Route 224

Updated: November 2008

Midway on Route 113 to Schneitter's Hot Pots May 13, 1941.

1953 Description:
From Route 113 in Midway northwesterly to Schneitter's Hot Pots. This route was changed to read: From the State Park boundary via Schneitter's Hot Pots southeasterly to Route 113 in Midway.

1963 Description:
From Route 113 in Midway northwesterly near Homestead Resort northerly via Empire Canyon and Park City to SR-248 near Park City north City limits. **(*A) Scanned) June 28, 1963

1965 Description:
From Route 113 in Midway northerly via Empire Canyon and Park City to Route 248 near Park City north city limits. Approved by the 1965 Legislature.

1967 Legislature:

1969 Legislature:
Re-designated SR-224 by the 1969 Legislature (prior to 1969 this was a part of SR-248).

1969 Description:
From SR-113 in Midway northerly via Ontario Canyon and Park City to SR-2 (Interstate 80 at Kimball Junction).
*(B)

1975 Legislature:
The portion of SR-224 in Park City from Heber Street southerly via Main Avenue and Hillside Street to Marsac Avenue relinquished to Park City.

1975 Description:
From SR-113 in Midway via Ontario Canyon, Heber Street and Marsac Avenue in Park City to SR-2 (I-80) at Kimball Junction.

1979 Legislature Description:
From Route 113 in Midway northerly via Ontario Canyon and Park City to Route 80 (I-80) at Kimball Junction.

1981 Legislature: Description remains the same.

1983 Legislature: Description remains the same.

*(C)
1985 Legislature Description:
From Route 113 in Midway northerly via Ontario Canyon and Park City (Snow Country Drive), to Route 80 (I-80) at Kimball Junction.
**Route 224 Cont.**

**1986 Legislature:** Description remains the same.
**1987 Legislature:** Description remains the same.
**1988 Legislature:** Description remains the same.
**1990 Legislature:** Description remains the same.

*(D) Commission Action October 5, 1990:
Deleted portion of SR-224 from the entrance to Pine Creek Campground to the Wasatch-Summit County Line.

**1990 Description:**
From SR-113 in Midway northerly to the entrance to Pine Creek Campground; commencing again at the Wasatch-Summit County line northerly via Ontario Canyon and Park City (Snow Country Drive), to SR-80 (I-80) at Kimball Junction.

**1992 Legislature:** Description remains the same.
**1993 Legislature:** Description remains the same.

**1994 Legislative Description:**
From Route 113 in Midway northerly to Pine Creek Campground; commencing again at the Wasatch-Summit County line via Ontario Canyon and Park City to Route 80 at Kimball Junction.

**1995 Legislature:** Description remains the same.
**1996 Legislature:** Description remains the same.
**1997 Legislature:** Description remains the same.

**1998 Legislative Description:**
From Route 113 in Midway northerly to Pine Creek Campground; beginning again at Wasatch-Summit County line through Ontario Canyon and Park City to Route 80 at Kimball Junction.

**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.

*(E) Commission Action May 27, 2004:
Re-designated portion of SR-224 from the Junction of SR-113 in Midway to the Pine Creek Campground as SR-222.

**2004 Legislative Description:**
From the Wasatch-Summit County line south of Park City through Ontario Canyon and Park City to Route 80 at Kimball Junction.
Route 224 Cont.

2005 Legislative Description:
From the Wasatch-Summit County line through Ontario Canyon and Park City to Route 80 at Kimball Junction.

2006 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2007 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2008 Legislature: Description remains the same.

* Refers to resolution index page following.
**Refers to Scanned Computer Resolution index on the following page.
Route 224

COUNTY/VOLUME & RESOLUTION NUMBER

A. Wasatch & Summit Co. 1/64  B. Summit Co. 5/5  C. Summit Co. 6/49
D. Wasatch Co. 8/17  E. Wasatch/Summit Co. 11/6

DESCRIPTION OF RESOLUTION CHANGE

(A). Extension - From near Homestead Resort northerly to SR-248 in Park City.

(B). Relocation - From a point on Main Avenue, southeasterly via Heber Street to Marsac Ave., thence southerly via Marsac Ave. To the Jct. With present SR-224 at Hillside Street.

