

From: Charles Haggerty chuckhaggerty@icloud.com

Subject: Dakota Pacific Development

Date: November 15, 2021 at 2:43 PM

To: gwright@summitcounty.orgmstevens@summitcounty.orgdclyde@summitcounty.orgarmstrong@summitcounty.orgcfrobinson@summitcounty.org

Cc: Haggerty Carleen carleenhaggerty@icloud.com, Summitcounty.org



We are writing to "Strongly Oppose" the Dakota Pacific Development.

We the taxpayers and voters of Summit County have absolutely no obligation to "Bail out" the Dakota company for making a bad business decision.

The Snyderville Planning Commission (your commission) voted 5-2 on September 8, 2020 not to approve this development, and I might add for "very sound reasons".

The original Boyer Company size approved was 1,295,000 sq feet. The Dakota Pacific project is purposing 1,725,000 sq feet, a 34 % increase on the same land footprint!

You have no plan on traffic. What you have is "hope" that the UDOT will come in and save the day. Well, hope is not a plan or strategy.

If a project is approved by UDOT and the funds secured, it will land right square in the middle of a "Possible Olympics". Not smart

You have no plan for WATER!

1,100 workforce housing units purposed by DP will be eaten up by the planned "Commercial Development". You will end up with more need then before the project started!

This is going to have a massive impact on Park City year around. We already have a a colossal mess on 248 and now you want to do even worse on 224?

Approval of this project will be the worst decision ever made in Summit County and for that matter the State of Utah or Park City (and PC has had their share of them)

You have not talked about the need for another new school which the taxpayers will foot the bill for and we just approved \$79M

You just got \$50M approved for open space and now you want to look the other way and approve this? You can't have it both ways.

We have not heard one good reason to bail out this developer and destroy the lives of the people of Summit County!

PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE OF THIS PROJECT. WE JOIN A 1000 OR MORE TAXPAYERS and VOTER'S OF SUMMIT COUNTY IN OPPOSITION!

VOTE "NO"

Chuck & Carleen Haggerty
Park City

*Please pass on to
each Council member
TKS
Chuck*



UTAH STATE LEGISLATURE

STATE CAPITOL • SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84114

LE.UTAH.GOV



November 26, 2021

Summit County Council
60 North Main, Coalville, Utah 84017
Chairman Glenn Wright

Chairman Wright -

Over the past decade Utah has become the nation's leader in economic growth and upward mobility. With that success has come some challenges. Keeping up with the constant growth means ever increasing investments in transportation and infrastructure. One aspect of growth that has been a growing concern and a potential hinderance to our economic leadership is making sure we also address housing affordability.

Today, we face a housing supply shortage that threatens to slow our state's economy. This isn't a new problem, it has been a challenge for the state since the post-recession recovery began in '09-10, but like many other issues this one seems to have been exacerbated by the challenges of the pandemic.

As state leaders, we are proud of what our state is accomplishing in the face of great challenges, and we are actively pursuing ways to keep Utah a place where upward mobility and economic opportunity are not blocked by lack of housing affordability. Including this last year our legislature has made housing affordability a top priority. However, we are still significantly behind on the supply curve, and we will continue to be behind if local governments across the state don't join with us in efforts to help.

State legislators understand all too well the politics at the local level of trying to promote smart growth. We watched with concern over the past month as many "smart growth" advocates at the city and county level lost elections to those who positioned themselves as anti-growth. Growth cannot be our enemy if we hope to remain an economic leader.

With a goal of working in a collaborative way with local cities and counties, in 2021, the legislature created the SB217, Housing and Transit Reinvestment Zone (HTRZ). It was developed in partnership with cities, counties, transportation agencies, planning agencies, developers, school districts and special districts and was aimed directly to address Utah's housing crisis by facilitating mixed-use, multi-family and affordable housing developments within proximity to commuter rail and certain transit hubs. The goals of the legislation are simple: promote higher use of public transit, increase housing availability, use water and other limited resources wisely, and establish clear commitments to invest in transit corridors.

We have watched the discussion in your community closely and we hope you will join with the legislature to address the housing affordability challenges faced by our state. As you consider making this important policy decision, Summit County can be confident in our commitment to support the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity HTRZ projects.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Adams", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

President J. Stuart Adams
Utah Senate

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brad Wilson", with a large, sweeping flourish above the name.

Speaker Brad Wilson
Utah House of Representatives

From: **Carolyn Rose** <c.rose1105@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific concerns
Date: 26.11.2021 21:20:44 (+01:00)
Attachments: Dakota Project comments.docx (2 pages)

Hello Council Members,

I appreciate all you have had to deal with these past 2 years! Especially in supporting the health department during this pandemic when I was the Nursing Director. I know we wouldn't have handled the pandemic as well as we did without your support.

Below are my concerns and comments regarding the Dakota Pacific project. I have also attached them in a word document.

Roger, thank you for maintaining your position to oppose the Dakota Pacific project.

1. Main question: Has there been any active recruiting of tech companies for the original proposed land use? With all the building of tech companies in Lehi I would think there are companies very willing to build here. I have not read any information addressing this issue.
2. One of the main reasons the original proposed use was for tech companies was to provide job openings in Summit County that offered a higher wage than the current low wage businesses offer.
3. Offering higher wage earnings then allows people to live in our community, maybe. According to the TownLift and information from The Park City Board of Realtors the cost of a home in the Snyderville basin has risen 46%. The current average home price is 1.9 million! I couldn't afford that and I had a great job with Summit County. When the current developer's plans state a "market" price home, who can really afford that? I could sell my home for a lot of money, but I can't afford to purchase another home in this area without taking out a \$100,000-\$200,00+ loan. Not what I can afford especially since I've retired. Enough personal issues, back to the facts.
4. Does Kimball Junction really need more small businesses that pay low wages, then wonder why they can't attract employees? Why build "affordable" or "low income" houses/apartments then add more low paying jobs to exacerbate the problem. Doesn't make sense.
5. I join others that have stated in the "Letters to the Editor" in the Park Record:
 - a. **Water**- residential home owners continue to receive letters from water companies dictating what days to water (even though most are not close to the allotted amount of water dictated by the water companies) and to conserve, conserve, conserve. How can more residences be added to our already drought laden county?
 - b. **Traffic**- Glenn I think you've read and heard most citizen's reactions to your comment so I won't elaborate, however I do agree with them. Kimball Junction area has not been developed appropriately when it comes to traffic, something I think we can all agree on. Please don't make it worse. There have been attempts to correct past mistakes like the bike/walk trails under highway 224, and other walking trails which are great. Building now before a UDOH plan is solid is ludicrous.
 - c. **Schools**- I think this has been vetted also.

d. **University of Utah Tech center**- I was just educated about this area taking years to be built out. I worked at one of the larger companies and think the area was well planned, and has Red Butte gardens within the development.

e. **Trails**- The county, Basic Rec, and Mountain Trails have done a superb job of creating wonderful trails. Due to advertising our great trails many people from surrounding communities, tourists, as well as adventure companies are now using the trails. As you are aware the trail heads, trails and surrounding neighborhoods are crammed with cars, and many trails are not safe to use because of inconsiderate people also using the trails.

6. The Quarry Village townhome project and Woodward PC were built before the big roundabouts were in place. Traffic was horrendous and unsafe. Recently I have read articles about the Cline Dolley (sp?) project being discussed again. What routes will all those people use to get in to PC? Using the great roundabouts at Jeremy Ranch exit has improved the traffic flow a lot and, how much more can they handle?

I voted for each of you as I thought you were the best candidates to represent my interests. Please stop Dakota Pacific's current plan. Development is inevitable, I realize that. I believe they need to re-visit the original plans that many of us labored over and voted for in the past. Talk with John Hanrahan and Sally Elliot. Kimball Junction is near disaster, but I think it can be made better.

Roger, thank you for opposing this project as it currently stands.

Thank you again for reading through my thoughts.

Carolyn Rose

8803 Gorgoza Dr

Park City, 84098

435-901-1055

Thankfully,
Carolyn Rose
435-901-1055



Council members, thank you for reading my comments on the Dakota Project.

