Route 319

Updated: December 2008

* (A) Commission Action November 3, 1989: Added to the State System of Highway roadway from a junction with the southbound on and off ramps of SR-40 Mayflower Interchange traversing in a southeasterly direction 0.44 miles, thence proposed roadway to the proposed boat ramp at the Jordanelle Reservoir Recreation site, a distance of 0.99 miles.

1990 Legislature Description:
From southbound on and off ramps Mayflower Interchange southeasterly to the end of constructed road; thence via proposed road to a point where the boat ramp at the proposed Jordanelle State Park will begin.

1992 Legislature: Description remains the same.
1993 Legislature: Description remains the same.
1994 Legislature: Description remains the same.
1995 Legislature: Description remains the same.
1996 Legislature: Description remains the same.
1997 Legislature: Description remains the same.

1998 Legislative Description:
From southbound on and off ramps Mayflower Interchange southeasterly to the end of constructed road; then via proposed road to a point where the boat ramp at the 10rdanelle State Park will begin.

1999 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2000 Legislature: Description remains the same.

2001 Legislative Description:
From the southbound on and off ramps of Route 40, Mayflower Interchange southeasterly to the Jordanelle State Park fee station.

2002 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2003 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2004 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2005 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2006 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2007 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2008 Legislature: Description remains the same.

* Refers to resolution index page following.
Route 319

COUNTY/VOLUME & RESOLUTION NUMBER

A. Wasatch Co. 8/1

DESCRIPTION OF RESOLUTION CHANGE

RESOLUTION

Relocation of Routes Around Jordanelle Reservoir

Relocation of SR-40 and SR-189
Addition SR-32 along with Redesignation of SR-35 and Extension of FAS-184
Addition SR-319
Deletion Portion of SR-248
Transfer of State Constructed Roads
at Various Locations Throughout
Project Plans NF-19(13), NF-19(14) & NF-61(3)

WHEREAS, Sections 27-12-27 and 27-12-29 of the Utah Code 1987-1988 provides for the addition or deletion of highways as well as disposition of realigned portions from the state highway system and,

WHEREAS, the frontage roads, cross roads and access roads along with the existing alignments of State Route 40 and State Route 189 described on project plans NF-19(13), NF-19(14), NF-61(3) serve as public roads though not justified as part of the state system of highways and,

WHEREAS, the District 2 and District 6 Directors have requested that the following roadways described within are justified for jurisdictional and maintenance relinquishment to the Bureau of Reclamation, Summit and Wasatch Counties and,

WHEREAS, the Summit County Commission as well as the Wasatch County Commission have concurred with the following jurisdictional and maintenance relinquishments and,

WHEREAS, the appropriate staff of the Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the requests for jurisdictional and maintenance relinquishments of aforementioned roadways and concurs with stated transfers.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

1. The realigned portion of State Route 40, (US-40), (FAP-15), will be 1.46+ miles shorter in length than the previous alignment, thus functional classification, as well as Federal-aid Primary mileages will decrease by said amount along new alignment.

2. The roadway known as existing State Route 40, (US-40), (FAP-15), from the beginning of "F" Line Project NF-19(13) traversing northerly to the point where the new alignment of State Route 40 junctions with the old alignment of State Route 40, (US-40), (FAP-15), a distance of 1.23+ miles be transferred to the jurisdiction of Summit County and be Functionally Classified Local. This transaction will increase Summit County's "B" system road mileage 1.23+ miles.
3. The roadway known as existing State Route 40, (US-40), (FAP-15), from the beginning of "P" Line Project NF-19(14) traversing northerly to end of required culdesac a distance of 0.08+ miles, commencing again at the beginning of "H" Line traversing northerly to the BOR boundary a distance of 2.38+ miles a combined total of 2.46+ miles be transferred to the jurisdiction of Wasatch County and be Functionally Classified Local. This transaction will increase Wasatch County's "B" system road mileage 2.46+ miles.

4. All rights, titles, and interest on the alignments of existing State Route 40, (US-40), (FAP-15), and existing State Route 189, (US-189), (FAP-61), that are contained within the Bureau of Reclamation boundary will be quit claimed to the United States as stipulated in a cooperative agreement reached between the Utah Department of Transportation and the Bureau of Reclamation. These alignments constitute 4.93+ miles on existing State Route 40, (US-40), (FAP-15), and 3.83+ miles on existing State Route 189, (US-189), (FAP-61).

5. The realigned portion of State Route 189, (US-189), (FAP-61), which will proceed from the Park City Interchange southbound on and off ramps of new State Route 40 traversing easterly and southerly to Main Street in Kamas will be 2.10+ miles greater in length than the previous alignment of State Route 189, thus functional classification as Minor Arterial as well as Federal-Aid Primary mileages will increase by said amount along new alignment.

