

Treasure Comments

From: Bill Humbert <recruiterguy@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 7:33 AM
To: Treasure Comments; John Phillips; Melissa Band; Adam Strachan; Laura Suesser; Douglas Thimm; Preston Campbell; Steve Joyce; Cindy Matsumoto
Subject: Treasure Hill Comments from Meeting of May 10, 2017

Good morning,

Hopefully you do not mind that I chose to copy you on my comments regarding last night's meeting on Treasure Hill. My experience since beginning on email in 1992 has been that a certain number of emails are not delivered. Secondly, you are certainly better informed in the details of this project than me. If I am not on target with my concerns and comments, please excuse me in advance.

This morning, I unsuccessfully tried to find the agenda and supporting documents from last night. My intent was to use their numbers. Unfortunately, we will need to use the numbers from my somewhat suspect memory - please excuse me if they are off.

Specifically I was concerned about the parking in the commercial area versus the traffic created by the parking spaces allotted in the commercial area parking. After the meeting, I discovered that the commercial area at Treasure is not supposed to attract people who are staying offsite. Knowing humans (namely me), that is probably a noble goal but not very probable, especially if the commercial area develops a name for itself.

Let's begin with the numbers from my memory - initially the commercial parking was allotted 178 spaces (pretty generous for an area that is not supposed to attract outside traffic). Then it was reduced to 142 spaces (previous sentence still applies). On the other hand, it was only going to create 26 vehicles on the road during morning commute and let's say double that in the evening. When are the other 100 vehicles in the parking places arriving and departing? Who are the people in those vehicles? There was a separate allotment for parking and travel for employees (where they intended to provide unnamed incentives to discourage employees from driving - if you work with seasonal workers, this will not happen).

My antennae went up when I heard meeting and event space. Therefore I did a little research. As a result of my research, the numbers better fell in line with their proposed parking for the commercial area. For my calculations, I rounded down the commercial square footage to 17,000 square feet. For fine dining, the recommended square footage is 20 square feet per diner (850 diners). Fast food is down to 11 square feet. <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/calculate-seating-capacity-restaurant-39808.html> For meeting and event space, the range is roughly the same - <http://www.entertaining.bestyoucanget.com/squarefootage> In my experience of reading about planning commission work over the years, generally creating enough parking by developers for approved projects is the nightmare. In this case, it appears to be the pipe dream that fits their desire to minimize the impact of traffic.

May I suggest a better way to calculate parking when a commercial area is not supposed to attract outside traffic? Begin at 0. Then add spaces for staff. Then subtract spaces using their formulas. Using this process, the traffic forecast will be more in line with their forecast.

Now let's discuss the use of a cabriolet for guest transportation. That will work great the first time, if it is not snowing or raining. After that, the guests will jump in their cars to go anywhere but Main Street. Since Bonanza Park is also going to be developed, people will want to go there too (not to mention the liquor store at

the Market). I accept that a certain number of people will not drive and park at Treasure. However, at a large resort such as this project, they will jump into someone's vehicle whether it is a Taxi, Uber, or Lyft. Those numbers are not included anywhere in the traffic forecast. We won't discuss the environmental impact of 40 cabs idling at the resort waiting for fares during cold weather.

Finally, let's discuss public safety very briefly. The owners' plans were approved during a period of time when Park City was scratching and clawing to remain viable 30 years ago. I did read Jody Burnett's Memorandum. It is not the fault of the people of Park City, especially the landowners along the roads impacted by this project, that this land owner waited until the city grew appropriately around this parcel. Now the existing infrastructure will not support this project without negatively impacting those land owners. (For the record, we do not own land. We are renters in Park Meadows) What happens if there is a wildfire on that portion of the mountain? Those roads will not support all of those Treasure vehicles trying to exit on the neighborhood roads at the same time current residents are attempting to exit. It will be a terrible disaster. The same is true if there is a building fire at Treasure.

Hopefully my comments/concerns are on target. As I mentioned in my first meeting in Santy Auditorium, generally I am not opposed to land owners developing their land. My feeling is simply it needs to fit the neighborhood it is in.

Thank you for your time,

Bill

Provocative Thinking Consulting, Inc.

Professional Speaker Member with National Speakers Association, Consultant/Recruiter, Award Winning Author

<http://www.SpeakBill.com/> (Soft Launch)

<https://www.espeakers.com/marketplace/speaker/profile/23767/Bill-Humbert>

www.RecruiterGuy.com

*New cell 435-714-4425

recruiterguy@msn.com

LinkedIn: <http://www.linkedin.com/in/recruiterguy> Feel free to invite me to join your LinkedIn network.

Twitter: RecruiterGuy81

Bill's first recruitment related book has been released - "RecruiterGuy's Guide to Finding a Job" - read about the book and order it from http://www.amazon.com/RecruiterGuys-Guide-Finding-Job-ebook/dp/B00DR4O8T0/ref=sr_1_1?s=digital-text&ie=UTF8&qid=1373981446&sr=1-1&keywords=recruiterguy%27s+guide+to+finding+a+job