Carolyn Rose, 34 year resident of Hidden Cove subdivision.

1. Main question: Has there been any active recruiting of tech companies for the original proposed land use? With all the building of tech companies in Lehi I would think there are companies very willing to build here. I have not read any information addressing this issue.
2. One of the main reasons the original proposed use was for tech companies was to provide job openings in Summit County that offered a higher wage than the current low wage businesses offer.
3. Offering higher wage earnings then allows people to live in our community, maybe. According to the TownLift and information from The Park City Board of Realtors the cost of a home in the Snyderville basin has risen 46%. The current average home price is 1.9 million! I couldn't afford that and I had a great job with Summit County. When the current developer's plans state a "market" price home, who can really afford that? I could sell my home for a lot of money, but I can't afford to purchase another home in this area without taking out a \$100,000-\$200,00+ loan. Not what I can afford especially since I've retired. Enough personal issues, back to the facts.
4. Does Kimball Junction really need more small businesses that pay low wages, then wonder why they can't attract employees? Why build "affordable" or "low income" houses/apartments then add more low paying jobs to exacerbate the problem. Doesn't make sense.
5. I join others that have stated in the "Letters to the Editor" in the Park Record:
 - a. **Water**- residential home owners continue to receive letters from water companies dictating what days to water (even though most are not close to the allotted amount of water dictated by the water companies) and to conserve, conserve, conserve. How can more residences be added to our already drought laden county?
 - b. **Traffic**- Glenn I think you've read and heard most citizen's reactions to your comment so I won't elaborate, however I do agree with them. Kimball Junction area has not been developed appropriately when it comes to traffic, something I think we can all agree on. Please don't make it worse. There have been attempts to correct past mistakes like the bike/walk trails under highway 224, and other walking trails which is great. Building now before a UDOH plan is solid is ludicrous.

- c. **Schools**- I think this has been vetted also.
 - d. **University of Utah Tech center**- I was just educated about this area taking years to be built out. I worked at one of the larger companies and think the area was well planned, and has Red Butte gardens within the development.
 - e. **Trails**- The county, Basic Rec, and Mountain Trails have done a superb job of creating wonderful trails. Due to advertising our great trails many people from surrounding communities, tourists, as well as adventure companies are now using the trails. As you are aware the trail heads, trails and surrounding neighborhoods are crammed with cars, and many trails are not safe to use because of inconsiderate people also using the trails.
6. The Quarry Village townhome project and Woodward PC were built before the big roundabouts were in place. Traffic was horrendous and unsafe. Recently I have read articles about the Cline Dolley (sp?) project being discussed again. What routes will all those people use to get in to PC? Using the great roundabouts at Jeremy Ranch exit has improved the traffic flow a lot and, how much more can they handle?

I voted for each of you as I thought you were the best candidates to represent my interests. Please stop Dakota Pacific's current plan. Development is inevitable, I realize that. I believe they need to re-visit the original plans that many of us labored over and voted for in the past. Talk with John Hanrahan and Sally Elliot. Kimball Junction is near disaster, but I think can it be made better using the original plans.

Roger, thank you for opposing this project as it currently stands.

Thank you again for reading through my thoughts.

Carolyn Rose

8803 Gorgoza Dr

Park City, 84098

435-901-1055

From: **rmctish@gmail.com** <rmctish@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota pacific development
Date: 24.11.2021 13:22:22 (+01:00)

Dear county council,

As you continue to review the Dakota Pacific development please do not allow yourself to be tempted by greed or corruption. This is the only logical reason that would explain why this development is still being considered in the face of such strong opposition from the public you serve. I fear the developer has unfairly incentivized you in some manner to ignore the voices of your neighbors. Please remain strong and don't allow this developer to buy your vote. Please stand with the majority of summit county and vote no on this development.

Thank you,

Ryan McTish

From: **Ed and Lynne Rutan** <rutans@comcast.net>
County Council <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>;
mstevens@countycouncil.org <mstevens@countycouncil.org>; **Glenn Wright**
To: <gwright@summitcounty.org>; **Douglas Clyde** <dclyde@summitcounty.org>;
cfrobinson@countycouncil.org <cfrobinson@countycouncil.org>; **Roger**
Armstrong <rarmstrong@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific Kimball Junction Proposal - Please Vote NO
Date: 29.11.2021 06:33:27 (+01:00)

We must join the thousands of other residents of Summit County who have already contacted you to oppose the Dakota Pacific proposal for Kimball Junction. Increased water use, environmental impacts, the added burden on taxpayers due to increased demands on schools, infrastructure and services, the minimal number of workforce housing units, etc. all figure in our opposition. But the lack of a guarantee that UDOT would agree to Kimball Junction traffic improvements if the project is approved is particularly concerning. As Pinebrook residents we have to travel through that area at least several times a day and can't even imagine what will happen if 1,100 residential units are added. The potential consequences, without any guarantee of mitigation, are frightening.

Your five votes will determine the shape of our county for generations. We respectfully ask that you listen to the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission, weigh the needs of your constituents above the wants of a developer and refuse to approve the proposed development agreement amendment.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lynne and Ed Rutan

From: **Howard Phillips** <thehowardphillips@gmail.com>
County Council <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>; **Douglas Clyde**
<dcllyde@summitcounty.org>; **Roger Armstrong**
To: <rarmstrong@summitcounty.org>; **Chris Robinson**
<cfrobinson@summitcounty.org>; **Glenn Wright**
<gwright@summitcounty.org>; **Malena Stevens**
<mstevens@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific Project change requests - VOTE NO
Date: 29.11.2021 21:38:36 (+01:00)

Greetings

I am a 12-year full-time resident of Park City and Summit County, Utah. I am emailing you to express my concerns regarding the Dakota Pacific project.

I understand the project is currently under review with a number of change requests to the originally approved plans being considered by the council.

I urge you to VOTE NO to any change requests that are not accompanied with developer-funded accommodations for the impact on the Summit County infrastructure including transportation, education, and public safety.

Far too often development projects are green-lit that have an adverse impact on communities' existing quality of life. Far too often those who profit from these development projects are not held responsible for funding 1:1 mitigation for the adverse impacts.

Please VOTE NO to any proposal that asks for changes to the previously-approved plans. It is clear the community at large does not want the adverse impacts on the community such growth will undoubtedly deliver.

Thank you
Howard Phillips
384 Summit Drive
Park City, UT 84098

From: **Roanne Mayer** <roannemayer1@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific Project
Date: 17.11.2021 14:00:50 (+01:00)

Dear City Council,

I am writing to express my concern for the development of the Dakota Pacific Project in Kimball Junction.

Please don't let this development proceed.

We are facing land, water and infrastructure limitations. Building "more" is not "better". Current developments in the area such as Redstone and Quarry Village have struggled to produce successful outcomes. Why build another that doesn't work?

The recent claim that the development needs to be built to push UDOT to improve the road exchange is an indication that this development is not right for the area. Please don't buy this logic!

Thank you for all you do.

Roanne Mayer

From: **Paul Newman** <pdnew@msn.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific Project
Date: 18.11.2021 04:01:53 (+01:00)

Council, I attended today's meeting and learned a lot about what is currently allowed under the existing development agreement and what is being contemplated by the revised agreement.

What is still unclear to me is what you want to achieve with that property and whether your goals are consistent with the goals of those who live near that development support.

From the discussion today it appears that goals might be, in no particular order, 1) hoping that the revised agreement would create some priority for UDOT to address the traffic issues on I-80 and Hwy. 224; 2) creating some affordable housing; 3) providing for sustainability in construction that is not present in the existing development agreement; 4) creating additional tax revenue for the County. One goal that is not clear to me is what population you would like to purchase the market value residential units. Do you want them to be people who live and work in Summit County, people who live in Summit County but who commute to Salt Lake for work, people buying them as second homes, or investors buying them to turn into rentals of 30 days or more?

It is difficult for citizens to evaluate a proposal on more than a gut level unless we know and understand the specific goals you are attempting to achieve.

