause.

Vice-Chair Peck said as she reads the Engineering report, it indicates that a wider, more uniform width would be created. She asked how much wider the right of way would be. Planner Strader said according to the Public Works Director, the right of way is about 50 feet on the top; it narrows to about 30 feet past the corner. Mr. Troilo said he is agreeing to widen the right of way by four feet, the entire 100-foot run of the downhill side. It was noted that the pavement does not narrow. The additional right of way easement would help with snow storage.

Vice-Chair Peck asked if the snow that is currently being stored in the turnaround would now be stored in this area with the increased width. Would it be proportional? She is bothered by the location of the driveway and how it would affect the turnaround and the snow storage. How would they plow around his driveway?

Commissioner Klingenstein said this reminds him of an "Old Town" problem. The snowplow drivers would now have to work around this driveway component. He noted this plat was created in 1958. It was intended to be summer cabins, not full-time residences.

The public comment period was opened. There were no comments made and the public comment period was closed.

Commissioner Klingenstein said he can't come up with good cause. He can only see how it would be beneficial to the owner. Right now there is a great place to store lots of snow. As the lots are built out, snow storage becomes more and more critical. **Commissioner Barnes** said he can see some benefit, such as fire protection to the applicant's house. He worries about setting precedence.

Commissioner Lawson said he agrees with **Commissioner Klingenstein** and **Commissioner Barnes**. The turnaround would assist cars to get by one another. It is part of the Code that a turnout is required every so many feet. He, too, is struggling with finding good cause.

Commissioner Harte said if he owned the lot, he would want to do what the applicant is proposing. The hard part for him is what is good for the public. He thinks it makes sense, but he can't answer what is the good cause for the public. He asked Planner Strader if it is decided in the future that this is the location where the driveway is going to be placed, could the Commission revisit this. Planner Strader responded that this will go before the County Council. It would not qualify for a variance, because there is no hardship. The applicant could apply for a special exception.

Vice-Chair Peck asked how an access could be granted through a right of way. Planner Strader said an encroachment permit from the Engineering Department would have to be granted. **Commissioner Harte** said if a permit is granted to build the access at this location, the rest of the issues become a moot point. He thinks it makes sense, he just doesn't see how they can say yes.

Mr. Troilo said if he is allowed to put a driveway there without the road vacation, the County gets no benefits. If the road vacation is granted, the County receives some benefit. He said Mr. Atwood has expressed a concern about the sewer right of way. Planner Strader said it is typical to have a public utility easement on a lot. If the property encumbered the sewer, than

there would be an easement associated with that. **Vice-Chair Peck** said it is self-perpetuating. If they are going to move the property line, they have to make sure they have the easement. Planner Strader said that is correct. Mr. Troilo said his point is there is some benefit to the County if the road vacation is granted.

Commissioner Klingenstein made a motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Harte, to send a negative recommendation to the County Council on the proposed Plat Amendment to vacate a portion of Zermat Strasse Road and add it to Lot 5, Plat D with the Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law as follows:

Findings of Fact:

- 1. John Troilo owns parcel SU-D-5, located in Summit Park.***
- 2. Parcel SU-D-5 is zoned Hillside Stewardship.***
- 3. Parcel SU-D-5 contains 0.26 acres.***
- 4. Parcel SU-D-5 is a legal lot of record as it is located in a recorded subdivision plat and is therefore eligible for development of a single family dwelling.***
- 5. Parcel SU-D-5 is currently vacant.***
- 6. The applicant is proposing a plat amendment to vacate a portion of Zermat Strasse Road, which is a public right of way, and add that property to Lot 5.***
- 7. The public right of way is identified on the Summit Park Plat D Subdivision, recorded in 1958.***
- 8. The amendment is being proposed to give the property owner the ability to construct a residence near the top of the lot and limit the length of the driveway.***
- 9. The required setbacks in Summit Park are fifteen (15) feet from the front property line and twelve (12) feet from the side and rear property lines.***
- 10. Parcel SU-D-5 is surrounded on all but one side by Zermat Strasse Road.***
- 11. A front setback is required on any frontage with a driveway leading to a garage or parking space. Only one minimum front setback is required.***
- 12. The Code provides an additional setback allowance in Summit Park. It states: "If more than fifty percent (50%) of the 'lot frontage' defines as the property that abuts the front property line, exceeds a thirty percent (30%) slope, measured for a distance of***

fifteen feet (15') back from the front property line, the front setback shall be measured as fifteen feet (15') from the edge of the road pavement. However, all structures and improvements, excluding driveways, are to be fully contained on the lot."

