

REPORT

GEOLOGIC HAZARDS RECONNAISSANCE

PROPOSED LEGACY MOUNTAIN DEVELOPMENT

SECTIONS 14 AND 23, TOWNSHIP 6 NORTH, RANGE 1 EAST

HUNTSVILLE, WEBER COUNTY, UTAH



Prepared for

Lewis Homes
3718 North Wolf Creek Drive
Eden, Utah 84310

September 8, 2020

Prepared by

Western Geologic & Environmental LLC
2150 South 1300 East, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, Utah 84106



Voice: 801.359.7222
Fax: 801.990.4601
Web: www.westerngeologic.com



WESTERN GEOLOGIC & ENVIRONMENTAL LLC

2150 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 500
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84106 USA

Phone: 801.359.7222

Fax: 801.990.4601

Email: kthomas@westerngeologic.com

September 8, 2020

Lewis Homes
Eric Householder
3718 North Wolf Creek Drive
Eden, Utah 84310

SUBJECT: Geologic Hazards Reconnaissance
Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
Sections 14 and 23, Township 6 North, Range 1 East
Huntsville, Weber County, Utah

Dear Mr. Householder:

This report presents the results of a reconnaissance-level engineering geology and geologic hazards review and evaluation conducted by Western Geologic & Environmental LLC (Western Geologic) for the proposed Legacy Mountain Development in Huntsville, Utah (Figure 1 – Project Location). The Project consists of four parcels identified as Weber County Assessor parcel numbers 20-035-0046 (228.07 acres), 20-015-0009 (2.11 acres), 20-035-0044 (8.40 acres) and 20-035-0028 (5.00 acres). The site is located in southern Ogden Valley on generally northeast-facing slopes overlooking Pineview Reservoir in the Sections 14 and 23, Township 6 North, Range 1 East (Salt Lake Base Line and Meridian; Figure 1). Slopes at the site vary in aspect and steepness. Elevation of the site is 5,815 to 4,980 feet above sea level. The property is currently undeveloped. It is our understanding that the property is currently in conceptual planning stages.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose and scope of this investigation is to identify and interpret surficial geologic conditions at the site and identify potential risk from geologic hazards to the project. This investigation is intended to: (1) provide preliminary geologic information and assessment of geologic conditions at the site; (2) identify potential geologic hazards that may be present and qualitatively assess their risk to the intended site use; and (3) provide recommendations for additional site- and hazard-specific studies or mitigation measures, as may be needed based on our findings. No hazard-specific evaluations or subsurface explorations were conducted for this report or within the scope of our study.

The following services were performed in accordance with the above stated purpose and scope:

- A site reconnaissance conducted by an experienced certified engineering geologist to assess the site setting and look for adverse geologic conditions;

- Review of readily-available geologic maps, reports, and air photos; and
- Evaluation of available data and preparation of this report, which presents the results of our study.

The engineering geology section of this report has been prepared in accordance with Bowman and Lund (2016) and current generally accepted professional engineering geologic principles and practice in Utah, and meets specifications provided in Chapter 27 of the Weber County Land Use Code within the above stated scope. However, we do not include discussion of radon hazard potential, as recommended in Bowman and Lund (2016), because radon gas poses an environmental health hazard and indoor levels are heavily influenced by several post-construction, non-geologic factors. The hazard from radon should be evaluated by long-term testing following construction.

HYDROLOGY

The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map of the Huntsville Quadrangle shows the site is in southern Ogden Valley straddling Poison Hollow (on the west) and a tributary of Smith Creek (on the southeast), both of which flow into Ogden Valley and Pineview Reservoir (Figure 1). Pineview Reservoir is north of the Project. Both drainages appeared dry at the time of our reconnaissance. Several ephemeral drainages and erosional swales also head at the Project.

The site is at the southern margin of Ogden Valley, which is dominated in the valley bottom by unconsolidated lacustrine and alluvial basin-fill deposits. Slopes in the site area are in weathered tuffaceous bedrock overlain by alluvium and colluvium from mixed sources, including landslides. The Utah Division of Water Rights Well Driller Database shows several water wells at the Project and in the vicinity that report static groundwater depths of 28 to 180 feet below the ground surface (Figure 2B). Based on the nearby well data and our experience with the area, groundwater is likely deeper than 30 feet in most of the Project, but may be shallower (from 10 to 30 feet deep) along the bottom of Poison Hollow. However, groundwater depths at the site likely vary seasonally from snowmelt runoff and annually from climatic fluctuations, and may also vary locally with subsurface conditions. Such variations would be typical for Ogden Valley.

Avery (1994) indicates groundwater in Ogden Valley occurs under perched, confined, and unconfined conditions in the valley fill to depths of 750 feet or more. A well-stratified lacustrine silt layer forms a leaky confining bed in the upper part of the valley-fill aquifer. The aquifer below the confining beds is the principal aquifer, which is in primarily fluvial and alluvial-fan deposits. The principal aquifer is recharged from precipitation, seepage from surface water, and subsurface inflow from bedrock into valley fill along the valley margins (Avery, 1994). The confined aquifer is typically overlain by a shallow, unconfined aquifer recharged from surface flow and upward leakage. Groundwater flow is generally from the valley margins into the valley fill, and then toward the head of Ogden Canyon (Avery, 1994). Based on topography, we expect regional groundwater flow at the site to be to the northeast.

GEOLOGY

Surficial Geology

The site is located on the southern margin of Ogden Valley, a sediment-filled intermontane valley within the Wasatch Range, a major north-south trending mountain range marking the eastern boundary of the Basin and Range physiographic province (Stokes; 1977, 1986). Surficial geology of the site is shown on Figure 2A at a scale of 1:24,000, and on Figure 2B at an enlarged scale of 1:6,000. Coogan and King (2016) map the surficial geology of the site on Figures 2A and 2B as a sequence of unconsolidated alluvial, colluvial, and lacustrine deposits of varying ages and bedrock of the Tertiary Norwood Formation. The underlined units described below are those mapped at the site.

Coogan and King (2016) describe surficial geologic units in the site area on Figure 2 as follows:

Qa2, Qa2?, Qay – *Younger alluvium (mostly Holocene)*. Like undivided alluvium, with Qay at to slightly above present drainages, unconsolidated, and not incised by active drainages; likely mostly Holocene in age and postdates late Pleistocene Provo shoreline of Lake Bonneville; height above present drainages is low and is within certain limits, with suffix 1 (not present on this map) being the youngest and being at to slightly (<10 feet [3 m]) above drainages and suffix 2 being slightly higher and older, with y suffix where ages 1 and 2 cannot be separated; Qa2 is up to about 20 feet (6 m) above drainage on south side of Round Valley indicating unit includes slightly older post Provo-shoreline alluvium; generally 6 to 20 feet (2-6 m) thick. Mapped as Qa2 (queried) where about 20 feet (6 m) above incised stream in Stephens Canyon (Devils Slide quadrangle).

Qal, Qal1, Qal2, Qal2? – *Stream alluvium and flood-plain deposits (Holocene and uppermost Pleistocene)*. Sand, silt, clay, and gravel in channels, flood plains, and terraces typically less than 16 feet (5 m) above river and stream level; moderately sorted; unconsolidated; along the same drainage Qal2 is lower than Qat2 and has likely been subject to flooding, at least prior to dam building; present in broad plains along the Bear, Ogden, and Weber Rivers and larger tributaries like Deep, Cottonwood, East Canyon, Lost, and Saleratus Creeks, along Box Elder, Heiners, and Yellow Creeks, and in narrower plains of larger tributary streams; locally includes muddy, organic overbank and oxbow lake deposits; composition depends on source area, so in back valleys typically contains many quartzite cobbles recycled from the Wasatch Formation; mostly Holocene, but deposited after regression of Lake Bonneville from the late Pleistocene Provo shoreline; width in Morgan Valley is combined flood plain of Weber River and East Canyon and Deep Creeks; 6 to 20 feet (2-6 m) thick and possibly as much as 50 feet (15 m) along Weber River and thinner in the Kaysville quadrangle; greater thicknesses (>50 feet [15 m]) are reported in Morgan Valley (Utah Division of Water Rights, well drilling database), but likely include Lake Bonneville and older Pleistocene deposits.