Under the revised agreement, goals 1 and 2 are not achieved in Phase 1 and are contingent on things that neither the County nor the developer can control. Even if the HTRZ mechanism can be achieved, there is no guarantee that addressing the traffic issue in a meaningful way will occur in 5, 10 or 15 years. If the HTRZ mechanism cannot be achieved, the developer has the right, but is not required, (it was unclear to me whether this is correct) to revert to the existing agreement after recognizing profits from the medical office building and market value residential units contemplated in Phase 1. If the developer has the right, but not the obligation to revert to the existing agreement, the County should have the right to void Phase 2 and revert to the existing agreement.

Phase 1 should require the developer to build a % of affordable housing equal to the % of affordable housing to the total number of units to be built in both Phase 1 and 2. If that percent is 33%, then 33% of the units to be built in phase 1 should be affordable housing.

I would also like to know who will have the ability to enforce the no short-term rental prohibition. An HOA will never enforce them and I am not sure the County wants to spend resources doing so. If there is no enforcement mechanism, it is somewhat useless.

If your hope is that people who live and work in Summit County or Salt Lake will occupy the market value units, you should consider a restriction that requires buyers to occupy the property for 1-2 years before being able to rent them or if your hope is that buyers will create long-term rentals, a rent cap.

Thank you, Paul Newman (Sun Peak)

1.

From: **AARON KOSARIN KOBERNICK** <Aaron.Kobernick@hsc.utah.edu>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific Project
Date: 18.11.2021 16:06:07 (+01:00)

Dear Council Members:

I write with concerns regarding the Dakota Pacific Project. As a resident of Park City, and as a physician, I value the air quality we enjoy in the Snyderville Basin. I am concerned that the impact of several thousand units/people/cars (as well as supporting services for those people) may bring our lovely air quality beyond repair.

Has environmental, air-quality impact of this project been studied?

Thank you,

Aaron

Aaron K. Kobernick, MD, MPH | Allergy and Immunology | Department of Dermatology | University of Utah

From: **jon man** <jonmzee@yahoo.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific Project
Date: 22.11.2021 23:29:37 (+01:00)

Please add our names, as registered Summit County Voters, to the list of active voting residents who absolutely OPPOSE this Project.

While transportation issues and affordable housing are issues to be addressed and solved; this Project is not the answer and will only exacerbate existing problems in this area.

Thank You

Jon Manwaring

Julie Manwaring

18 Payday Dr

Park City UT

84060

Sent from my iPhone

From: **Bruce Kirchenheiter** <brucekirch50@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific proposal
Date: 18.11.2021 22:02:15 (+01:00)

As a 32 + year resident of the Snyderville Basin I am writing regarding the request by Dakota Pacific for changes to the approved land use of the Park City Tech Center property. I attended the Council's work session Wednesday 11/17/21 and learned a lot. The proposal is still very much a work in progress as evidenced by the last minute changes discussed at the meeting. A project with such significant and long lasting impact to the community deserves a thorough vetting and analysis. After completion of that analysis the public deserves an unbiased presentation discussing the Council's goals for the community and how this project would fulfill those. Going forward with the project without buy in from the Council's constituents will be divisive and injurious to the community.

The Planning Commission has already given a negative recommendation on this proposal. Public sentiment appears to be very strongly against it. There are many questions regarding the proposal for which I have not heard a convincing answer.

- Water. The proposed change for residential and a hotel will have significantly greater water usage than the currently approved Tech Center use.
- Traffic. There is no question the immediate impact will significantly negatively impact current residents. There is no guarantee UDOT can or will make improvements, and even if they do, it will mean putting up with many years of worse traffic before any improvement.
- Preventing sprawl. This land is not currently zoned for residential, so the residential is in addition to what is being built elsewhere. It does not prevent sprawl, it adds to it.
- Affordable housing. 1. As I understand it much of the affordable housing is in Phase Two of the development. Phase two is conditional, so may not be built. 2. Do the proposed number of affordable housing units actually remedy the current shortage or will it even be enough to provide for the increased number of workers at the commercial spaces of the development?
- Sustainability. Use patterns for residential and hotel will be different than for office type usage in the currently approved Tech Center. Renewable energy may work some of the time for the predominantly daytime occupation of the Tech Center, the residential, retail and hotel units will add significant demands to the electric grid during night time hours when solar is not available, and wind generated power may not be available.
- County Services. Residential development will put a much greater demand on services such as the School district, water reclamation, emergency services. Development does not pay for itself, the burden of these increases will be borne by the taxpayers.
- The Tech Center under the current land use authorization will be a slow build out, spreading construction over a long time. The Dakota Pacific proposal will result in a huge amount of construction very soon; something I and I suspect many other residents do not want.

Summit County Council please take the time to articulate a plan for what is desired in that parcel, then analyze how this proposal fits that plan, and what benefits to the community it offers. That will require first having a finalized proposal, not one sent out hours before the meeting at which it will be considered. It seems as though the process is being rushed, putting the cart before the horse. Please take the time to do this the right way, and please respect the will of your constituents. This constituent is opposed to approval of Dakota Pacific's request.

Bruce Kirchenheiter
5052 E. Meadows Dr
Park City, UT 84098

From: **Linda Pflughaupt** <pflughauptlinda@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific proposed development
Date: 30.11.2021 01:47:19 (+01:00)

To The Summit County Council;

I live in the Ranch Place neighborhood just outside Kimball Junction so I access the KJ area daily. Our family opposes the proposed development as we feel it is oversized for the existing space. If the council moves forward on this project your actions will change the area to the detriment of all of us living in the Snyderville Basin by adding congestion, traffic, and further demands on limited resources like water. Please stop this development.

Regards,

Linda Pflughaupt
Ranch Place Neighborhood

From: **Marianne Birch-jensen** <mbirchiensen@aol.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 29.11.2021 13:43:35 (+01:00)

Please stop the Dakota Pacific as 1. UTAH IS A DESERT WHICH MEANS NO WATER

2. LACK OF OXYGEN

Yours sincerely,

M Birch Jensen MD.

From: **Gordon Mills** <gmillsfaia@me.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 28.11.2021 17:40:35 (+01:00)

Good morning...I regret that I will be unable to attend your public hearing on December 1. To that end I offer the following for your consideration, and I wish you my very best as you deal with this contentious matter.

Over the past several weeks, this project has drawn a significant number of very vocal objections from the public. The concern most often voiced is over increased traffic from the additional 1100 apartments and condominiums proposed. While I certainly understand that concern, I have a somewhat different perspective on the proposed project. Before you take action, I encourage you to consider the following.

I was a member of the Blue-Ribbon Committee you appointed in 2017 to develop a neighborhood masterplan for Kimball Junction. The goal of the KJNMP Committee was to create a set of joint planning objectives/principles and a concept neighborhood land use map for future infill development and redevelopment in Kimball Junction area focusing on:

- Land Use
- Transportation/Transit (including parking)
- Neighborhood Connectivity
- Way-Finding Signs

After 20 months of investigation of the problems and potential solutions in each of these areas, the Committee proposed a new Neighborhood Masterplan. That plan was presented first to the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission and after their supportive recommendation, it was considered by the Summit County Council where it was adopted. In public hearings before each of these bodies, significant public comment was taken and broad public support for this new plan was received.

The proposed Dakota Pacific project before you impacts the west side of SR 224 and is in sync with these positive attributes, and the approved vision. The implementation of this sustainable development is supported by the Neighborhood Mixed Use zoning. Traffic studies show the peak time traffic load added by the Dakota Pacific development when fully built, appears to be less than what would occur with the build out of the original entitlement. While more must be done to alleviate the traffic and congestion problems on SR 224 in Kimball Junction, and it is encouraging to see that the UDOT and Summit County are engaged in a serious study of the problem and analyzing potential solutions. The preferred Alternative 3, that depresses SR 224, will allow the east and west sides of Kimball Junction to be connected into a single cohesive neighborhood. It will separate the 13,000 cars (reported by UDOT in 2018) that pass-through Kimball Junction each morning and again each evening on their way to or from Park City and Interstate 80. This proposed project, along with the anticipated future Olympic Games, should help motivate all parties to finally take steps to resolve our long-standing congestion problem.

