Route 35

Updated: May 2016

Wanship via Kamas to Duchesne. Wanship-Kamas, June 6, 1910; Kamas-Stewart's Ranch, 1914; Stewart's Ranch-Stockmore, 1918; Stockmore-Tabiona, March 7, 1927; Tabiona-Duchesne, May 12, 1931.

1953 Description:
From Wanship on Route 4 via Peoa, Kamas and Tabiona to Duchesne on Route 6.

1962 Description:
From Wanship on Route 2 via Peoa, Kamas and Tabiona to Duchesne on Route 6.

Approved by 1963 Legislature:

1964 Description:
From Wanship on Route 2 (Interstate Route 80) via Peoa, Kamas and Tabiona to SR-87 north of Duchesne. ****(***(A) Scanned**)** 7/31/64

1965 Legislature (5.3 miles transferred to SR-87)

1965 Description:
From SR-2 (I-80) westerly to Wanship thence southerly via Peoa, Kamas and Tabiona to SR-87 north of Duchesne. ****(***(B) Scanned**)** September 27, 1965.

1967 Legislature:
From Route 2 (I-80) via Wanship, Peoa, Kamas and Tabiona to Route 87 north of Duchesne.
*(C)
1975 Legislature: Description remains the same.

*(D) 1977 Commission Action (May 20, 1977)
That portion of State Route 35 from Francis northerly via Kamas to State Route 80 (I-80) south of Wanship, deleted from the State System and reassigned as a part of State Route 189.

1977 Description:
From State Route 189 at Francis southeasterly via Tabiona to State Route 87 north of Duchesne.

1983 Legislature: Description remains the same.
1985 Legislature: Description remains the same.
1986 Legislature: Description remains the same.

1987 Legislature: Description remains the same.
*(E)
1988 Legislature: Description remains the same.

Route 35 Cont.

*(F) 1989 Commission Action (November 3,1989):
All of SR-35 was deleted, from SR-189 at Francis southeasterly via Tabiona to route 87 north of Duchesne.

Approved by 1990 Legislature:

*(G) Commission Action October 5, 1990:
Added SR-35 to the State system of Highways to traverse alignment that was deleted by resolution action November 3, 1989.

1990 Description:
From SR-32 at Francis southeasterly via Tabiona to SR-87 north of Duchesne.

1992 Legislative Description:
From Route 32 at Francis southeasterly via Tabiona to Route 87 north of Duchesne.

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 32 at Francis southeasterly through Tabiona to Route 87 north of Duchesne.

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.
2011 Legislature: Description remains the same.
2016 Legislation: Description remains the same.

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

Route 35

COUNTY/VOLUME & RESOLUTION NO.

A. Duchesne Co. 1/77	**B**. Summit Co. 1/98	**C**. Duchesne Co. 2/9
D. Summit Co. 6/2	**E**. Multiple Co. 7/31	**F**. Multiple Co. 8/1
G. Multiple Co. 8/17		

DESCRIPTION OF RESOLUTION CHANGE

(**A**). Deletion -	From Jct. SR-6 in Duchesne to Jct. of SR-134.
(**B**). Extension -	Near Wanship old alignment of SR-2.
(**C**). Relocation/New Alignment -	From Tabiona northwesterly toward Hanna.
(**D**). Deletion -	From Francis to I-80 at Wanship.
(**E**). Functional Class Change -	From Jct. SR-189 in Francis southeasterly to near Hanna.
(**F**). Re-designation/Deletion -	Re-designated SR-35 as a portion of SR-32 from Jct. old SR-189 in Francis to Jct. SR-87 in Duchesne County.
(**G**).Addition/Reinstatement -	Reinstated SR-35 to its previous alignment from Jct. SR-32 in Francis to Jct. SR-87 in Duchesne County.

U-35 - 7-87-1.0
U-86 - 7-87-220.5
U-87 - Conn
U-134 - 7-87-1.6
U-221 - 7-87-210.6

RESOLUTION

State Routes 35, 86, 87, 134, 221

35 86 87 134 221

WHEREAS, to maintain continuity in the designation of State Routes in the Blue Bench area, north and east of Duchesne City; and

WHEREAS, Representatives of the Utah State Department of Highways, the governing bodies of Altamont, Bluebell, Mountain Home, Duchesne County and the Area Commissioner of the Utah State Road Commission conducted a field trip over all State Routes in the area; and

WHEREAS, there was mutual agreement of all agencies; and

WHEREAS, there will be no increase in State Route mileage,

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

1. That the State Route designation of 87 will commence at the present junction of State Route 6 and 35 in Duchesne City, traversing that portion of State Route 35 to the present junction of State Routes 35 and 134, thus deleting the designation of State Route 35 for this section of roadway, thence northerly traversing the existing portion of State Route 134 to the present junction of State Routes 134 and 221, south of Mountain Home, thus deleting the designation of State Route 134 for this section of roadway, thence continuing easterly traversing existing State Route 221 to its junction with present State Route 86, south of Altonah, thus deleting the State Route designation of 221, thence east, southeasterly and south, traversing existing State Route 86 to its junction with State Route 87, thus deleting the designation of State Route 86 for this section of roadway, thence east via existing State Route 87 to its junction with State Route 6 southwest of Roosevelt.

2. That with the re-designation of State Route 87, the following interim designations be adopted subject to the approval of the legislature:

State Route 35 - From Wanship on Route 2 via Peoa, Kamas and Tabiona to Route 87.

State Route 86 - From Route 6 southeast of Bridgeland, northerly via Bridgeland to Route 87.

State Route 87 - From Route 6 in Duchesne northerly, thence easterly via Altamont, thence southeasterly via Upalco thence east to Route 6 southwest of Roosevelt.

State Route 221 - From Route 87 in Altamont north to Altonah.

State Route 134 - From Route 87, north via Mountain Home to the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation Grazing Land Boundary.

State Route 199 - From Route 87, north to Bluebell, thence west to Route 87 east of Altamont.

3. That application be made to the U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, to have the Federal-aid Secondary Route designations changed to follow in continuity with the State Route designations.

Dated this 31st day of July, 1964.