Suffixes 1 and 2 indicate ages where they can be separated, with 1 including active channels and 2 including low terraces 10 to 20 feet (3-6 m) above the Weber and Ogden Rivers, and the South Fork Ogden River that may have been in the flood plain prior to damming of these waterways. Qal2 queried in low terraces above Bear River, Saleratus Creek, and Dry Creek where deposits may not be in the flood plain.

Qac – Alluvium and colluvium (Holocene and Pleistocene). Unsorted to variably sorted gravel, sand, silt, and clay in variable proportions; includes stream and fan alluvium, colluvium, and, locally, mass-movement deposits too small to show at map scale; typically mapped along smaller drainages that lack flat bottoms; more extensive east of Henefer where Wasatch Formation (Tw) strata easily weather to debris that “chokes” drainages; 6 to 20 feet (2-6 m) thick. Some deposits are “perched” on benches 80 feet (25 m) and more above present-day drainages like Left Fork Heiners Creek (Heiners Creek quadrangle) and Harris Canyon (Henefer quadrangle). In the Devils Slide quadrangle, some deposits are “perched” on benches about 60 to 130 feet (18-40 m) above Quarry Cottonwood Canyon indicating the alluvium is at least partly Lake Bonneville age and older (see Qab and Qao in tables 1 and 2).

Qat, Qat2, Qaty, Qatp, Qatp?, Qatpb, Qato – Stream-terrace alluvium (Holocene and Pleistocene). Sand, silt, clay, and gravel in terraces above floodplains near late Pleistocene Lake Bonneville and are geographically in the Ogden and Weber River, and lower Bear River drainages; moderately sorted; variably consolidated; upper surfaces slope gently downstream; locally includes thin and small mass-movement and alluvial-fan deposits; where possible, subdivided into relative ages, indicated by number and letter suffixes, with 2 being the lowest/youngest terraces, typically about 10 to 20 feet (3-6 m) above adjacent flood plains; Qat with no suffix used where age unknown or age subdivisions of terraces cannot be shown separately at map scale; 6 to at least 20 feet (2-6+ m) thick, with Qatp 50 to 80 feet (15-24 m) thick in Mantua Valley.

Relative ages are largely from heights above adjacent drainages in Morgan and Round Valleys. This subdivision apparently works in and is applied in Ogden, Henefer, and Lost Creek Valleys and above the North, Middle, and South Forks of Ogden River (see tables 1 and 2). Despite the proximity to Lake Bonneville, terraces along and near Box Elder Creek in the northwest corner of the Ogden map area (Mantua quadrangle) seem to be slightly higher than comparable terraces in Morgan Valley. Terraces labeled Qat2 are post-Lake Bonneville and are likely mostly Holocene in age. A terrace labeled Qaty is up to 20 feet (6 m) above the South Fork Ogden River, but may be related to the Provo or regressional shorelines. Terraces labeled Qatp are likely related to the Provo and slightly lower shorelines of Lake Bonneville (at and less than ~4820 feet [1470 m] in area), and with Qap form “benches” at about 4900 feet (1494 m) along the Weber River and South Fork Ogden River. Qato terraces pre-date Lake Bonneville. Relative age queried (Qatp?) where age is uncertain, generally due to height not fitting into ranges in table 1 and/or typical order of surfaces contradicts height-derived age.

Qms, Qms?, Qmsy, Qmsy?, Qmso, Qmso? – Landslide deposits (Holocene and upper and middle? Pleistocene). Poorly sorted clay- to boulder sized material; includes slides, slumps, and locally flows and floods; generally characterized by hummocky topography, main and internal scarps, and chaotic bedding in displaced blocks; composition depends on local sources; morphology becomes more subdued with time and amount of water in material during emplacement; Qms may be in contact with Qms when landslides are different/distinct; thickness highly variable, up to about 20 to 30 feet (6-9 m) for small slides, and 80

to 100 feet (25-30 m) thick for larger landslides. Qmsy and Qmso queried where relative age uncertain; Qms queried where classification uncertain. Numerous landslides are too small to show at map scale and more detailed maps shown in the index to geologic mapping should be examined.

Qms without a suffix is mapped where the age is uncertain (though likely Holocene and/or late Pleistocene), where portions of slide complexes have different ages but cannot be shown separately at map scale, or where boundaries between slides of different ages are not distinct. Estimated time of emplacement is indicated by relative-age letter suffixes with: Qmsy mapped where landslides deflect streams or failures are in Lake Bonneville deposits, and scarps are variably vegetated; Qmso typically mapped where deposits are “perched” above present drainages, rumpled morphology typical of mass movements has been diminished, and/or younger surficial deposits cover or cut Qmso. Lower perched Qmso deposits are at Qao heights above drainages (95 ka and older) and the higher perched deposits may correlate with high level alluvium (QTa) (likely older than 780 ka) (see table 1). Suffixes y and o indicate probable Holocene and Pleistocene ages, respectively, with all Qmso likely emplaced before Lake Bonneville transgression. These older deposits are as unstable as other slides, and are easily reactivated with the addition of water, be it irrigation or septic tank drain fields.

Qmc – Landslide and colluvial deposits, undivided (Holocene and Pleistocene). Poorly sorted to unsorted clay- to boulder-sized material; mapped where landslide deposits are difficult to distinguish from colluvium (slope wash and soil creep) and where mapping separate, small, intermingled areas of landslide and colluvial deposits is not possible at map scale; locally includes talus and debris flow and flood deposits; typically mapped where landslides are thin (“shallow”); also mapped where the blocky or rumpled morphology that is characteristic of landslides has been diminished (“smoothed”) by slope wash and soil creep; composition depends on local sources; 6 to 40 feet (2-12 m) thick. These deposits are as unstable as other landslide units (Qms, Qmsy, Qmso).

Qafp, Qafp?, Qafb, Qafb?, Qafpb, Qafpb? – Lake Bonneville-age alluvial-fan deposits (upper Pleistocene). Like undivided alluvial fans, but height above present drainages appears to be related to shorelines of Lake Bonneville and is within certain limits (see table 1); these fans are inactive, unconsolidated to weakly consolidated, and locally dissected; fans labeled Qafp and Qafb are related to the Provo (and slightly lower) and Bonneville shorelines of late Pleistocene Lake Bonneville, respectively, while unit Qafpb is used where fans may be related to the Provo or Bonneville shoreline (for example Qafpb is ~40 feet [12 m] above Lost Creek Valley), or where fans of different ages cannot be shown separately at map scale; Qafp fans typically contain well-rounded, recycled Lake Bonneville gravel and sand and are moderately well sorted; generally 10 to less than 60 feet (3-18 m) thick. Lake Bonneville-age fans are queried where relative age is uncertain (see Qaf for details); fans labeled Qafpb? are above the Bonneville shoreline and might be Qafo or like Qafm; see the note under Qao about two possible ages of older alluvium (Qao, Qato, and Qafo).

Most of the Lake Bonneville-age fans in the James Peak quadrangle are far from the Bonneville shoreline and their age is inferred from their stratigraphic relationship(s) to coeval Pinedale glacial outwash (see age equality in Table 3).

