**Route 190**

*Updated: November 2008*

Junction with Route 1 in Cedar City to Branch Agricultural College May 14, 1935.

**1953 Description:**
From Route 1 in Cedar City westerly to branch of the State Agricultural College.

**1962 Description:**
From Route 1 in Cedar City westerly to branch of the Utah State University of Agriculture.

**Approved by the 1963 Legislature:**

**1965 Description:**
From Route 1 in Cedar City westerly to branch of the Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.

**Approved by the 1965 Legislature:**

**(*A) Scanned**

**1966 Description:**
From Route 1 in Cedar City westerly via Center Street to 8th West Street, thence south via 8th West Street to 2nd South Street, thence east via 2nd South Street to 3rd West Street, thence east to 3rd West Street, thence north to Center Street providing a peripheral road around the College of Southern Utah.

**1969 Legislature:**
Withdrawn as a State Route and re-designated SR-289 by the 1969 Legislature.

**(B) Commission Action June 5, 1987:**
Deleted portion of SR-152 changed to SR-190 description as follows.
From Junction of Wasatch Boulevard and Route 210 easterly via Guardsman Pass to 224 near the Summit-Wasatch County line, a distance of 18.06+, miles be re-designated as Route 190.

**Approved by the 1988 Legislature Description as follows:**
From Route 210 near the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon easterly via Big Cottonwood Canyon to Brighton, including the Brighton Loop; thence easterly via Guardsman Pass to Route 224 near the Summit-Wasatch County Line.

**(C) Commission Action December 16, 1988:**
Revised Route 190, added from 215 at Knudsen’s Corner southeasterly to the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon a distance of 1.84 miles.

**Approved by the 1990 Legislature to read as follows:**
From Route 215 at Knudsen’s Corner southeasterly to Route 210 at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon; thence easterly via Big Cottonwood Canyon to Brighton, including the Brighton Loop; thence easterly via Guardsman Pass to Route 224 near the Summit-Wasatch County Line.
Route 190 Cont.

*(D) Commission Action October 5, 1990:
Deleted the portion of SR-190 from the Salt Lake-Wasatch County Line easterly to its ending termini at the junction with SR-224 near Guardsman Pass.

1990 Description:
From Route 215 at Knudsen’s Corner southeasterly to Route 210 at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon; thence easterly via Big Cottonwood Canyon to Brighton, including the Brighton Loop; thence easterly via Guardsman Pass to the Salt Lake-Wasatch County Line.

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 Route 215 at Knudsen’s Corner southeasterly to Route 210 at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon; then easterly through Big Cottonwood Canyon to Brighton; including Brighton Loop; then easterly through Guardsman Pass to the Salt Lake-Wasatch County Line.

1999 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2000 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2001 Legislature: Description remains the same.
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 on the following page.
**Refers to Scanned Computer Resolution index on the following page.
Route 190

COUNTY/VOLUME & RESOLUTION NUMBER

A. Iron Co. 1/121  B. Salt Lake Co. 7/28  C. Salt Lake Co. 7/37  D. Wasatch Co. 8/17

DESCRIPTION OF RESOLUTION CHANGE

(A). Extension/Deletion - Delete portion from Center Street south via 550 West to 2\textsuperscript{nd} South and obliterate. Extend as described in resolution, circumventing campus on college in Cedar City.

(B). Re-designation - Portion of SR-152 from Wasatch Boulevard to Brighton including Loop.

(C). Re-designation - Portion of SR-210 from Knudsens Corner Interchange to the Jct. of current SR-190 (mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon).

(D). Deletion - Portion from the Salt Lake-Wasatch County Line. Transferred to the jurisdiction of Wasatch County.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/28/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Davis - Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49A</td>
<td>1/28/66</td>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>Davis - Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/28/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>5/24/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>5/24/66</td>
<td>New Route</td>
<td>Wasatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>6/17/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>7/28/66</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Wayne - Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>7/28/66</td>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>Wayne - Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>7/28/66</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>9/23/66</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Cache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>9/23/66</td>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>Cache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>9/23/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9/23/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Juab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9/23/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>10/6/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>10/6/66</td>
<td>New Route</td>
<td>Millard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10/6/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Utah - Carbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/7/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>11/7/66</td>
<td>New Route</td>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11/8/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Weber - Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11/25/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Box Elder - Cache - Rich (Signed Route Number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>11/25/66</td>
<td>Designation or Change</td>
<td>Sanpete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>11/25/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Doggett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11/25/66</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Sanpete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-106</td>
<td>11/25/66</td>
<td>Transfer - Extension</td>
<td>Davis - Weber - Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>12/15/66</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>12/15/66</td>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>Weber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION
State Route 190

WHEREAS, it has been recommended by Mr. Loren A Whetten, Mayor of Cedar City and concurred in by the officials of the Branch of Utah State University of the Agricultural and Applied Science, at Cedar City and due to the continued growth of this college a circumferential road around the campus is justified and,

WHEREAS, the present portion of State Route 190 from Center Street south via 550 West Street to Second South Street will be closed to thru traffic and will be obliterated due to construction of additional buildings. It is recommended that this roadway be abandoned as part of the State System of Highways and,

WHEREAS, to maintain continuity in the State System of Highways.