Regardless of your action on this proposed project, whether it is to approve, or to pause for more refinement, I believe it is critical that Summit County and Park City work together immediately in order to position us to receive a share of the \$2.6B in funds for roads and bridges and \$650M for transit from the recently passed Infrastructure Bill that is headed to Utah. Funds from the Infrastructure Bill along with tax funds generated from this project present a unique opportunity, a once in a generation opportunity, to solve our long-standing traffic problem. This needs to be addressed no matter how this land on the west side of SR 224 is developed.

Gordy Mills

Gordon E. Mills, FAIA, Hon. RAIA

Studio M

1161 Cutter Lane
Park City, UT 84098
T 563.588.2198 | Cell 563.663.5445



Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail.

From: **qbanda@aol.com** <qbanda@aol.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 25.11.2021 22:13:25 (+01:00)

Dakota Pacific vs. Greater Park City

While this is not exactly someone trying to sell you the Brooklyn Bridge, it's pretty close.

Here we have someone (Dakota Pacific) stuck with a piece of property that is a definite financial liability to them. Their solution is to find a way to unload it, make a tremendous amount of money, and never look back. All they have to do is convince 5 people that there are no downsides to their proposal.

If they are successful in their efforts and get someone (Summit County) to buy the bridge, they will ultimately walk away with pockets bulging and a big smile on their face. If those 5 people are wrong and thousands of residents are correct – it's too late. What are the penalties? To the developer – nothing. To the 5 Council members – nothing. To the thousands of residents who sounded the alarm – EVERYTHING.

Someone must be held responsible should all go wrong – underpass denied, the need for a new school, increased energy costs, water, pollution, congestion, etc. Will it be the developer who created the problem? Will it be the County Council who approved it? Or will it be ALL taxpayers of Summit County who will bear the financial burden?

Respectfully,
Irwin Krigman

From: **Brad Kuhn** <bradkuhn@aol.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 24.11.2021 23:15:24 (+01:00)

I hope all County Council members can read this message.

You have been elected to represent the citizens of Summit County. Given that, you should all respect and follow the desires of the majority of your constituents. I have not been able to find anyone in the community that is in favor of allowing the Dakota Pacific project to proceed.

I don't want to reiterate the reasons not to approve the zoning change since, hopefully, you have already heard them. There is no compelling reason to support this project and disregard the wishes of your constituents.

Please do NOT approve the zoning change in support of this project.

Frederick Kuhn
Summit Park

From: **Personal** <katygjackson@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 27.11.2021 17:14:02 (+01:00)

Hi All,

Really concerned about putting another 1,100 homes in kimball junction- which seems to struggle with the amount of people there already. I encourage you to limit the size of this development to align with our city's vision for preserving our natural spaces and lesson if our impact.

Thanks

Katy

Sent from my iPhone

From: **Jodi Buren** <Jodi@trippstreetstudio.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 18.11.2021 16:30:47 (+01:00)

I am a resident of Kimball junction and was at the meeting yesterday. I dont see any reason to change the zoning. Why have zoning that residents rely on if it can be changed?

As I left the meeting, the end of day traffic coming down 224 was staggering and it's not even ski season. All this talk about traffic mitigation, on phase 2; when 200 more homes have already been built, when/if one of four plans might work, who specifically gets taxed?, when exactly would the plan even start or be completed?

But the real reason I'm writing is to hear exactly what is proposed being done to fix the traffic problem the project will create? I don't understand what this

"Traffic mitigation" will accomplish? There is one road into town. Burying the highway at Kimball junction will not fix this. Please do a study on whatever you imagine could fix the traffic issues from this project. I'd like to see that.

And thank you Roger for your support. I agree with your main question. WHY are we considering building this?

Thank you
Jodi Buren

Sent from my iPad

From: **Gifford Brown** <gbrown@leahy-ifp.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 17.11.2021 15:27:52 (+01:00)

Dear County Council,

The Dakota Pacific project serves no benefit to the county/community but rather Dakota Pacific. If approved I will be relocating and taking my business and tax dollars elsewhere.

Make the right decision please,

Gifford Brown
Vice President of Sales
C 435.655.5629
www.Leahy-IFP.com



From: **DEBBIE WALSH** <debbie.walsh1153@comcast.net>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 17.11.2021 19:19:45 (+01:00)

Please CONSIDER POSTPONEMENT of the zoning changes on this property.

It seems like a yes vote is 'putting the cart before the horse' as is said. Purposefully adding more traffic in the hope of moving Kimble Junction up on Udot's list of things to do is wrong on so many fronts. Already during winter months traffic is backed up on 224 all the way to the blue roof on most days! Inconvenient, yes, but the exhaust accelerates air pollution and climate change.

What about water requirements? You've all seen how low our reservoirs were this summer due to drought. A drought that is expected to continue. Look further at the Great Salt Lake, Colorado River, Lake Powell.....how many more households can we support?

Only a fraction of the 1100 residential units proposed are considered 'affordable'. The remainder are simply money makers for the developers and tax revenue for the county. Tax revenue that likely won't do much more than provide support services to this development.

Also, what about retail and office space? In our current environment, folks are working remotely. The bulk of retail purchases are on line. Do we really need the commercial aspect of this project?

During this period of so much change, a wait and see approach might be smart. Thank you for your time.

From: **Alexandra Ziesler** <alicat@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 17.11.2021 17:22:54 (+01:00)

Dear Summit County Council,

I'm not opposed to the Dakota Pacific, but would ask that a requirement of that project be a total redesign of the Kimball Junction traffic routing.

The roundabout at Bus Station by Home Depot already has many backups at many times of the day. The intersections do not seem to be able to handle current traffic levels, much more the addition of 1000 new homes.

Thank you,
Alexandra Ziesler

From: **Jen Infurchia** <jinfurchia@icloud.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota pacific
Date: 17.11.2021 15:48:23 (+01:00)

Knowing that we don't have enough room in our schools should be enough reason to say no to the Dakota pacific project. This project will overcrowd our already crowded roads and trails and will lower our quality of life. It will push us exponentially faster toward being being an over populated impersonal, dirty, ruined city. Please do the right thing and say no.

Jen Infurchia

Sent from my iPhone

From: **richard eichner** <rickeichner@hotmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>;
mjeich15@hotmail.com <mjeich15@hotmail.com>; **lynne**
<rutans@comcast.net>
Subject: Dakota Pacific
Date: 29.11.2021 20:56:54 (+01:00)

My wife and I live year-round in Pinebrook and are strongly opposed to the proposed Dakota Pacific (DP) development. This is a clear-cut decision-do you favor the overwhelming majority of Summit County residents , who are opposed to this development, or do you bail out a greedy developer who bought the property knowing the zoning would have to change ? The arguments against the development are very strong and I will not repeat them. We still live in a democracy and you were elected to represent the people in Summit County. This case is very similar to the proposed toxic waste dump at Round Valley. If , after hearing a clear message from the community, you still believe that the DP development is appropriate, then you should delay your decision to the next election. You can then run on a platform in favor of DP- if the voters elect you , then approve the project. The worst thing you could do is vote in favor of the project now , and irreparably harm the quality of life in Summit County , without having any mandate to take such an action.

From: **John Bagley** <John.Bagley@imail.org>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Pacific-no
Date: 29.11.2021 18:53:58 (+01:00)

Hello! I can't be there in person Wednesday but I wanted to urge you to vote no on this request to change current zoning. The community is vehemently and overwhelmingly against this project.

Please vote no. Maybe the tech center needs to be rethought but this is not the right project.

Thank you.

John Bagley, Pinebrook

Sent from my iPhone

NOTICE: This e-mail is for the sole use of the intended recipient and may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are prohibited from reviewing, using, disclosing or distributing this e-mail or its contents. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of this e-mail and its contents.

From: **Jerry Hubbell** <jhubbell64@hotmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Project and Vote
Date: 20.11.2021 20:35:45 (+01:00)

County Council Members:

I am writing you to ask you as Council members to defer you scheduled 1 December vote on the Dakota Project until a later date.