The channels (Qafp/Qdlb) on the Weber River delta and Lake Bonneville fines (Qafp on Qlfb) probably record scour and fill during the rapid drawdown of the lake as it fell from the Bonneville shoreline to the Provo shoreline.

Qap, Qap?, Qab, Qab?, Qapb – *Lake Bonneville-age alluvium (upper Pleistocene)*. Like undivided alluvium but height above present drainages appears to be related to shorelines of Lake Bonneville and is within certain limits, and unconsolidated to weakly consolidated; alluvium labeled Qap and Qab is related to Provo (and slightly lower) and Bonneville shorelines of Lake Bonneville (at ~4800 to 4840 feet [1463-1475 m] and 5180 feet [1580 m] in Morgan Valley), respectively; suffixes partly based on heights above adjacent drainages near Morgan Valley (see tables 1 and 2); Qap is typically about 15 to 40 feet (5-12 m) above present adjacent drainages, but is locally 45 feet (12 m) above; Qapb is used where more exact age cannot be determined, typically away from Lake Bonneville, or where alluvium of different ages cannot be shown separately at map scale; Qap is up to about 50 feet (15 m) thick, with Qapb and Qab, at least locally up to 40 and 90 feet (12 and 27 m) thick, respectively. Queried where classification or relative age uncertain (see Qa).

A prominent surface (“bench”) is present on Qap and Qatp at about 4900 feet (1494 m) elevation and about 25 to 40 feet (8-12 m) above the Weber River in Morgan Valley and along the South Fork Ogden River.

In the Devils Slide quadrangle, the Qab that is mapped about 80 to 95 feet (24-29 m) above Round Valley and 40 to 50 feet (12-15 m) above adjacent drainages at the mouth of Geary Hollow appears unique. Based on heights above adjacent drainages, these deposits would be Qao (see table 1), but similar alluvial deposits to the east near Phil Shop Hollow have a Bonneville shoreline cut in them and are much thinner than 40 feet (12 m). The lack of a Bonneville shoreline, and small thickness and heights above drainages indicate the deposits could be a Bonneville shoreline fan-delta.

Ql, Ql? – *Lake Bonneville deposits, undivided (upper Pleistocene)*. Silt, clay, sand, and cobbly gravel in variable proportions; mapped where grain size is mixed, deposits of different materials cannot be shown separately at map scale, or surface weathering obscures grain size and deposits are not exposed in scarps or construction cuts; thickness uncertain.

Qlf, Qlf?, Qlfb, Qlfb? – *Fine-grained lacustrine deposits (Holocene and upper Pleistocene)*. Mostly silt, clay, and fine-grained sand deposited near- and off-shore in Lake Bonneville; typically mapped as Qlf below the Provo shoreline (P) because older transgressive (Qlfb) deposits are indistinguishable from younger regressive deposits; mapped as Qlfb above the Provo shoreline because these deposits can only be related to the Bonneville shoreline (B) and transgression; grades upslope with more sand into Qls or Qlsp; typically eroded from shallow Norwood Formation in Ogden and Morgan Valleys and at least 12 feet (4 m) thick near Mountain Green. Qlf and Qlfb queried where grain size is uncertain.

In the Kaysville quadrangle, Qlf deposits that are below the Gilbert (G) shoreline are at least partly the same age as this shoreline (Holocene-latest Pleistocene) and post-date late Pleistocene Lake Bonneville. Qlf deposits below the Holocene (H) highstand shoreline are Holocene. Both ages of deposits are generally less than 15 feet (5 m) thick.

Deeper water fine-grained deposits overlie older shoreline and delta gravels (Qlf/Qdlb) at the mouths of several drainages along the Weber River. These gravels were deposited above the Provo shoreline during transgression of Lake Bonneville to the Bonneville shoreline (see unit Qdlb).

Qls, Qls?, Qlsp, Qlsb, Qlsb? – *Lake Bonneville sand (upper Pleistocene)*. Mostly sand with some silt and gravel deposited nearshore below and near the Provo shoreline (Qlsp) and between the Provo and Bonneville shorelines (Qlsb); Qls mapped downslope from slope break below Provo shoreline beach deposits where thin Lake Bonneville regressional sand may overlie transgressional sand; grades downslope into unit Qlf with decreasing sand content and laterally with more gravel into units Qdlp, Qdlb, and upslope with more gravel into unit Qlgb; Qls and Qlsb queried where grain size or unit identification uncertain; may be as much as 75 feet (25 m) thick, and thickest near Ogden; typically less than 20 feet (6 m) thick in Morgan Valley; may include small deltas and deltas that lack typical delta shape.

Qao, Qao? – *Older alluvium (mostly upper Pleistocene)*. Sand, silt, clay, and gravel above and likely older than the Bonneville shoreline; mapped on surfaces above Lake Bonneville-age alluvium (Qap, Qab, Qapb); deposits lack fan shape (Qaf) and are distinguished from terraces (Qat) based on upper surface sloping toward adjacent streams from sides of drainage; also shown where areas of fans and terraces are too small to show separately at map scale; composition depends on source area; at least locally up to 110 feet (34 m) thick. Queried where classification or relative age is uncertain (see Qa for details); for example near head of Saleratus Creek.

Older alluvium is likely older than Lake Bonneville and the same age as Qafo, so likely Bull Lake age, 95,000 to 130,000 years old (see Chadwick and others, 1997, and Phillips and others, 1997); see table 1 and note revision from Coogan and King (2006) and King and others (2008). From our work in the Henefer (Coogan, 2010b) and Devils Slide quadrangles and ages in Sullivan and Nelson (1992) and Sullivan and others (1988), older alluvium (Qao, Qafo, Qato) may encompass an upper (pre-Bull Lake) and lower (Bull Lake) alluvial surface that is not easily recognized in Morgan Valley (see tables 1 and 2).

Tcg, Tcg? – *Unnamed Tertiary conglomeratic rocks (Oligocene?)*. Characterized by rounded, cobble- to boulder-sized, quartzite-clast conglomerate with pebbles and less than 10 percent to more than 50 percent gray, tan, or reddish-gray to reddish-tan matrix; conglomerate clasts locally angular to subangular Tintic Quartzite and angular to rounded lower Paleozoic carbonate rocks; interbedded with tan, gray, and reddish-brown, pebble-bearing mudstone to sandstone and some claystone (altered tuff); most beds poorly indurated and poorly exposed; mudstone likely constitutes matrix of conglomeratic beds; in

Morgan and Durst Mountain quadrangles, about 500 to 700 feet (150-210 m) thick and thickening northward to possibly 3000 feet (900 m), though faulting may make this estimate too large.

Reddish-hued Tcg strata mostly contain recycled Wasatch Formation clasts (quartzite and carbonate) with a distinct reddish patina in a reddish matrix. Some non-conglomeratic beds in Tcg look like gray upper Norwood Formation (Tn) and are locally tuffaceous, indicating the units are interbedded. Further, some Tcg pebble beds have carbonate and chert clasts (like the Norwood) and lesser quartzite clasts, and Tcg conglomerate includes rare altered tuff clasts from the Norwood Formation. Despite tuffaceous matrix, unit Tcg seems to be less prone to mass movements than Norwood strata.

