

Dana Schuler Weber County Engineering Division 2380 Washington Blvd. #240 Ogden, UT 84401

RE: Summit at Powder Mountain Phase 1D Response to Engineering Comments

Ms. Shuler,

The following are comments and responses pertaining to the civil engineering plans from your review and received on November 7, 2013.

General Comments:

1. Compaction tests will be required on sub-base, base, and asphalt.

Response: Agreed Compaction tests will be performed during construction.

2. An excavation permit will be required for all work done within the existing public right-of-way.

Response: Agreed

3. A review approval letter from PMWSID will be required.

Response: Agreed an approval letter will be provided

4. All improvements need to be either installed or escrowed for prior to recording of the subdivision.

Response: Agreed

- 5. A Storm Water Construction Activity Permit is required for any construction that:
 - 1. disturbs more than 5000 square feet of land surface area, or
 - 2. consist of the excavation and/or fill of more than 200cubic yards of material, or
 - 3. requires a building permit for which excavation or fill is a part of the construction, and less than five acres shall apply for a county permit.

Response: Agreed the site will require a Storm Water Activity Permit.

6. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is now required to be submitted for all new development where construction is required. The State now requires that a Utah Discharge Pollution Elimination Systems (UPDES) permit be acquired for all new development. A copy of the permit needs

OFFICES NATIONWIDE

to be submitted to the county before final approval. Permits can now be obtained online thru the Utah State Department of Environmental Quality at the following web site: https://secure.utah.gov/swp/client.

Response: Agreed Contractor will obtain the SWPPP and UPEDS and provide the documentation to the county before construction activity begins.

7. After all items have been addressed a wet stamped copy of the improvement drawings will be required.

Response: A wet stamp set will be provided once final approval is given.

Plat Specific Comments:

Sheet 1

1. Date is missing.

Response: Date added, Revision table

2. Plat notes label and owner's dedication label references "Summit Eden Estates" which is neither the name of the subdivision nor the owner

Response: Updated to Summit at Powder Mountain Phase 1D

3. Title block title is incorrect:

Response: Updated title block section information

4. Rocky Mountain Power spelling error

Response: Corrected

5. Spell out full name of Improvement District

Response: Corrected

6. Survey Narrative note #1- does not read correctly

Response: Corrected

7. Owner's Dedication, incorrect property owners



Response: Property owners included, SMHG Phase 1, And two (2) Village Neighborhood Associations: Summit Eden Village Association and Summit Main Street Association.

8. Owner's Dedication, private easement paragraph.

Response: added note #19 and deleted obsolete information.

9. Note needed on plat or in CC&R's prohibiting on street parking

Response: Note in CC&R's

10. Added note regarding restricted lots.

Response: added note #22

Sheet 2

1. Change label of diagonal hatch to "Building Envelope" or Building Pad"

Response: Changed label to Building Envelope

2. Are parcel K and L Open Space

Response: Yes, added labels accordingly.

3. No access line needed along Summit Pass for Parcel K through Lot 106 (access via Rolling Drive only)

Response: Added to Summit Pass

4. & 5. Lots 101 through 106 need to be labeled as restricted and the Lots classified as restricted by placing the letter R immediately to the right of the lot number of said lot

Response: added restricted labels in correct location on Lots 101-106

6. Label owner of land where "Road Parcel A "label is

Response: Added Summit holding group as land owner

7. & 8. Development parcel D reference a plat notes that does not exist and Drainage Easement is labeled as 20' but only measures 10' Also, hatch pattern identifies as Buildable Area.

Response: Corrected Drainage Easement width and hatching pattern.



9. & 10. Unlabeled but hatch easement adjacent to lot 107 is outside of subdivision. Easements are required for all improvement that extends outside of the subdivision.

Response: Removed 10' Sewer Easement for Phase 1D plat, Created an Exhibit for 10' Sewer Easement including a legal description.

Improvement Plan Specific Comments:

1. Sheet 1.01 – Keynote 6 – what size service?

Response: The water service size is 3/4" see Keynote 6, sheet 1.01

2. Sheet 1.03 – See general comment #3 above. Also, need acknowledgement of 17.5' deep sewer line.

Response: Agreed a letter will be provided from PMWSID prior to construction, and we do understand that we have a 17.5' deep sewer line.

3. Sheet 1.03 – Why an 18" line on Meridian Ave? Master Plan does not show development past this. If anything, suggest looping it in to line on Daybreak Ridge.

Response: The line in Meridian Ave is sized for and 18" due to the future development potential that is planned in the area. This water line will act as a main point of connection for any future development. Waterline has been added to provide looping.

4. Sheets 1.03 and 1.04 – All improvements outside of subdivision boundary require an easement from affected property owner. (i.e. grading, drainage, sewer line, utility stubouts)

Response: The property owner will provide the grading and utility easements. These easements are currently being prepared

5. Sheet 1.05 – Geotech report needs to be more specifically referenced and provided to contractor.

Response: Agreed, see the Geotechnical note added to the General Notes Sheet for Specific Reference. Sheet 1.01

6. Sheet 1.05 – Roadway typical section shows communication conduits, but none are shown in the utility or p&p sheets. Nor are details provided for any communications structures.

Response: The communication design is still being worked out with the communication company. Details and design will be provided to the county once the design is complete. The conduits are shown in profile for the purpose of describing the general scope of work. Additional details will be provided in the future.



7. Sheet 1.05 – Fire hydrants are in potential conflict with dry utilities.

Response: If a conflict does arrive dry utilities will be adjusted horizontally to avoid the Fire hydrants

8. Sheet 3.00 – Maximum cut per WC ordinance is 15'.

Response: The area that we have more than 15' of cut we are constrained by the Public Road. If we modify the grading to meet the 15' cut maximum we will have to raise the intersection between Meridian and the Public Road.

9. Sheet 3.00 – Why is section 11+00 not perpendicular to road centerline?

Response: Section 11+00 has been changed to be perpendicular to the centerline of the road. See sheet 3.00

We have addressed all of your comments and are submitting new improvement drawings for your review and approval. Please review and comment if need. If you have any questions please let me know.

Regards,

Brandon Preece

Assistant Engineer

CC: Jared Andersen, PE- Weber County Engineer Rick Everson, PE- Watts Enterprises, Inc.-Land Owner's Representative