6. The aforementioned length of increase on the new alignment of State Route 189 (US-189), (FAP-61) precipitates the need for remilepost from the aforementioned termini at the Park City Interchange to its conclusion at the I-80 westbound on and off ramps at Wanship in order to maintain milepost integrity by avoiding duplicating mileposts with a previous section of State Route 189.

7. The realigned portion of State Route 189 traversing easterly from Engineer Station 567+95, Project NF-61(3), to the west incl. of Kamas a distance of 0.91+ miles be deleted from Summit County's "B" system mileage also from the west incl. of Kamas to Main Street Kamas a distance of 0.10+ miles be deleted from Kamas City's "C" system mileage.

8. The realignment of State Route 189 which will proceed from the Park City Interchange along with said interchange realigning State Route 248 will decrease State Route 248 by .21+ miles, thus State Route 248's ending termini will be at the southbound on and off ramps Park City Interchange where State Route 189 will proceed.

9. The roadway known as existing State Route 189 (US-189), (FAP-61) traversing easterly, from the BOR Boundary to the Junction of State Route 35 in Francis, a distance of 3.36+ miles be transferred to the jurisdiction of the following entities in subsequent manner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Mile Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of Miles</th>
<th>Func. Class From To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Co.</td>
<td>33.00 to 33.56</td>
<td>BOR Boundary to Jct. Co. Road</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>Min. Art. Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Co.</td>
<td>33.56 to 34.97</td>
<td>Jct. Co. Road to Wasatch-Summit Co. Line</td>
<td>(B) 1.41+</td>
<td>Min. Art. Mjr. Col.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Co.</td>
<td>34.97 to 35.44</td>
<td>Wasatch-Summit Co. Line to West Incl. Francis</td>
<td>(B) 0.47+</td>
<td>Min. Art. Mjr. Col.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>35.44 to 37.36</td>
<td>West Incl. Francis to Jct. SR-35 Francis</td>
<td>(C) 0.92+</td>
<td>Min. Art. Mjr. Col.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The existing alignment of State Route 389 (US-189 (FAP-61)) from 200 South Street in Kamas to the Junction of State Route 35 in Francis, be placed on the State System of Highways as State Route 32, Functionally Classified Major Collector and placed on the Federal-Aid Secondary System as an extension of Federal-Aid Secondary System 184, a distance of 2.02+ miles.

11. The roadway residing as State Route 35 traversing southeasterly from the existing alignment of State Route 189 (US-189) (FAP-61) to its termini at the Junction of State Route 87 in Duchesne County, a distance of 62.47 miles be redesignated as a portion of State Route 32. Functional Class designations as well as Federal System designations will be retained, thus the combined mileage total for State Route 32 will be 64.49+ miles.

12. The roadway known as "0" Line, as constructed, Project NF-19(13) from Engineer Station 11+78.28 southbound on & off ramps to Engineer Station 35+00, a distance of 0.44+ miles be placed on the State System of Highways and numbered State Route 319, also Engineer Station 35+00 to the proposed boat ramp residing within the future State Park on the Jordanelle Reservoir approximately .99+ miles of unconstructed roadway be included as State Route 319 for a total length of 1.43+ miles and be Functionally Classified Local.

13. The following frontage, access, and crossroads constructed as part of Projects NF-19(13), NF-19(14) and NF-61(3) within the boundaries of Summit and Wasatch Counties be transferred to the jurisdiction of these entities as follows.
NF-19(13) (Park City Jct. to South Mayflower)

Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location</th>
<th>Transferred To County</th>
<th>Total Feet Existing on &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Total Feet Add to &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Func. Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Line</td>
<td>730' = .14 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>730' = .14 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* D Line</td>
<td>7485' = 1.42 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>7485' = 1.42 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>8215' = 1.56 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>8215' = 1.56 mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wasatch County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location</th>
<th>Transferred To County</th>
<th>Total Feet Existing on &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Total Feet Add to &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Func. Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* D Line</td>
<td>565' = .11 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>565' = .11 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Line</td>
<td>160' = .03 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>160' = .03 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Line</td>
<td>4801' = .91 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>4801' = .91 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Line</td>
<td>5466' = 1.04 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>5466' = 1.04 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Line</td>
<td>5748' = 1.09 mi</td>
<td></td>
<td>5748' = 1.09 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Line</td>
<td>2855' = .54 mi</td>
<td>360' = .07 mi</td>
<td>2495' = .47 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Line</td>
<td>1020' = .19 mi</td>
<td>512' = .10 mi</td>
<td>508' = .09 mi</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>20615' = 3.91 mi</td>
<td>872' = .17 mi</td>
<td>19743' = 3.74 mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footage deleted from previous "B" routes in Wasatch County that are either obliterated by new construction or replaced by newly constructed frontage and access roads is 7,752 ft. = 1.47 miles, indicating net gain of "B" system footage in Wasatch County for Project NF-19(13) = 11,991' = 2.27 miles.