Tn, Tn? – *Norwood Formation (lower Oligocene and upper Eocene)*. Typically light-gray to light-brown altered tuff (claystone), altered tuffaceous siltstone and sandstone, and conglomerate; unaltered tuff, present in type section south of Morgan, is rare; locally colored light shades of red and green; variable calcareous cement and zeolitization; involved in numerous landslides of various sizes; estimate 2000-foot (600 m) thick in exposures on west side of Ogden Valley (based on bedding dip, outcrop width, and topography). Norwood Formation queried where poor exposures may actually be surficial deposits. For detailed Norwood Formation information see description under heading “Sub-Willard Thrust - Ogden Canyon Area” since most of this unit is in and near Morgan Valley and covers the Willard thrust, Ogden Canyon, and Durst Mountain areas.

ZYp, ZYp? – *Formation of Perry Canyon (Neoproterozoic and possibly Mesoproterozoic)*. Argillite to metagraywacke upper unit, middle meta-diamictite, and basal slate, argillite, and meta-sandstone; phyllitic at least south of Pineview Reservoir; due to overturned folding, only one diamictite unit (Adolph Yonkee, Weber State University, February 2, 2011, email communication) rather than two (see Crittenden and others, 1983); total thickness likely less than 2000 feet (600 m) (this report). Queried in knob west of North Fork Ogden River in North Ogden quadrangle because rock is quartzite that may be in this unit or the Papoose Creek Formation. The formation of Perry Canyon is prone to slope failures.

Balgord’s (2011; Balgord and others, 2013) detrital zircon uranium-lead and lead-lead maximum depositional ages (~950-1030 Ma) on the basal mudstone unit straddle the Upper and Middle Proterozoic boundary, but other maximum ages (925 Ma) on this mudstone unit are Upper Proterozoic; her maximum ages on the upper unit are about 640, 660, and 690 Ma.

Lower part of formation not measured where thick in the Wasatch Range and stratigraphy not worked out, because upper and lower parts incompletely measured and at least locally the upper and lower parts in the Wasatch Range are lithologically indistinguishable. Unit (“member”) thicknesses vary due to syndepositional faulting (see Balgord and others, 2013). The best stratigraphic section of the lower unit (ZYpm), volcanic unit (Zpb), and diamictite (Zpd) is 30 miles (50 km) to the southwest on Fremont Island in Great Salt Lake, but the base of ZYpm is not exposed (see Balgord, 2011, figure 14, p. 51; Balgord and others, 2013, figure 5). The Fremont Island section is likely in a different Proterozoic faulted basin; compare thicknesses and lithologies between Fremont Island and Willard

Peak shown by Balgord (2011, Balgord and others (2013). Also, although both localities are shown on the Willard thrust sheet by Yonkee and Weil (2011), they may be on different thrust sheets. Therefore, the formal term Perry Canyon Formation is not used. Where possible divided into several lithosomes which have been called members.

Citations, tables, and/or figures referenced above are not provided herein but are in Coogan and King (2016).

Seismotectonic Setting

The property is located at the southern margin of Ogden Valley, a roughly 40-square mile back valley described by Gilbert (1928) as a structural trough similar to Cache and Morgan Valleys to the north and south, respectively. The back valleys of the northern Wasatch Range are in a transition zone between the Basin and Range and Middle Rocky Mountains physiographic provinces (Stokes, 1977, 1986). The Basin and Range is characterized by a series of generally north-trending elongate mountain ranges, separated by predominately alluvial and lacustrine sediment-filled valleys and typically bounded on one or both sides by major normal faults (Stewart, 1978). The boundary between the Basin and Range and Middle Rocky Mountains provinces is marked by the Wasatch fault zone at the base of the Wasatch Range. Late Cenozoic normal faulting, a characteristic of the Basin and Range, began between about 17 and 10 million years ago in the Nevada (Stewart, 1980) and Utah (Anderson, 1989) portions of the province. The faulting is a result of a roughly east-west directed, regional extensional stress regime that has continued to the present (Zoback and Zoback, 1989; Zoback, 1989). The back valleys are morphologically similar to valleys in the Basin and Range, but exhibit less structural relief (Sullivan and others 1988).

Ogden Valley occupies a structural trough created by up to 2,000 feet of vertical displacement on normal faults bounding the northeastern and southwestern margins of the valley. Based on the Utah Geological Survey Quaternary Fault Database (Black and others, 2003; January 2017 update), the Ogden Valley Northeastern Margin fault is about 3.7 miles to the east-northeast of the Project and the Ogden Valley Southwestern Margin fault about 0.2 miles to the west. Both faults were most-recently active more than 10,000 years ago (Sullivan and others, 1986). The nearest active (Holocene-age) fault to the site is the Weber segment of the Wasatch fault zone about 5.8 miles to the west.

The site is also in the central portion of the Intermountain Seismic Belt (ISB), a generally north-south trending zone of historical seismicity along the eastern margin of the Basin and Range province extending from northern Arizona to northwestern Montana (Sbar and others, 1972; Smith and Sbar, 1974). At least 16 earthquakes of magnitude 6.0 or greater have occurred within the ISB since 1850; the largest of these earthquakes was a M 7.5 event in 1959 near Hebgen Lake, Montana. None of these earthquakes occurred along the Wasatch fault or other known late Quaternary faults (Arabasz and others, 1992; Smith and Arabasz, 1991). The closest event was the 1934 Hansel Valley (M 6.6) event north of the Great Salt Lake. The March 18, 2020 M 5.7 earthquake north of Magna, Utah reportedly showed a style, location, and slip depth consistent with an earthquake on the Wasatch fault system (<https://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eventpage/uu60363602/executive>). Despite being moderate in size (less than magnitude 6.0), this earthquake was felt from southern Idaho to south-central Utah and caused serious damage to multiple buildings (<https://www.ksl.com/article/46731630/>).

Lake Bonneville History

Lakes occupied nearly 100 basins in the western United States during late-Quaternary time, the largest of which was Lake Bonneville in northwestern Utah. The Bonneville basin consists of several topographically closed basins created by regional extension in the Basin and Range (Gwynn, 1980; Miller, 1990), and has been an area of internal drainage for much of the past 15 million years. Lake Bonneville consisted of numerous topographically closed basins, including the Salt Lake and Cache Valleys (Oviatt and others, 1992). Portions of Ogden Valley were inundated by Lake Bonneville at its highstand, including the northern part of the Project. The highest (Bonneville) shoreline is mapped on Figures 2A and 2B crossing the northern part of the Project at an elevation of roughly 5,180 feet (blue line and B).

Timing of events related to the transgression and regression of Lake Bonneville is indicated by calendar age estimates of significant radiocarbon dates in the Bonneville Basin (Oviatt, 2015). Approximately 30,000 years ago, Lake Bonneville began a slow transgression (rise) to its highest level of 5,160 to 5,200 feet above mean sea level. The lake rise eventually slowed as water levels approached an external basin threshold in northern Cache Valley at Red Rock Pass near Zenda, Idaho. Lake Bonneville reached the Red Rock Pass threshold and occupied its highest shoreline, termed the Bonneville beach, around 18,000 years ago. During the transgression and highstand, major drainages that emanate from within the Wasatch Range (such as the Weber River) formed large deltaic complexes in the lake at their canyon mouths. Headward erosion of the Snake River-Bonneville basin drainage divide then caused a catastrophic incision of the threshold and the lake level lowered by roughly 360 feet in fewer than two months (Jarrett and Malde, 1987; O'Conner, 1993).

Following the Bonneville flood, the lake stabilized and formed a lower shoreline referred to as the Provo shoreline between about 16,500 and 15,000 years ago. Climatic factors then caused the lake to regress rapidly from the Provo shoreline, and by about 13,000 years ago the lake had eventually dropped below historic levels of Great Salt Lake. Drainages that fed Lake Bonneville began downcutting through stranded deltaic complexes and near-shore deposits as the lake receded from the Provo shoreline. Oviatt and others (1992) deem this low stage the end of the Bonneville lake cycle. Great Salt Lake then experienced a brief transgression around 11,600 years ago to the Gilbert level at about 4,250 feet before receding to and remaining within about 20 feet of its historic average level (Lund, 1990).