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to the Authority of Section 27-12-72, UCA, 1953, AS AMENDED, it is hereby resolved as follows:

1. That the portion of State Route 190 from Center Street southerly via 550 West Street to Second South Street in Cedar City be deleted from the State System of Highways.

2. That State Route 190 be extended commencing at a point on Center Street at a junction with 550 West Street, west via Center Street to 8th West Street; thence, south via 8th West Street to Second South Street; thence, east via Second South Street to 3rd West Street; thence north via 3rd West Street to Center Street in Cedar City, providing a circumferential road around the College Campus.

3. That by this action State Route mileage will increase 0.646 miles.
4. That Exhibit "A" attached herewith illustrating the action taken
herewith is hereby incorporated as a part of this submission.
Dated this 24th day of May, 1966.

STATE ROAD COMMISSION OF UTAH

Eli P. Strong
Chairman

Clay H. Church
Commissioner

Emery M. Hall
Commissioner

Fannie Toole
Commissioner

ATTEST:

Ronald A. Ferley
Secretary
PROPOSAL TO CLOSE FIELDHOUSE ROAD

Increased student traffic from the upper campus to classes in the Physical Education Building, Fieldhouse, Trades and Industries Building, and playfields, as well as student traffic to and from dormitories, makes the continuation of through traffic on the Fieldhouse road an inexcusable safety hazard. The fact that married students with small children are housed in the northwest side of Oak Hall adds to the danger. Also, through traffic entering onto 200 South Street in such close proximity to the junction of 500 West Street, and the entrances to the Manzanita, Juniper, and Physical Education parking lots, creates congestion. Space now used as roadway could provide some additional badly needed parking area.

With the above considerations in mind it is proposed that a bill be presented in the Legislature to delete the Fieldhouse road, between Center Street and 200 South Street, from the State Road system, and to add in its place the following, as a temporary access, awaiting future frontage road by Freeway:

Beginning at the juncture of Fieldhouse road and the existing State road on Center Street and running west along Center Street to 800 West Street, thence south along 800 West Street to 200 South Street, thence east along 100 South Street to juncture of existing State road at intersection of Fieldhouse road.

Blockades could then be placed near the Fieldhouse, as shown on the map, to stop through automotive traffic.
RESOLUTION

F-068(3) Big Cottonwood Canyon Connection

WHEREAS, Sections 27-12-27 and 27-12-28 of the Utah Code 1986-1987 provide for the addition or deletion of highways from the State Highway System and the relinquishment of highways to the county, and

WHEREAS, Salt Lake County has requested the addition of a proposed roadway, known as project F-068(3) Big Cottonwood Canyon Connection, to the State Highway System and the relinquishment of a portion of State Route 152 to the County as outlined in the following paragraphs, and

WHEREAS, the District 2 Director has recommended the aforesaid transfer of roads, and

WHEREAS, the appropriate staff of the Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the request and determined that the proposed roadway qualifies for inclusion on the State Highway System.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows that:

1. The proposed roadway, F-068(3) Big Cottonwood Canyon Connection, from the I-215 interchange at Knudsens Corner in Salt Lake County to Wasatch Boulevard at the junction with SR-210, a distance of 1.04± miles, be added to the State Highway System as an extension of State Route 210,

2. A portion of State Route 152 from the I-215 interchange near 20th East and 6400 South Street, south coincident with 2000 East Street to 7000 South Street; thence easterly coincident with 7000 South Street to the junction with Wasatch Boulevard, a distance of 2.93± miles, be deleted from the State Highway System,

3. The aforesaid roadway be relinquished and conveyed to Salt Lake County in accordance with the agreement document attached hereto and made a part of this Resolution,

4. The portion of State Route 152 from the junction of Wasatch Boulevard and SR-210 easterly to Brighton, including the Brighton loop; thence easterly via Guardsman Pass to State Route 224 near the Summit-Wasatch County line, a distance of 18.06± miles, be redesignated as State Route 190,
5. The changeover in control, operation and maintenance of the aforementioned road systems will become effective upon completion of construction of the proposed roadway.

6. As a result of the foregoing actions, the State Highway System mileage will decrease 1.09 miles.

7. The letters from Salt Lake County, the memorandum from the District 2 Director, and the accompanying map be hereby incorporated as a part of this Resolution.

Dated this 27th day of June, 1987

UTHAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Chairman

Vice-Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

Attest:

Secretary
Memorandum

TO: Ron Delis, Engineer for Planning & Programming
   Attn: Gus Jackson, Planning Statistics Engineer

FROM: Sheldon W. McConkie, P. E.
      District Two Director

SUBJECT: I-215-9(57)10, Union Park Avenue; P-068(3), Big Cottonwood
         Canyon Connection Rd. (SR-152 and Wasatch Blvd.)

In accordance with Policy & Procedure Section 07-60,
paragraphs 6-7, we hereby submit executed documents for the transfer
of sections of the above mentioned roads to Salt Lake County.

Please proceed to have the Director sign these documents and
prepare the necessary resolutions for Commission action.