There are several reasons for this request. I attended your recent "working meeting" and came away feeling the Dakota representatives had not presented fully developed plans for their development, which left unanswered many questions concerning the project.

1. The Dakota personnel seem to be changing the plans on a somewhat regular basis. Give the Dakota people a chance to fully develop their plans with the idea that they can and will resolve the several issues with their plans as they stand at this time. They should explain just what they mean by affordable housing that could be used by local educators, firemen, police officials and service personnel. Once they develop their full plan, then it can be presented to the Summit Council and the people of Summit County with an explanation of how it will benefit Summit County/Park City and maintain current values of the residents.
2. Traffic is one of the main issues and the Dakota people offered no solutions to this issue at your last meeting. this issue should be addressed and potentially resolved before their plans should be approved. Traffic around Kimball Junction and the approach to Park City is already a critical issue and the additional 2000 to 5000 vehicles without any attempt to improve the situation is simply WRONG.
3. As far as I can tell, the Folks at the Dakota project have not conducted any type of study to determine their plans impact on the paths, trails and wildlife of the area. They should conduct an impact study.
4. Contrary to the opinion of your former colleague, Mr. Jeff Smith, the land is not lying fallow. The land is used by hikers and bikers and by wildlife. And, the land abuts a larger area that is a multiple use area.
5. Explain to the folks the issue of the area being a transportation hub. Many folks got the idea at your last meeting that UDOT and the state of Utah would reap most of the tax benefits for the area as opposed to Summit County and Park City. This needs to be explained,
6. The folks who are currently opposed to this development are not "noisy individuals" stomping and screaming to get their way with this issue. They are folks who are genuinely concerned about the development of Park City and Summit County and want to preserve those qualities that make living here the quality place that it is. Those folks do not believe that this project will do that as it is currently planned.

It is for these reasons that I hope you will defer your vote until the Dakota people develop a plan that will not add to an already serious traffic issue and one that will not severely impact the area population wise. But hopefully, one that will better benefit Park City and Summit County and maintain those qualities of the area that makes Park City and Summit County appealing---- maintaining the full array of recreational areas and maintaining the areas for wildlife that the residents and visitors so love to see and watch.

Respectfully.

Gerla R. Hubbell
Jeremy Ranch

From: **Linda McCausland** <lindamccausland@icloud.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota project at Kimball Junction
Date: 21.11.2021 21:31:26 (+01:00)

Please stick to the original entitlements. Do not let them do this large development.

Linda McCausland
21 Eagle Point Court
Park City, UT 84060

From: **Yahoo! Mail** <fergie2210@yahoo.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota project
Date: 21.11.2021 16:55:37 (+01:00)

Council Members,

I want to record my opposition to the Dakota Project. The thought of our wonderful mountain community turning into a tech hub and the unbelievable traffic chaos this will cause is not worth anything. Please listen to the people of the community

Ashley Ferguson

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: **David DiBiase** <davidtdibiase@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Project
Date: 17.11.2021 05:44:02 (+01:00)

As a long term (since 1991) property owner, I find the Dakota project onerous and entirely inconsistent with the interests for me and every other of your constituents who has been heard. Just what we need, hundreds of additional cars daily at Kimbal- why? To line the picket of a developer who does not have the right to proceed- unless you grant him permits to which he is not entitled.

Stand up for you constituents- VOTE NO TO DAKOTA!

David DiBiase

Sent from my iPad

From: **SUSAN GLASMANN** <sglasmann@mac.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota project
Date: 20.11.2021 18:06:43 (+01:00)

Please do not change the 2008 development agreement to accommodate the Dakota Pacific project. There is no reason to do so. The proposed project will not enhance our community and will exacerbate existing problems. It is naive to think otherwise.

Susan Glasmann
4674 New Lane Road
Oakley, Utah

Sent from my iPad
sglasmann@mac.com
435-640-6737

From: **Meinhold Dorothy** <dmconsultingllc@aol.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Project
Date: 19.11.2021 22:50:39 (+01:00)

I'm going to keep this short.

NO
NO
NO.....

On this incredibly irresponsible project. It will NOT get UDOT to explore traffic patterns, It WILL create untenable traffic and congestion issues. We do NOT have the infrastructure to support this insane proposal. But more than anything.....

**WATER
STOP THIS
MADNESS NOW!**

Dorothy Meinhold
Pinebrook

From: **Mary Perry** <mpgofish123@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota Project
Date: 30.11.2021 01:29:50 (+01:00)

Dear Country Council

I have lived near Kimball in Spring Creek for the past thirty years. In those years I have seen increasing traffic issues. It is not uncommon to hear sirens throughout the day and night. Traffic takes time to fix by adding more development just adds to the issue. Development is not a way to fix the issue it's a mess out there!

I see the night sky disappearing more and more. What has happened to our night sky initiatives? Adding more development adds more lighting.

East Canyon Creek is a treasure we have with adding more cars it adds more pollution to go into the creek.

Water is a crucial issue for all the west. How can we keep adding more development when this is such an important and critical problem.

Please think about those who call this area home. Walkable areas are frightening, driving is also frightening to add more development scares me.

Thank you for your time on this critical issue.

I urge you to vote no on this project.

Sincerely,

Mary Perry
1694 W Pheasant Way
Park City, Utah 84098
435-640-4600

Sent from my iPhone

From: **Robin Fillion** <rlfillion@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Dakota proposal
Date: 25.11.2021 17:38:15 (+01:00)

I'm not sure whether I've seen the latest proposal, but if the project is approved I suggest that the developer be required to put in a pedestrian/bike tunnel under Landmark Dr. to keep the pedestrians and bikes from having to navigate the circles on Landmark (or otherwise stop traffic to cross the road), which is likely to become a very busy road. Also, have you considered whether a traffic light will become necessary at Powderwood and Kilby if the project is approved. Any traffic from the development heading West is likely to hit the Powderwood/Kilby intersection. Perhaps the developer should contribute to that as well.

Robin Fillion
7910 Pinebrook Road
Park City, UT 84098

From: **Judd Werner** <judd.werner@ymail.com>
County Council <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>; **Glenn Wright**
<gwright@summitcounty.org>; **mstevens@countycouncil.org**
To: <mstevens@countycouncil.org>; **Douglas Clyde** <dclde@summitcounty.org>;
Roger Armstrong <rarmstrong@summitcounty.org>;
cfrobinson@countycouncil.org <cfrobinson@countycouncil.org>
Subject: Feedback on Dakota Pacific Project
Date: 23.11.2021 02:56:47 (+01:00)

Dear County Council,

First off: **Thanks to Glenn Wright for publishing his Editorial in the Park Record. The Editorial was transparent, broadly distributed and has effectively engaged the community.**

Please add my voice to the chorus in opposition to the Tech Park Rezone and Dakota Pacific Project. **As a local resident residing in Ranch Place, a stone's throw away from Hwy 224, there is nothing in the Dakota Pacific proposal nor the UDOT Alt-3 upgrade to Kimball Junction I find compellingly desirable, either now or in the foreseeable future.** To be honest, I perceive the level of County effort expended and apparent support of this Project to be an unfortunate misalignment with the desires of the local community.

The Snyderville Basin General Plan discusses how public input from local residents was collected to prioritize planning objectives during formation of that Plan in 2010-11. At that time, residents told the County the lowest four priority planning objectives were: Energy Efficiency, Mixed Use Development, Growth, and Green Building Construction. Yet we find ourselves in a position now wondering how our county government could possibly be in support of an unentitled Project primarily defined by these four low priority objectives. Given, we're all more enlightened now by the reality of climate change and we're all generally more supportive of energy efficient construction than we were in 2010-11. However, if there has been any change in local attitude over the past ten years since the Snyderville Basin Plan was initiated, it would be an even stronger aversion in our community to growth. I believe a general perception exists in the full-time resident community of the Snyderville Basin that incremental business and population growth in the area is no longer having positive impact on our quality of life. It troubles me to find myself in opposition to my local elected officials who seem determined to impose unentitled and unwanted growth upon us; using among other logically deficient justifications, a proposed side by side comparison to an existing development agreement that may never be built out, be only partially built, or be built over a long period of time.

