



CACHE COUNTY CORPORATION

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

JOSH RUNHAAR, AICP
DIRECTOR / ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
PAUL BERNTSON
CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL

179 NORTH MAIN, SUITE 305 LOGAN, UTAH 84321 ♦ (435)755-1640 ♦ FAX (435)755-1987

Memorandum

The Development Services Office has compiled the public and official comment regarding the application for a ski area known as **Cherry Peak** for the purpose of identifying any impacts and possible mitigation regarding the proposal. The major issues and concerns of official and public comment have been noted below:

2011 Official Comment:

Division of Wildlife Resources

- Impact to habitat due to road widening, specifically winter range, of mule deer and elk herds.
- An impact analysis should be completed identifying the impacts to Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, a state sensitive species.
- Impacts to wildlife from traffic, snow grooming machines, and night skiing activities.
- The potential impact on the Cherry Creek drainage of high runoff from artificially high snowpack due to snowmaking and an increased area of impermeable surfaces such as the parking lots (stormwater management). This also includes how contaminants (oil, grease, gas, road salts, anti-freeze, etc.) from the resort will be handled in regard to the protection of the aquatic resources of Cherry Creek.
- Master plan needs to address conflict issues of adjacent forest system lands (USFS and Richmond WMA) between wildlife and off-area skiing, and between hunters and recreationists - open Big Game hunting occurs on forest system lands from September through January.
- Widening of the road outside of the established right-of-way will require consultation with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Division of Air Quality

- Cache County is a PM-2.5 non-attainment area. A fugitive dust control plan must be submitted to the Utah Division of Air Quality for review prior to commencement of the project.

Utah Geological Society

- There may be geologic hazards in the area that may affect the project. Geologic hazards should be addressed prior to land development and construction.

City of Richmond

- Possible contamination of culinary water source springs and the newly acquired culinary water source well.
- Damage to or excessive fill on top of water transmission line.
- How will culinary water be provided, treated, and monitored?
- Based on existing connections, Richmond City can provide 35,000 gallons of water per month (non-cumulative) and any water beyond that must be contracted for at current commercial business rates.
- Inadequacy of existing roads.

- Negative impact upon Richmond City streets and roads and a lack of provision for any funding or mitigation relative to repair and maintenance of streets and roads.
- Residential safety and nuisance from the increase in traffic through a primarily residential area.
- Impact on emergency response personnel and equipment.
- Who will provide fire suppression service to this facility?
- Light trespass from night skiing (*Rainey*).
- On-site electrical generators should be in an area designed to contain any spills (*Rainey*).

USFS

- Primary concern is the management of the ski area boundary in regard to the possibility of activity from the ski area extending into the Wilderness area.
- Impact of noise, lights, and activity due to ski area on wintering wildlife and the character of the Wilderness area.

2011 Public Comment - 25 individuals/groups (Duplicate concerns have not been restated):

1. This is a great opportunity for recreation and the economy of Richmond.
2. Ski area will offer a good variety of terrain for beginners and advanced skiers.
3. Provide incentives to help ski area succeed.
4. Proximity of ski area to USFS wilderness area is a legal non-issue as per Public Law 98-428 that states, "The fact that nonwilderness activities that can be seen or heard from areas within the wilderness shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area."
5. Easier access than Beaver Mountain and may result in reduced traffic in Logan Canyon.
6. Compatibility with FR-40 zone and surrounding properties. Should be zoned Resort Recreation (RR) zone.
7. Request does not meet the requirement of a CUP specifically in regard to compatibility with adjacent properties.
8. The site of the proposed ski area is on the edge of the mountain range to the east which is a national priority wildlife corridor.
9. Lack of oversight and enforcement on the part of the County. Ski area will get out of hand.
10. Destruction of scenic, civic, and natural resources.
11. Loss of hunting opportunities.
12. The NEPA process must be followed.
13. Wildfire prevention, evacuation, and suppression plan.
14. Impacts to vegetation.
15. Invasive and noxious weeds.
16. Increase in unregulated access.
17. Proposal is out of step with Envision Cache as it increases sprawl and diminishes rural character.
18. Increase in Richmond City resident's taxes to fund road maintenance.
19. Will negatively impact Richmond City businesses.
20. Require a sidewalk be placed along Richmond City roads that provide access to the resort.
21. This is a threat to Richmond City's safety and infrastructure.
22. Potential negative impact on Cove and Mountain Home areas.
23. A lack of skiers that visit Cache Valley and a low proposed elevation.
24. The location does not make sense due to a lack of skiable area.

25. Require a detailed business plan and estimate net social benefit (financial) of the proposal.
26. An increase of trash and general mess.
27. Surety bonds for reclamation of site if resort fails.

Comments from the Rainey Ranch application that were not reiterated for this application:

28. Protection of aquatic habitat with vegetative screening.
29. Location of utilities.
30. Closure of County road.
31. Resort will cut off trails.
32. Excessive traffic speeds on Richmond City roads will get worse due to ski area.
33. Increased crime in Richmond due to ski area.
34. One ski resort is enough.
35. Summer use of site is undefined.
36. The use of dangerous explosives and chemicals in avalanche management.
37. Need for a professional ski patrol for insurance requirements.
38. Any water lost to existing users must be restored by and all costs assumed by the ski resort.
39. Ski area will reduce opportunities and access for backcountry skiing, and snowshoeing.