* The footage on "D" Line is located in Summit and Wasatch Counties and each will be credited with the appropriate footage.
NF-19(14) (South Mayflower to Midway Jct.)

Wasatch County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location</th>
<th>Transferred To County</th>
<th>Total Feet Existing on &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Total Feet Add to &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Func. Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Line</td>
<td>930' = .18 mi.</td>
<td>150' = .03 mi.</td>
<td>780' = .15 mi.</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Line</td>
<td>2000' = .38 mi.</td>
<td>465' = .09 mi.</td>
<td>1535' = .29 mi.</td>
<td>Mn.Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Line</td>
<td>475' = .09 mi.</td>
<td></td>
<td>475' = .09 mi.</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1 Line</td>
<td>375' = .07 mi.</td>
<td></td>
<td>375' = .07 mi.</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>3780' = .72 mi.</td>
<td>615' = .12 mi.</td>
<td>3165' = .60 mi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footage deleted from previous "B" routes in Wasatch County that are either obliterated by new construction or replaced by newly constructed frontage road, cross roads and access roads is 1,450' = .27 miles, indicating a net gain of "B" system footage = 1,715' = .32 miles.

NF-61(3) (Park City Jct. to Kamas)

Wasatch County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location</th>
<th>Transferred To County</th>
<th>Total Feet Existing on &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Total Feet Add to &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Func. Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Line</td>
<td>1130' = .21 mi.</td>
<td>375' = .07 mi.</td>
<td>755' = .14 mi.</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Line</td>
<td>1555' = .29 mi.</td>
<td>480' = .09 mi.</td>
<td>1075' = .20 mi.</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>2685' = .50 mi.</td>
<td>855' = .16 mi.</td>
<td>1830' = .34 mi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footage deleted from previous "B" routes in Wasatch County that are either obliterated by new construction or replaced by newly constructed frontage roads, cross roads and access roads is 3,390' = .64 miles, indicating a net loss of "B" system footage 1,560' = .30 miles.

Summit County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location</th>
<th>Transferred To County</th>
<th>Total Feet Existing on &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Total Feet Add to &quot;B&quot; System</th>
<th>Func. Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H Line</td>
<td>800' = .15 mi.</td>
<td>800' = .15 mi.</td>
<td>637' = .12 mi.</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Line</td>
<td>1062' = .20 mi.</td>
<td>425' = .08 mi.</td>
<td>637' = .12 mi.</td>
<td>Mn.Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1862' = .35 mi.</td>
<td>1225' = .23 mi.</td>
<td>637' = .12 mi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footage deleted from previous "B" routes in Summit County that are either obliterated by new construction or replaced by newly constructed frontage road, cross roads and access roads is 530' = .10 miles, indicating a net gain of "B" system footage 87' = .02 miles.
14. By these actions Summit County's "B" system mileage will increase 2.37± miles, also Wasatch County's "B" system mileage will increase 6.09± miles, Francis City's "C" system mileage will indicate a net increase of 0.92± miles, and Kamas City's "C" system mileage will indicate a net decrease of .10± miles.

15. The changeover in control, operation and maintenance of the aforementioned roadways will become effective when aforementioned sections are completed and open to traffic, also upon approval from the Federal Highway Administration, where applicable.

16. The accompanying letter, Part IV of Agreement, maps, and system change proposals be made part of this resolution.

DATED on this 2nd day of November, 1989.

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Edward Anderson

Secretary to Commission

James S. Sandlin

Commissioner
August 17, 1987

Lorin E. Allred, Chairman
Wasatch County Commission
24 North Main
Heber City, Utah  84032

SUBJECT: Relocation of U.S. 40 and U.S. 189

Dear Mr. Allred,

In response to your letters dated February 19, 1987 addressed to Mike Arambula and Larry Jacobson and June 4, 1987 addressed to Mr. Alfred Olschewski concerning the Relocation of U.S. 40, the Utah Department of Transportation offers the following comments:

February 19, 1987 letter
Comments to Paragraph No. 1, which asks if UDOT could inform property owners of the proposed design and consult with them for the best possible access to their properties.

UDOT has proceeded with the design of US 189 ("C" Line) with our standard design criteria and have provided continuity to the county and property access roads. Any change in control and ownership of these roads would be accomplished by the county through its established procedures and Highway Code 27-12-102.1 through 102.5.