Please consider the following:

1. Myself and the people you have already heard from do not consider expansion of Kimball Junction a short-term priority. **We do not endorse additional large scale residential, office and hotel occupancy at the Junction to accelerate UDOT Alt-3, or any other traffic upgrades at the Junction.** Rather, please consider working with Park City to insure all of the existing development entitlements relying on Hwy 224 are somehow burdened with and participatory to the discussions, funding and timing of UDOT Alt-3. If the upgrade comes a little later, we're ok with that. We're in no hurry for Hwy 224 to be placed below grade or for the natural shoulders to be replaced with paved ramps and frontage roads. If Hwy 224 capacity constrains growth of local business activity until UDOT determines the project to be a priority, we're ok with that. I drive the Junction frequently. The times I experience frustrating traffic are few and predictable and I can put up with it getting worse, if necessary, to avoid additional residential and commercial development entitlements there.
2. Other writers have elaborated the logical weaknesses in the Editorial's climate change mitigation and economic diversity arguments as justification for the Project. I don't want to spend a whole lot of words re-elaborating those responses. However, I will ask how a new hotel and 180 townhomes/condominiums permitted for nightly rental in the Project Housing Agreement contribute to local economic diversity? They are just more of what we already have. There is nothing about the Dakota Pacific Project that prevents suburban sprawl in the County. Dakota Pacific's carbon footprint is supplementary to those existing entitlements. Finally, any analysis that probabilistically considers the scale and timing of Tech Park Development according to the original development agreement would likely show **Dakota Pacific represents an accelerated and larger cumulative expansion of the County's carbon footprint, not a reduction of that footprint.**
3. **Justification of Dakota Pacific Project on the basis of local workforce housing is a deception.** As other writers have pointed out, it is very likely the Project creates a demand for affordable housing near or in excess of the affordable housing supplied. Also, there are no guaranteed Waterfall provisions to the Housing Agreement that prioritize the housing for local workers, nor are there any provisions that prioritize our local government, education and healthcare workers who serve the needs of the local community, within the local affordable housing applicant pool. There are no firm restrictions designating the Market Rate residential units for County residents either. I believe the County should interpret local rejection of the Dakota Pacific Project as a general lack of support for the strategy of providing affordable housing as a smaller, leveraged component of

larger market rate high density residential developments. **As related to workforce housing, Dakota Pacific Project is a bad project in service of a flawed strategy.**

4. **The Dakota Pacific Project will not make Kimball Junction into a Town Center.** Please discard any logical justification of Dakota Pacific Project you may be using in support of the Kimball Junction Neighborhood Plan. The Kimball Junction Neighborhood Plan is a flawed vision; impractical and unconstrained by existing realities at the Junction. The commercial character of Kimball Junction is defined by the multiple, large footprint destination businesses there: Smiths, Walmart, Factory Stores, Staples, Best Buy, Petco, Whole Foods, TJ Maxx and Michaels. These businesses draw clientele from the entire County. They draw additional special event and seasonal tourism related clientele from the Park City and Snyderville areas. The addition of a proposed hotel and large medical office building at the Junction will only increase the destination traffic. In addition, the Kimball Junction interchange routes substantial traffic through Kimball Junction supplementary to the destination traffic. Adding the new Dakota Pacific development will not change the nature of the Kimball Junction neighborhood. It will just add to the existing destination and through traffic, overload businesses, further urbanize the daily experience of life for those of us who live nearby and create additional demands on all of our local recreational venues and social services. **Dakota Pacific Project is too big and too late to create the flawed vision of a Kimball Junction Town Center.**

In summary, there are no compelling, countervailing public interests justifying approval of the Dakota Pacific Project. Please terminate County efforts in support of this Project as soon and efficiently as possible. I struggled somewhat with this writing as it offers no alternatives. However, I believe better land development alternatives exist in collaboration with County businesses, citizenry, land owners and municipalities, on a regional basis, than are manifest in the Dakota Pacific Project at Kimball Junction. I am willing to help with the search for solutions to County growth challenges if you find yourself in need of participation from the citizenry. Thank you for considering my thoughts.

Best Regards,

Judd Werner
4720 Winchester Ct. 84098
435-640-6380

From: **mike washington** <washingtonjmg@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Fwd: Dakota Pacific Development Proposal
Date: 22.11.2021 03:15:03 (+01:00)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **mike washington** <washingtonjmg@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Nov 21, 2021 at 8:05 PM
Subject: Dakota Pacific Development Proposal
To: <editor@parkrecord.com>

I am responding to Jeff Smith's recent letter supporting replacement of the current development agreement for the Tech Center at Kimball Junction. Jeff seems to think that our county government needs to honor "promises" made to the new owner of the tech center project. Jeff currently resides in Heber so I am unsure why he is continuing to support a very impactful project in our community.

I served with Jeff on the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission when the Tech Center development agreement was negotiated and approved by the Boyer Company, the real estate development arm of the LDS Church, Park City Municipal, and Summit County. All of the participants were happy with the agreement at the time. The only remaining obligation of the County is to process development requests "under the terms of the agreement."

The Tech Center has seen limited activity in the years since, which is apparently not unusual with this type of property. Dakota Pacific purchased the property from Boyer about two years ago and immediately began negotiating to replace the existing agreement with "a new deal" which would allow a dense mixed use development on the site.

The Snyderville Basin planning Commission rejected the proposed development with a 5-2 vote. Dakota then approached the Summit County Council to negotiate a new agreement which would allow a very dense residential (1,100 unit), commercial, and hotel development. The proposal would result in 20% more square footage at build out than the existing agreement.

And how large will the hotel be and with what traffic implications? That's not mentioned and could be very significant plus require staff, possibly needing even more affordable housing.

At this time County Council has not defined any community benefit other than 300 affordable/attainable residential units (which will revert to market rate after 60 years) and "potential political" help in moving a redo of the Kimball Junction interchange to a higher spot on Utah Department of Transportation's list of future projects. According to a presentation by Dakota approximately two thirds of the affordable/attainable units would be required to house staff of the commercial portion of their development, leaving **100** units for other needs (including those needed for the hotel staff?

Silver Creek Village, another recent, large-scale residential development, provided affordable housing, community playing fields, trails and a school site as part of their community benefits. Residents of the Dakota project will **use** our community trails, playing fields, recreation facilities, and schools. Our community will pay increased taxes to maintain our current level of services.

This project will have a significant negative impact on traffic at Kimball Junction both during construction and as it is built out. Delivery of construction materials and workers is not restricted in the current draft development agreement. Imagine the 18 wheelers delivering steel, concrete, and other building materials through the existing junctions of I80 and SR224, SR224 and Ute Blvd., the roundabout at Ute and Landmark Drive, and then returning to Salt Lake through the Olympic Parkway roundabout, SH224 and I80, Powderwood Drive and Kilby Road will also be negatively impacted. I cannot imagine the disruption caused by the future rebuild of SH224 at the Junction. Maybe one lane each way for three years?

Mike Washington
Snyderville
435 729-9095

--
Mike

From: **Patrick Bauer** <bauerpw@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: In Support of Dakota Pacific
Date: 29.11.2021 01:02:16 (+01:00)

City Council Members:

As a resident and taxpayer in Summit County, I want to add my voice as an enthusiastic YES in support of the Dakota Pacific Project.

Summit County should welcome more residents, and adding 1,100 units of housing is urgently needed to alleviate the current housing crisis.

All new housing is good housing! Affordable, market rate, above rate!

We cannot let the NIMBYs dictate the future of our county. This is not a private club - people opposed to growth should move to the Yellowstone Club/

I also want to stress the importance of property rights. Opponents of the project do not have the deed to the land. If they wish to stymie development, they should have purchased the land. I am concerned by big government meddling in the choices that property owners wish to exercise in developing their land.

Let's all welcome new neighbors and embrace the future. Yes In My Backyard.

Thanks,
Patrick Bauer
Resident of Park City / Summit County

From: **Ken Baber** <kbaber@msb-realestate.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Kimball Development Project
Date: 17.11.2021 23:35:14 (+01:00)

Dear Council Members,

A question was put forth at the work session on the 17th –
“... so what should we be focusing on in this agreement?”