(C). Relocation/New Alignment - Depicted on map associated with Project No. RS-0177(2).

(D). Deletion - Portion of SR-224 from the entrance of Pine Creek Campground to the Wasatch-Summit County line.

(E). Re-designation- Portion of SR-224. From the Junction of SR-113 in Midway to the Pine Creek Campground as new SR-222
RESOLUTION

State Routes 152 - 224 - 97

WHEREAS, to provide adequate State Route connections to the newly created Wasatch Mountain State Park and Recreation Area, it is deemed necessary to extend State Route 152 from its present termini near Brighton (including Brighton Loop) easterly, via Guardsman Pass to a junction with the proposed extension of Route 224 near the Summit - Wasatch County line.

It is further recommended that Route 224 be extended from its present termini near Homestead Resort northerly, via Empire Canyon and Park City to Route 248 near Park City north city limits.

This action would result in the deletion of State Route 97, which is from Park City south city limits northerly, to a junction with State Route 248, and replaced by State Route 224.

The addition of these roads would result in an increase of approximately 14.4 miles in the State Route mileage.

NOW, THEREFORE, the State Road Commission, after considering the necessity of the afore mentioned route changes, adopts the following route revisions as interim designations subject to the approval of the Legislature:

Route 152 from its present termini near Brighton (including Brighton Loop) easterly, via Guardsman Pass to a junction with Route 224 near the Summit - Wasatch County line.

Route 224 be extended from its present termini near Homestead Resort northerly, via Empire Canyon and Park City to Route 248 near Park City north city limits.

Route 97 be deleted as a State Route designation.

Dated: June 28, 1963

STATE ROAD COMMISSION OF UTAH

[Signatures of State Road Commission members]

ATTORNEY: [Signature of Attorney]
Under the Public Works Acceleration Act of last September, funds were made available to State agencies to be used in depressed areas, and one of these depressed areas was Summit County. Funds were made available to the Park Authority in the amount of $10,000 and to the State Fish & Game Department for $20,900. These funds may be used for fire roads, trails, fire protection, etc., and they have to be matched 100%. The Fish & Game Department has decided that they do not want to use these funds, and, therefore the Park people have received verbal authorization from the Regional Forester that these funds could be made available to the Road Commission in the amount of $20,900 for fire roads and trails within the Park. This could then be matched, which would bring this amount to $41,800 for roads and trails within this area.

Mr. Burton said that District Engineer Wilbert is meeting with the Park people today to look this over on the ground. Mr. Wilbert was previously allocated $5,000 to punch some roads through this area, and he feels that he can do this additional work on an equipment rental basis and do a measurable amount of work in the park for the $41,800.

The terms under which these funds can be spent are that this work must be done by private contract, and the work is to be either done or under contract by June 30th of this year. This money can not be taken from any other planned road projects, and comes under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. The State would provide the engineering and supervision of the work.

Mr. Burton said this would be a beginning step in fulfilling some of the work that we intended to do, and it would be advantageous to the State as a whole to spend these funds inasmuch as this would be on a 50-50 matching basis.

A motion was then made by Commissioner Feltch, that if funds are available, we proceed along the lines indicated by the Director, and that we approve the expenditure of $20,900 State funds for roads and trails in the Wasatch State Park. This motion was seconded by Commissioner Strong, and unanimously passed.
WASATCH MOUNTAIN STATE PARK

Mr. Griffin said we have a letter from Mr. Dwight C. Freeman, Assistant Director of the State Park and Recreation Commission relative to the Wasatch Mountain State Park. Mr. Freeman said a meeting had been recently held with Mr. James Diehl, Director, Division of Cooperative Forest and Fire Control, Washington, D.C., advising that additional money had been made available for fire road construction and indicated the possibility of obtaining another $100,000 to $200,000 for the Wasatch Mountain State Park on an equal matching basis.

Mr. Griffin said the next Commission meeting will be held at Heber City and we will probably have some questions on this matter. It was stated that probably some State Project would have to be deferred in order to provide funds in this amount.

Chairman Balch said that in view of our critical funding situation on State Projects he did not know where this money would come from.

