

**Summary of URAAC Steering Committee Meeting-Steamboat Unbridled
12/10/09
Meeting held in Rooms #113 & 114, Centennial Hall**

Committee Members in Attendance	Ex-Officio	Staff, Consultants, and TAC Members	Other Interested Parties
Steve Frasier Chris Diamond Jim Schneider (Alt.) David Baldinger Peter Patten John Curnow Brent Pearson Jon Wade	Scott Myller	Joe Kracum Nicole Horst Bob Keenan Janet Hruby	Shannon Dillard

Co-Chairman Frasier called the meeting to order at approximately 1:05pm. He introduced Brent Pearson as a new member of URAAC.

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. Administrative Items

- Review meeting notes from November 12, 2009 meeting
- Next SSRA Meeting & Open House – December 15, 2009
- Next URAAC Meeting – January 14, 2009 (No meeting on Dec 24)

Change to previous minutes:

Diamond - Item #3 membership update – please change the reason the new association is being changed. Instead of their being no paperwork for the old association, the reason the new association is being formed is that it has a different mission.

MOTION:

A motion was made by Baldinger to approve the minutes from November 12th as amended. Diamond seconded the motion.

VOTE:

The motion was approved unanimously.

Frasier welcomed new committee member Brent Pearson and provided an update of future meeting dates.

Kracum explained that in January he will be asking to move forward with putting the plans on the streets. The resolutions to move forward with the bond will take place at the next SSRA meeting.

NON CONSENT AGENDA:

2. Financing Update

- A briefing on the bond issue will be provided.

Kracum –

Explained that the bond resolution will go to SSRA on December 15, 2009. At the next City Council meeting, the moral obligation will go in front of the Council. The scheduled date for closing is the 21st with signatures on the 22nd of this month. The bond has been reduced, as discussed before, which should give us about \$5.1m available for construction in 2010. Next year, hopefully earlier than this year, we should have a better idea of how much money we will get for 2011.

3. Promenade & Daylighting of Burgess Creek Design Update

- A briefing will be made on the progress of the final design. A preliminary opinion of the construction costs will be presented. *URAAC input will be requested on the design.*

Horst –

Displayed drawings explaining the current plan. We will have one more presentation in January before they go out on the streets on February 9th. The one big thing they are working on is the ventilation of the garage. She showed on the plans what they are proposing for the garage ventilation. They will leave all the windows open to allow air flow and possibly create an additional opening. Section A is the east side of the garage and you can ski over it. Section C is where the stairs come up. She showed on the plans how this will work for the ventilation of the garage. They still have a little more to figure out on the design.

Kracum –

They are trying to make it so the garage can be skied over. They are trying to make the MSE retaining wall (stabilized earth). They don't want to have any structural connection with the wall and the garage.

Horst –

This has to be checked out by the structural engineer. She gave an explanation of the layout and the materials.

An extensive discussion took place regarding the drawings.

Horst -

This seems to be the most cost effective to meet all the requirements, however, more discussion needs to take place. We have to keep 180 sq.ft. of air open space and we don't want to count the garage entrance. We need to look at upgrading the existing fans.

Kracum –

12/10/09

We are planning for the ventilation code today rather than for when the garage was built.

Frasier –

Is someone going to come along after the fact and say sorry, now that you have modified building by adding a window, the URA is responsible for its future upkeep and this is what we are trying to avoid. His question is, “Is the structural engineer certificate sufficient to avoid any repercussion? Kracum explained that the engineer has to stamp this and he is on the line for this.

Patten -

In our coordination with the Torian Association, at some point they will need to upgrade or redevelop this parking structure. What are the impacts on our project at the point where Torian says we are going to do something with the parking structure?

Horst –

That is why nothing is resting on the parking structure. We are staying clear of the foundation with this MSC wall.

Patten –

We need to work closely with the Torian and they need to know what we are doing, what the impact is, what future redevelopment of this structure would mean, etc.