SITE CHARACTERIZATION

Empirical Observations

On August 28, 2020 Bill D. Black, P.G. of Western Geologic conducted a brief reconnaissance of the property. Weather at the time of the site visit was clear with a temperature of about 72 °F. A photographic record of our reconnaissance is included in the Appendix. The site was accessed via a jeep trail that enters the eastern part of the property from the adjoining Chalets at Ski Lake subdivision. The jeep trail trends generally westward and southwestward, and ascends to and crosses a ridge top underlying the middle of the Project. The road splits to the west and south near the south boundary of the Project. Due to the Project size and lack of access to some areas, not all areas of the Project were directly accessed or could be observed, particularly in Poison Hollow and to the west.

The site is in southern Ogden Valley on slopes overlooking Pineview Reservoir. Native vegetation appeared to consist mainly of sage brush, oak brush, mature pine and aspen trees, and various grasses, wildflowers, and broadleaf weeds. The western side of Poison Hollow is heavily vegetated. Surficial soils varied, but generally appeared to be sandy with gravel, clay and rare small boulders. Some desiccation cracking suggestive of clay-enriched soil was observed in the northern part of the site and on the ridge top at the head of Poison Hollow. The Project straddles Poison Hollow on the west and a tributary of Smith Creek on the southeast. Both drainages were dry at the time of our reconnaissance. No other perennial or intermittent drainages cross the site, but several ephemeral drainage swales and dry washes head at the Project that are likely active only during intense rainstorms and from spring snow melt. No seeps or springs were observed at the site. A low outcrop of finely bedded tuffaceous sandstone to siltstone was observed in the northern part of the Project and tuffaceous sandstone residuum was evident in the road where it begins ascending the ridge. The ridge top is mapped on Figures 2A and 2B as being underlain by queried mass movement deposits sourced in Norwood Formation, however we infer the ridge is instead underlain by weathered tuffaceous sandstone similar to those further east. Most of the Qms deposits mapped on Figures 2A and 2B observed at the site appeared eroded and subdued. No evidence for recent or ongoing slope instability, characteristic debris flow features, significant bedrock outcrops, or other geologic hazards was observed.

Air Photo Observations

High-resolution orthophotography from 2012, bare earth LIDAR (Light Imaging Detection and Ranging) digital elevation mapping from 2016, and NAIP orthophotography from 2018 available from the Utah AGRC were reviewed to obtain information about the geomorphology of the Project area (Figures 3A-C). Site-specific surficial geologic mapping for the area is shown on Figures 2B. Figure 3B shows slopes at the site vary in aspect and steepness.

The site straddles Poison Hollow, which crosses the western part of the Project. The area west of Poison Hollow is heavily vegetated and underlain by a sequence of landslides of varying ages. Two landslides are mapped near the north and northeast boundary of the Project that truncate the Bonneville shoreline and therefore post-date the lake. A sequence of landslide deposits is also in the eastern part of the site that predates and may post-date or be contemporaneous with Lake Bonneville. A northeast-facing scarp marks the head of the source area for the Qms slide deposit. A southeast-facing scarp is further south that marks a likely deep-seated slump; the deposit from the slump appears to be developed by a home along Old Snow Basin Road and the toe is cut by the same tributary of Smith Creek that crosses the southeast corner of the Project. A northeast-trending ridge crosses the central part of the Project. The northern and southern parts of the ridge are mapped as being underlain by Tertiary Norwood Formation, whereas the middle part (ridge top) is mapped as being underlain by queried landslide deposits sourced in Norwood Formation. Based on our empirical observations above, we believe the ridge top is similarly underlain by tuffaceous sandstone bedrock, although it is likely that adjacent slopes are mantled by colluvium. No evidence for other geologic hazards was observed on the air photos at the site.

GEOLOGIC HAZARDS

Assessment of potential geologic hazards and the resulting risks imposed is critical in determining the suitability of the site for development. Table 1 below shows a summary of the geologic hazards reviewed at the site, as well as a relative (qualitative) assessment of risk to the Project for each hazard. A “high” hazard rating (H) indicates a hazard is present at the site (whether currently or in the geologic past) that is likely to pose significant risk and/or may require further study or mitigation techniques. A “moderate” hazard rating (M) indicates a hazard that poses an equivocal risk. Moderate-risk hazards may also require further studies or mitigation. A “low” hazard rating (L) indicates the hazard is not present, poses little or no risk, and/or is not likely to significantly impact the Project. Low-risk hazards typically require no additional studies or mitigation. We note that these hazard ratings represent a conservative assessment for the entire site and risk may vary in some areas. Careful selection of development areas can minimize risk by avoiding known hazard areas.

Table 1. *Geologic hazards summary.*

Hazard	H	M	L
Earthquake Ground Shaking	X		
Surface Fault Rupture			X
Liquefaction and Lateral-spread Ground Failure			X
Tectonic Deformation			X
Seismic Seiche and Storm Surge			X
Stream Flooding			X
Shallow Groundwater			X
Landslides and Slope Failures	X		
Debris Flows and Floods			X
Rock Fall			X
Problem Soil		X	

Earthquake Ground Shaking

Ground shaking refers to the ground surface acceleration caused by seismic waves generated during an earthquake. Strong ground motion is likely to present a significant risk during moderate to large earthquakes located within a 60 mile radius of the Project area (Boore and others, 1993). Seismic sources include mapped active faults, as well as a random or “floating” earthquake source on faults not evident at the surface. The Utah Geological Survey Quaternary Fault Database (Black and others, 2003; January 2017 update) shows numerous class A faults within 60 miles of the Project that may pose potential seismic sources.

The extent of property damage and loss of life due to ground shaking depends on factors such as: (1) proximity of the earthquake and strength of seismic waves at the surface (horizontal motions are the most damaging); (2) amplitude, duration, and frequency of ground motions; (3) nature of

foundation materials; and (4) building design. Based on 2018 IBC provisions, a site class of D (stiff soil), and a risk category of II, calculated seismic values for the site (centered on 41.247579° N, -111.807261° W) are summarized below:

Table 2. *Seismic hazards summary.*

S_s	0.873 g
S_1	0.308 g
$S_{MS} (F_a \times S_s)$	1.004 g
$S_{M1} (F_v \times S_1)$	See ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.8
$S_{DS} (2/3 \times S_{MS})$	0.67 g
$S_{D1} (2/3 \times S_{M1})$	See ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.8
Site Coefficient, F_a	= 1.151
Site Coefficient, F_v	See ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.8
Peak Ground Acceleration, PGA	= 0.386 g

Given the above information, we rate the hazard from earthquake ground shaking as high. Earthquake ground shaking is a regional hazard common to all Wasatch Front areas. The hazard is mitigated by design and construction of homes in accordance with the current adopted building code. We note that IBC 2018 provisions require calculation of the spectral acceleration value (S_{M1}), seismic design value (S_{D1}), and site coefficient (F_v) differently from IBC 2015. In municipalities where IBC 2018 has been adopted, the Project engineer or architect should determine these seismic values in accordance with ASCE 7-16 Section 11.4.8 guidelines.

Surface Fault Rupture

Movement along faults at depth generates earthquakes. During earthquakes larger than Richter magnitude 6.5, ruptures along normal faults in the intermountain region generally propagate to the surface (Smith and Arabasz, 1991) as one side of the fault is uplifted and the other side down dropped. The resulting fault scarp has a near-vertical slope. The surface rupture may be expressed as a large singular rupture or several smaller ruptures in a broad zone. Ground displacement from surface fault rupture can cause significant damage or even collapse to structures located on an active fault.