STATE ROAD COMMISSION OF UTAH

Ernest H. Babb
Chairman

Francis Talbot
Commissioner

Elias Strong
Commissioner

Amos K. Bagley
Commissioner

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Florence H. Allred
Secretary


7-134-1-0
7-221-1-0
7-199-2-5.5
7-87-2-15.5
7-199-1-0
7-87-3-20.8
7-87-1-0
7-87-4-30.5
7-86-1-0
UINTAH
OURAY
Tolmage
Blue Bell
Upalco
Blue Bench
DUCHESNE
RIVER
LAKE
FORK
CREEK
Fort
Lake
Angus
Lat
Ditch
Canal
Drainage
Reservoir
Res
Cem
Sch
Ch
Mun
Pal
Airport
134
87
221
86
199
35



UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
Transportation - Research Section

STATE ROAD DESIGNATION CHANGES

Location of Re-designated State Routes

Existing Route Designation

Proposed Route Designation

Date Submitted: _____

Date Approved: _____

Change and Transfer in State Route Numbers
Authority: Sec. 27-12-29, UCA, 1953, As Amended

SR-2-35
98

RESOLUTION

State Routes 2 and 35

WHEREAS, the programming of Interstate Construction Projects in Summit County in the vicinity of Wanship has resulted in the completion of a portion of Federal-aid Interstate Route 80 through this area and,

WHEREAS, to maintain continuity in the State System of Highways it is necessary to redesignate a portion of State Route 2 near Wanship and,

WHEREAS, portions of the old location of State Route 2 will no longer be justified as a part of the State Highway System, but nevertheless will still serve as a public road and,

WHEREAS, in compliance with the resolution adopted by the Utah State Road Commission on August 20, 1963, designating Interstate Route 80 as State Route 2 as maintenance responsibility is assumed.

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to the Authority of Section 27-12-29, UCA, 1953, AS AMENDED, it is hereby resolved as follows:

1. That the new alignment created by the construction of Interstate Route 80 in the vicinity of Wanship will be designated as part of State Route 2.

2. That State Route 35 be extended from its present termini in Wanship northeasterly via a portion of former State Route 2, to a junction with a county road and thence, traversing a portion of this county road to a junction with the southbound off ramp at Interstate Route 80 (State Route 2).

3. That the old location of State Route 2 from a junction with State Route 35, westerly to a barricade, a distance of 1.90 + - miles be transferred to the jurisdiction of Summit County, and the remaining portion of this route will be abandoned as it will no longer serve as a public roadway.

4. That the former location of State Route 2 from a junction with recommended State Route 35 northeasterly to Interstate Route 80 (State Route 2), a distance of 1.3 + - miles be transferred to the jurisdiction of Summit County.

5. That by this action State Highway System mileage will be increased 0.5 + - mile and Summit County "B" mileage will increase 1.9 2.9 + - miles.

6. That application be made to the U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads to extend Federal-aid Secondary Route 184 to traverse the extension of State Route 35 from Wanship northeasterly to a junction with Interstate Route 80.

7. That Exhibit "A" attached herewith illustrating the action taken herewith is incorporated as a part of this submission.

Dated this 27th day of September, 1965.

STATE ROAD COMMISSION OF UTAH

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Secretary



UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
Transportation - Research Section

STATE ROAD CHANGES
SUMMIT COUNTY

Addition to State Road System
Deletion from State Road System
Transferred to Local Jurisdiction

ROUTE DESIGNATION CHANGE
Existing Route Designation
Proposed Route Designation

Date Submitted: _____

Date Approved: _____

Relinquishment of Realigned Highway
Authority: Sec. 27-12-29, UCA, 1953, As Amended

R E S O L U T I O N

State Route 35

WHEREAS, with the construction of Project S-0184(4) from Tabiona northwesterly toward Hanna, a distance of 4.885 miles, has resulted in the construction on new alignment a section of new roadway and,

WHEREAS, the remaining alignment of the old roadway will still serve as a public road though not justified as part of the State System of Highways and,

WHEREAS, it has been recommended by Mr. Earl A. Johnson, District Engineer, and concurred in by the Duchesne County Commission, that the former location of State Route 35 from a point near Tabiona northwesterly to a point south of Defas Park be transferred to the jurisdiction of Duchesne County and,

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

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to the Authority of Section 27-12-29, UCA, 1953, As Amended, it is hereby resolved as follows:

1. That all portions of highway constructed on new alignment as a result of Project S-0184(4) be designated as a part of State Route 35.

2. That all remaining portions of the old alignment of State Route 35, between engineers stations 748 + - to 963 + -, be transferred to the jurisdiction of Duchesne County.

3. That by this action State Highway System mileage will decrease 0.8 + - mile and Duchesne County "B" mileage will increase 4.8 + - miles.

4. That application be made to the U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Bureau of Public Roads to transfer Federal-aid Secondary Route 184 to the new alignment created by the construction of Project S-0184(4).

5. That the map attached illustrating the action taken herewith is hereby incorporated as part of this submission.

Dated this 9th day of November, 1967.

STATE ROAD COMMISSION OF UTAH

Clinton D. Hamilton
Chairman

Glenn H. Edwards
Commissioner

Ross W. Hunt
Commissioner

Francis Tesch
Commissioner

Elias A. Throne
Commissioner

Attest:

Donald A. Tenney
Secretary



UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
Systems Planning Division

STATE ROAD CHANGES
DUCHESNE COUNTY

Addition to State Road System
Deletion from State Road System
Transferred to Local Jurisdiction

Date Submitted: _____

Date Approved: _____

DIRECTOR
HENRY C. HELLAND

STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER
REED T. KAY

Utah State Department of Highways

State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

November 17, 1967

Mr. William J. Ostler, Chairman
Duchesne County Commission
Duchesne County Courthouse
Duchesne, Utah 84021

Dear Mr. Ostler:

Subject: Transfer to a new alignment a portion of State Route 35 in Duchesne County

Effective November 9, 1967, the State Road Commission adopted a resolution transferring a portion of State Route 35, from Tabiona northwesterly toward Hanna, to a new alignment, a distance of 4.885 miles.