13. Staff's calculations confirm the average slope of the lot is approximately twenty-three percent (23%). The Code allows for construction on slopes up to thirty percent (30%).

14. Section 10-4-10(F) of the Snyderville Basin Development Code states that the maximum length of a cul-de-sac on any non-rural road shall be six hundred feet. The existing cul-de-sac (Zermat Strasse Road) is approximately nine hundred (900) feet.

Conclusions of Law:

- 1. It is not in the best interest of the public to vacate a portion of the public right of way that could be used for a public purpose in the future.*
- 2. It is not in the best interest of the public to remove any public right of way on a cul-de-sac that is currently non-conforming.*
- 3. A residence can be constructed on Parcel SU-D-5 without the right of way being vacated and added to Lot 5, including the driveway in the location proposed by the applicant.*
- 4. There is not good cause for the plat amendment.*

- **MOTION CARRIED (5-0)**

WORK SESSION

1. Annual review of the Snyderville Basin General Plan - Patrick Putt, Community Development Director

Community Development Director Putt said he would like to have this time be more of a conversation. He said even though they don't have a formal public hearing scheduled for this meeting, he asked if **Vice-Chair Peck** would consider taking public comment if there is time.

She agreed.

Director Putt said one of the commitments they made last year when they reworked the General Plan was to have a yearly review so that the document will stay current. It is not anticipated this will be a rewrite. If any amendments are made to the document, these will go through a public hearing. This is a chance to see what they have learned over the course of the last year. Are there some adjustments, additions, or possibly deletions that are needed? Are there priorities that need to be adjusted or strengthened?

One of the things they built into the General Plan was an opportunity (in the right locations and at the right time) to have more neighborhood-specific plans. Earlier in the month, he announced this meeting on the radio. Since then, he has been contacted by a couple of homeowner's associations and some individuals expressing interest in this idea.

Director Putt noted there was a representative from the Silver Creek area in attendance. He said he will hand out an email he received from the representatives from Fox Point. One of the comments isn't specific to the Fox Point/Newpark/Redstone neighborhood plan, but a desire for a discussion about whether or not they want to consider a SR 224 Corridor Plan program coming out of the General Plan. This should not be confused with the UDOT corridor plan. This program would consider what the public realm would look like from the interchange of I-80 to the Kimball Junction area. He would like to open this up to get their thoughts. Is there a work program or other items that they would like to have scheduled for further discussion?

COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Commissioner Klingenstein said it is too early for him to give input on the General Plan. There hasn't been much coming through the pipeline. There is probably some fine tuning needed in the neighborhood plan. They need to get the Development Code and the General Plan to start meshing. Until that happens, it is hard to know where the blemishes are. He is excited to get consistency between the two documents.

He acknowledged there has been a couple of parcels that have shown up over the past year that have waited until the General Plan and the Development Code are ready. Mixed-use zones have been talked about along with other items. They need to figure out how to get these things implemented.

Commissioner Harte concurred with **Commissioner Klingenstein**. Nothing has really been tested yet. One of the things that Director Putt and Administrator Barnes have focused on is the "human-focus design." He would like to see that addressed properly in the General Plan, meaning development being centered on people and how they interact and move rather than developing parking lots with buildings around the perimeter. His question on the General Plan is if there is room to move forward with the idea of being people-focused.

Commissioner Harte said one thing that has come up is the idea of dark skies and lighting. He wonders if the General Plan captures well enough what is the intent. They want to maintain the ability to see the stars. They don't want residential areas to have a lot of lighting coming in from neighboring businesses.

Commissioner Lawson said what is standing out for him is the neighborhood planning areas. A couple of months ago they had a neighborhood meeting and discussed the opportunity for the public to provide input on the General Plan during the time this was being reviewed. This seems to be an opportunity to involve the residents more in the planning. He asked if this is the time for input on the neighborhood planning, or are they better off to wait until they get the Code changes made.

Vice-Chair Peck noted the Old Ranch Road neighborhood has met. They took comments when the General Plan was revised. She asked if the intent has been met. **Commissioner Lawson** questioned if this is a good time to give the neighborhoods a chance to come in and comment. That could easily blend into the review of the General Plan.

Vice-Chair Peck said it seems to her that they need more micromanagement through the Development Code and how it affects the neighborhood plan. If the effect is being constructively criticized, that may be the time to have the neighborhoods come in to see how they are being affected by the implementation of the Development Code. The Development Code is basically the General Plan being put into action. **Commissioner Lawson** said they have not reached out to the public.

Director Putt said his recommendation to the Commission is to hold the public hearing until the formal review of the General Plan. What they are looking for is if there are any significant changes that have occurred. Are there any significant new issues? It would be a good time for the public to talk on the neighborhood aspect. This would also provide an opportunity to give an update of what is going on in terms of the Development Code rewrite.