SWM/BEWang/ch

Attachment

cc: Les Jester
    John Gardner
    District R/W File
May 5, 1987

Utah Department of Transportation
District 11
2060 South 2400 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104

Attention: David Miles

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: Agreements between Utah Department of Transportation and Salt Lake County to transfer and/or exchange jurisdiction of Union Park Avenue, SR-152 and Wasatch Boulevard.

Attached are the originals and three (3) copies each of the above mentioned agreements which have been approved "as to form" by Jeffrey Thorpe, of the County Attorney's Office.

We recommend that these agreements be hereby processed in the usual manner for signatures and that copy remain for your file and the other copies sent to this department for further dispensement.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

TOSHIHARU KANO, P.E., Director
Flood Control and Highway Divisions

cc: John Hiskey

attachments
Mr. John D. Hiskey, Director
Public Works Department
Rm. N3100, Government Center
Salt Lake City, Utah

Dear Mr. Hiskey:

The Board of County Commissioners, at its meeting held this day, approved the attached AGREEMENTS between Salt Lake County and Utah Department of Transportation to transfer and/or exchange jurisdiction: Union Park Avenue, SR-152 and Wasatch Boulevard.

Pursuant to the above action, you are hereby requested to return fully executed copies to the Commission Clerk's Office for filing.

Very truly yours,

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
H. DIXON HINDLEY, COUNTY CLERK

RECEIVED
APR 30 1987
SALT LAKE COUNTY
DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS
AGREEMENT

In accordance with Sections 27-12-27, 27-12-28, 27-12-29 and 27-12-102 of the Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended.

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 27th day of April, 1967 by and between the Utah Department of Transportation, hereinafter called the "Department", and the Authorized Officials of Salt Lake County hereinafter called "County".

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Department proposes the construction of a highway between the Knudsen's Corner Interchange and Wasatch Boulevard, known as Project No. F-066(3), and has prepared a plan showing that portion of the highway within the limits of and/or affecting the roads of County.

The plan, which is attached to and becomes a part of this Agreement, shows the location of the completed highway, the location of proposed access and frontage roads and the roads which cross or connect with existing roads in County.

The plan is marked to show roads which have been realigned or abandoned and/or those roads requiring a transfer of maintenance responsibility, and

NOW THEREFORE, it is agreed:

1. The Department, in the construction of the highway project, will at the expense of the Department, make the changes in the roads of County in accordance with the plan, or as may hereafter be agreed between the parties hereto.

2. County approves and consents to the construction of the proposed highway project with the access and frontage roads and crossings of and connections with County roads, as shown on the plan; also, to the closing, relocation, abandonment, or transfer of the roads as shown by the special markings on the plan.

3. The Department will retain control and maintenance of the roads which are adopted or recommended for adoption by the Department or by the Utah State Legislature as part of the State Highway System, and are so marked on the plan. County will assume control and maintenance of all other roads which are within its jurisdiction, as marked on the plan, and upon notice from the Department. Notification will be given by the Department at the time maintenance responsibility is to be assumed by County.

4. This Agreement may be modified at any time by the mutual consent of the parties hereto, as may become necessary in the public interest.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized officers on the day and year first set forth above.

[Signatures]

County of Salt Lake, State of Utah

By Chairman, Board of Co. Commissioners

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By Director, Dept. of Transportation

ATTEST:

Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Salt Lake County Attorney's Office

Date: 5/6/67

Recommended for Approval

Date: 5/26/67
RESOLUTION

Revision SR-210 from Knudsen's Corner Interchange (I-215) to Jct. Fort Union Blvd. & Big Cottonwood Canyon (SR-190)
Project F-068(3)
Project No. I-ID-IR-215-9(74)5

WHEREAS, Section 27-12-27 of the Utah Code 1986 provides for the addition or deletion of highways from the State Highway System and

WHEREAS, it has been determined the resolution passed June 5, 1987 concerning the proposed roadway from Knudsen's Corner to the junction of Big Cottonwood Canyon being passed as an extension of State Route 210 creates a problem with mileposting and historical data within the Planning and Safety divisions and

WHEREAS, it would benefit the Utah Department of Transportation to designate stated portion of roadway as an extension of State Route 190 and

WHEREAS, the appropriate staff of the Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the problem of remileposting State Route 210 and conferred with the staff of the Safety Division concerning the change.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

1. The proposed roadway designated as an extension of State Route 210, projects F-068(3) and I-ID-IR-215-9(74)5 Big Cottonwood Canyon Connection, from the south bound on and off ramps I-215 to the junction currently residing as termini for State Route 190 and Fort Union Boulevard redesignated as the beginning part of State Route 190, a distance of 1.84+ miles.

2. The aforementioned section of roadway residing as State Route 210 that was designated a limited access roadway by resolution passed August 26, 1986 be designated limited access for redesignated State Route 190, a distance of 1.61+ miles.