The former location of State Route 35 from near Tabiona northwesterly to a point south of Defas Park will still serve as a public road and is transferred to the jurisdiction of Duchesne County.

By this action State Highway System mileage is decreased 0.8 + - mile and Duchesne County "B" mileage is increased 4.8 + - miles.

The designation of Federal-aid Secondary Route 184 will follow the new alignment created by the construction of Project S-0184(4).

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

Very truly yours,

B. Dale Burningham
Planning Statistics Supervisor

Transmittal

DIRECTOR
HENRY C. HELLAND

STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER
H. L. ONEN, JR.

Utah State Department of Highways

State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

November 17, 1967

Mr. William L. Wadley
Town President
Tabiona, Utah 84072

Dear Mr. Wadley:

Subject: Transfer to a new alignment a portion of State Route 35 in Duchesne County

Effective November 9, 1967, the State Road Commission adopted a resolution transferring a portion of State Route 35, from Tabiona northwesterly toward Hanna, to a new alignment, a distance of 4.685 miles.

The former location of State Route 35 from near Tabiona northwesterly to a point south of Defas Park will still serve as a public road and is transferred to the jurisdiction of Duchesne County.

By this action State Highway System mileage is decreased 0.8 + - mile and Duchesne County "B" mileage is increased 4.8 + - miles.

The designation of Federal-aid Secondary Route 184 will follow the new alignment created by the construction of Project S-0184(4).

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

Very truly yours,

B. Dale Burningham
Planning Statistics Supervisor

Transmittal

DUCHESNE COUNTY

Duchesne, Utah



Oct. 5, 1967

B. Dale Burningham
Chief Research Engineer
State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah

Dear Mr. Burningham:

Enclosed herewith is a map showing in red approximately five miles of old highway No. 35 between Tabiona and Hanna which has been transferred from the State Department of Highways to Duchesne County. Will you kindly add this to our Class "B" mileage.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Cowan

Janet Cowan
County Clerk

encl.

Burningham

RECEIVED
1967 OCT 9 AM 11 11
UTAH STATE
DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS

UCHIESNE COUNTY

Sept. 7, 1966

Earl A. Johnson
District Engineer
American Fork, Utah

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for your letter of August 16th regarding the Tabiona-Hanna road. Our commissioners indicated they would be most happy to cooperate.

Sincerely yours,

Porter L. Merrell,
County Clerk

PLM:jc

DUCHESNE COUNTY

Duchesne, Utah



Oct. 5, 1967

Edwin Lovelace, District Engineer
District Six
Orem, Utah

Dear Mr. Lovelace:

The Board of County Commissioners in accordance with your your request of August 16, 1966 hereby agrees to the transfer of the old Tabiona to Hanna Road to the County, said road being of the length of approximately five miles.

Sincerely yours,

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

By Janet Cowan
Janet Cowan, Clerk

UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

August 16, 1966

Duchesne County Commission
Duchesne, Utah

Gentlemen:

The new roadway along the river between Tabiona and Hanna is now under construction and may be completed or opened to traffic this year. This new route is to be designated as State Route 35 and Federal-aid Secondary Route No. 184.

It is supposed that there will still be some need for the existing route between Tabiona and Hanna, and that this route can not be abandoned. It is proposed that this roadway be transferred to Duchesne County for control and maintenance. The mileage of this road would be added to Duchesne County's Class "B" mileage.

To avoid any misunderstanding in connection with maintenance of this road, it is desirable that there be agreement at the time the new road is opened to traffic.

Very truly yours,

_____
District Engineer

AWadley/jcw

34

Memorandum · UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

DATE: March 13, 1967

TO : B. Dale Burningham
Chief Research Engineer

FROM : Earl A. Johnson
District Engineer

SUBJECT: Transfer of by-passed road - Duchesne County

A new roadway is now under construction on State Route 35 between Tabiona and Hanna in Duchesne County. This will be completed as soon as weather conditions permit road mixing of asphalt surfacing. This could possibly be by June 15, 1967.

Copies of a letter written to the Duchesne County Commission and an answer received from the County Commission are enclosed. These show the request for approval of a transfer of the road and the acceptance of the proposal.

The bypassed section of road extends from Milepost 57.38 to Milepost 62.19. A length of 4.81 miles of roadway is to be transferred to the County. The new roadway between these two Mileposts is 4.095 miles long.

Will you arrange for the transfer of the road at the proper time and also provide any adjustment in transferring the State Route 35 and FAS 184 designation to the new highway.

A Wadley/jnc
Enclosure:

R E S O L U T I O N

Redesignation of Various State Routes

WHEREAS, it has been determined that it would be advantageous for record keeping and developing a Highway Reference System that various state routes be redesignated by hierarchy with the route number being synonymous with the US route designation, and

WHEREAS, this proposed revision of State Route Designations is concurred in by all District Directors.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

That Interstate Route 15 be designated as State Route 15 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 1 and redesignate present State Route 15 as State Route 9,

That Interstate Route 80 be designated as State Route 80 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 2 and redesignate present State Route 80 as State Route 92,

That Interstate Route 80N be designated as State Route ~~82~~ 84 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 3 and redesignate present State Route ~~82~~ 84 as State Route 126 92,

That Interstate Route 70 be designated as State Route 70 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 4 and redesignate present State Route 70, part of State Route 102, part of State Route 69, part of State Route 16 and State Route 51 as State Route 30 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 51,

That Interstate Route 215 be designated as State Route 215 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 5,

That US-6 and 50 from the Utah-Nevada State line to Delta be designated as State Route 6 and that US-6 from Delta to the junction with I-70 west of

State changes 2

Green River also be designated as State Route 6 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 27,

That US-40 be designated as State Route 40 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 6 and redesignate present State Route 40 as State Route 134,

That US-50 from Delta to Salina be designated as State Route 50 with the exception of that section coincident with Interstate Route 15 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 26 and redesignate a part of present State Route 50 as State Route 26,