Commissioner Strong mentioned that the first bid on the Wasatch Mountain State Park is being opened by the Road Commission next Tuesday.
WASATCH MOUNTAIN STATE PARK

Mr. Griffin said we have a letter from Mr. Dwight C. Freeman, Assistant Director of the State Park and Recreation Commission relative to the Wasatch Mountain State Park. Mr. Freeman said a meeting had been recently held with Mr. James Diehl, Director, Division of Cooperative Forest and Fire Control, Washington, D.C., advising that additional money had been made available for fire road construction and indicated the possibility of obtaining another $100,000 to $200,000 for the Wasatch Mountain State Park on an equal matching basis.

Mr. Griffin said the next Commission meeting will be held at Heber City and we will probably have some questions on this matter. It was stated that probably some State Project would have to be deferred in order to provide funds in this amount.

Chairman Balch said that in view of our critical funding situation on State Projects he did not know where this money would come from.

Commissioner Strong mentioned that the first bid on the Wasatch Mountain State Park is being opened by the Road Commission next Tuesday.
RESOLUTION
State Route 224

WHEREAS, it has been requested by the Park City Municipal Corporation that State Route 224 be relocated beginning at a point on Main Avenue southeasterly via Heber Street to Marsac Avenue, thence southerly via Marsac Avenue to a junction with present State Route 224 at Hillside Street, and

WHEREAS, Mr. J. Q. Adair, District Engineer, concurs with the Park City Officials request.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

That State Route 224 be relocated beginning at a point on Main Avenue southeasterly via Heber Street to Marsac Avenue, thence southerly via Marsac Avenue to a junction with present State Route 224 at Hillside Street,

That by this action, that portion of State Route 224 from Heber Street southerly via Main Avenue and Hillside Street to Marsac Avenue be transferred to the jurisdiction of Park City,

That by this action Park City "C" mileage will increase 0.1 + - mile, and the State Highway System will decrease 0.1 + - mile,

That the letter from the Park City Municipal Corporation and the memorandum from J. Q. Adair, pertaining to the relocation of this route be hereby incorporated as a part of this submission,

That the map illustrating the action taken herewith be hereby incorporated as a part of this submission.

Dated this ___ day of September, 1973.

STATE ROAD COMMISSION OF UTAH

[Signature]
Chairman
RESOLUTION
State Route 224
Page 2

[Signatures]

Vice-Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Secretary
Memorandum

TO: B. Dale Burningham, Planning Statistics Supervisor

FROM: J. Quintin Adair, P.E., District Engineer - District Two

SUBJECT: Relocation of State Route 224 through Park City, Utah

DATE: May 17, 1973

Attached is a copy of letter from William F. Sullivan, Mayor, Park City, Utah, requesting a change in the location of the present State Highway through Park City from Main Street to Marsac Street.

Add to State Highway System (marked in blue on attached map)
- Marsac Avenue from its intersection with Heber Avenue to its intersection with SR 224, approximately 3,000± ft.

Delete from present State Highway System (marked in red on attached map)
- Main Street from its intersection with SR 224, to its intersection with Heber Avenue, approximately 3,200± ft.

Please continue with the processing of this transfer.

cc: Commissioner Samuel Taylor
    David L. Greenwood
    John W. Pritchard
    C. J. Reaveley
    Robert Wheadcn
    Mayor William P. Sullivan
State of Utah  
Department of Highways  
District #2, Engineering Office  
2410 West 21st South  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104  

Attn: Mr. J. Quintin Adair,  
District Engineer  

Dear Mr. Adair:  

The Park City Council, at their regular meeting of April 19, 1973, voted unanimously to request a change of the State Highway from its present location on Main Street to Marsac Street. The following information was from that meeting:  

"Councilman Hays moved to prepare a request to the State Highway Department to shift the State Highway designation to Marsac, and to have the Attorney prepare an ordinance in coordination with the APA Planners for establishing a Main Street Historic District with the Planning Commission authorized to approve changes to our new construction of buildings, signs and street furniture. Councilman Lehmer seconded the motion and it carried unanimously."  

The Park City Municipal Corporation hereby requests a highway change from Main Street to Marsac Street. Please consider this a formal request.  

Your immediate attention to this matter would be greatly appreciated. Please keep us informed as to the progress of this project.  