3. The attached letter and map be made part of this resolution.
RESOLUTION
Revision SR-210 from Knudsen's Corner Interchange (I-215) to Jct. Fort Union Blvd. & Big Cottonwood Canyon (SR-190)
Project f-068(3)
Project No. I-ID-IR-215-9(74)5

Dated this 16th day of December, 1988

[Signatures]

Chairman

Vice-Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

Attest:

Secretary
RESOLUTION

Deletion Portion of SR-189, SR-190 and SR-224
Deletion of SR-220 Addition of SR-35
Relocation of SR-32 Extension of SR-248
Addition of "H Line Project NF-19 (14)
Old Alignment of SR-40, Wasatch County Route A
Project No. SP-1776, Old Alignment of SR-189
to the State System of Highways

WHEREAS, Section 27-12-27 of the Utah Code 1987-1988 provides for the
addition or deletion of Highways from the State System of Highways and,

WHEREAS, the Wasatch County Commission, Summit County Commission, and
the town of Francis have requested the Transportation Commission to
accept transfer of roadway known as A line, Project Number SP-1776 along
with Old alignment of SR-189 onto the State System of Highways and,

WHEREAS, the Wasatch County Commission has stated acceptance to the
jurisdictional transfer of portions of State Routes 190, 220 and 224 and,

WHEREAS, the District 2 and District 6 Directors have reviewed and
concur with the foregoing transfers and changes to the various routes
contained within stated resolution and,

WHEREAS, the appropriate staff of the Transportation Planning
Division has reviewed and analyzed the foregoing transfers and changes
contained within stated resolution and concurs, the foregoing changes
be accepted by the Transportation Commission.

NOW THEREFORE, it is resolved as follows:

1. Roadway known as State Route 189 (FAP-61), from the south bound on
and off ramps, Park City Interchange, traversing easterly and southerly
to a junction with Main Street in Kamas, (SR-32 right), a distance of
11.43+ miles be deleted and this roadway be reassigned as an extension
of SR-248, with its ending termini at the junction of Main Street and
200 South Street in Kamas. The functional classification will remain
Minor Arterial with the Federal-aid System changing to FAP-60 a distance
of 11.43+ miles, also SR-189 from 200 South Street and Main Street in
Kamas traversing northerly, westerly and northwesterly to its ending
termini at the west bound on and off ramps of the Wanship Interchange
a distance of 16.02+ miles be deleted and this roadway be reassigned to
a portion of SR-32, with its ending termini at the west bound on and
off ramps of the Wanship Interchange a distance of 16.02+ miles. The
functional classification will remain Minor Arterial and the Federal-
aid System will remain FAP-61.

2. Various segments of roadway that have been transferred to Wasatch,
and Summit Counties, along with roadway in the town of Francis through
resolution dated November 3, 1989 and roadway known as Route A, (A line)
will be placed on the State System of Highways as a portion of State
Route 32 in the following manner.
Resolution Page 2
Deletion Portion of SR-189, SR-190 and SR-224
Deletion of SR-220, Addition of SR-35 Relocation of SR-32
Extension of SR-248 Addition of "H" Line Project NF-19(14)
Old Alignment of SR-40, Wasatch County Route A
Project No. SP-1776, Old Alignment of SR-189 to the
State System of Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location and Description</th>
<th>From to</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. &quot;H&quot; Line project No. NF-19(14)</td>
<td>Engineer Station 22+12 to Beginning of &quot;H&quot; Line Engineer Station 13+50</td>
<td>.16 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Old Alignment SR-40</td>
<td>Beginning of &quot;H&quot; Line to the Beginning of Route A project SP-1776 Engineer Station 6+27</td>
<td>.10 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Route A (A line)</td>
<td>Beginning of project SP-1776 Engineer Station 6+27 to the end of project SP-1776 Engineer Station 421+94</td>
<td>7.87 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Old Alignment of SR-189</td>
<td>End of project SP-1776 Engineer Station 421+94 to the junction of current SR-32 in Francis</td>
<td>2.80 mi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combined mileage of all segments that will encompass this portion of SR-32 totals 10.93+ miles. This roadway will continue to be functionally classified Major Collector and it will be placed on the Federal-aid Secondary System as FAS-611.

3. The portion of State Route 32 that was transferred by resolution on November 3, 1989 with its beginning termini at 200 South Street and Main Street in Kamas, to the intersection of West Main, Village Way and South Spring Hollow in Francis, a distance of 2.02+ miles, will be incorporated into the other sections of SR-32 that are described within this resolution with its mileposting traversing in a northerly direction. The functional classification will remain Major Collector and the Federal-aid Secondary System will become a portion of FAS-611.

4. Roadway that was previously designated as State Route 35, thence transferred by resolution dated November 3, 1989 as a portion of State Route 32, be reinstated as State Route 35 with all previous milepoints and descriptions remaining intact.

5. Portions of roadway known as State Route 224 from the entrance to Pine Creek Campground to the Wasatch-Summit County line be deleted from the State System of Highways and Placed under the jurisdiction and
Resolution Page 3
Deletion Portion of SR-189, SR-190 and SR-224
Deletion of SR-220, Addition of SR-35 Relocation of SR-32
Extension of SR-248 Addition of "H" Line Project NF-19(14)
Old Alignment of SR-40, Wasatch County Route A
Project No. SP-1776, Old Alignment of SR-189 to the
State System of Highways

maintenance responsibility of Wasatch County a distance of 7.51+ miles. The remainder of State Route 224 will retain its present milepost into Summit County in order to maintain milepost integrity throughout the State System of Highways. The deleted portion will remain functionally classified Minor Collector and does not qualify to be placed on the Federal-aid Secondary System. This action will increase Wasatch Counties "B" System mileage by 7.51+ miles.