That US-89 be designated as State Route 89 with the exception of those sections coincident with Interstate Route 70, US-6, I-15 and US-91 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 259, part of State Route 11, part of State Route 28, State Route 32, State Route 8, State Route 271, part of State Route 106, State Route 169, State Route 49, part of State Route 50, part of State Route 84, State Route 13 and the remaining part of State Route 16, redesignate present State Route 89 as State Route 169 and redesignate that portion of State Route 84 from Brigham northerly to State Route 30 as State Route 13,

That US-91 be redesignated as State Route 91 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 85,

That US-189 be designated as State Route 189 with the exception of those sections coincident with US-40 and Interstate Route 80 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 7, 151 and part of State Route 35,

That US-163 be designated as State Route 163 and by this action delete the designation of State Route 47, part of State Route 9 and redesignate present State Route 163 as State Route 78,

That US-666 b[illegible]esignated as State Route 666 and by this action delete

the remaining portion of State Route 9,

That as a result of the aforementioned revisions the State Routes involved will be described as follows:

Route 6 From the Utah-Nevada State line easterly via Delta and Tintic Junction, thence easterly via Santaquin, Payson and Spanish Fork to Moark Junction, thence easterly via Spanish Fork Canyon and Price to Route 70 (Interstate Route 70) west of Green River.

Route 9 From Harrisburg Junction on Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) easterly to Zion National Park south boundary, thence from Zion National Park east boundary to Mt. Carmel Junction on Route 89.

Route 11 From the Utah-Arizona State line north to a junction with Route 89 in Kanab.

Route 13 From a junction with Route 91 in Brigham City northerly via Bear River and Haws Corner to a point south of Riverside, thence east to Route 30 north of Collinston.

Route 15 From the Utah-Arizona State line near St. George to the Utah-Idaho State line south of Malad, Idaho, (traversing the alignment of Interstate Route 15). Segments of present State Routes used as Interstate Traveled-way will remain State responsibility until these segments are replaced by completed Interstate Projects.

Route 16 From the Utah-Wyoming State line northerly to Route 30 at Sage Creek Junction.

Route 26 From Route 84 in Roy easterly to Route 89 in Ogden (Former SR-50 Part).

Route 28 From a junction with Route 89 in Gunnison northerly via Levan to a junction with Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) north of Levan.

Route 30 From the Utah-Nevada State line northeasterly via Curlew Junction to Route ~~82~~ 84 (Interstate Route 80N) west of Snowville. Then commencing

again at a junction with Route 82 (Interstate Route 80N) west of Tremonton easterly via Tremonton, Haws Corner and Collinston to Route 91 in Logan. Then commencing again at a junction with Route 89 in Garden City southeasterly via Sage Creek Junction to the Utah-Wyoming State line.

Route 35 From Route 189 at Francis southeasterly via Tabiona to Route 87 north of Duchesne.

Route 40 From Silver Creek Junction on Route 80 (Interstate Route 80) easterly via Heber City, Duchesne and Vernal to the Utah-Colorado State line.

Route 50 From Route 6 in Delta southeasterly to Holden, thence northerly to Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) and commencing again on Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) near Scipio southeasterly via Scipio to a junction with Route 89 in Salina.

Route 69 From Brigham on Route 13 northerly via Honeyville to Route 30 at Deweyville.

Route 70 From Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) near Cove Fort to the Utah-Colorado State line west of Grand Junction, Colorado, (traversing the alignment of Interstate Route 70). Segments of present State Routes used as Interstate Traveled-way will remain State responsibility until these segments are replaced by completed Interstate Projects.

Route 78 From Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) west of Levan east to Route 28 in Levan.

Route 80 From the Utah-Nevada State line near Wendover to the Utah-Wyoming State line west of Evanston, Wyoming, (traversing the alignment of Interstate Route 80). Segments of present State Routes used as Interstate Traveled-way will remain State responsibility until these segments are replaced by completed Interstate Projects.

Route ~~82~~ 84 From the Utah-Idaho State line near Snowville to a point on Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) near Tremonton, thence from another point on Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) near Roy to Route 80 (Interstate Route 80) near Echo, (traversing the alignment of Interstate Route ~~80N~~ 24). Segments of present State Routes used as Interstate Traveled-way will remain State responsibility until these segments are replaced by completed Interstate Projects.

Route ~~84~~ 126 From Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) south of Layton northerly to Route 89 at Hot Springs Junction.

Route 89 From the Utah-Arizona State line northwest of Page, Arizona, westerly to Kanab, thence northerly to a junction with Route 70 (Interstate Route 70) at Sevier Junction. Then commencing again at the junction with Route 70 (Interstate Route 70) south of Salina northerly via Salina, Gunnison and Mt. Pleasant to a junction with Route 6 at Thistle Junction. Then commencing again at a junction with Route 6 at Moark Junction northerly via Springville, Provo, Orem and American Fork to Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) north of Lehi. Then commencing again at a junction with Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) near Draper Crossroads northerly via Murray and Salt Lake City to a junction with Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) at Becks Interchange. Then commencing again at a junction with Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) near Orchard Drive northerly via Bountiful to a junction with Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) at North Bountiful Interchange. Then commencing again at a junction with Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) at Lagoon Junction northerly via Uintah Junction and Ogden to Route 91 near south city limits of Brigham City. Then commencing again at a junction with Route 91 in Logan northeasterly to Garden City, thence north to the Utah-Idaho State line.

Route 91 From Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) south of Brigham, thence

easterly via Brigham Canyon and Logan to the Utah-Idaho State line near Franklin, Idaho.

Route 92 From Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) near Point of the Mountain east via American Fork Canyon to Route 189 in Provo Canyon.

Route 102 From Route 83 east of Lampo Junction northeasterly via Penrose and Thatcher to Route ~~82~~ 84 (Interstate Route ~~80N~~ 84) west of Tramonton.

Route 106 From Route 89 northerly via Second West and Fourth North in Bountiful, thence northerly to Sheppard Lane in Farmington, thence east to Route 89.

Route ~~126~~ 82 From Route 30 in Tremonton north via 300 East to Garland, thence east approximately 0.8 mile, thence north to Route 13.

Route 134 From Kanesville on Route 37 northerly to Plain City, thence easterly to Pleasant View on Route 89.

Route 163 From the Utah-Arizona State line southwest of Mexican Hat northerly via Blanding, Monticello and Moab to Route 70 (Interstate Route 70) at Crescent Junction.