Sincerely,  

William P. Sullivan  
Mayor
September 19, 1973

The Honorable William F. Sullivan
Mayor of Park City
Park City Municipal Corporation
Park City, Utah 84060

Dear Mayor Sullivan:

Subject: Relocation of State Route 224 in Park City

Effective September 14, 1973, the State Road Commission adopted a resolution to relocate State Route 224 in Park City and transfer the old alignment of State Route 224 to the jurisdiction of Park City.

Attached is a copy of the resolution and a location map.

Very truly yours,

L. R. Jester, P.E.
Chief Systems Planning Div.

Attachment
RESOLUTION
Relocation of State Route 224 in Park City

WHEREAS, it has been recommended by the District 2 Director and concurred in by officials of Park City that with the completion of Project RS-0177(2) that State Route 224 be relocated to be coincident with this new roadway, and

WHEREAS, the old location of State Route 224 between M.P. 14.31 and M.P. 15.73 will no longer serve as a state highway but will still serve as a public road.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

1. That in accordance with Section 27-12-29 of the Utah Code, Annotated, 1953, that the roadway resulting from the completion of Project RS-0177(2) be designated as part of State Route 224.

2. That the old alignment of State Route 224 from Snow County Drive (M.P. 15.73) southeasterly coincident with Park Avenue, 7th Street and Heber Avenue to Marsac Avenue (M.P. 14.31) be relinquished and conveyed to the jurisdiction of Park City.

3. That this revision be included in the Master Highway Bill to be submitted to the next Legislature.

4. That by this action State Highway System mileage will not change and Park City "C" mileage will increase 1.42 miles.

5. That the accompanying map and memorandum be hereby incorporated as a part of this submission.

Dated this 21st day of March, 1984.

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

[Signatures]
Chairman
Vice-Chairman
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner

Attest:

[Signature]
Secretary
UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING DIVISION

Park City
Summit County

Relocation State Route 224
Transferred to Park City "C" System
Memorandum

TO: Ronald Delis
    Engineer for Transportation Planning
FROM: Blaine J. Kay, P.E.
    District Two Director
SUBJECT: SR-224 Route Change

DATE: 10/23/84

The by-pass road in Park City has been completed and open to traffic. There has been a long standing agreement with Park City that upon the completion of this road, the State would assume jurisdiction of the by-pass road as part of SR-224 and Park City would receive the parallel portion of SR-224.

The by-pass road begins at the intersection of Park Avenue and Snow Country Drive (MP 15.73) and goes east along Snow Country Drive and then south to Marsac Avenue (MP 14.31). Park City will assume responsibility of the portion of SR-224 between MP 14.31 and MP 15.73. We would like to have this transaction ready to be presented to the legislature in January.

O311
BJK/JCMcBride/ws

cc: Joseph C. McBride

RECEIVED
Utah State Department of Transportation
Transportation Planning Division

OCT 27, 1984
AM 7:18:19 PM 10:45:16
RESOLUTION

Moratorium on State Highway System Revisions

WHEREAS, the Utah League of Cities and Towns and the Utah Association of Counties are proposing a comprehensive study analyzing highway responsibility, functional classification, funding sources and money distribution formulas, and

WHEREAS, the Utah Transportation Commission recommends support of the study to begin in 1986, and

WHEREAS, there is a definite need to establish criteria for the addition and deletion of roadways or proposed roadways to the State System of Highways

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

That a moratorium on State Highway System additions be in effect until the completion of the proposed study.

That the only exceptions to this moratorium will be those roadway connections built to assure proper function of the Interstate System and existing routes built on new alignment.

Dated this 13th day of December, 1985.