Comments to Paragraph No. 2, which is a two-part question. Part one asks that the portion of U.S. 40 which will be inundated by Jordanelle Reservoir remain in the State Roads System, because the Jordanelle Reservoir will be part of the State Parks System, and part two asks that UDOT abandon that portion of the old U.S. 40 which passes through the Fitzgerald's property, and warrant the abandoned right of way to Fitzgeralds.

Policy 63-11-20 of the State Parks and Recreation Code provides that UDOT can build and maintain roads to or through an existing park. Until there is an official park designation, UDOT is not authorized to implement and assume responsibility for an access road system. We believe that either recommendation by Wasatch County is feasible, but at this time the County is the only entity able to take action.
June 4, 1987 letter

Comments to Paragraph No. 1, which questions the use of the Union Pacific Railroad right of way for access to United Park City Mines.

The United Park City Mines access road, previously known as the "KK" Line, has been redesigned and designated as the "R" Line. It is UDOT's understanding that United Park City Mines acquired in fee the old Union Pacific Railroad right of way, which traverses, through their property near the Ontario No. 2 Drain Tunnel, back in 1982. UDOT and United Park City Mines did spend considerable time discussing the location of said "R" Line before agreeing that this design was the most feasible and economical way to serve United Park City Mines. If the railroad study underway finds that reestablishment of railroad services is feasible, UDOT will work with the Counties and others interested in investigating and evaluating alternate designs that are compatible with all public and private property owners' needs. United Park City Mines also reminds us that their decanting pond for the Ontario No. 2 Drain Tunnel is located on the old railroad bed, and to remove or change the location would be environmentally difficult.

Comments to Paragraph No. 2, which shows that UDOT's "O" Line access road on Sheet 18 appears to cut across the Mayflower Tailing Ponds.

We assume that you are referring to the "O" Line frontage road in your letter. The purpose of the "O" Line is to provide access to the proposed State Park, which will be east of the new U.S. 40 alignment. Your assumption is correct. We do not plan to construct the entire alignment at this time, but presently UDOT intends to construct the portion from U.S. 40 to a point near the tailings ponds. UDOT is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation and Mayflower Development are negotiating to enlarge those particular tailings ponds. UDOT will likely become involved later when the environmental issues have been resolved. At that time UDOT will be expected to initiate a contract to complete the "O" Line. The proposed railway will have to be designed for a grade structure or tunnel under UDOT's "O" Line.

Comments to Paragraph No. 3, which questions the grade of the proposed U.S. 40 and the Union Pacific Railroad grade. UDOT's plan Sheet No. 20 does not allow enough clearance for a railroad structure.

UDOT has been in the process of designing the Relocated U.S. 40 for the past ten years. During that period UDOT and the BOR have designed and evaluated many different alignments, based on engineering and political concepts. The final location for the alignment was determined in 1982, which is the alignment that plans and specifications were prepared for contracting purposes. In 1985 UDOT and the BOR went to an accelerated schedule for construction of both the highway relocation
and the dam. The BOR estimated that a delay of one year would cost the taxpayer and water users about 30 million dollars. By keeping on this accelerated schedule, UDOT can have the traffic relocated from its present alignment by 1990. The February 19, 1987 letter suggests that UDOT alter its design to meet the needs of a study, to determine if it would be feasible to construct a railroad on the old Union Pacific Railroad right of way. After conferring with Mr. Caine Alder, employed by UDOT, it has been determined that a feasibility study, funded by UDOT, will be completed in September of 1987. Mr. Alder also informed us that Utah, Wasatch and Summit Counties are also doing a study of their own, concerning the railroad. The information gathered from the above-mentioned studies will not be available until September. Delay that would be caused by a major design change at this late date would have a serious impact on the coordination of traffic services with the dam construction. UDOT recently opened bids for the south portion of the U.S. 40 Relocation, and the target date for awarding the contract for the north portion is November, 1987. If the railroad study leads to a decision by Wasatch County to finance and construct the railroad between Heber City and the Phoeton Plant, then it would be necessary to provide a highway-railroad separation structure designed and constructed in a manner to avoid delay in the completion of the new U.S. 40. A design change on the north portion would be complex at this time. It would alter the design of the Mayflower Interchange, the "Y" Line structure, right of way, hydraulic design, an access to the Mayflower development, and would impact the south portion which will be under construction.

Comments to Paragraph No. 4, which questions UDOT's policy for water pollution control around the Jordanelle Reservoir and the Provo River watershed.

