



## FORSGREN-PERKINS ENGINEERING, p.a.

May 7, 1979

780387

Mr. Stan Strebel  
Summit County Planning Office  
County Courthouse  
Coalville, Utah 84017

Dear Stan:

To summarize our meeting on Silver Springs this morning, May 4, 1979, in the office of J.J. Johnson and Associates in Park City, it was concluded that we would not object to the following changes desired by the developer:

- 1) A 49' (back of curb to back of curb) road with a 70' right-of-way collector, closed street with highback curb, parking strip and sidewalk, will be installed from U-224 to a street intersection located north of a proposed residential/commercial and multi-unit area on the south part of the development lying east of the highway as shown on the Silver Springs Master Plan. This represents no change from the County Standards. Part #2 below does request a variance.
- 2) From the intersection stated in Point No. 1, the road can be classified as subcollection with a 39' (back of curb to back of curb) road and a 60' right-of-way. The road can be designed with two (2) 12' lanes, a 10' parking lane. Rolled curb and gutter can be considered by the Summit County Agencies with no objection from the engineers.
- 3) All other streets not discussed in Points 1 and 2 will be built to not less than County standards for residential roads. Use of rolled curb and gutter in these areas will not be objected to by the County engineer.
- 4) A pedestrian walkway system can be developed as discussed in the meeting with the addition of easements in the interior of the development which lead to the primary walkways.

5) The developers may post a bond for staking. The developers and engineers realized that any and all improvements not located correctly in the right-of-way will be ripped up and placed correctly at the developer's expense.

6) The engineers and developers were strongly made to realize that if they obtain final approval subject to engineering designs and specifications being approved by the County engineer, any and all plans made after obtaining tentative final approval must conform exactly to county standards and specifications with no ability to obtain variances. Any variances requested, such as those above, must be approved at the time of final approval.

While not discussed during the meeting, during our discussions with both the engineers and the developer afterwards in the office and at the site, we expressed grave concerns about the water table on the site east of the highway. Extensive preliminary work must be done to determine if the problem can be solved. [Further, we must be satisfied that the high water table has been eliminated on a year-round, permanent basis before we will consider recommending final approval.]

A construction cost estimate was presented by the developer's engineer for \$701,450 (see attachment). All costs appear to be in line with current costs. Therefore, we approve these costs with the usual inflation and contingency factors applied by the County for the bond amount.

7) Water design will show lines interior to plat 1A which are of sufficient size to handle the complete development or extra lines will be required to insure adequate water.

If you have any questions, contact us directly.

Sincerely,

FORSGREN-PERKINS ENGINEERING, p.a.

Klane F. Forsgren, Ph.D., P.E.  
Area Manager

encl/pg