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

[Signatures]

Attest:

[Signature]
## Changes in State Routes

Approved by the 1985 Legislature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date of Commission Resolution</th>
<th>Highway Code Section</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Davis 400 East Street in North Salt Lake</td>
<td>8/24/84</td>
<td>27-12-27</td>
<td>Deletion of that portion of SR-93 from SR-89 north to 2600 South Street, a distance of 0.43 mile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 &amp; 287</td>
<td>Salt Lake Bluffdale Road</td>
<td>10/12/84</td>
<td>27-12-27</td>
<td>Addition of Bluffdale Road from SR-68, Redwood Road, east to the on and off ramps on the east side of SR-15 and by this action redesignate that portion of SR-287 on the Bluffdale Road connection to SR-15, a distance of 2.36 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 &amp; 148</td>
<td>Iron &amp; Garfield</td>
<td>Cedar Breaks National Monument and Panguitch Lake Road</td>
<td>11/9/84</td>
<td>27-12-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Morgan &amp; Weber</td>
<td>Trappers Loop Road</td>
<td>12/7/84</td>
<td>27-12-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Washington Main St. in Enterprise</td>
<td>9/28/84</td>
<td>27-12-27</td>
<td>Addition of Main St. in Enterprise connecting to SR-18, a distance of 1.30 miles. (Exchange for Gunlock Rd. SR-307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Summit Park City</td>
<td>11/9/84</td>
<td>27-12-29</td>
<td>Relocate SR-224 between MP 14.31 and MP 15.73 to be coincident with Snow Country Drive in Park City, a distance of 1.45 mile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes in State Routes

Approved by the 1985 Legislature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date of Commission</th>
<th>Highway Code Section</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>12/7/84</td>
<td>27-12-28</td>
<td>Transfer former location on Park Avenue, 7th St. and Heber Ave. to Park City, a distance of 1.42 miles as a result of new construction. (Does not change description in law.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9/28/84</td>
<td>27-12-27</td>
<td>Deletion of Route 247 in its entirety, a distance of 2.04 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>2/4/83</td>
<td>27-12-17</td>
<td>Deletion of SR-307 in its entirety, a distance of 0.22 mile. (Exchange for Enterprise Main St. SR-219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assign State Route number to roads and parking areas at complex, a distance of 1.62 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revise route description (technical correction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend route to off ramp from route 80, northeast to Wanship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net addition 45.05+ miles.
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 "M 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, be it 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</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. &quot;H&quot; Line project</td>
<td>Engineer Station 22+12</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Engineer Station 13+50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. NF-19(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Old Alignment SR-40</td>
<td>Beginning of &quot;H&quot; Line</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>the Beginning of Route A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer Station 6+27</td>
<td></td>
<td>project SP-1776 Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Station 6+27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Route A (A line)</td>
<td>Beginning of project SP-1776</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>the end of project SP-1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer Station 6+27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer Station 421+94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Old Alignment of</td>
<td>End of project SP-1776</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>the junction of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-189</td>
<td>Engineer Station 421+94</td>
<td></td>
<td>current SR-32 in Francis</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 be 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 mileposting
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 .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
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

Dated on this 5th day of December 1990

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

[Signatures]

Attest:

Secretary to Commission
March 16, 1990

Scott Nay
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 campground 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

JMB/1m
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

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 PTE'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 graveled 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 Poca, and SR-35 from Heber City over Route A to Tabiona, Duchasne 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.
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
RESOLUTION

Transfer Alignment and Abandonment
Portion SR-224
Park City
Summit County

WHEREAS, Sections 72-4-102, 72-4-103, 72-4-104 of the Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, authorize the Transportation Commission in instance of 72-4-102, to approve deletions from the state highway system between general sessions of the state Legislature, in instance of 72-4-103. Deletion of highway from state highway system - Return to county or municipality or abandonment, and

WHEREAS, the property owner, United Park City Mines, has constructed a 0.844+/- mile segment of roadway to replace the existing 0.464+/- mile section of SR-224 to better serve the adjacent property, eliminate the conflict with the existing ski run, and improve the roadway conditions, and

WHEREAS, the Utah Department of Transportation Region 2 Director and staff have reviewed the construction of this segment of roadway and have found it to meet current AASHTO standards and exceeds the quality of the existing roadway it will replace, and

WHEREAS, the Utah Department of Transportation, subject to approval, assumes jurisdictional and maintenance responsibilities of additional aforementioned 0.844+/- miles of roadway as part of SR-224 and abandons any and all interests in the existing 0.464+/- miles defined herein, and

WHEREAS, the Region 2 Director having reviewed all statements defined herein concurs with the necessity for the Utah Department of Transportation to assume jurisdictional and maintenance responsibilities for the defined portion of roadway described herein, and

WHEREAS, the Program Development Division, having reviewed all provisions defined herein concurs with the Region 2 Director for the necessity of stated transfer of roadway.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

1. The Utah Department of Transportation assumes all jurisdictional and maintenance responsibility for roadway, from Mile Point 4.302 of current SR-224 traversing southerly, northerly, and northeasterly to mile point 4.766 of current SR-224 a distance of 0.884+/- miles and become inherent as a portion of SR-224 with stated portion of roadway being functionally classified as Minor Collector.

