

Miranda Menzies
3807 N. Elkridge Trail,
P.O. Box 1130
Eden 84310

July 24, 2014

Ogden Valley Planning Commission
Weber County Planning Department
Weber Center
2380 Washington Blvd., Suite 240
Ogden, UT 84401

Re: Powder Mountain “Weber County Rezone Application – Destination and Recreation Resort Zone DRR-1

Dear Commissioners,

I am a resident of Eden, Utah, and these comments are made by me as a private citizen and not on behalf of any of the organizations with which I am associated as a volunteer or Board Member.

Please consider the following comments on the Powder Mountain “Weber County Rezone Application – Destination and Recreation Resort Zone DRR-1. This submission is based on Commission Chairman’s statements on July 22, 2014 at the commission meeting, requesting comments on the Presentation and Master Plan filed by Summit Mountain Holding Group in support of this rezone application.

General Comments:

A. Density

There is a lot to like in the Master Plan overall. In particular, I support the clustered village development, goals of reduced water usage, and efforts to minimize the impact on the mountain environment.

However, on multiple occasions, at neighborhood public meetings and otherwise, SMHG have stated that their intent is to develop only 1000 units out of the 2800 units in the original Western American Holdings Development Agreement with Weber County (2006). In this July 2014 Master Plan, the 2800 development units are specifically cited in 3 or more places, including the breakout of development types on page 18. In other words the development plan now appears to be back to the original 2800 units. Then the Economic Benefit analysis (page 5) – Exhibit to the application is based upon 1000 units of single family or multi-family housing. It is unclear whether all of the other supporting calculations are based on 1000 DU or 2800 DU.

While I recognize that the 2002 development agreement exists, it now appears that SMHG is not being internally consistent in the plan, nor with the multiple representations they have made to the community. I suggest the plan be based on what they actually plan to do, while making reference to the 2800 entitlements as a footnote, not the primary subject of the Plan.

B. Trails

There is a statement (p41) that: “*all recreation facilities will be available to the public. Some uses will be fee-based such as skiing, guided events, spas etc*”. This implies that hiking, biking and equestrian trails will possibly be open and free to the public, or maybe not?

Trails which have existed and been used by the public for 20 years or more have a prescriptive easement under Utah statute. Many of these trails are mapped on old maps. The trails from top of Sundown Saddle to White Pine basin, the trail to Flat Top, and Sunridge Vista Loop Trails are shown on the Weber County hosted GIS map of trails (recreation layer) and duplicated on the Weber Pathways trail maps used by many of the public. The development plan appears to turn several of these into roads.

A clear statement by SMHG that these recreational hike/bike and equestrian trails, and others, will remain open and available to the public without charge would go a long way to allaying concerns of the hiking and biking public.

Specific Comments

The following specific editorial comments are offered in order to increase the completeness and accuracy of the Master Plan, and support its usefulness in the future:

1. Page 8 A statement is made that there are no historical or cultural resources at the project. However, previously there was much description of the history of the resort, including the work by Dr Alvin Cobabe the original resort owner and developer. At the top of the Timberline Lift, there is still the quite well-preserved saw mill used by Dr Cobabe and his team in construction of the original resort. Similarly the crane, now at the top of Hidden Lake Lift, which was used during original construction. I suggest these artifacts be considered “historical” during resort development, protected, and signage provided to enhance the visitor experience.
2. In multiple places the Plan describes how homes and other structures will be placed within forested areas. The need to remove deadwood and brush fuel should be emphasized (it is already noted), as should hard-scaping around the structures, in order to reduce the fire risk, and the consequent risk to the lives of our firefighters.
3. The transportation report is referenced, and the following comments refer to that Exhibit.
 - The transportation plan makes no mention of the construction traffic that will be caused by development of the resort. This is omitted from the estimated numbers of employee trips, and parking requirements. Note that the economic Benefit Analysis document from Weber County Economic Development Director indicates 743 annual construction jobs, throughout the project. This is the same order of magnitude as the projected number of resort employees (1010 or 1623 depending on which section you are reading), so the transportation needs of these employees should be considered.
 - Many of these construction vehicles will be loaded, and therefore heavy and slow going up on the SR 158. The same vehicles are potentially dangerous in case of brake failure coming down SR 158. Overall their omission from the Transportation Plan is puzzling and troubling. They will be seasonal to a large extent, but should be considered, if only to strengthen

SMHG's excellent suggestion of truck runaway ramps on the road (made at the public hearing).