6. A portion of roadway known as State Route 190 from the Salt Lake-Wasatch County line to its ending termini at the Jct. of SR-224 a distance of 1.69+ miles be deleted from the State System of Highways and placed under the jurisdiction and maintenance responsibility of Wasatch County. The deleted portion of SR-190 will remain functionally classified Minor Collector and does not qualify to be place on the Federal-aid Secondary System. This action will increase Wasatch Counties "B" System mileage by 1.69+ miles.

7. Portions of roadway known as State Route 220 be deleted from the State System of Highways and placed under the jurisdiction and maintenance responsibility of Wasatch County in the foregoing manner. From the Jct. of SR-113 to the boundary of Wasatch Mountain State Park a distance of 0.78+ miles, also a portion from the National Forest boundary to the northwest boundary of Wasatch Mountain State Park a distance of 2.40+ miles, thus the total number of miles transferred from SR-220 to Wasatch County will be 3.18+. The remainder of SR-220 a distance of 16.52+ miles be deleted from the State System of Highways and become like other highways included within the boundaries of State Parks. The deleted portions of SR-220 will remain functionally classified Minor Collector and do not qualify to be placed on the Federal-aid Secondary System. This action will increase Wasatch Counties "B" System mileage by 3.18+ miles.

8. The changeover in control, operation and maintenance of the aforementioned roadways will become effective upon approval of the Utah Transportation Commission, and when stated roadways are completed and open to traffic and upon approval from the Federal Highway Administration where applicable.

9. The accompanying Commission minutes, Letters, and maps be made part of this resolution.
Resolution Page 4
Deletion Portion of SR-189, SR-190 and SR-224
Extension of SR-240, Addition of "H" Line Project NE-19(14)
Old Alignment of SR-40, Wasatch County Route A
Project No. SP-1776, Old Alignment of SR-189 to the
State System of Highways

Dated on this 5th day of December 1990

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

[Signatures]

Attest:

[Signature]
Secretary to Commission
March 16, 1990

Scott Noy
Utah Department of Transportation
4501 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Ut. 84119

Dear Scott,

Wasatch County Commission have met with the Utah Department of Transportation, both parties have come to an agreement on Rt A, which will be a State Road as of their meeting March 9, 1990.

Would you please add to Wasatch County Road system Tate Lane which is 2.7 miles. It goes from 213 to entrance of Wasatch Mountain State Park on the road to Cascade Springs. Also Pine Canyon Road which starts at the entrance of the camp grounds to County line of Salt Lake City and Summit County, which is 7.5 miles

If you need any other assistance with this please contact our Public Works Director, Kent J. Berg. We appreciate your help and hope you will be able to add these changes and all other changes you made for our Allocation for the Class "B" Road fund.

Sincerely,

J. Moroni Besendorfer
Commission Chairman
March 15, 1990

Wasatch County Commission
ATTN: Moroni Besendorfer, Chairman
25 North Main Street
Heber, Utah 84032

Dear Moroni,

The District Permits Officer, Karen Baker, has identified two signs on Route A that do not meet our outdoor advertising policy and will need to be relocated outside the right-of-way before this section of highway can be brought on the State system. Those two signs are as follows:

1. South side of "A" Route approximately 0.286 miles from Junction SR-40, advertising Jordan Ranch R.V. Park (see copy of photograph attached).

2. North side of "A" Route approximately 0.553 miles from Junction SR-40 (see copy of photograph attached).

Signs located outside the right-of-way are not a problem as this highway will be functionally classified as a Federal Aid Secondary Highway and do not have the same requirements of primary systems.

Please let us know, at your convenience, when these signs have been relocated and we will inform Mr. Clint Topham, Engineer for Planning and Programming, who is preparing the resolution for the Transportation Commission.

Thank you for your continued cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Dan F. Nelson, P.E.
District Six Director

DPN/fs
CC: Commissioner Wayne Winters
   Clint Topham, P.E.
Wasatch County Request on A Line

Dan Nelson explained that there has been several discussions on Route A and whether or not it should be taken onto the State Highway System and what the trades would be if it was. They have talked about exchanging SR-224 and SR-220, and such swaps could be made on that. It has been left up to the Commission. If they decide to take Route A onto the State Highway System, they will try to adjust some tradeoff to offset the mileage we pick up. People are here from Wasatch County today, and it will be interesting to know what tradeoff will be recommended. From a maintenance standpoint, there would not be a great change if we were to continue with those sections on SR-220 and SR-224. They feel they can handle it, with the additional people identified in the maintenance request for additional FTE's in their District. They are targeted for two additional people in that area of the State to handle additional sections of road.

Commissioner Winters asked about additional equipment. Dan Nelson said additional equipment has also been identified in the snow plan. Mr. Findlay reported yesterday that requests to the legislature have been cut, and they will need to stretch their equipment thinner to cover the additional miles. It pushes the number of miles above the 50 recommended per man in their maintenance forces. We will be strapped to handle those sections at high altitudes and steep grades with the equipment we have. We are on the down side for snow removal this year, because winter is about over.