2. With this action the Utah Department of Transportation relinquishes all and any interest in the current alignment of SR-224 from mile point 4.302 to mile point 4.766 a distance of 0.464 miles.
3. With the action defined in statement 2, United Park City Mines agrees to close stated section of roadway to public access with the intent of dedicating the defined roadway.

4. These actions will become effective upon passage of this resolution by the Utah Transportation Commission.

4. The accompanying map displayed as Exhibit "A", will be included and become part of this resolution.

Dated on this 22nd day of November 2002

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Chairman

Vice-Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

Attest: Secretary
# Utah Transportation Commission Workshop
## Agenda Fact Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>December 12, 2003</th>
<th>Agenda Item:</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Subject:** Alignment Revision to Segment of SR-224 – Park City, Summit Co.

**Background:**

The property owner, United Park City Mines, has constructed a 0.712 +/- mile segment of roadway to replace the existing 0.417 +/- mile section of SR-224, to better serve the adjacent property and improve the roadway conditions, and

The Utah Department of Transportation, Region Two Director and staff, have reviewed the construction of this segment of roadway and have found it to meet current AASHTO standards and exceed the quality of the existing roadway it will replace, and

The Utah Department of Transportation, subject to approval, assumes jurisdictional and maintenance responsibilities of additional 0.712 +/- miles of roadway as part of SR-224 and abandons any and all interests in the existing 0.417 +/- miles defined herein, and

The Region Two Director concurs with the necessity for the Utah Department of Transportation to assume jurisdictional and maintenance responsibilities for the defined portion of roadway described herein, and

The Program Development Division, having reviewed all provisions defined herein, concurs with the Region Two Director for the necessity of revising alignment of roadway.

With this action, the Utah Department of Transportation relinquishes all and any interest in the current alignment of SR-224 from mile point 10.985 to mile point 11.697, a distance of 0.417 +/- miles. United Park City Mines agrees to close stated section of roadway to public access with the intent of obliterating the defined roadway.

**Exhibits:** Exhibit “A” - Map of area

**Commission Action Requested:** None - Information Only

**Prepared by:** John Quick | **Date:** December 5, 2003
APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Clyde said there was one thing he would like to have included in the November minutes from the discussion with UP&L. He asked about the expectations for the Hunter Four plant, and their response was 2007 or 2008. Commissioner Wilson noted that it's important to include the fact that if the permitting comes through and if the plant is going to be built, construction of the plant could possibly start in 2007.

Commissioner Warnick asked that the sentence on page 8, fourth line from the end of the first paragraph, starting out with "Some money was transferred..." be reworded to make it more clear.

Commissioner Warnick moved to approve the minutes of the November 21, 2003, Commission meeting held in Castle Dale, Utah, with the changes as noted. It was seconded by Commissioner Wilson and approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments at this time.

RESOLUTION
Abandonment of SR-295 in Orem

John Quick from Program Development said this resolution is a proposal to delete SR-295 from the State Highway System. The route is actually a driver's course on what was the DMV site in Orem. The DMV has moved their offices and the property has been sold to private interests, so there is no longer a need for that driver's course at that site. This resolution will take the official action necessary to abandon that road.

Commissioner Clyde moved to approve the resolution. It was seconded by Commissioner Bodily and approved.