- Section C of the transportation report states (no doubt correctly) that the average existing grade up SR 158 from Wolf Creek to the top is 9%. This plan section should also include a couple of sentences about the maximum grade, and the average grade over the one or two steepest ¼ mile sections (immediately above Lefty's Canyon confluence, and at the "last corner" below Mid-Mountain). I believe the grade on these sections exceeds 12 percent. These sections are what actually stops the 2-wheel drive cars in their tracks on snowy days. To have no mention of them is in my opinion misleading and incomplete presentation for the reader.
 - The transportation report fails to consider the effect of the linkage proposed in the Ogden Valley Transportation Element, between North Divide and the Powder Mountain Road, with a junction at Fairways Drive. Much of this road is either already constructed or platted into sub-divisions. The consequence of its omission is that the assumptions of traffic distribution between North Divide and Ogden Canyon are likely erroneous (by 2019 Phase I completion). Similarly, recommendations for mitigation at Valley Market 4-way stop and at the Dam (SR-39 and SR-158) may be inappropriate.
 - However, a roundabout at the Valley Market is likely a good idea as long as provision can be made for pedestrians, since there is now a walking trail crossing SR-158 on the south side of this junction (not shown in the transportation plan). See Figure 6 Area A. Consideration of pedestrians should be included for high pedestrian usage areas in the transportation plan.
 - At the Dam junction (SR-39 and SR-158), placing a signal (suggested for mitigation) is possibly inconsistent with Federal and State guidelines or regulations for management of this "High Risk dam" due to seismic risk and consequent safety hazard. (This point was raised by a resident at a neighborhood meeting where Summit presented their ideas).
 - The section on current parking capacity Section IV, fails to include parking capacity at Hidden Lake Lift, including Summit's new Sky Lodge parking area, which is 50 - 75 stalls, and is regularly used at higher percentage occupancy than the main parking lot at Timberline. It is the parking area of choice for many season ticket holders, who do not need to buy day-passes. The maps in the main report indicate that this is planned as a "mixed use area", but the parking demand still exists.
4. The seasonal workforce housing plan (page 43) is not clear with respect to the amount of housing to be provided at the mountain nor whether it is consistent with the Transportation Plan and the economic Benefit Analysis.
- a. The Master Plan talks about 1,623 full time equivalent employees in the main document, however the **estimated total [new] employees** shown on Transportation Plan Table 7 is 364 to 450 at Stage 1 and an additional 186 to 232 at Stage 2. New workforce trips estimated in the transportation plan is 683 (Transportation Plan Table 8). Are these numbers consistent? Presumably these discrepancies are made up by mandatory employee public transit?
 - b. As stated above, the Cost Benefit Analysis document from Weber County Economic Development Director indicates 743 annual construction jobs, throughout the project.

Are these included in the 1623 employees? Maybe, since the economic benefit analysis mentions 1010 direct employment jobs at the resort. However, using the Eden median salary is inconsistent with point 4d. below.

- c. 984 workforce housing units and 98 seasonal employee workforce housing units are mentioned. Lower down a statement is made that Seasonal workforce will be housed at “Mid-Mountain”, but the remaining 886 will be “off-site”. Is this consistent with the Transportation Plan?
- d. The last sentence at the end of this paragraph is incomplete/typographically erroneous, but appears to assume the workforce will be housed in Ogden Valley and Ogden. This is likely, but should also include North Ogden area, given the additional road connection via North Divide, commented on above in Item 3.

I appreciate your consideration of these review comments.

Sincerely,

Miranda Menzies

Resident of Eden.

801-745-2793