UDOT has been working and cooperating with Wasatch County's consultants, Swob and Berg during all design phases of the project, and it is UDOT's intent to continue to do so. UDOT's Construction Project Engineer John Keyes of District No. 6 has been informed of the Jordanelle/Deer Creek Technical Advisory Committee's concerns during the construction phase. UDOT has suggested that Mr. Keyes be put on the mailing list, so he would be made aware, and updated of said Advisory Committee's interests of the Jordanelle Reservoirs and the Provo River Watersheds. UDOT is also providing a Special Provision "Environmental Commitments for Highway Construction," which has specific instructions for both the Contractor and UDOT's Project Engineer. (See attachment.) His mailing address is Field Office, 1075 South Main Street, Heber City, Utah or P. O. Box 215, Orem, Utah 84057.

Comments to Paragraph No. 5, which asks if UDOT is providing access to private properties, with the present design of the "Y" Line.
We understand that the Bureau of Reclamation intends to buy out the Baum property in this area. The proposed "Y" Line does give access to the Lewis and State properties.

It is the sincere desire of UDOT to work closely with all entities and agencies of varying interest. We are confident that a coordinated planning and design process will lead to final solutions that strike a balance that can serve each of the respective interests and still be in the best overall public interest. To this end we wish to continue to maintain a cooperative rapport with the County, Bureau of Reclamation and the C.U.P. 

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Blaine J. Kay, P. E.
Preconstruction Engineer
PART IV
PROGRAM NARRATIVE

1. OBJECTIVES AND NEED FOR ASSISTANCE. The construction of Jordanelle Dam and Reservoir is part of the ongoing Central Utah Project. This facility will be utilized to store water for Municipal and Industrial use in Utah and Salt Lake Counties. The storage of water at higher elevations such as the location of Jordanelle provides a minimization of losses due to evaporation. As a result of the construction of Jordanelle Dam, 10.8 miles of U.S. Highway 40 and 11.8 miles of U.S. Highway 189 will be rendered inoperable and will have to be relocated. In addition, a new road, approximately 9.8 miles long and identified as Wasatch County Route A, will be constructed. In order to provide funds to the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), the entity responsible for this type of construction in the State of Utah, the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) will enter into a Cooperative Agreement with UDOT.

2. RESULTS OR BENEFITS EXPECTED. The relocation and construction of these highways will provide to BOR an unencumbered reservoir area. The relocated roads will also provide access to recreation areas created by the new reservoir, to areas previously inaccessible to public use, and to land areas along Route A now accessed by Highway 189. The relocation of these roads will also result in high quality, safe, and efficient routes around the Jordanelle Dam and Reservoir. The resulting benefits will be to all visitors to the newly-constructed reservoir and to the public in general.

3. APPROACH.

3.1 Utah Department of Transportation Responsibilities. The UDOT will:

(a) Prepare designs and specifications for the relocation of highways U.S. 40 and U.S. 189, in accordance with current approved UDOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) standards. Any betterments above requirements needed to meet current approved UDOT and FHWA standards, and as herein agreed for the relocated Highways 40 and 189, will be at the expense of the UDOT.

(b) Submit or make available to the BOR for approval:

(1) preliminary highway design plans, specifications, and estimates.

(2) final highway design plans, specifications, and estimates.
(3) contractual obligations (awards) entered into as a result of this Agreement.

(4) the completed highway relocation projects.

(c) Compute and furnish right-of-way descriptions for U.S. Highway 40 and U.S. Highway 189.

(d) Construct the identified segments of U.S. Highway 40 and U.S. Highway 189, and manage Wasatch County's design and construction of Route A.

(e) Include in the design and construction of the highways those environmental commitments as provided by the BOR from the Municipal and Industrial System, Final Environmental Statement (FES), and FES Supplement.

(f) Include in the design of the highways, access openings or features for each of the proposed recreation areas to be developed later by the Federal Government. Also include in the design of the highways an access opening for an operation and maintenance road to Jordanelle Dam, and partially construct this opening. The access points shall be located and designed in accordance with current highway design standards.

(g) Follow standard procedures and Federal-aid requirements, and be responsible for seeing that all State requirements related to highway construction programs for highways as described in Paragraph 4 below are followed.

(h) Comply with all necessary Federal, State, and local licenses and permits, including but not limited to Section 402 NPDES permits and State Engineer's permits to alter natural streams.

(i) Abandon the segments of U.S. Highway 40 and U.S. Highway 189 within the Jordanelle reservoir right-of-way boundary, and quit claim all right, title, and interest therein to the United States.

(j) Allow traffic on two lanes of Highway 40, with only a bituminous surface, while the third stage of construction (concrete surfacing) is being completed.

(k) Complete construction of Highway 40 to an acceptable standard to safely accommodate traffic by December 31, 1988. The final design pavement will be placed prior to December 31, 1991.