No evidence of active surface faulting is mapped or was evident at the site. The nearest active (Holocene-age) fault to the site is the Weber segment of the WFZ about 5.8 miles to the west. Given the above, the risk from surface faulting is low.

Liquefaction and Lateral-spread Ground Failure

Liquefaction occurs when saturated, loose, cohesionless, soils lose their support capabilities during a seismic event because of the development of excessive pore pressure. Earthquake-induced liquefaction can present a significant risk to structures from bearing-capacity failures to structural footings and foundations, and can damage structures and roadway embankments by triggering lateral spread landslides. Earthquakes of Richter magnitude 5 are generally regarded as the lower threshold for liquefaction. Liquefaction potential at the site is a combination of expected seismic (earthquake ground shaking) accelerations, groundwater conditions, and presence of susceptible soils.

Although the Project is in an area of potentially strong ground shaking, groundwater is likely more than 30 feet deep based on nearby water well driller reports. Subsurface soils that would be susceptible to liquefaction are also unlikely to be present, although some lacustrine sand deposits may underlie the northern part of the site below the Bonneville shoreline. Assuming the above, we rate the risk from liquefaction as low. Weber County hazard mapping also shows the site in an area of low liquefaction potential (code 1).

Tectonic Deformation

Tectonic deformation refers to subsidence from warping, lowering, and tilting of a valley floor that accompanies surface-faulting earthquakes on normal faults. Large-scale tectonic subsidence may accompany earthquakes along large normal faults (Lund, 1990). Tectonic subsidence is believed to mainly impact those areas immediately adjacent to the downthrown side of a normal fault. Given that the site is not on the downthrown side of any active faults, we rate the risk from tectonic subsidence as low.

Seismic Seiche and Storm Surge

Earthquake-induced seiche presents a risk to structures within the wave-oscillation zone along the edges of large bodies of water, such as the Great Salt Lake. Given relative elevations and distance to the nearest large body of water (Pineview Reservoir), we rate the risk from seismic seiches and storm surges as low.

Stream Flooding

Stream flooding may be caused by direct precipitation, melting snow, or a combination of both. In much of Utah, floods are most common in April through June during spring snowmelt. High flows may be sustained from a few days to several weeks, and the potential for flooding depends on a variety of factors such as surface hydrology, site grading and drainage, and runoff.

Poison Hollow and a tributary of Smith Creek cross the site and several ephemeral drainages and erosional swales head at the Project. No other perennial, intermittent or ephemeral drainages are mapped crossing the site, were evident on air photos, or were observed during our reconnaissance. Federal Emergency Management Agency flood insurance rate mapping (Map Number 49057C0475F, effective 06/02/2015; and 49057C0243E, effective 12/16/2005) classify the Project in "Zone X" (area of minimal flood hazard), except for the narrow strip on the north, which is in "Zone D" (area where there are possible but undetermined flood hazards). Given the above, we rate the risk from stream flooding as low. However, the risk may vary seasonally in close proximity to Poison Hollow creek and the tributary of Smith Creek.

Shallow Groundwater

Given evidence discussed in the Hydrology Section above, groundwater at the site is likely more than 30 feet deep, except for in the bottom of Poison Hollow. Although shallower levels may occur seasonally, as would be expected for an alpine environment, we do not anticipate that groundwater will pose a significant development constraint. We therefore rate the risk from shallow groundwater as low. However, groundwater is a significant trigger for slope instability. Care should therefore be taken that proper surface and subsurface drainage is maintained. The risk may vary seasonally in close proximity to Poison Hollow creek and the tributary of Smith Creek, and locally in areas where subsurface conditions cause perched conditions above less-permeable subsurface layers.

Landslides and Slope Failures

Slope stability hazards such as landslides, slumps, and other mass movements can develop along moderate to steep slopes where a slope has been disturbed, the head of a slope loaded, or where increased groundwater pore pressures result in driving forces within the slope exceeding restraining forces. Steep slopes underlain by landslide-prone bedrock (such as the Norwood Formation), slopes exhibiting prior failures, and deposits from landslides are particularly vulnerable to instability.

Several Pleistocene to Holocene-age landslides underlie the portions of the site, mainly west of Poison Hollow and in slopes bordering the northeast-trending ridge crossing the middle of the Project. Slopes at the site vary in aspect and steepness. Figure 3D shows a slope and landslide hazard map that combines mapped landslides and slope steepness to show potentially restrictive slope conditions. Areas in red are severely restrictive and should be avoided in the subdivision planning stage. Areas in orange and brown have high and moderate restrictive conditions and may be buildable depending on future analyses. The areas most likely to be favorable are shown in green and yellow. The hazard above and below severe and high restrictive areas could have a higher risk than indicated. Small areas of favorable conditions within larger areas that are less favorable should thus be viewed skeptically.

Given the mapped landslides and steep slopes in some areas of the site, we rate the risk from landsliding at the site as high. However, the risk may vary. We therefore recommend a geotechnical engineering evaluation be conducted prior to building to evaluate stability of the slopes at the site. Recommendations should be provided for reducing the risk from slope instability if factors of safety are determined to be unsuitable. The stability evaluation will require subsurface exploration (such as test pits) to obtain site-specific data, as well as geologic cross sections based on subsurface geologic conditions. Groundwater and/or water from sources such as septic systems (if they will be in use) should be considered in the analyses. Water, steep man-made cuts, non-engineered fill materials, and deposits from prior landslides are often major causes of slope instability. Care should also be taken to maintain proper site drainage and that site grading does not destabilize slopes at the site without prior geotechnical analysis and grading plans.

Debris Flows

Debris flow hazards are typically associated with unconsolidated alluvial fan deposits at the mouths of large range-front drainages, such as those along the Wasatch Front. Debris flows have historically caused significant damage in the Wasatch Front area. The Project is not in an area subject to alluvial-fan flooding and no debris-flow channels, levees, or other debris-flow features were observed. We therefore rate the hazard from debris flows to the Project as low.

Rock Fall

No bedrock outcrops were observed at the site or in higher slopes that could present a source area for rock fall clasts. We therefore rate the hazard from rock falls to the Project as low.

Problem Soil and Rock

Surficial soils that contain certain clays can swell or collapse when wet. Weber County hazard mapping shows the northeast half of the Project in an area of possible expansive soils, and desiccation cracking suggestive of possible clay-rich soil was observed in several areas during our reconnaissance. We therefore rate the hazard from problem soil and rock to the Project as moderate. A geotechnical engineering evaluation should be conducted prior to construction to evaluate site-specific soil conditions and provide recommendations for site grading, subgrade preparation, and footing and foundation design.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Earthquake ground shaking and landslides pose a high relative geologic hazard risk to the Project. The hazard from ground shaking is common to all Wasatch Front areas. We recommend the following:

- ***Seismic Design*** – All habitable structures developed at the property should be designed and constructed to current seismic building codes to reduce the risk of damage, injury, or loss of life from earthquake ground shaking.
- ***Geotechnical Considerations*** – A design-level geotechnical engineering evaluation should be conducted after conceptual planning and prior to construction to: (1) address soil conditions at the site for use in foundation design, site grading, and drainage; (2) confirm the ground-shaking hazard and provide appropriate seismic design parameters; and (3) evaluate stability of slopes at the site, including providing recommendations for reducing the risk of landsliding if the factors of safety are deemed unsuitable. The stability evaluation should be based on site-specific geotechnical data and geologic characterizations, and account for groundwater and water from sources such as septic systems. No unplanned slope cuts should be made at the site without prior geotechnical analyses and care should also be taken that proper site drainage is maintained. The geotechnical engineering evaluation will require a cooperative effort between a geologist and the geotechnical engineer, and involve subsurface exploration to obtain soil samples and characterize the landslide deposits.
- ***Report Availability*** – This report and any subsequent reports regarding geologic conditions at the property should be made available to the architect and building contractor, as well as real estate agents and potential buyers in the event of a future sale. The report should be referenced for information on technical data only as interpreted from observations and not as a warranty of conditions throughout the site. The report should be submitted in its entirety, or referenced appropriately, as part of any document submittal to a government agency responsible for planning decisions or geologic review. Incomplete submittals void the professional seals and signatures we provide herein. Although this report and the data herein are the property of the client, the report format is the intellectual property of the authors and should not be copied, used, or modified without their express permission.