Commissioner Winters commented that SR-40 will be a difficult road to keep open during the winter, and Dan Nelson agreed. Commissioner Winters noted that Route A will be a terrible one to keep open, and that is the reason we did not want to go over there with the road. With the additional work on US-40, there will be choices needing to be made for temporary closure of Route A because of the shortage of manpower and equipment. Dan Nelson said Route A will not be the same priority as that placed on SR-40 or US-189, but it will be above SR-220 and SR-224 or other highways. It will be about the third category. The frequency of Route A would not be the same as other routes, and they may have a temporary closure during inclement weather. He said they will definitely need a blower on Route A. They have a blower in the District, but they need to use it on SR-40 and Indian Canyon on SR-191 between Duchesne and Helper. They will need an additional blower to handle US-40 and Route A. They will also need a cat in those areas from time to time. They use one at Strawberry most of the time, and it will need to be spread a little thinner. They will need the ability to pull a cat from another area. Commissioner Winters asked if there is enough money in the budget to buy a blower, and Gene
Findlay said they do not have enough money for one. They will need to take a look at what they programmed for and determine what they can drop out in favor of buying a blower. Sheldon agreed that there is no money for buying a blower. He said the legislature cut $1 million from our equipment budget.

Dan Nelson said there is another equipment item they need to be aware of too. They will need an ice cutter. The Federal government has come back and warned them of potential problems with parapet and barriers where we have accumulation of ice. If we were to have accidents in those areas, it could be very detrimental to the State because of the liability involved. FHWA cautioned them there are areas they will need to go in and clean. The only ice cutter in the State is shared among all of the Districts, and they will need some time for using it in their area, both on SR-40 and Route A. Commissioner Winters asked Wasatch County about their equipment, and Commissioner Coleman told him they don’t have any extra.

Gene Findlay said they had a meeting approximately a month ago where they discussed the proposals and what would happen if they took on Route A. They looked at the possibility of trading mileage on Route A for mileages we are currently maintaining on SR-224 and SR-220. They were going to look at it and bring it to the Commission for their consideration.

Commissioner Pete Coleman, Wasatch County, said they can live with the trade. They are seeing that they are taking slightly more mileage. They think the criteria for Route A should be given as US-189 since it replaces US-189. They recommended at first that it be an extension of SR-35 coming from Hannah and Woodland to the junction of US-40, but the most logical would be for US-189 to meet SR-35 at Francis. The legislature designated $450,000 to help with construction of the Lemon Hill. To him it would be a logical State project to have the road designated as a State Highway. They will take over SR-220 to the top of Guardsman’s Pass and SR-224 to the entrance of the State park.

Chairman Taylor said we are talking about two different subjects. We need to discuss the trade and then discuss the designations at a later date.

Clint Topham said the policy calls for the staff to make a recommendation. From the State Highway Systems standpoint, they have reviewed the proposed changes. They think it will be more palatable for them to take the roads off the State Highway System which were supposed to come off through the Wilbur Smith Study than to just take Route A onto the system. If the Commission should decide to take Route A, he would like to take a minute or two to discuss the issues Commissioner Coleman has brought up about the numbering so they can prepare a resolution to bring
back to the Commission.

Commissioner Winters said he would like to back up to what he said first. Clint said the road is functionally classified to go either way. The Highway Systems Study said that the State Highway System should serve Heber City, Kamas, and those types of areas, and we serve those with the current system. This will serve them with more than one high highway.

Commissioner Coleman said the highway replacement of Route A is the highway which runs from Heber to Kamas. If they go the other way, they go quite a few miles north to the Park City Junction to connect onto the road to Kamas. They have road maintenance in the Bench Creek area south of Woodland still in Wasatch County, and it would have been a considerable distance to do that. Route A and US-40 were both constructed with Federal funds. At that time, they said they would maintain the County road. In subsequent meetings, they said they would abide by the Wilbur Smith Study. Route A falls under the criteria of being a State Highway. They think some of the highways they are taking should fall under that category, but they are willing to trade. They feel the park has some responsibility for the interior park road going from one campground to another, but they will take SR-220 from Wasatch State Park to Guardsman’s Pass and SR-224 from the road near Charleston to the entrance to the park.

 Commissioner Winters said Commissioner Coleman and Clint Topham do not agree on what the study says. Clint said that is because Commissioner Coleman claims Route A replaced US-189, and Route C replaced US-189.

Commissioner Weston asked what distances are involved on SR-220 and SR-224. Commissioner Coleman said it will be about ten miles, and the State would be taking over approximately 7 miles on Route A. Dan Nelson said the mileage would be almost an equal swap, but they are looking at two completely different roads as far as service, pavement, etc. There are sections on SR-220 which would not be plowed in the winter, and UDOT will be required to adhere to the bare pavement policy they have for plowing during the winter. Dan Nelson said there is considerable snow removal on the road to Wasatch State Park, and the County plows that section now. Commissioner Weston said he thinks they are proposing a pretty good trade for the County. It is easier to grade the gravel road than to keep Route A open. He keeps going back to the meetings on Route A as to who would take over the road, and it was agreed that the County would take over the maintenance of Route A. They also know that Route A will have a lower priority for maintenance as a State Highway than if it is a County road. Commissioner Coleman said they had a normal winter this year, and Kent Bird did an excellent job in keeping the road open. They feel it is more cost-effective for both Wasatch and Summit counties and the State of Utah. There will be
a State maintenance shed near the Mayflower Interchange, and he thinks it makes sense for the trade.