REALIGNMENT OF PORTION OF SR-224

John Quick said this is an information item regarding a proposal for the Department to realign a portion of SR-224 that traverses through Park City and up to the county line. United Park City Mines has constructed about a 7/10 of a mile section that realigns a portion of SR-224, and replaces a 4/10 of a mile section. Region Two's director, Randy Park, has reviewed this proposal and the construction of the road. This is the second such change that has been made in the alignment of SR-224. The last change actually had a resolution, but that might have been a little overkill. UDOT's legal staff doesn't believe there needs to be a resolution since the beginning or ending portion of the route is not changing. The Code just identifies a route as a beginning and ending point, and doesn't even indicate the length, so they don't think there needs to be much of an official action and could be done administratively. This is for the Commission's discussion and information.
Chairman Brown asked if the old alignment is going to be torn up. Randy Park said that decision will be made by the property owners. Director Njord commented that he thought that it was important to bring this issue to a public setting like this to give the Commission a chance to look at this and to give the public an opportunity to say something before any kind of action was taken because of the amount of interest in this particular section of road. Also, as a matter of normal course when building roads, the Department has not brought these kinds of things to the Commission. Commissioner Wilson asked for further clarification on the difference between the last resolution and this item. Director Njord explained that state law describes state routes by their beginning and ending, and in the case of SR-224, there is still a beginning and an ending point. It’s just the route in between that has changed slightly. With SR-295, the whole road is being abandoned, and when the Highway Bill is passed in the Legislature, it will describe the new highway system and SR-295 will no longer be on it as a result of the Commission’s action today. SR-224 will still be there, and the beginning and ending routes will be the same.

Commissioner Bodily asked if there were any significant access points along the new road that will benefit the owner of the property. Mr. Park said that is one of the reasons the new road was built. They can also use the existing property where the old alignment sits for other purposes. The new alignment has a paved surface and drainage features have been added, so it’s an upgraded facility compared to what they had before. Bob Wells from Deer Valley Resort said what is being proposed here is a step two that didn’t just happen haphazardly. Two years ago, the Commission approved step one in the improvement of this road, and this step gets them a little closer to what they think is the total resolution. They’ll be back with step three, which hopefully will take care of the issues involving Wasatch County and Brighton Estates. Mr. Wells added that United Park City Mines has recently been acquired principally by a company called Talisker Corporation, and then introduced Jim Tadeson from Talisker. Mr. Tadeson said they paid for the construction of the new portion of road, and thinks that Mr. Park and his staff are satisfied with the level of construction.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS/CONDITIONS AND NEEDS REPORTS

Robert Hull, Traffic and Safety Engineer, said their presentation today would focus on three different segments: safety leadership and commitment, program overviews, and funding recommendations. In the leadership category, they have taken the role as champions for safety within UDOT, and they are taking a leadership role nationwide also. Utah has been chosen to be a lead state in a couple of areas. First is the mitigation of roadway departure crashes, and second is the implementation of integrated safety management process. Fatalities have been rising steadily over the last several years, but are currently on a downward trend. As of this year to date, there have been 258 fatalities, compared to 329 in 2002. Carlos Braceras, Deputy Director, said that the decrease is significant because of the increase in vehicle miles driven. Mr. Hull said their commitment is a 15% reduction in fatalities by the year 2010. The Safety Leadership Team consists of UDOT, UHP, FHWA, FMCSA, FRA, UHS, and Emergency Medical Services. The functions they represent, or the ‘4 E’s for Success’, are Education, Enforcement, Engineering and Emergency Services. It’s a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary approach, and a data driven decision making process. The fifth E they want to introduce is ‘Everyone Else’. The Safety Team is the core organization to help drive the safe direction of the state, but they need help from everyone else. The Commission plays a vital part with the money and direction they give. A short video was shown of selected sights statewide. Additional discussion focused on cable barriers and concrete barriers.
DATE: March 25, 2004

TO: THOSE LISTED BELQW

FROM: John L. Quick, P.E.
Engineer for Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Re-designate Portion of SR-224 to new SR-222 in Wasatch County

This proposed action was presented to the Transportation Commission on May 27, 2004 and it was discussed that this action could be a Department Administration action not requiring a resolution by the Commission.

The configuration of SR-224 creates confusion and misunderstanding to the general public and Region 3 Director and Program Development personnel, perceiving the related problems has agreed the renumbering the portion of SR-224 in Wasatch County will eliminate this problem.