Route 169 From Route 162 east to Eden on Route 166.

Route 189 From Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) south of Provo northerly via University Avenue and Provo Canyon to Route 40 south of Heber. Then commencing again from Route 40 at Hailstone Junction easterly to Francis, thence northerly via Kamas to Route 80 (Interstate Route 80) south of Wanship.

Route 215 From a junction with Route 80 (Interstate Route 80) near the mouth of Parleys Canyon southeast of Salt Lake City, southwesterly near the south city limits of Murray, junctioning with Route 15 (Interstate Route 15), thence northwesterly, northerly and easterly to a junction with Route 15 (Interstate Route 15) north of Salt Lake City, (traversing the alignment of Interstate Route 215).

Route 666 From Route 163 at Monticello east to the Utah-Colorado State line.

State Changes

RESOLUTION
Redesignation of Various State Routes
Page 7

The maps presented relating the action taken herewith are hereby a part of this resolution and will be stored at the office of the Planning Statistics Section of the Transportation Planning Division.

Dated this 3rd day of May, 1977.

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

B. LeLaun Cox
Chairman

Wayne A. Clarke
Vice-Chairman

Glen E. Good
Commissioner

Glen H. Blanch
Commissioner

Samuel D. Taylor
Commissioner

ATTEST:

David A. Fenley
Secretary

STATE ROUTES REQUIRING CHANGES IN ROUTE DESIGNATION SIGNING

Existing Designation	New Designation	District	Miles
SR-15	SR-9	5	32.6
SR-15	SR-9	3	12.3
SR-80	SR-92	6	26.8
SR-82	SR-126	1	3.1
SR-40	SR-134	1	12.4
SR-50 Part	SR-26	1	3.8
SR-89	SR-169	1	0.6
SR-84	SR-13	1	27.8
		Total	119.4

SR-70, SR-102, SR-69, SR-16 and SR-51 in District 1, remove rectangular route signs from sign posts.

US-89 signs thru Sevier Valley will be replaced with "Temporary I-70" signs with rectangular signs under the Temporary I-70 sign indicating the State Route designation until completion of I-70 thru this area. Upon completion of I-70 between Sevier Junction and Salina all State Routes will be resigned by their designated State Route, District 3

Present State Routes 15 and 80 will be dual route signed for a period of approximately two years as a guide to Tourists, Districts 5, 3 and 6

All directional signing (junction signs, etc.) affected by these revisions will also require changing.

2

-234

Memorandum

UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

DATE: June 2, 1977

TO : District Directors

FROM : L. R. Jester, P.E.
Engineer for Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Redesignations of State Routes

On May 20, 1977, the Utah Transportation Commission approved the redesignations of various State Routes as described in the attached resolution. Please review the changes that have been approved in your District and notify all interested agencies within your area.

Attachment

Note: All Districts refer to last page of resolution for necessary signing changes.

UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

June 2, 1977

C

O

P

Y

Mr. Norman V. Hancock, Chief
Game Management Section
Utah State Division of Wildlife Resources
1596 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104

Subject: Redesignation of State Routes

Dear Mr. Hancock:

On May 20, 1977, the Utah Transportation Commission approved the redesignations of the various State Routes as described in the enclosed Resolution.

Yours very truly,

L. R. Jester, P.E.
Engineer for Transportation Planning

LRJ/BDB/WDM/BDent/cs
Enclosure

cc: H.B. Leatham

Memo sent to all District Engineers & interested state personnel.

Also sent to: Mr. Marvin E. Olson, U.S. Dept. of Soil Conservation
Mr. Ralph Hodges, Utah Forest & Wildlife Service

State changes
2

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS

ROBERT N. HUNTER, President
Chief Engineer
Missouri State Highway Department

HENRY E. STAFFELDT, Executive Director
444 N. Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 225
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone (202) 624-5800

July 12, 1977

Mr. Blaine J. Kay, Director
Utah Department of Transportation

Mr. Darrell V. Manning, Director
Idaho Transportation Department

Mr. Robert A. Burco, Director
Oregon Department of Transportation

Gentlemen:

The Route Numbering Committee reviewed the application coming from the Idaho Department of Transportation, and concurred in by the Utah Department of Transportation, for the redesignation of I-80N.

After reviewing the application, together with objections raised by States of Washington and Oregon, the Committee voted to redesignate I-80N as I-84, subject to concurrence by the Federal Highway Administrator, and with the State of Oregon in consultation with the States of Utah and Idaho to make the determination when the sign change would take place; but no later then July 1st, 1980.

This action was reviewed by the Executive Committee at its meeting on July 7th, 1977, and concurred therein.

Sincerely,

H. J. Rhodes
Deputy Director

HJR:pw

cc: Mr. William Cox
Federal Highway Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

RECEIVED
7-14-77

COPY OF LETTER RETAINED IN CENTRAL FILES. RETURN THIS [illegible] TO CENTRAL FILES AFTER ACTION HAS BEEN [illegible]

Kay

UTAH STATE DEPA TMENT OF HIGHWAYS

June 2, 1977

COPY

Mr. Norman V. Hancock, Chief
Game Management Section
Utah State Division of Wildlife Resources
1596 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104

Subject: Redesignation of State Routes

Dear Mr. Hancock:

On May 20, 1977, the Utah Transportation Commission approved the redesignations of the various State Routes as described in the enclosed Resolution.

Yours very truly,

L. R. Jester, P.E.
Engineer for Transportation Planning

LRJ/BDB/WDM/BDent/cs

Enclosure

cc: N.B. Leatham

Memo sent to all District Engineers & interested state personnel.

Also sent to: [illegible]

SR-35
Ext FAS
184
31

R E S O L U T I O N

State Route 35

Extension of FAS-184

WHEREAS, the Utah Transportation Commission desires that the portion of State Route 35 from the junction with State Route 189 at Francis, Summit County, southeasterly to the northwesterly terminus of Federal-aid Secondary Route 184, near Hanna, Duchesne County, a distance of 35.44 miles, be added to the State's Federal-aid Secondary System, and

WHEREAS, the appropriate staff of the Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the request and recommends that the aforementioned roadway be functionally reclassified from Minor Collector to Major Collector.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

That the roadway from the junction with State Route 189 at Francis, Summit County, southeasterly to the northwesterly terminus of Federal-aid Secondary Route 184, near Hanna, Duchesne County, a distance of 35.44 miles, be added to the State's Federal-aid Secondary System, and that it be designated as an extension of State Federal-aid Secondary Route 184, and

That this action becomes effective upon approval by the Federal Highway Administration, and

That the accompanying map be incorporated as a part of this Resolution.