Kracum –

We are showing this to URAAC members today before meeting with Torian.

Discussion took place regarding the difference with the ramp and the construction in these drawings.

Diamond –

Expressed concern over the ramp placement leading up to the Torian garage.

Horst –

Explained the reasoning for this. It depends on if URAAC wants the gathering spaces where people can sit and wait for people coming, or if you want to make the switch-back it makes it more of just a pedestrian access.

More discussion took place regarding the switchbacks and the stairs.

Patten –

Discussed the possibility of relocating the stairs.

Baldinger –

Thinks we are getting hung up with these being “to scale” drawings. He is not concerned with the wall with all the seating area and thinks it is bigger than it looks on the drawings.

Frasier –

For presentation purposes, this birds-eye view is hard to see how it will actually look.

Kracum –

We can possibly get with Winston Assoc. to put this in 3D to visualize it better. This could help explain it to a lot of people.

Diamond –

Disagreed that the presentation is the problem. He thinks this is just a functional issue. This is a year round issue of how accessible this ramp is going to be? There is no question that we have changed the original design. He understands why the change was made but would prefer if the pedestrian traffic was directed right to the bottom of the ramp.

Baldinger –

Thinks the proposed design is terrific even though it is the minority view. He thinks it just may need minor tweaking and it is fine as shown.

Patten –

He thinks we have two options. He showed what his thoughts were on the plans.

Horst –

Time would be a consideration and we are already over construction budget. This change would make more pavement but we could make the area by the Sheraton less.

Frasier –

What is the goal for today's discussion?

Kracum –

He would like to take some decision to the SSRA meeting next Tuesday. Alignment and grade needs to be fixed. Changing the stairs would add a lot of time. There is a way to make these changes but it would be tough to get it done in the time allotted.

Frasier –

Option #1 is not an option because of timing. Option #2 is to come up with a different design at the end of the ramp. Is there consensus to have Joe and Nicole look into this and would they be able to do this in time for the SSRA meeting next Tuesday?

Kracum –

No, we could not engineer this by next Tuesday.

More discussion took place regarding the confusion of the ramp area and the difference from the original plans for the amphitheatre. Some compromises with the entrance were made and Nicole will make the changes that were shown by URAAC

Summary of URAAC

12/10/09

members on the plans. She explained how they came up with this design and felt this was the best direction because they were running out of time.

Kracum –

They will keep this as is at this point but will look at it to change some of the detail.

Horst –

We are here for meetings next week and can sketch up the changes to bring at that time and can send them electronically.

Kracum –

Estimates the current scope of the project will be over what we thought we had money for. Even so, he would like to put this on the streets as is and see where actual pricing comes in. He doesn't want to start taking things out at this point. This is the standard that you all wanted and he doesn't want to take things out until they have pricing on everything. The pricing will be on individual components. They anticipate doing this February 9th. The prices would be due the 15th of March. This would give us a month to work out details.

Baldinger –

Philosophically, do we shave everything a little bit or take out a huge chunk to keep everything up to gold standard?

Diamond –

Is concerned with the space for the amphitheatre. There is a lot of traffic there and the stage is right in front of the main traffic area. Somewhere we have to create a better space.

Horst –

She is calling that area a stage that would have a tent set up for company picnics, etc. It is a nice flat lawn area and serves a purpose different than the big stage. This is programmed on a smaller scale than an amphitheatre.

Patten –

These kinds of spaces are critical to our success to have areas for more functions.

Kracum –

Do you want this area to be paved or have a platform? We would need a retaining wall to make it flat.

A discussion took place regarding where and how they want this area. If we are trying to create a small venue for small concerts, weddings, etc., maybe the Promenade should be partially changed. We need flexibility. Some ideas were given and Horst feels these are easy changes.