(l) UDOT will review and approve all designs, plans, and specifications prepared under this Agreement by Wasatch County
for Wasatch County Route A together with right-of-way descriptions to insure compliance with applicable design requirements and/or right-of-way acquisition procedures. UDOT will further monitor and inspect as needed construction of said Wasatch County Route A to insure compliance with approved plans and specifications.

(m) UDOT will be responsible for disbursing federal grants in aid to Wasatch County for highway design engineering, construction engineering, and construction of the said Wasatch County Route A upon approval by UDOT of those items referred to in preceding subparagraphs.

3.2 Wasatch County Responsibilities, as enumerated in separate cooperative agreements between the County and UDOT. Wasatch County will:

(a) Prepare and submit to UDOT designs and specifications in accordance with applicable design criteria for Wasatch County Route A covering the following:

(1) Preliminary highway design plans, specifications, and estimates.

(2) Final highway design plans, specifications, and estimates.

(3) Contractual obligations (awards) entered in to as a result of this Agreement.

(4) The completed Wasatch County Route A project.

(b) Compute and furnish right-of-way descriptions for Wasatch County Route A to UDOT for review and approval prior to submission to the BOR.

(c) Construct Wasatch County Route A in accordance with design standards specified herein or as otherwise mutually agreed upon between the parties.

(d) Include in the design and construction of the highway those environmental commitments as provided by the BOR from the Municipal and Industrial system, Final Environmental Statement (FES), and FES supplement.

(e) Include in the design of the highway, access openings or features for each of the proposed recreation areas to be developed later by the Federal Government. Also include an access opening for an operation and maintenance road to Jordanelle Dam. The access points shall be located and designed in accordance with current highway design standards.
(f) Follow Standard Procedures required by UDOT and BOR as may be hereafter determined in order to qualify for Federal Grants in Aid. Betterments in excess of contract requirements herein agreed upon will be at the expense of Wasatch County except for those betterments which are mutually agreed upon pursuant to Paragraph 4 below.

(g) Comply with all necessary Federal, State, and local licenses and permits, including but not limited to Section 402 NPDES permits and State Engineer's permits to alter natural streams.

(h) Subject to availability of funds, complete construction of Wasatch County Route A in accordance with agreed upon completion dates as shown under Paragraph 5.

3.3 Bureau of Reclamation Responsibilities. The BOR will:

(a) Prepare plat maps from descriptions furnished by UDOT and Wasatch County, and acquire all rights-of-way involved in relocating U.S. Highway 40, U.S. Highway 189, and Wasatch County Route A and furnish to UDOT and Wasatch County a quit claim deed to those lands.

(b) Provide for the relocation of all utilities in conflict with the highway relocation work, including Wasatch County Route A.

(c) Obtain all National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance for the highway construction and provide to UDOT and Wasatch County, for inclusion in specifications for award, a copy of the environmental commitment plan for those commitments which must be completed during highway construction.

(d) Ensure that all NEPA and other environmental impact statement requirements are met and approved (a certification to this effect will be made to UDOT and Wasatch County prior to any construction authorization).

(e) Make available all maps, drawings, and/or informational material gathered by BOR to date upon request.

(f) Approve final designs and specifications prior to UDOT and Wasatch County advertising for construction.

(g) Approve all contracts for construction prior to award.

(h) Participate in final inspections with UDOT and Wasatch County.
(i) Fund 100 percent of the design and construction costs except for unapproved betterments incurred in accordance with this Agreement.

(j) Make available in advance any special environmental mitigation, engineering, dam site, access, or other requirements or needs.

(k) BOR shall transfer to UDOT periodic payments to cover all approved engineering and construction contract costs (including approved costs to Wasatch County). These payments shall be made monthly in the amount of such month's costs for contractors (including UDOT and Wasatch County).