State Route 35
Extension of FAS-184

Dated this 13th day of March, 1987.

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Samuel H. Taylor
Chairman

Wayne A. Christensen
Vice-Chairman

B. La Dean Cox
Commissioner

Ira D. Huston
Commissioner

Attest:

Secretary

James D. Larkin
Commissioner



Utah Department of Transportation
Transportation Planning Division

Federal-aid Secondary System
SUMMIT, WASATCH, and DUCHESNE COUNTIES

—— Extension FAS Route 184

R E S O L U T I O N

Relocation of Routes Around Jordanelle Reservoir

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

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

2. The roadway known as existing State Route 40, (US-40), (FAP-15), from the beginning of "F" Line Project NF-19(13) traversing northerly to the point where the new alignment of State Route 40 junctions with the old alignment of State Route 40, (US-40), (FAP-15), a distance of 1.23± miles be transferred to the jurisdiction of Summit County and be Functionally Classified Local. This transaction will increase Summit County's "B" system road mileage 1.23± miles.

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. The roadway known as existing State Route 189 (US-189), (FAP-61) traversing easterly, from the BOR Boundary to the Junction of State Route 35 in Francis, a distance of 3.36± miles be transferred to the jurisdiction of the following entities in subsequent manner.

Entity	Mile Points	Description	No. of Miles	Func. Class From	Func. Class To
Wasatch Co.	33.00 to 33.56	BOR Boundary to Jct. Co. Road	.56	Min. Art.	Local
Wasatch Co.	33.56 to 34.97	Jct. Co. Road to Wasatch-Summit Co. Line	(B) 1.41±	Min. Art.	Mjr. Col.
Summit Co.	34.97 to 35.44	Wasatch-Summit Co. Line to West Incl. Francis	(B) 0.47±	Min. Art.	Mjr. Col.
Francis	35.44 to 37.36	West Incl. Francis to Jct. SR-35 Francis	(C) 0.92±	Min. Art.	Mjr. Col.

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

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

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

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

NF-19(13) (Park City Jct. to South Mayflower)

Summit County

Map Location	Transferred To County	Total Feet Existing on "B" System	Total Feet Add to "B" System	Func. Class
F Line	730' = .14 mi		730' = .14 mi	Local
* D Line	7485' = 1.42 mi		7485' = 1.42 mi	Local
Total:	8215' = 1.56 mi		8215' = 1.56 mi	

Wasatch County

* D Line	565' = .11 mi		565' = .11 mi	Local
O Line	160' = .03 mi		160' = .03 mi	Local
L Line	4801' = .91 mi		4801' = .91 mi	Local
X Line	5466' = 1.04 mi		5466' = 1.04 mi	Local
K Line	5748' = 1.09 mi		5748' = 1.09 mi	Local
R Line	2855' = .54 mi	360' = .07 mi	2495' = .47 mi	Local
Y Line	1020' = .19 mi	512' = .10 mi	508' = .09 mi	Local
Total:	20615' = 3.91 mi	872' = .17 mi	19743' = 3.74 mi	

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

* The footage on "D" Line is located in Summit and Wasatch Counties and each will be credited with the appropriate footage.

NF-19(14) (South Mayflower to Midway Jct.)

Wasatch County

Map Location	Transferred To County	Total Feet Existing on "B" System	Total Feet Add to "B" System	Func. Class
F Line	930' = .18 mi.	150' = .03 mi.	780' = .15 mi	Local
H Line	2000' = .38 mi.	465' = .09 mi.	1535' = .29 mi	Mj.Co.
P Line	475' = .09 mi.		475' = .09 mi	Local
P-1 Line	375' = .07 mi.		375' = .07 mi	Local
Total:	3780' = .72 mi.	615' = .12 mi.	3165' = .60 mi	

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

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

Wasatch County

Map Location	Transferred To County	Total Feet Existing on "B" System	Total Feet Add to "B" System	Func. Class
A Line	1130' = .21 mi.	375' = .07 mi.	755' = .14 mi	Local
X Line	1555' = .29 mi.	480' = .09 mi.	1075' = .20 mi.	Local
Total:	2685' = .50 mi.	855' = .16 mi.	1830' = .34 mi.	

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

Summit County

Map Location	Transferred To County	Total Feet Existing on "B" System	Total Feet Add to "B" System	Func. Class
H Line	800' = .15 mi.	800' = .15 mi.		Local
L Line	1062' = .20 mi.	425' = .08 mi.	637' = .12 mi	Mn.Co
Total:	1862' = .35 mi.	1225' = .23 mi.	637' = .12 mi	

Footage deleted from previous "B" routes in Summit County that are either obliterated by new construction or replaced by newly constructed frontage roads, cross roads and access roads is 530' = .10 miles, indicating a net gain of "B" system footage 87' = .02 miles.

14. By these actions Summit County's "B" system mileage will increase 2.37± miles, also Wasatch County's "B" system mileage will increase 6.09± miles, Francis City's "C" system mileage will indicate a net increase of 0.92± miles, and Kamas City's "C" system mileage will indicate a net decrease of .10± miles.

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

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

DATED on this 3rd day of November, 1989.

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Secretary to Commission

Commissioner

Mike

WILLIAM D. HURLEY, P.E.
Director

GENE STURZENEGGER, P.E.
Assistant Director

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
4501 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119

August 17, 1987

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

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

Dear Mr. Allred,

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

February 19, 1987 letter

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

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

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

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

June 4, 1987 letter

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

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

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

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

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

UDOT has been in the process of designing the Relocated U.S. 40 for the past ten years. During that period UDOT and the BOR have designed and evaluated many different alignments, based on engineering and political concepts. The final location for the alignment was determined in 1982, which is the alignment that plans and specifications were prepared for contracting purposes. In 1985 UDOT and the BOR went to an accelerated schedule for construction of both the highway relocation

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

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

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

Comments to Paragraph No. 5, which asks if UDOT is providing access to private properties, with the present design of the "Y" Line.