Frasier –

Can we all agree in concept to provide something for Joe to take to SSRA. The general plan is to have Nicole show a different rendering submitted to URAAC

12/10/09

members prior to the SSRA meeting. That new drawing would be instrumental in presenting it to SSRA as well. When URAAC members receive it, at that point they can tweak it individually. If that is the case, are we comfortable enough with the remainder to accept a motion to approve the recommendation?

MOTION:

Wade moved to recommend to SSRA to approve the plans leaving the east side the way it was presented as a potential amphitheater space and adding a wall to get 20-25' of a flat space between the ramp and the stairs and making a seat wall 22" high. This will not interrupt the Promenade. Sketch options will be sent out for approval by URAAC members. A couple stone terraces will be added towards the west. The motion was seconded by Patten.

VOTE:

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Promenade & Daylighting of Burgess Creek Phasing Options

- Phasing options for 2010 and 2011 will be presented. A recommendation on the phasing will be requested from URAAC.

Kracum –

He previously sent URAAC members a couple of drawings. He showed on slides what needs to be done. Work areas for construction were shown in colors for the next two (2) years. The northernmost section will be building the shuttle stop and widening the sidewalk in that area. The area on top of the garage is dependent on the Torian Plum getting their garage resurfaced to bring it up to grade. Then we can put in snowmelt, power lines and pavers. Torian is hoping to get this done by July and have already committed. Torian is also working on making their ventilation operational. Then, we will look at the connection with One Steamboat Place to the Sheraton. The last item is the creek.

Earlier in the fall what we wanted to do was to complete everything north of the Sheraton connection, plus rough grading everything else, plus getting a rough grade and some usable surface over the One Steamboat Place to Sheraton area. Then the following year, come in and put the snowmelt in and finish the pavers and then finish the creek. He doesn't think we have enough money to do all that now so that is why he has presented three options. He does not really like option #3. He showed the options on the slides by color codes.

Discussion took place regarding the different options.

Frasier –

He feels the missing component is between Torian and Gondola Square and it is a crucial part of the design. The sooner we can get that done would be his vote.

Kracum –

12/10/09

If the ventilation and top of the garage doesn't get done, that would be the only reason it couldn't get done. He has spoken to some of the property owners and they want to get it done. Torian is talking about having the construction done by the middle of July. He will be able to get the top of the garage done if Torian gets their part done. The intent will be to get a piece done that will be functional in case the project gets delayed another year.

Diamond –

He is concerned about having two projects going on at the same time but interested in making the connection. Even if Torian runs into time delays, we could still put in a temporary hard surface across the grass on top of the garage which would prevent that area from becoming a muddy mess.

Wade -

Agreed the top (Torian) section is more important to get done than the middle section.

Kracum –

He would like to get as much of the preferred plan done as possible next year. It is obviously money dependent and it is somewhat dependent on the Torian.

MOTION:

Baldinger moved to recommend to SSRA to approve Option #1.

For 2010, construct the amphitheater area and the top of the Torian Plum garage, connecting the existing plaza next to Slopeside with the area of the Sheraton. Wade seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

Kracum explained that Option #1 is the pink area down to where the Sheraton entrance is on the north side of Bear River and making the connection on top of the garage all the way over to the Burgess Creek Plaza.

VOTE:

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Street Furniture, Art, & Memorials Policy Discussion

- We will discuss a draft of a policy for street furniture, art, and memorials on the public access easements on the Promenade. *URAAC input will be requested.*

Kracum –

Distributed information on the policy for street furniture, art, and memorials on the public access easements on the Promenade.

Furniture,

Regarding furniture, he does not believe anything should go into the creek area that is fixed. No art or furniture. Talked about getting a distinctive "Unbridled" type of furniture. We have an allowance but nothing definite has been decided. There will be benches, chairs, tables and trash receptacles. There is an idea to use solar

power curb side trash compactors which makes good sense. These would have maintenance associated with them such as bags, batteries, etc., but would save in the long run. Furniture should be placed outside the flow of pedestrians on the Promenade.