(l) Make application and obtain all Section 404 dredge and fill permits related to highway construction.
4. SPECIFICATIONS. Utah Department of Transportation standards for each road are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S. 40</th>
<th>U.S. 189</th>
<th>Route A*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width of Traffic Lanes</td>
<td>48'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Shoulders</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>4'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(outside) (inside)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width</td>
<td>64'(min)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Grade</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Maximum Curvature</td>
<td>2 45'</td>
<td>4 15'</td>
<td>11 15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Width Curb to Curb</td>
<td>42'</td>
<td></td>
<td>32'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All other structures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Design Loading</td>
<td>HS20</td>
<td>HS20</td>
<td>HS20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Design Thickness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular Borrow</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untreated Base Course</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lean Concrete Base</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Cement Concrete</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bituminous Plant Mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Course</td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Mix Seal Coat</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Standards and specifications for Route A may be modified after completion of the preliminary planning process if mutually agreed upon by BOR, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, UDOT, and Wasatch County. The parties agree that they will not unreasonably withhold approval of changes in design standards where Wasatch County demonstrates the need at a reasonable cost.
5. **DELIVERABLES.** The UDOT anticipates completing the following schedule of deliverables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. 40 Relocation</th>
<th>Date Start</th>
<th>Date Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Execution Date</td>
<td>October 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Portion, Grading</td>
<td>March 87</td>
<td>October 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>March 87</td>
<td>October 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Portion, Grading</td>
<td>April 87</td>
<td>October 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing (Final)</td>
<td>March 89</td>
<td>December 91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. 189 Relocation</th>
<th>Date Start</th>
<th>Date Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>Execution Date</td>
<td>September 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>August 87</td>
<td>September 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>August 87</td>
<td>September 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing</td>
<td>August 87</td>
<td>September 89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wasatch County anticipates completing the following schedule of deliverables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Road Route A</th>
<th>Date Start</th>
<th>Date Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Location and Preliminary Design</td>
<td>October 86</td>
<td>May 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>May 87</td>
<td>February 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>May 88</td>
<td>July 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>May 88</td>
<td>July 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing</td>
<td>May 89</td>
<td>October 89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above completion dates are subject to modification by mutual agreement of the parties, contingent upon availability of funds and as conditions dictate.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have subscribed their names through their proper officers thereunto duly authorized, as of the day and year first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
By [Signature]
Regional Director, Upper Colorado Region, Bureau of Reclamation

UTAH DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
By [Signature]
Director

Attest [Signature]
Commission Secretary

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL:
By [Signature]
Eng. for Preconstruction

By [Signature]
Assistant Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM
David L. Wilkinson, Attorney General

By [Signature]
Assistant Attorney General

REVIEWED COMPTROLLER
[Signature]
to keep accident records on it. If not, they will need to remilestone the entire section and mess up the records of the Division of Safety. They recommend that SR-35 be designated as SR-32 all the way through to Duchesne and begin at Francis instead of Kamas.

Item 12 deals with the proposed State Park at Jordanelle. They are recommending that it be a State Highway and designated as SR-319 to serve the State Park in the area.

Item 13 covers all of the other frontage roads constructed by UDOT as part of the various projects. They are numerous and are contained in the attached resolution. Most of the time there were county roads there, and we made connections to those county roads as well as building frontage roads at the interchanges. Items 13 to 16 amend the mileages on the B&C Road System and state the changes which will take place when all of the highways are completed and open to traffic.

Commissioner Winters asked for any questions or comments. Moroni Besendorfer, Wasatch County Commissioner, said they have some real concerns about the designation of these roads to be County roads. He noted that Glade Sowards is representing Wasatch County, and he turned the time over to him.

Glade Sowards said he represents a governmental consulting firm, and he has been employed by Wasatch County to make a presentation to the Commission. He noted that Heber Valley and Wasatch County have become the playground of the Wasatch Front. While this has brought a lot of money and help to the economy of the County, it has really cost more. Everything is impacted because of the amount of people coming into Wasatch County; i.e., garbage disposal, road maintenance and construction, law enforcement, and water. Everything administered by the Commission is impacted by the tremendous number of people coming into Wasatch County. Because of this and the shrinking private ownership of roads in the County, it has become increasingly difficult to tax and keep up the governmental services from the limited tax base they have. As an example, they had 22,000 acres come out of private ownership when they established Wasatch State Park. Strawberry Reservoir has now been increased. That have taken more land out of private ownership and put it into the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service. There was Deer Creek Reservoir, and now there is Jordanelle.

In making their appeal today, they would like to be able to take some of the roads under their scrutiny for maintenance, but they can't afford it. Specifically, Mr. Sowards said he would like to address Route A. He thinks
the State Transportation group and the contractors are to be complimented on the beautiful intricate series of roads surrounding the Jordanelle. They are really going to be expensive to maintain. The conclusion goes back to the Wilbur Smith Study. That Study indicates that those roads which provide services of Statewide importance; i.e., traversing the rural area, should logically be administered by State agencies. In this case, that is the State Department of Transportation. More specific criteria states that the general criteria should apply and take precedence in all discussions of administrative jurisdiction. Beyond those general statements, more detailed criteria have been developed for principal arterials and minor arterials. When this road was first built, it was decided that they would not qualify under either one of those categories.

Mr. Sowards went on to explain that as they look at it now, Route A provides tremendous access to Mirror Lake and on through to Wyoming, to Hannah and the Uintah Basin, and to the Smith Moorehouse area. They think they could be either Major or Minor Arterials and placed on the State Highway System. Of specific interest is the rural population centers of 1,000 or more people, and this joins two of these very significant centers. Their appeal to the Commission is that they think Route A should be included on the State System, because it is a Major Arterial access from Utah County into the High Uintas and Wyoming. It is an important link between two city centers of 1,000 people or more. They would appeal to remove that section from the resolution and include it on the State Highway System.