At the end of the public hearing, the Commission would be in a good position to consider if there are needs that need to be changed.

Director Putt recommended a public hearing be held the first week in April. Then the Commission can evaluate the feedback they have received. **Vice-Chair Peck** noted it will not be a year in April. She suggested starting in July. They can have a work session and invite one or two of the neighborhoods. This would allow a more focused group than having all of the neighborhoods at one time. That would also give the Commission enough time to get further down the road on the Development Code.

Commissioner Klingenstein said until they roll up their sleeves and work on the Development Code, they may not have anything new to say about the General Plan.

Commissioner Harte said he likes the idea for waiting until the year mark.

Commissioner Lawson said he is encouraged by Director Putt's comment. It will offer the opportunity for public input. He doesn't feel strongly if it is the first of April or if it waits until July. He likes the idea that the public would have the opportunity to comment on the General Plan. He assumed a neighborhood could come in at that time with suggestions for their neighborhood plan.

Vice-Chair Peck said she would like to see one or two neighborhoods at each meeting. Having them all at once, when the time is limited, would be difficult. Everybody would get an opportunity to give their ideas, but it would be staggered out. Director Putt said that Phase 1 was adopted a year ago in December. Phase 2 was adopted in June.

Vice-Chair Peck opened the time for public comment.

Doug Clyde said he has done work for the Ivers family. He also did some land planning for the Park City Mayor. Both of these properties are across from the Catholic Church. The purpose of his visit is to ask them to consider drawing a red line around these parcels as a potential mixed use zone.

Mr. Clyde said there are various reasons for this. One is that identifying it as a mixed use is a means to present to the Commission projects that makes good planning sense. As it is, development in this area is extremely limited by zoning. It is a unique parcel because it has two historic properties on it, as well as a major trail system that is planned to eventually run the full length of that side of the valley.

Commissioner Klingenstein asked for more specific details of the location. Mr. Clyde said it is on White Pine Canyon Drive. The Red Barn, that is the Mayor's architectural firm, is located on this property. A graphic was displayed that showed the location of the property.

Mr. Clyde pointed out the Ivers family home. This is a historic home that was moved from Park City about 1930. There are two historic properties and four to five parcels. There is an irrigation channel that runs through it, along with some wetlands.

Essentially what they have is an incipient mixed-use neighborhood. Through the historic properties, there is the right to put in different sorts of uses other than residential and/or barns. He would like to have the ability to come in and suggest the Commission consider some residential or an affordable unit. Perhaps there is a way to bring the trail, or a way for people to enjoy the wetland area.

Mr. Clyde said he is not proposing a mixed use like a “Hyatt”-type hotel with a large commercial underneath it. He thinks that the best and highest use for this land might involve some restaurant use or perhaps some office use. What he is asking for is that they draw a circle around this area that would allow someone to come in and explain why they think it would be a good mixed use and what that mixed use would look like.

Glen Colvin is on the Board of Trustees of Service Area 3. He is not there in an official capacity. He explained Service Area 3 is the Silver Creek neighborhood north of the I-80/I-40 interchange. Over the next couple of years there will be a lot of work done in this area. There are three entities that have jurisdiction over this area. They are UDOT, Summit County, and Service Area 3. There are four County projects lined up.

Currently, there is a moratorium on developing the business properties located in the area by the interstate because of a lack of sewer. As soon as the sewer line comes in, there will be a lot of activity. There have already been requests for access to water. UDOT has opened the truck stop at the interchange. There is room for improvement in vehicle flow

and in walkability. If all this development takes place, there could be a quagmire for the next 20 to 30 years.

At the last meeting, there were several different lots that were identified for potential business development. All of these businesses will have buildings, parking lots, but no sidewalks. They have children walking down the road to the bus stop in the area. Further down, there is a Montessori School with its associated traffic.

Mr. Colvin said UDOT held a transportation meeting two weeks ago. At that meeting, a UDOT representative said they are willing to work with the local governments in deciding what to do with this parcel. Public Works have been very good in working within the confines of the parcel.

Mr. Colvin said there is no overarching vision for the area. There is nothing to help it become useful for pedestrians or bikers. When the second access comes in, Basin Recreation wants to put a bicycle path on it. There are many rumors about the wetland area behind Bells. Mr. Colvin said the development in this area is something they could use some help with as a neighborhood. The Service Area has very limited jurisdiction.