Your consideration of the additional density being considered by the projects surrounding Kimball Junction and across our City need to be considered from a greater perspective than whether *housing is deemed a superior use than office*, or, whether a *failing series of intersections can be corrected*.

I suggest the Council should be considering the shortage of water available to support its current citizens before granting approvals to additional density and its demands for water.

At each of the Council meetings the majority of the time is spent discussing ground-level nuances of a development agreement without giving consideration to the most important challenge: the project under discussion is forecast to require over 190 million more gallons more water per year. To approve the project proposed without regard for its demand on our water infrastructure, at a time that the Jordanelle Reservoir is down by 35 billion gallons [a/o Q2/21] would be contradictory to your roles as leaders and stewards of our community. As a side note; experts forecast it will take four to five years of *above average* rainfall for the Jordanelle to recover to normal; at a time most predict *lower than average* rainfall in the coming years.

If the Council desires to approve projects which create new demand on our infrastructure then they have a responsibility to first develop a sustainable plan for additional water storage and availability, and to develop a plan to appropriately allocate those net new infrastructure costs to the projects they intend to approve. If the Council

To approve more density that is reliant on a fixed and lessening resource to the detriment of the City's current residents would be contradictory to the roles you were empowered.

While growth and development within our community is necessary for it to remain vibrant, it must be performed without causing the existing infrastructure to fail; and without reliance on the subsidization of its [current] citizens.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these important matters.

Sincerely,
Kenny

Kenneth A. Baber

From: **Hillie Hillenmeyer** <hillieh@yahoo.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Kimball Junction Development
Date: 29.11.2021 18:14:09 (+01:00)

To The Council Members,

We are writing to voice our opposition to the Dakota Pacific plans for the rezoning and development of the Kimball Junction area.

We are residents of the South Ridge neighborhood of Jeremy Ranch, and thus transit the Kimball Junction area on a regular basis.

We have several objections to the plan. First and foremost, is traffic congestion. Putting that many residential units in addition to businesses will add substantial stress to the area. The idea that we need more traffic, so we can get more government assistance for traffic improvements is ridiculous! There is no guarantee we would even get the assistance, and it would lag the development and subsequent traffic by years. The best traffic solution is to not add more traffic.

Secondly, in an area where water is always an issue, even a "water wise" development will use far too much water. It is irresponsible to put that much stress on our water infrastructure.

Our third objection is in changing the zoning in the area to satisfy an out of town developer, when the majority of residents in the area are opposed. The county council represents the county residents not a developer from another town trying to make millions.

There could also be a substantial economic impact. With the traffic reaching horrific levels, it will discourage day visitors from coming to Park City. Employees from the Valley, already difficult to get, will be even more difficult to persuade to travel up here to work. The paltry amount of affordable housing will not fix that, as it will still be far too expensive for hourly wage earners. While we need a solution for that, this is certainly not the solution.

We ask that you vote no and represent your citizens and not another developer.

Respectfully,
Edwin and Paige Hillenmeyer
4104 Hilltop Ct
Park City, UT 84098
435-731-7482

Sent from my iPhone

From: **Arnie Rubin** <arnierubin47@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Kimball Junction Development
Date: 20.11.2021 19:22:04 (+01:00)

Dear Council Members

My wife, Laura and I have been full time residents of Summit County for the past 12 years. I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed plan to add eleven hundred residential units in Kimball Junction. The traffic in Kimball Junction has increased exponentially over the past several years. Trying to exit the 80, even during shoulder season, is already a nightmare. Eleven hundred additional residential units could add 2,200 plus cars in the already over taxed area. The area in question was supposed to be a high tech office park, not a high density residential area.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Arnie Rubin
arnierubin47@gmail.com
(818) 879-3455

From: **Andrew Krcik** <krcik@mac.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: No on the Dakota Pacific Project
Date: 18.11.2021 17:25:31 (+01:00)

Good Morning

We strongly encourage you to vote "No" on the proposed Dakota Pacific Project at Kimball Junction.

This seems a simple decision. Developers want what they always want, the people of Summit County want to maintain our quality of life. This development has only negatives for your constituents - more traffic, more density, more water consumption, more impact on our schools. If this were mostly affordable housing, there would be some benefit, but there is little here. Until there's a firm (and acceptable) plan for how to mitigate the traffic mess at Kimball Junction, it's irresponsible to approve 1,100 units and perhaps 2,000 more vehicles.

Summit County is large and the council is approving housing elsewhere. If more development is inevitable, at least place it where there is sufficient freeway access and low impact on existing residents. You owe this to your constituents.

Best regards

Andrew and Mary Lynne

Andrew Krcik
Mary Lynne Hulme
3473 Daybreaker Drive
Park City, UT 84098
415.602.7620 mobile

From: **Matt McWhirter** <mdm@mcwrealty.com>
County Council <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>; **Glenn Wright**
<gwright@summitcounty.org>; **Chris Robinson**
To: <cfrobinson@summitcounty.org>; **Roger Armstrong**
<rarmstrong@summitcounty.org>; **Douglas Clyde**
<dcllyde@summitcounty.org>; **Malena Stevens**
<mstevens@summitcounty.org>
Subject: NO TO DAKOTA PACIFIC PROPOSAL
Date: 29.11.2021 20:45:13 (+01:00)

All,

I am writing this to express my strong desire for the County Council to **DENY** Dakota Pacific's request.

Not only did the Planning Commission vote for a negative recommendation, but the community, in which all of you represent, is strongly opposed to this development.

Do the right thing and deny their request.

Regards,

Matt McWhirter
Pinebrook Resident

From: **Jared Pulham** <pulhamjk@hotmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Opposition Feedback for the DAKOTA PACIFIC PROJECT
Date: 17.11.2021 21:01:53 (+01:00)

Hello Summit Country,

I'd like to express my **opposition** to the Dakota Pacific Project that you are currently reviewing/hearing. I'd really like to encourage you to vote No and push back against new development like this. As a resident (of Jeremy Ranch) I am joining up with the community members opposing this project and I plan to attend the upcoming meetings to help voice our issues.

Our geography/location just cannot handle more development and people like this. I'd like to keep this email short but give you a simple list of my personal biggest concerns:

- **No water to accommodate more people** - With droughts and water bans there is no way we can responsibly allow more people here. I personally believe from the science that Water shortages will get worse...Park City needs to send a message that while water shortages exist and no rain/snow that we need to protect our existing citizens.
- **Limited infrastructure/roads** - Kimball junction is already maxed out with development. I moved here (from NYC) to get away from 1000s of people living on top of each other. Don't destroy Park City any more by going down a path of more Urban Sprawl. Development like this just needs to be somewhere else and that's Okay.
- **Terrible Non-Park City Architecture/building Designs** - Most recent new developments (Canyons, Lincoln Station, etc.) have been completely outside of our initial Park City architecture. These building ruin our community look at feel. Architects and builders need to think and bring better.
- **Developers taking profits while community left to pick up infrastructure bills** (increased taxes for Roads, Schools in recent bonds, etc.)

Please protect us as our representative. This is a time in Park City's history where we need to reset our plans to environmental changes/impact, community/work changes from Covid moving in, and political pressures from those looking to make money off of our community.

Regards,
Jared Pulham

3951 Saddleback Rd.
Park City, 84098

Tel: 917-602-3773

From: **dayna stern** <sterndayna@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Opposition to Dakota Pacific project at Kimball Junction
Date: 29.11.2021 18:07:57 (+01:00)

Dear Summit County Council,

My husband and I have lived in Silver Creek for over 10 years. We are opposed to the Dakota project.

The traffic is already terrible. Last night we almost ran over people crossing from Wendy's to McDonalds. How many wrecks have there been in the last week?

What a lousy entrance to Park City. Welcome to Utah's junkyard.

Affordable housing is too expensive for low-income earners. What a joke.

Please improve the quality of life for residents/taxpayers. You are ruining Park City with the out of control growth.

Thank you for voting NO on Dakota Pacific.