Commissioner Winters asked that Clint Topham respond. He thinks it is unfortunate for Chairman Taylor to be called out at this time. This falls into his area, and he knows that he would like to be here during the discussion.

Clint Topham said the Wilbur Smith Study discusses the Regionwide and Statewide Transportation movements and how they should be handled by State and local agencies. There was an extensive study done on the location of these highways. It was decided the best location for US-40 would be along the west side of the new Jordanelle, and that the major route carrying most of the traffic would be built along the north side, or Route C. It was recognized in that location study that it would make the Heber to Francis/Kamas traffic go out of direction to go on a State Highway. That was part of the reason for putting the "C" Line where it is and building it to the standard it was built to. The study states that when these criteria were being applied to the
system throughout the State, if there were two highways which basically pro-
vided the same service, UDOT would claim as one of theirs the highway easiest
to maintain, and the County would maintain the other one. Mr. Topham said
that the major movement from the Kamas area to US-40 is towards Park City and
Salt Lake rather than to Heber and Provo. That is why they made the decision
they did.

Chairman Taylor re-entered the room at this time, and Vice-Chairman
Winters explained that they just finished making the presentation of the
routes, and Glade Sowards has just made his presentation requesting that Route
A stay on the State System. Clint Topham just made an explanation why we
separate those roads with one going on the County System and one going on the
State System.

Commissioner Winters explained that when Route A first came before the
Commission as a possibility, there were two main reasons discussed. One was
because of the out-of-direction travel to get into the Francis area and one of
equal importance was that promoted by the Wasatch County Commission for access
to properties which Route A goes through now. The Bureau of Reclamation
finally came around to paying for the road, because they could see that it was
going to cost them a good deal of money paying damages if they didn't put in
the road. As the Commission met with the Wasatch County group, it was under-
stood that the road would stay on the County System. There was an agreement
made in this room as the Commission became a party to that. It has been the
understanding of the Commission ever since then that the County would keep
that road. That is, that we would keep the "C" Route, and the County would
keep the "A" Route. He realizes that a lot of changes take place on County
Commissions. The Commission did everything they could to help that become a
reality; and if they will go to those who were a part of that, they will let
them know that.

Glade Sowards said he has a copy of those minutes, and Commissioner
Winters is absolutely right. The Commission assisted, as did the State
people, and there was an agreement. As they have looked at the situation, it
will be a situation that will be very near impossible for them to meet. He
doesn't want the Commission to think they have gone back on their word. That
is not the situation. They are really in trouble right now financially, and
it is going to be a problem to maintain the road.

Ronald Brittenden, Representative for Congressman Nielson's Office, said
he would like to make his remarks as a taxpayer in Wasatch County and not in
his capacity as a representative for Congressman Nielson. Because of his service with Congressman Nielson, he has been involved in this for the past seven years and knows the background. He has used all of the roads in the area since he was younger and lived in Hoytsville, and he is familiar with the traffic and roads in the area. He noted that the original plans show Routes A, B and C, with Route B including a bridge across the Jordanelle. It would have been the best compromise, but the BOR realized they could probably build Routes A and C for what B would have cost. UDOT had the opportunity to be the agency to select the alternative to US-40. The traffic flow, etc. was the result of that decision. He suspects that Route C accommodates traffic previously using Brown's Canyon from Kamas to Park City and Salt Lake areas and will have more traffic demands in the near future. Route A handles the traffic which was formerly SR-40 from Utah County to Woodland and Hannah.

Mr. Brittenden said that as a resident of Wasatch County and paying the burden of the Wasatch Front's playground, he would like to have the Commission consider retaining Route A as a State Highway as it serves a purpose for the State.

Commissioner Taylor said anyone who has traveled Summit and Wasatch counties during the past year knows what a tremendous addition of lane miles we have put on the State Highway System this year. When they talk about being broke in Wasatch County, they should look at the Department's maintenance budget and the amount of overtime the snow removal crews had to work last year. That is not saying what they will have to do this year with over $150 million in new highways. UDOT has many problems too when it comes to pushing snow.

Commissioner Dunlop said he is confused. He keeps hearing that it is a problem in having all of these part time residences up there, and yet we are talking about sponsoring the Olympics because it will be a great advantage to them to bring tourists in.

Commissioner Larkin moved that the Commission adopt the resolution as presented. If the Commission wants to go back at another time and look at Route A, he will have no objection to that. Commissioner Weston seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**MUTCD Supplement for Flashing School Signs**

Chairman Taylor said he hopes those present understand the constraints under which the Commission and the Department have to work as far as traffic