Vice-Chair Peck asked if this is the staging area for UDOT. Director Putt replied it had been the staging area and batch plant for the I-80 construction. He doesn't know what the remediation time frame is for that project. He is happy to work with Public Works and the Engineering Department to find out what their plans are for this area.

Vice-Chair Peck asked who the appropriate entity to oversee this area is. **Commissioner Harte** said ownership is a piece of that puzzle. If UDOT maintains ownership, they may or may not work with the County. Should the County try to purchase this land from UDOT? If they have three different bodies working together, it seems there will always be some kind of conflict. Director Putt said he thinks he should get information about the short term and long term plans of what is going to happen there. **Vice-Chair Peck** said when they work on the master planned development part of the Code this is an area they should keep in mind.

Commissioner Klingenstein said they have struggled with this area for way too long. The Canyon Ranch subdivision that is going in was a lost opportunity because they didn't have the appropriate tools in place. They need to develop the necessary tools. He asked when the sewer line is going to start functioning.

Julia Colins said she is a Silver Creek resident. She is very active in Special Service District 3 on the road and transportation side of things. She said this community doesn't have any goals; they have a lot of conflict. There are a lot of players. UDOT cares about freight. The residents care about lifestyle. There are commercial businesses. There are a lot of new and old residents.

They need to have support to dial in on some of these issues. She suggested they dive more into the issues of the human aspect, urban design, and how transportation and land use can

work together. Perhaps the Commission doesn't need to take a look at every community, but at the ones who are asking for help and questions to be answered. If there are conflicts with the General Plan, they should take the time to build a consensus so they don't have folks that are upset and angry. Long range planning is something she gets excited about. There is an opportunity for trails, commercial, and residential. There is an opportunity to establish a vision for these communities.

There were no other members of the public who wanted to speak.

Director Putt asked when the Commission would like Staff to arrange a formal public hearing on the General Plan. **Commissioner Harte** said he is fine with what the group wants to do, but it makes sense to him to wait until the year mark. **Vice-Chair Peck** said she would like to have more time with the Development Code. She likes the idea of summer.

Commissioner Klingenstein said he would like to get it before school lets out, so that it doesn't interfere with the public's vacations. Director Putt said they could look at a calendar at the next meeting and pinpoint some dates. **Vice-Chair Peck** said she would like to schedule it for June or July so they can have three more months to put into the Development Code.

DRC UPDATES (NONE)

COMMISSION ITEMS

Vice-Chair Peck said that she will miss having **Commissioner Barnes** on the Commission. She thanked him for everything he did. She wished him good luck. Director Putt said Staff sincerely shares those sentiments.

DIRECTOR ITEMS

Director Putt said that Planner Milliner handed out a memo. He said in November the Planning Commission approved a Rocky Mountain substation. There was considerable discussion on the materials the new poles would be made of. A number of options were considered. One was core-10, the other was galvanized, and the third was painting the poles. Rocky Mountain Power is requesting direction from Staff on how to move forward. Core-10 tends to be problematic because when it rusts, it flakes. When it flakes, it creates problems for the transformers. Essentially, that is not an option.

Another option would be to paint something close to the core-10 coloring which is represented on the memo that was distributed. The downside to painting the poles is that in 10 to 15 years the poles will need to be repainted. This would require the entire substation to be shut down. Rocky Mountain Power estimates it will take approximately three days to complete that task. The remaining option is to use galvanized poles.

Director Putt said he is uncomfortable with making this call on his own. He would like to get the thoughts of the Commission. **Commissioner Harte** said their entire reason for expanding the power line was so that the community wouldn't lose power. This seems ironic. He thinks they should choose the color or the pole that best suits the community; let Rocky Mountain figure out the other piece.

Commissioner Klingenstein said there is no way to validate this information. He believes there is a solution. There is no independent verification to know if shutting down the power in the future for 2 to 3 days is an idle threat or not. He doesn't have a good answer.

Vice-Chair Peck said she thinks that their doomsday scenario is premature. In two or three years they may find better paints. They should stick with what they told them to do and let Rocky Mountain Power sort it out.

Commissioner Harte said as he recalled, it was the “H” frames that were the issue, not the poles outside of the fenced-in area. He leans towards camouflaging it as best as they can. Director Putt verified that what he is hearing from the Commission is they prefer to have the terracotta paint on the poles inside the fenced-in area.

Vice-Chair Peck agreed. They should stick with the plan. If something improves in the meantime, that is great. **Commissioner Klingenstein** asked if phone calls were made to similar jurisdictions like Aspen and Sun Valley. He believes there are other solutions. He just doesn't know what they are. Director Putt thanked the Commission for their input.

ADJOURN

At 7:35 the meeting adjourned.



Approval Signature