Patten –

In the fire pit area specifically, we talked about benches for people to put their feet on by the fire. There is room and space to do that. Some nice benches there would be a good idea. Benches are for sale at the High School that could be custom made by students.

Kracum –

Explained we could get an “Unbridled” type of bench that would be heavy enough not to be moved. There is also the idea of a “bake sale” that could generate revenue in some way by using the bench idea. We could have a local firm build them and sell them for more money that could give us a revenue source for more art or whatever. We can also put names on bricks and benches.

The idea of furniture would be to have requests come to the URAAC Committee and get approved by the SSRA. Maintenance would be done by the property owner. We would need to develop a standard. We could possibly jury out a competition locally for designing something, and possibly use some of the beetle kill pine to make it sustainable.

Artwork,

Wade –

Asked what the City rules and process for art and public spaces is currently?

Keenan –

The Public Arts Board reviews the art and makes a recommendation to City Council. Typically this is written in as a public benefit for a project. Planning does not look at this outside of having the Arts Board looking at it.

Kracum -

The concept would be to send anything to the Arts Board first then let the Arts Board come to URAAC with a recommendation, especially if there is funding involved. Placement would be important to discuss. Art should be placed outside the flow of pedestrians on the Promenade and could serve as a wayfinding feature.

The committee members are concerned that the Arts Board may not make timely decisions. They are concerned that there might not even be an Arts Board formed at the present time.

Pearson –

Suggested there was consensus that this committee decides where the art should go. There was consensus that this committee should be able to decide where the art should go. Patten would like signs to be added to this also. A sub-committee should be formed to identify the spots where art should go.

Kracum –

Will speak with the Arts Council as well as Planning and see what can be done. Hruby suggested tying this into wayfinding. Kracum feels that the biggest problem is maintenance. It was suggested that the special district or property owner should maintain the art. We have had several requests up to now.

Memorials,

We have received three requests for memorials on the Promenade. Kracum stated that a possible policy would be to not allow memorials on the public access easement of the Promenade and Creek but could be placed on private property. With that, only the property owner would have approval and the URAAC and SSRA would not be involved.

The committee members agreed and Kracum said he would update the policy from these discussions for the next URAAC meeting.

Horst –

Had information which was shown regarding wayfinding. She showed the directories and what Nobel Erickson came up with. She felt these were good until she started looking at them from a distance and they do not seem to be readable. These are a change in concept and she would like to have the sub-committee discuss what we should show.

Discussion took place regarding what should be on the signs and what size they should be. There was consensus that names are better than numbers. One at the new plaza, one on top of the stairs of the garage, one at the bottom of the stairs in the plaza, one in Gondola Square. The one not yet defined would be the Torian Plum amphitheatre area. Thunderhead will be the same standard as the Sheraton.

There are two standards of signage. One costs \$16k and one costs \$4k. The ones with the directory include iconic points. This will all be discussed at the sub-committee meeting.

Horst –

The meeting for this sub-committee will be 9:00am next Wednesday in the Crawford Room.

Baldinger –

Suggested having the signs made with the place name bigger, the snowflakes smaller, and possibly brighter colors.

Horst –

The colors they are using are Steamboat Unbridled colors.

6. Miscellaneous Items

- We will provide a discussion of items raised between the development of this agenda and the URAAC meeting.

Summary of URAAC

12/10/09

Frasier –

There was public comment at a recent City Council meeting about the size of the trash enclosure at Torian Plum. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

Signage was discussed and how we can display what is coming in the future. Torian needs to be distinguished from Slopeside. The kiosk in front of the Clock Tower could easily be moved to go in-between the Creek side and the Torian tower. There is a temporary kiosk by One Steamboat Place that can be moved and one out by the airport.

ADJOURN:

Frasier declared the meeting adjourned at approximately 3:10pm.