We understand that the Bureau of Reclamation intends to buy out the Baum property in this area. The proposed "Y" Line does give access to the Lewis and State properties.

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

Sincerely,

Blaine J. Kay, P. E.
Preconstruction Engineer

PART IV
PROGRAM NARRATIVE

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

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

3. APPROACH.

3.1 Utah Department of Transportation Responsibilities. The UDOT will:

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

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

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

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

(3) contractual obligations (awards) entered into as a result of this Agreement.

(4) the completed highway relocation projects.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(l) UDOT will review and approve all designs, plans, and specifications prepared under this Agreement by Wasatch County

for Wasatch County Route A together with right-of-way descriptions to insure compliance with applicable design requirements and/or right-of-way acquisition procedures. UDOT will further monitor and inspect as needed construction of said Wasatch County Route A to insure compliance with approved plans and specifications.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) The completed Wasatch County Route A project.

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

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

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

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

(f) Follow Standard Procedures required by UDOT and BOR as may be hereafter determined in order to qualify for Federal Grants in Aid. Betterments in excess of contract requirements herein agreed upon will be at the expense of Wasatch County except for those betterments which are mutually agreed upon pursuant to Paragraph 4 below.

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

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

3.3 Bureau of Reclamation Responsibilities. The BOR will:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(h) Participate in final inspections with UDOT and Wasatch County.

(i) Fund 100 percent of the design and construction costs except for unapproved betterments incurred in accordance with this Agreement.

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

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

(l) Make application and obtain all Section 404 dredge and fill permits related to highway construction.

4. SPECIFICATIONS. Utah Department of Transportation standards for each road are as follows:

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

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

5. DELIVERABLES. The UDOT anticipates completing the following schedule of deliverables:

	Date Start	Date Complete
U.S. 40 Relocation		
Preliminary Engineering	Execution Date	October 89
North Portion, Grading	March 87	October 88
Structures	March 87	October 88
South Portion, Grading	April 87	October 88
Surfacing (Final)	March 89	December 91
U.S. 189 Relocation		
Preliminary Engineering	Execution Date	September 87
Grading	August 87	September 89
Structures	August 87	September 89
Surfacing	August 87	September 89

Wasatch County anticipates completing the following schedule of deliverables:

County Road Route A		
Route Location and Preliminary Design	October 86	May 87
Preliminary Engineering	May 87	February 88
Grading	May 88	July 89
Structures	May 88	July 89
Surfacing	May 89	October 89

The above completion dates are subject to modification by mutual agreement of the parties, contingent upon availability of funds and as conditions dictate.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have subscribed their names through their proper officers thereunto duly authorized, as of the day and year first above written.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

By _____
acting Regional Director, Upper Colorado Region, Bureau of Reclamation

UTAH DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

By _____
Director

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL:

By _____
Engr. for Preconstruction

By _____
Assistant Director

Attest _____
Commission Secretary

By N/A
Director of Finance

APPROVED AS TO FORM
David L. Wilkinson, Attorney General

By _____
Assistant Attorney General

REVIEWED COMPTROLLER

_____


RICHARDSON FLAT
PARK CITY
Pop. 2,823
Keetley
Keetley Jct.
McCune
Canyon
Hailstone
Bonanza
SATCH
MIDWAY
Pop 1,194
HEBER
Pop 4,362
Midway
Jurisdictional Transfer
SR-40 to Summit County
SR-40 to Wasatch County
SR-40 & SR-189
to BOR


KAMAS
Marion
VALLEY
KAMAS
Pop. 1,084
FRANCIS
Pop. 371
PAULSIN BASIN
Jurisdictional Transfer
SR-189 to BOR
SR-189 to Wasatch County
SR-189 to Summit County
SR-189 to Francis


KAMAS
KAMAS
Pop. 1,084
FRANCIS
Pop. 371
PAULSIN BASIN
Jurisdictional Transfer
Summit County Roadway
to SR-189
Kamas to SR-189
State Route Change
Becomes SR-32


TO SILVER
CREEK JCT.
NF-19(13)
SUMMIT
WASATCH
COUNTY
"F" Line
248
189
40
"D" Line
CITY
"R" Line
"L" Line
"K" Line
"O" Line
"X" Line
"Y" Line
JORDANELLE
RESERVOIR
HAILSTO
Becomes SR-319
N



S. 40 RELOCATION

NF-19(14)


NF-61(3)
S. 189 RELOCATION
189
"H" Line
"L" Line
189
KAMAS
PROVO
RIVER

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

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

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

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

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

In making their appeal today, they would like to be able to take some of the roads under their scrutiny for maintenance, but they can't afford it. Specifically, Mr. Sowards said he would like to address Route A. He thinks

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

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

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

Clint Topham said the Wilbur Smith Study discusses the Regionwide and Statewide Transportation movements and how they should be handled by State and local agencies. There was an extensive study done on the location of these highways. It was decided the best location for US-40 would be along the west side of the new Jordanelle, and that the major route carrying most of the traffic would be built along the north side, or Route C. It was recognized in that location study that it would make the Heber to Francis/Kamas traffic go out of direction to go on a State Highway. That was part of the reason for putting the "C" Line where it is and building it to the standard it was built to. The study states that when these criteria were being applied to the

system throughout the State, if there were two highways which basically provided the same service, UDOT would claim as one of theirs the highway easiest to maintain, and the County would maintain the other one. Mr. Topham said that the major movement from the Kamas area to US-40 is towards Park City and Salt Lake rather than to Heber and Provo. That is why they made the decision they did.