LIMITATIONS

This investigation was performed at the request of the Client using the methods and procedures consistent with good commercial and customary practice designed to conform to acceptable industry standards. The analysis and recommendations submitted in this report are based upon the data obtained from site-specific observations and compilation of known geologic information. This information and the conclusions of this report should not be interpolated to adjacent properties without additional site-specific information. In the event that any changes are later made in the location of the proposed site, the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report shall not be considered valid unless the changes are reviewed and conclusions of this report modified or approved in writing by the engineering geologist.

This report has been prepared by the staff of Western Geologic for the Client under the professional supervision of the principal and/or senior staff whose seal(s) and signatures appear hereon. Neither Western Geologic, nor any staff member assigned to this investigation has any interest or contemplated interest, financial or otherwise, in the subject or surrounding properties, or in any entity which owns, leases, or occupies the subject or surrounding properties or which may be responsible for environmental issues identified during the course of this investigation, and has no personal bias with respect to the parties involved.

The information contained in this report has received appropriate technical review and approval. The conclusions represent professional judgment and are founded upon the findings of the investigations identified in the report and the interpretation of such data based on our experience and expertise according to the existing standard of care. No other warranty or limitation exists, either expressed or implied.

The investigation was prepared in accordance with the approved scope of work outlined in our proposal for the use and benefit of the Client; its successors, and assignees. It is based, in part, upon documents, writings, and information owned, possessed, or secured by the Client. Neither this report, nor any information contained herein shall be used or relied upon for any purpose by any other person or entity without the express written permission of the Client. This report is not for the use or benefit of, nor may it be relied upon by any other person or entity, for any purpose without the advance written consent of Western Geologic.

In expressing the opinions stated in this report, Western Geologic has exercised the degree of skill and care ordinarily exercised by a reasonable prudent environmental professional in the same community and in the same time frame given the same or similar facts and circumstances. Documentation and data provided by the Client, designated representatives of the Client or other interested third parties, or from the public domain, and referred to in the preparation of this assessment, have been used and referenced with the understanding that Western Geologic assumes no responsibility or liability for their accuracy. The independent conclusions represent our professional judgment based on information and data available to us during the course of this assignment. Factual information regarding operations, conditions, and test data provided by the Client or their representative has been assumed to be correct and complete. The conclusions presented are based on the data provided, observations, and conditions that existed at the time of the field exploration.

It has been a pleasure working with you on the Project. Should you have any questions, please call.

Sincerely,
Western Geologic & Environmental LLC



Bill. D. Black, P.G.
Subcontract Engineering Geologist

Reviewed By:



Kevin J. Thomas, P.G.
Principal Geologist

ATTACHMENTS

- Figure 1. Location Map (8.5"x11")
- Figure 2A. Regional Geologic Map (8.5"x11")
- Figure 2B. Site-Specific Geologic Map (11"x17" portrait)
- Figure 3A. 2012 Air Photo (11"x17" portrait)
- Figure 3B. LIDAR Analysis (11"x17" portrait)
- Figure 3C. 2018 Air Photo (11"x17" portrait)
- Figure 3D. Slope and Landslide Hazard Map (11"x17" portrait)
- Appendix. Photographic Record of Site Reconnaissance

C:\Users\GLENDA\Documents\WG&E\PROJECTS\Lewis Homes\Huntsville, UT - Geo Haz Recon - Legacy Mountain Development
#5483\Geo Haz Recon - Proposed Legacy Mountain Development - Huntsville, UT.docx

WG&E Project No. 5483


Copyright 2020 by Western Geologic & Environmental LLC. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any media or format, in whole or in part, of any report or work product of Western Geologic, or its associates, is prohibited without prior written permission

REFERENCES


- Anderson, R.E., 1989, Tectonic evolution of the intermontane system--Basin and Range, Colorado Plateau, and High Lava Plains, *in* Pakiser, L.C., and Mooney, W.D., editors, Geophysical framework of the continental United States: Geological Society of America Memoir 172, p. 163-176.
- Arabasz, W.J., Pechmann, J.C., and Brown, E.D., 1992, Observational seismology and evaluation of earthquake hazards and risk in the Wasatch Front area, Utah, *in* Gori, P.L. and Hays, W.W., editors, Assessment of Regional Earthquake Hazards and Risk along the Wasatch Front, Utah: Washington, D.C, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1500-D, Government Printing Office, p. D1-D36.
- Avery, Charles, 1994, Ground-water hydrology of Ogden Valley and surrounding area, eastern Weber County, Utah and simulation of ground-water flow in the valley-fill aquifer system: Utah Department of Natural Resources, Technical Publication no.99, 84 p.
- Black, B.D., Hecker, Suzanne, Hylland, M.D., Christenson, G.E., and McDonald, G.N., 2003, Quaternary fault and fold database and map of Utah: Utah Geological Survey Map 193DM, CD-ROM.
- Boore, D.M., Joyner, W.B., and Fumal, T.E., 1993, Estimation of Response Spectra and Peak Acceleration from Western North America Earthquakes--An interim report: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 93-509.
- Bowman, S.D., and Lund, W.R., 2016, Guidelines for conducting engineering-geology investigations and preparing engineering-geology reports in Utah, *in* Bowman, S.D., and Lund, W.R., editors, Guidelines for investigating geologic hazards and preparing engineering-geology reports, with a suggested approach to geologic-hazard ordinances in Utah: Utah Geological Survey Circular 122, p. 15–30.
- Coogan, J.C., and King, J.K., 2016, Interim Geologic Map of the Ogden 30' x 60' Quadrangle, Box Elder, Cache, Davis, Morgan, Rich, and Summit Counties, Utah, and Uinta County, Wyoming: Utah Geological Survey Open-File Report 653DM, scale 1:100,000, 141 p. with appendices.
- Gilbert, G.K., 1928, Studies of Basin and Range Structure: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 153, 89 p.
- Gwynn, J.W. (Editor), 1980, Great Salt Lake--A scientific, historical, and economic overview: Utah Geological Survey Bulletin 166, 400 p.
- Jarrett, R.D., and Malde, H.E., 1987, Paleodischarge of the late Pleistocene Bonneville flood, Snake River, Idaho, computed from new evidence: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 99, p. 127-134.
- Lund, W.R. (Editor), 1990. Engineering geology of the Salt Lake City metropolitan area, Utah: Utah Geological and Mineral Survey Bulletin 126, 66 p.
- Miller, D.M., 1990, Mesozoic and Cenozoic tectonic evolution of the northeastern Great Basin, *in* Shaddrick, D.R., Kizis, J.R., and Hunsaker, E.L. III, editors, Geology and Ore Deposits of the Northeastern Great Basin: Geological Society of Nevada Field Trip No. 5, p. 43-73.
- O'Connor, J.E., 1993, Hydrology, hydraulics, and geomorphology of the Bonneville flood: Geological Society of America Special Paper 274, 83 p.
- Oviatt, C.G., 2015, Chronology of Lake Bonneville, 30,000 to 10,000 yr B.P.: Quaternary Science Reviews, v. 110 (2015), p. 166-171.
- Oviatt, C.G., Currey, D.R., and Sack, Dorothy, 1992, Radiocarbon chronology of Lake Bonneville, Eastern Great Basin, USA: Paleogeography, Paleoclimatology, Paleoecology, v. 99, p. 225-241.