The following action has been taken to eliminate the confusion on this broken route. SR-224 in the portion traversing northwesterly from the Junction of SR-113 in Midway to the Pine Creek Campground, a distance of 3.335± miles, will be assigned as SR-222. The function classification will be Major Collector from 0.000 to 2.041± miles and Minor Collector from 2.041 to 3.335± miles. SR-224 will begin at the Wasatch/Summit County line traversing through Ontario Canyon and Park City to Route 80 at Kimball Junction for a distance of 11.610± miles. The function classification will be Minor Collector from 0.000 to 2.911± miles; Major Collector from 2.911 to 6.032± miles; and Minor Arterial from 6.032 to 11.610± miles.

Map, exhibit A, showing the location of SR-222 is attached.
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Brett Hadley, Local Gov. Programs Eng.
Kathy Starks, Program Development Officer
Char Mitchell, Programming Coordinator
Leone Harwood, Transit Manager
Linda Toy-Hull, Dir. Leg. & Government Affairs
Chuck Larsen, Comptroller
Darrell Giannonati, Director for Const. & Materials
Jason Davis, Engineering Services Director
Brent Jensen, Chief Environ. Engineer
Keith Brown, Chief Geotechnical Engineer
David Kinnecon, ITS (TOC) Manager
Richard Clarke, Engineer for Maintenance
Lynn Bernhard, Methods Planning Engineer

Jim McMinimee, Project Development Director
Stan Burns, Engineer for Research & Develop.
Fran Rieck, Statewide Permits Officer
Lyle McMillan, Right of Way Chief
Warren Grames, Risk Manager
Rae Ann Jensen, Records Supervisor
David Nazare, Bridge Management Eng./Structures
Robert Hull, Engineer for Traffic & Safety
Robert Clayton, Accident Information Manager
Zeke Gonzalez, Studios Engineer
Peter Jager, Traffic Studies Engineer
John Leonard, Traffic Operations Engineer
Larry Montoya, Signal & Lighting Engineer
Glenn Schulte, Transportation Safety Specialist
Peter Tang, Safety Transportation System
Major Neil Porter, Utah Highway Patrol
Tracy Conti, Region Three Director
Merrell Jolley, Region Three Preconstruction Eng.
Alan Bills, North Area Supervisor - Region Three
Val Davis, Shed 3431 Supervisor
Barry Sawsak, Region Three Permits
Grant Wiley, Region Three Pavement Manager
Randy Park, Region Two Director
Todd Richins, East Area Supervisor - Region Two
Darrell Roberts, Shed 2435 Supervisor
Alan Loiacono, Region Two Permits
Steve Park, Region Two Pavement Manger
From: Merrell Jolley
To: Marva Braun
Date: 3/24/04 10:56AM
Subject: Re: SR-224

It is fine with me.


Tracy-
This email is in reference to our telephone conversation this morning. We have been looking at different routes throughout the state and SR-224 is one of those routes. SR-224 begins at SR-113 junction in Midway and continues north to just past the Pine Creek Campground area for 3.338 miles and stops. Then SR-224 resumes again at the Wasatch/Summit county line and continues to I-80 "Kimball Interchange". Our suggestion is to begin SR-224 at the Wasatch/Summit county line and end at I-80. Then take the portion that begins at SR-113, which runs for just over 3 miles, and renumber it SR-222. I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Marva
From: Tracy Conti
To: Braun, Marva
Date: 3/24/04 2:14PM
Subject: Re: SR-224

Marva, In talking to our people and Midway City, we are fine with the change to SR-222. In fact it may help our maintenance crews in some ways. Thanks TC

>>> Marva Braun 03/23/04 11:05AM >>>
Tracy-
This email is in reference to our telephone conversation this morning. We have been looking at different routes throughout the state and SR-224 is one of those routes. SR-224 begins at SR-113 junction in Midway and continues north to just past the Pine Creek Campground area for 3.336 miles and stops. Then SR-224 resumes again at the Wasatch/Summit county line and continues to I-80 "Kimball Interchange". Our suggestion is to begin SR-224 at the Wasatch/Summit county line and end at I-80. Then take the portion that begins at SR-113, which runs for just over 3 miles, and renumber it SR-222. I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.
Marva

CC: Arnold, Jerry; Kuhl, Gary; Quick, John