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

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

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

Ronald Brittenden, Representative for Congressman Nielson's Office, said he would like to make his remarks as a taxpayer in Wasatch County and not in

his capacity as a representative for Congressman Nielson. Because of his service with Congressman Nielson, he has been involved in this for the past seven years and knows the background. He has used all of the roads in the area since he was younger and lived in Hoytsville, and he is familiar with the traffic and roads in the area. He noted that the original plans show Routes A, B and C, with Route B including a bridge across the Jordanelle. It would have been the best compromise, but the BOR realized they could probably build Routes A and C for what B would have cost. UDOT had the opportunity to be the agency to select the alternative to US-40. The traffic flow, etc. was the result of that decision. He suspects that Route C accommodates traffic previously using Brown's Canyon from Kamas to Park City and Salt Lake areas and will have more traffic demands in the near future. Route A handles the traffic which was formerly SR-40 from Utah County to Woodland and Hannah.

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

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

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

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

MUTCD Supplement for Flashing School Signs

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

SR-35
SR-32
SR-248

17

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, 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.

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

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

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

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 October 1990

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Samuel J. Taylor
Chairman

Wayne S. Mumford
Commissioner

Fred S. Weston
Commissioner

James H. Larkin
Commissioner

Commissioner

Attest:

Secretary to Commission

WASATCH COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH

25 North Main Heber City, Utah 84032 • Phone (801) 654-3211

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

PETE A. COLEMAN J. MORONI BESENDORFER, CHAIRMAN T. LAREN PROVOST

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 Transportaion, 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

J. Moroni Besendorfer
Commission Chairman

JMB/lm

Clint 3-19-90

State of Utah
UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Eugene H. Findlay, CPA
Executive Director
Howard H. Richardson, P.E.
Assistance Director
Dan F. Nelson, P.E.
District Director

825 North 9th West
Orem, Utah 84057

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

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

RECEIVED
MAR 19 1989
UDOT

DFN/fs

CC: Commissioner Wayne Winters
Clint Topham, P.E.


JORDAN RANCH
RV Park
300

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 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 Peoa, 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
SUMMIT COUNTY
SHEET NO. 2
WASATCH NATIONAL FOREST
UINTA
WASATCH
MOUNTAIN
STATE
PARK
NATIONAL
FOREST
MIDWAY
HEBER
CHARLESTON
Pop. 320
HEBER VALLEY AIRPORT
Charleston
Dannetsville
Midway
Bonanza
Anchor
Sawtooth
FLAGSTAFF MTN
Park
Bloods Lake
Lake Bronnell
Lucer Lake
CLAYTON PEAK
10,729'
SUNSET PEAK
10,856'
BALD EAGLE MTN
Big Flat Spring
Banner Hollow
MIDDLE MTN Slide
Faucett Can
Pot Hollow
Thomas
Bear Can
Deseret Spring
Lagoon Spring
Tucker Spring
Provo River
Provo River Canal
Deer Creek Reservoir
Big Hollow
Daniels Creek
Lake Creek
Canyon
Valley
Ditch
Canal
R. 4 E.
T. 2 S.
T. 3 S.
111° 30'
40° 30'
10 PARK CITY 33 MILES
TO JCT SR 248 16.8 MILES


ROCKPORT RESERVOIR
SILVER CREEK JUNCTION
OAKLEY
Park City Interchange
SUMMIT COUNTY
WASATCH COUNTY
KAMAS
JORDANELLE RESERVOIR
Old Hailstone Jct.
D. Old SR-189
FRANCIS
C. Route A
PROVO RIVER
B. Old SR-40
A. "H" Line
HEBER
DELETE
Portion of SR-189
EXTENSION
SR-248
ADDITION
A. Portion of "H" Line to SR-32
B. Old alignment of SR-40 to SR-32
C. Route A to SR-32
D. Old SR-189 to SR-32
ADDITION
SR-35
RELOCATION
SR-32

WASATCH COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH

25 North Main Heber City, Utah 84032 • Phone (801) 654-3211

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

PETE A. COLEMAN J. MORONI BESENDORFER, CHAIRMAN T. LAREN PROVOST

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

Steven L. Hansen
Wasatch County Attorney

SLH:sj

State of Utah
UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Norman H. Bangerter
Governor
Eugene H. Findlay, C.P.A.
Executive Director
H.H. Richardson, P.E.
Assistant Director

4501 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119-5998
(801) 965-4000

Transportation Commission
Samuel J. Taylor
Chairman
Wayne S. Winters
Vice Chairman
Todd G. Weston
James G. Larkin
John T. Dunlop
Elva H. Anderson
Secretary

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

State of Utah
UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Norman H. Bangerter
Governor
Eugene H. Findlay, C.P.A.
Executive Director
H.H. Richardson, P.E.
Assistant Director

4501 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119-5998
(801) 965-4000

Transportation Commission
Samuel J. Taylor
Chairman
Wayne S. Winters
Vice Chairman
Todd G. Weston
James G. Larkin
John T. Dunlop
Elva H. Anderson
Secretary

6 December 1990

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 is 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

State of Utah
UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Norman H. Bangerter
Governor
Eugene H. Findlay, C.P.A.
Executive Director
H.H. Richardson, P.E.
Assistant Director

4501 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119-5998
(801) 965-4000

Transportation Commission
Samuel J. Taylor
Chairman
Wayne S. Winters
Vice Chairman
Todd G. Weston
James G. Larkin
John T. Dunlop
Elva H. Anderson
Secretary

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,

Gene

E.H. Findlay, CPA
Executive Director

EHF:CDT:ra


SNAKE CREEK
PRIVATE PROPERTY
STATE PARK
N
Powerhouse
Spring
Mill Flat
Creek
PIPELINE
Epperson Spring
Hollow
Powerhouse
WEST BENCH DITCH
Mahogany Spring
GOLF COURSE
Snake
Gerber Spring
Creek
Hollow
The Pea
Phosphate
16
17
21
20
22
15
7400
7600
7000
6800
6400
6200
6000
5800
5845
6087


U.S. FOREST SERVICE
Snake
Creek
Powerhouse
Spring
Mill
Flat
Creek
PIPELINE
Epperson
Spring
Powerhouse
WEST BENCH
DITCH
Bonner
Hollow
18
17
16
19
20
21
7593
7621
7889
7810
7600
7400
7800
8200
8000
7200
6400
6200
7000
6600
6000
8400