Dayna Stern and Howard Phillips

384 Summit Drive

Park City 84098

From: **Chad and Gina Lundstrom** <teamlundy@msn.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Opposition to the Dakota Pacific Project
Date: 18.11.2021 01:26:02 (+01:00)

Dear County Council,

Last spring, we sat for hours on calls regarding this major development that trumped our garage/apartment project on 2 separate public hearing zoom calls.

What we heard mostly was the emphasis on this as a solution to the affordable housing need for people who work in Summit County. Are the people living in these units resort/restaurant workers, teachers, etc. or will be SLC commuters, wanting to live in PC, bottlenecking Kimball Junction and our roads even more and increasing traffic in Parleys. Pretty certain these units aren't going to be "affordable" for resort and restaurant works, teachers, firefighters.

Massive developments like this and the Highland Flats project only increase traffic. Other resort communities encourage people to build accessory buildings or tiny homes for long term rentals, prohibiting airbandb/vrvo to ease the affordable housing problem and disperse traffic throughout the community.

Please stop looking at financial gains and tax benefits from large developers and save the community from more urban sprawl, and more traffic issues than we are already experiencing. Disperse affordable housing on existing properties, make it an easier process for residents to build accessory buildings, for rentals, on their properties and stop bending for large developers despite community opposition.

Gina & Chad Lundstrom

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: **kacpreston** <kacpreston@aol.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: please vote no to allow 1100 new homesite at the junction!!!!
Date: 20.11.2021 00:43:12 (+01:00)

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: **Delia Reece** <Dreece@bhhsutah.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Please! STOP Dakota Pacific!
Date: 29.11.2021 15:00:34 (+01:00)

We have lived in town for 30 years, seen Many developments over the years; but this is untenable as it would create too much stress on our limited resources, as well as the an unmitigated traffic nightmare.

Most residents agree; This development has NO benefits to the community; just Profit for the developer.

Regards,
Delia

Delia Reece, ABR, e-Pro
Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices- Utah
[2200 Park Ave #B](#)
[Park City, UT 84060](#)
[800-553-4666](#) toll free
[435-901-3064](#) cell
dreece@BHHSutah.com
www.DeerValleySpecialist.com

From: **KCG ROGERS** <kcgrogers@msn.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Regarding new homes in Kimball Junction
Date: 28.11.2021 20:58:16 (+01:00)

PPlease vote no for the 1100 new homes in Kimball Junction... there will be no Park left in Park City if this is allowed to happen. Obviously no concern about water

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: **TED PALOMAKI** <palomakit@comcast.net>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Say NO to Dakota Pacific
Date: 17.11.2021 22:25:48 (+01:00)

Dear Summit County Council,

Please follow the recommendation of your Planning Commission and vote **NO** on the Dakota Pacific development in Kimball Junction.

I live in the Silver Springs neighborhood of the Basin. My home is less than one mile from this proposed development. I am adamantly OPPOSED to this development.

We don't need the growth in population, the traffic or other infrastructure problems that will be associated with 1000+ new homes.

If this development is approved, it will adversely affect my home's property value and my quality of life.

The land is approved for a Tech Center. There is no obligation to modify that approval. If the Tech Center is not economically feasible, and the land sits idle until conditions change, this is a huge win for everyone. Don't bow to big money and development!

Thank you very much,

Ted D. Palomaki
5033 E Meadows Drive
Park City, UT 84098

435 655 5596

From: **Karen O'Driscoll** <kododat@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Say NO to Dakota Pacific
Date: 29.11.2021 19:57:53 (+01:00)

We know what growth without forward-looking attention to traffic looks like: the congested roads and intersections at KJ we have now.

Fix the traffic problems first, then we can talk about bringing more people to the area.

Most sincerely,
Karen O'Driscoll

From: **Chris Ashman** <christopherashman101@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Stop Dakota Pacific Development at Kimball Junction
Date: 28.11.2021 04:41:34 (+01:00)

Hi,

As a current resident of Summit County, it would be great if you could listen to the people you represent. It's clear from letters to park record, and the on going petition with 3,500 signatures, that your people do not want this to make the area worse. Please think beyond money.

From: **Troy Dehm** <tdehm1@gmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Stop Dakota Pacific
Date: 18.11.2021 19:30:37 (+01:00)

Hello Summit County Council,

I would like to let you know that I completely disagree with the concept of building out the Dakota Pacific development in Kimball Junction. I live in Bear Hollow and am already seeing the overgrowth occurring in Park City Proper and how it is affecting the Snyderville / Kimball Junction area. We cannot build the roads any wider, build new roads, etc. to handle the massive influx of more residents. I would prefer the County's focus to be on anything other than building more homes. Enough is enough.

Concerned Resident,
Troy Dehm
Bear Hollow

From: **Kelly Gallagher** <Kellypcdudes@msn.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Suggestion for Dakota Pacific Public Hearing
Date: 18.11.2021 00:24:27 (+01:00)

First, nice job with your discussions tonight. Thank you.

Last night I attended a function for the Arts Council at the DeJoria Center. I understand why this facility is not discussed for the upcoming hearing, although the facility could support it. Distance could be an issue.

My suggestion is regarding physical access to the upcoming meeting. The Arts Council used Evite to get feedback on likely attendees. I do not know if this can be done legally with your public meetings, but if you can use this type of RSVP, it might help fill the seats to your capacity but not necessarily significantly beyond. I actually had an e-ticket to attend the event. You could use this to ensure the access will not exceed your allowed attendance.

Thanks for what you are doing!
Kelly Gallagher
Jeremy Ranch

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: **Keri Schoenenberger** <keri@spidertransport.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Tech Center Rezoning
Date: 23.11.2021 23:31:10 (+01:00)

Dear Council,

I recently attended the unproductive zoom meeting on this project and re-read the guest editorial by Glenn Wright.

Glenn stated in the op-ed that “Electrification, use of 100% renewable energy and mandatory xeriscaping is essential to this goal.” Continuing to state that this project will be using 100% renewable electrical energy is disingenuous when the people entering the 1100 leases will be “**educated and encouraged**” to use renewable energy- **not required** to do so. (Staff Report Draft 10/21/21 page 34)

Traffic? You’ve heard it all.

Water? I heard the developer mention “pools” with an s.

This council could singlehandedly slow the growth in the Kimball Junction area. The current agreement allows for tech buildings to be built out setback to setback. Will that happen when there is no market for office space? No, it will not, or it already would have. These developers bought this land knowing the limitations. Let Dakota Pacific assume the risk. We are all having trouble understanding why the quality of life in PC takes a hit whenever a developer figures out how to make a massive profit by offering to throw in a few affordable housing units. I hope the council is really studying how many low paying jobs this project will create. There could not possibly be a net benefit when all is said and done.

I look forward to hearing the public input on the 1st.

Keri Schoenenberger
6075 Trailside Dr.

www.spidertransport.com



From: **John B** <thebartzman@hotmail.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Vote NO on the Dakota Pacific development
Date: 17.11.2021 16:04:45 (+01:00)

I encourage you to follow the negative recommendation by the Summit County Planning Commission, and address the concerns they outlined.

Vote NO on the Dakota Pacific development at Kimble Junction.

Quality of life has already been severely diminished in Park City. Don't turn Park City into a Salt Lake suburb with urban density development. This project will add too many people into area that already fails from a traffic perspective, negatively impact open space and view corridors, and stress water supplies.

Vote NO.

John Bartz
2071 Equestrian Way
Park City, UT 84060

From: **Carol Burr** <ccburr@me.com>
To: **County Council** <CountyCouncil@summitcounty.org>
Subject: Vote No to Dakota Pacific
Date: 17.11.2021 14:50:55 (+01:00)

This project has to stop. Traffic is horrible already. Developments like this will stress our infrastructure beyond its capacity. Where is the water going to come from? It's not Council's job to make the developers whole. It is the Council's job to listen to its constituents. This entire project needs to be stopped. There is zero guarantee that UDOT will do anything to 224. Vote NO!

Respectfully,

Carol Burr

ccburr@me.com

413 658 7789

Sent from my iPhone