Commissioner Dunlop said on the cooperative trade where they have been plowing the section of the road near the park, will we still be plowing that road? He was told they would not. Howard said the maintenance station at the Mayflower Interchange is not a given yet. It is in the long-range program. He asked about the section of road at Woodland they need to keep open. Commissioner Coleman said they have a cooperative agreement with Summit County. Road maintenance is still in their County. They want Route A open so they can get over the summit. If there is very deep snow, they send up their cat to push back the bank.

Commissioner Weston asked if it is foreseeable that SR-152 to Brighton will be an oiled road, and Commissioner Coleman said yes because of the development. Chairman Taylor said the road will still be ours to the Salt Lake County line. With development in the area, it is inevitable that it will become and oiled road.

Chairman Taylor turned the chair over to Commissioner Winters. He then moved that the Commission consummate the trade as outlined. Commissioner Weston seconded the motion. Commissioners Taylor, Weston, and Larkin voted for the motion, Commissioner Winters voted no, and Commissioner Dunlop abstained. The motion passed by a vote of three.

Commissioner Winters explained the reason for his vote. He feels very strongly that when we make a commitment that we must keep the commitment. Going back several years ago when we started on the project, he thought there was a firm commitment made by Wasatch County that if we did everything we could to make Route A a reality, it would stay on the County System. The Commission and staff of UDOT did everything possible. The County did a lot of work, but they will never know the work others did to make that a reality. Then to get to this point and have a change of direction is tough for him to accept. That is why he can’t vote yes. Quite frankly, he doesn’t feel good about it.

Clint Topham asked if they can talk for a moment about the highways. There are a couple of issues the Commission needs to address now we have taken on Route A. At the time they made the changes, they designated US-189 running concurrently with US-40, over Route C, and north through Peoa and out onto I-80. FHWA questioned why US-189 even goes through Summit County that way. ASHTO indicates that the purpose of the US-numbered routing system is to facilitate travel on main interstate routes over the shortest and best roads possible. Strictly interpreted, he thinks the best route for US-189 is to come up Provo Canyon to Heber and then run concurrently with US-40 to I-80.

Clint Topham said they need to decide whether to take US-
189 up through Kamas or leave it concurrent with US-40. Chairman Taylor said we are getting pressure and will probably ultimately be constructing the Wolf Creek Pass highway to Tabiona. Route 32 would be logical going north from Francis to Pooa, and SR-35 from Heber City over Route A to Tabiona, Duchesne and Roosevelt would be logical. It is his feeling that we run US-189 concurrent with US-40. Clint said SR-248 will go from Park City over Route C to Kamas.

Planning & Programming
IR-80-3(112)103 - Great Salt Lake Frontage Road

Clint Topham said that with work done around the Great Salt Lake with State rehabilitation forces, they built a frontage road dike along I-80. It was determined that the project would be eligible for IR funds, and that we would pave the road. The amount of $855,000 has been programmed by the Commission. That project is ready for advertisement, and it was determined that some length should be added with the pavement on it. The final cost estimate before construction is $1,146,957.27, and it is recommended by the staff that the Commission program additional funds so it can be advertised.

Commissioner Larkin so moved, and Commissioner Weston seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous that;

Additional Interstate 4R funding be programmed in the amount of $291,957.27 in addition to that previously programmed in the amount of $855,000, for a total of $1,146,957.27 for paving of the I-80 Frontage Road.

Pedestrian Walkway on Clark Lane Road

Clint Topham recalled that a few months ago, we had a group from Davis County in to talk about a project of widening the structure on I-15 to approach a new jail complex they are building west of I-15. They wanted Commission participation in widening the bridge, and they were going to do a secondary project to construct the road west of there. The Commission declined to do that at that time, and Davis County said they would go back and take another look at their plans.

Clint Topham went on to explain that they met with our Local Governments people and the District Director. Davis County decided that rather than widening the structure, the structure is adequate for vehicle traffic to go along it for a long time but they would like better pedestrian access.
DELETE AND TRANSFER
SR-220 to
Wasatch County
SR-224 to
Wasatch County
SR-190 to
Wasatch County

DELETE
Portion of SR-220 Within
Wasatch Mountain State Park
November 26, 1990

Gene Findlay, Director
Utah Department of Transportation
4501 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119

Dear Mr. Findlay:

The Wasatch County Commission has requested that I inform you of their position regarding State Road 220.

The minutes of the meeting dated October 5, 1990 of the road commission are incorrect. The Wasatch County Commission did not accept jurisdictional transfer of portions of State Road 220. Our commissioners who were present at the meeting have received the minutes and were astounded at the conclusions stated therein.

The matter needs to be addressed immediately by UDOT since the snow removal is not being completed.