- Sbar, M.L., Barazangi, M., Dorman, J., Scholz, C.H., and Smith, R.B., 1972, Tectonics of the Intermountain Seismic Belt, western United States--Microearthquake seismicity and composite fault plane solutions: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 83, p. 13-28.
- Smith, R.B., and Arabasz, W.J., 1991, Seismicity of the Intermountain Seismic Belt, *in* Slemmons, D.B., Engdahl, E.R., Zoback, M.D., and Blackwell, D.D., editors, Neotectonics of North America: Geological Society of America, Decade of North American Geology Map v. 1, p. 185-228.
- Smith, R.B. and Sbar, M.L., 1974, Contemporary tectonics and seismicity of the western United States with emphasis on the Intermountain Seismic Belt: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 85, p. 1205-1218.
- Stewart, J.H., 1978, Basin-range structure in western North America, a review, *in* Smith, R.B., and Eaton, G.P., editors, Cenozoic tectonics and regional geophysics of the western Cordillera: Geological Society of America Memoir 152, p. 341-367.
- _____, 1980, Geology of Nevada: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Special Publication 4.
- Stokes, W.L., 1977, Physiographic subdivisions of Utah: Utah Geological and Mineral Survey Map 43, scale 1:2,400,000.
- _____, 1986, Geology of Utah: Salt Lake City, University of Utah Museum of Natural History and Utah Geological and Mineral Survey, 280 p.
- Sullivan, J.T., Nelson, A.R., LaForge, R.C., Wood, C.K., and Hansen, R.A., 1986, Regional seismotectonic study for the back valleys of the Wasatch Mountains in northeastern Utah: Denver, Colorado, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Seismotectonic Section, Division of Geology, Engineering and Research Center, unpublished report, 317 p.
- Western Geologic, 2019, Geologic Hazards Evaluation--Legends at Hawkins Creek Lot 30, 6551 East Chaparral Road, Huntsville, Weber County, Utah: unpublished consultant's report prepared for Mr. Ron Murone, Job 5291, 20 p. with test pit logs.
- Zoback, M.L., 1989, State of stress and modern deformation of the northern Basin and Range province: Journal of Geophysical Research, v. 94, p. 7105-7128.
- Zoback, M.L. and Zoback, M.D., 1989, Tectonic stress field of the conterminous United States: Boulder, Colorado, Geological Society of America Memoir, v. 172, p. 523-539.

FIGURES



Source: U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Series Topographic Maps, Utah - Huntsville and Snow Basin, 1998.




Scale 1:24,000
(1 inch = 2000 feet)


LOCATION MAP

GEOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION
 Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
 Parts of Sections 14 and 23
 Township 6 North, Range 1 East
 Huntsville, Weber County, Utah

FIGURE 1



Source: Coogan and King (2016), original map scale 1:100,000. See text for explanation of nearby surficial geologic units.




Scale 1:24,000
(1 inch = 2000 feet)

REGIONAL GEOLOGIC MAP


GEOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION

Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
Parts of Sections 14 and 23
Township 6 North, Range 1 East
Huntsville, Weber County, Utah

FIGURE 2A




Modified from Coogan and King (2016; Figure 2A), original map scale 1:100,000. See text for explanation and discussion of surficial geologic units. Red hatched lines denote mapped landslide scarps. Nearby water wells from Utah Division of Water Rights data with reported static groundwater depth in feet. Contours at 4 foot intervals based on geoprocessed 2016 LIDAR data.





SITE-SPECIFIC GEOLOGIC MAP

GEOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION
 Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
 Parts of Sections 14 and 23
 Township 6 North, Range 1 East
 Huntsville, Weber County, Utah

FIGURE 2B



Source: Utah AGRC, 2012 High Resolution Orthophoto, 12.5 cm resolution.




2012 AIR PHOTO



GEOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION

Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
 Parts of Sections 14 and 23
 Township 6 North, Range 1 East
 Huntsville, Weber County, Utah

FIGURE 3A



Source: Utah AGRC, 2016 LIDAR Bare Earth DEM, 50 cm resolution; slope gradients <15% unshaded, 15-25% in yellow, and >25% in red.




LIDAR ANALYSIS



GEOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION

Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
 Parts of Sections 14 and 23
 Township 6 North, Range 1 East
 Huntsville, Weber County, Utah

FIGURE 3B





Source: Utah AGRC, 2018 NAIP orthophoto, 60 cm resolution.





2018 AIR PHOTO
GEOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION Proposed Legacy Mountain Development Parts of Sections 14 and 23 Township 6 North, Range 1 East Huntsville, Weber County, Utah
FIGURE 3C

EXPLANATION

- 



Low restrictive conditions. Slopes in these areas are gentler than 25% and not in any Qms or Qmc deposits. A slope stability evaluation is recommended to determine the need for mitigation, but is likely to show adequate factors of safety.
- 

Moderate restrictive conditions. Slopes in these areas are steeper than 25% and not in any Qms or Qmc deposits, or are on gentle slopes (< 15%) in Qms and Qmc deposits. A slope stability evaluation is recommended to determine the need for mitigation and may show inadequate factors of safety in some areas.
- 

High restrictive conditions. Slopes in these areas are steeper than 25% in Qmso, queried landslides or landslide-prone bedrock, or on slopes steeper than 15% in Qms and Qmc deposits. A slope stability evaluation is recommended to determine the need for mitigation and has a higher risk than moderate areas of showing inadequate factors of safety.
- 

Severe restrictive conditions. Slopes in these areas are steeper than 25% and in Qms and Qmc deposits. These areas should be avoided for preliminary planning purposes.

PROJECT



SLOPE AND LANDSLIDE HAZARD

GEOLOGIC HAZARDS EVALUATION
 Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
 Parts of Sections 14 and 23
 Township 6 North, Range 1 East
 Huntsville, Weber County, Utah

FIGURE 3D

APPENDIX

**Photographic Record of Site Reconnaissance
Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
Sections 14 and 23, Township 6 North, Range 1 East
Huntsville, Weber County, Utah**

Photo 1. View north at east property boundary.



Photo 2. View east from east property boundary.



**Photographic Record of Site Reconnaissance
Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
Sections 14 and 23, Township 6 North, Range 1 East
Huntsville, Weber County, Utah**

Photo 3. View south at east property boundary.



Photo 4. View west across northern part of site.



**Photographic Record of Site Reconnaissance
Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
Sections 14 and 23, Township 6 North, Range 1 East
Huntsville, Weber County, Utah**

Photo 5. Thinly bedded tuffaceous sandstone to siltstone bedrock exposure.



Photo 6. Weathered tuffaceous sandstone in road.



**Photographic Record of Site Reconnaissance
Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
Sections 14 and 23, Township 6 North, Range 1 East
Huntsville, Weber County, Utah**

Photo 5. Poison Creek Canyon, looking west from ridge top.



Photo 6. View north at head of Poison Creek.



**Photographic Record of Site Reconnaissance
Proposed Legacy Mountain Development
Sections 14 and 23, Township 6 North, Range 1 East
Huntsville, Weber County, Utah**

Photo 5. Possible expansive soil cracking.



Photo 6. Ridge top in center of Project.