I would appreciate your immediate attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Steven L. Hansen
Wasatch County Attorney

SLH:sj
November 27, 1990

Steven L. Hansen, Wasatch County Attorney
Wasatch County
25 North Main
Heber City, Utah 84032

Dear Mr. Hansen:

The jurisdictional transfers which took place with final Transportation Commission approval on October 5, 1990, were the result of several months of discussions between the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and Wasatch County. As you know, your County Commission has been desirous to have "A" Line as a state highway ever since it was in the planning stages. My staff and I met with your Commission on February 9, 1990 in Heber City. At that time, we explained our newly adopted policy on highway transfers and indicated that the Transportation Commission may entertain a trade for highways designated to come off the State System on the west side of Wasatch County. Commissioner Coleman protested taking the part of SR-220 which is in the Wasatch Mountain State Park, and we told him the portion in the park would not be designated as a county road.

This matter was brought before the Transportation Commission at their March 9, 1990 meeting. I informed the Commission of our previous meeting and discussed the possibility of the trade. Commissioner Coleman was at that meeting and, according to the minutes of the meeting, he said "[Wasatch County] can live with the trade."

An official document in the form of a resolution was prepared and distributed to both Summit and Wasatch counties, but a request for a chance for input by Summit County and delays of signs being removed from the "A" Line delayed action by the Commission until October 5, 1990. Commissioner Coleman attended that meeting, had access to the resolution, and did not object to the action. I guess there is a possibility your Commissioners did not completely understand all the provisions involved in the trade, but you can see we did all we could to inform them. I am sure that my staff and the Transportation Commission intended that the deletion of SR-220 was a condition of our acceptance of "A" Line. Any reservation
on your part to assume responsibility of the parts of SR-220, which are outside the park boundary, would also open the question of our jurisdiction on "A" Line.

If I can be of further assistance in providing information on this subject, please let me know.

Sincerely,

E.H. Findlay, CPA
Executive Director

EHF/CDT/jaj
Jerry A. Miller, Director
Department of Natural Resources
Division of Parks and Recreation
1636 West North Temple, Suite 116
Salt Lake City, Utah  84116-3156

Dear Jerry:

I have received your memorandum of concern about State Route 220 near and through Wasatch Mountain State Park. Please let me explain some of the history of our highway service to State Parks and the circumstances surrounding recent Commission actions and perhaps your concerns may be addressed.

Indeed, the Utah Code does allow for UDOT maintenance of highways to serve state parks. However, the level of service to be provided has always been somewhat shaded by 2 principal issues. The first has to do with the level to which your parks have been developed; at some, facilities are limited and visitation is minimal. Over the years we have worked with you to determine where additional State Routes are needed to provide access. We have designated sixteen (16) highways on the State System with the sole purpose to serve state parks. We have endeavored to construct and maintain these highways at an adequate level of service. Additionally, we have worked with you in attempts to secure additional funds from the Legislature to upgrade these entrance roads to the parks. Some success has been achieved on county access roads but none on the State ones as yet.

The second major issue, and perhaps the more difficult, is that of interior roads within park boundaries. Traditionally, UDOT has only been involved in maintaining those roads within the park boundaries that extend from the access road to the principal destination. We have, at your request, performed work for you on other interior roads at your expense.

A few years ago, UDOT did a comprehensive study of all the highways in the state to determine appropriate jurisdictional responsibility. This was accomplished in cooperation with the cities and counties. The study identified a need for a state highway to serve Wasatch Mountain State Park and designated State Route 224 which serves the golf course and adjoining campground as providing that service. The study also identified
State Route 220 as being unique in that it was the only interior road in any state park to be on the State System, and recommended that it be deleted from that system.

Subsequent to the study, the Transportation Commission passed new Policies and Administrative Rules which established the criteria for state highways. These rules exempted highways currently on the system except in the case where a county wanted another road added to the system, then an exchange of highways was needed. The Commission negotiated a trade with Wasatch County which gave the county all the part of State Route 220 outside park boundaries and, consequently, the remainder of the road fell into the category of all your other interior park roads.

We understand your limitations on funding and it was not our intent to place an extra burden on you but given the circumstances, it is appropriate that this road be treated as others like it throughout the state. We will pledge to help you with the road as we can. Our local maintenance crew is under the direction of Dan Nelson, District Director in Orem, and through him you can expect the same cooperation as you experience in other locations.

I hope this explanation has been helpful, but if you have further questions, please don't hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

E.H. Findlay, CPA
Executive Director

EHF:CDT:ra

cc: Dan Nelson, District Six Director
    Dee C. Hansen, Executive Director, Natural Resources
December 17, 1990

Pete A. Coleman, Chairman  
Wasatch County Commission  
25 North Main  
Heber City, Utah  84032

Dear Pete:

We appreciated talking to you at the Transportation Commission meeting last Friday and thank you for your clarification on questions on the Snake Creek Road. The private property located within the park through which the road passes was not specifically addressed in the resolution, so I can understand the confusion as to its disposition.

Title 27 of the Utah Code outlines the process of deletion of state highways. The code specifies that a public road, not on the State System, becomes the responsibility of the county or city. The fact that part of this road is in a state park caused us to designate that part in the park differently. However, the portions on private land, even if they are "islands" within the state park, are under county jurisdiction.

As to your questions about snow removal up to the snowmobile trail head, that issue will be up to you and the Division of State Parks and Recreation to work out.

I hope this information is helpful. Please don't hesitate to call if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

E.H. Findlay, CPA  
Executive Director

EHF:CDT:ra