

Route 260

Updated: December 2011

From Route 44 near Glendale northerly via Flaming Gorge Dam to the Utah-Wyoming State line at a point either east or west of the Green River March 18, 1957.

1963 Description:

From Route 44 near Greendale northerly via Flaming Gorge Dam to the Utah-Wyoming State line near Spring Creek Gap. This route was **approved by the Legislature.**

Approved by the 1965 Legislature:

1967 Legislature:

*(A) 1981 Commission Action (Sept. 4, 1981):

SR-260 Withdrawn as a State Route and transferred in its entirety to SR-191, following the same alignment. (Legislature action to follow)

Approved by the 1983 Legislature: Effective May 10, 1983.

*(B) Commission Action (October 15, 1993):

Re-designates SR-170 in its entirety as SR-260.

1994 Legislative Description:

From Route 24 south of Aurora to Route 50 west of Salina.

1995 Legislature: Description remains the same.

1996 Legislature: Description remains the same.

1997 Legislature: Description remains the same.

1998 Legislature: Description remains the same.

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.

* Refers to resolution index page following.

Route 260

COUNTY/VOLUME & RESOLUTION NUMBER

A. Daggett Co. 6/37

B. Sevier Co. 10/6

DESCRIPTION OF RESOLUTION CHANGE

(A). Re-designation -

SR-260 in its entirety becomes SR-191.

B). Addition -

SR-170 becomes SR-260 from Jct. SR-24 to Jct. SR-50 north of Aurora.

Addition and Redesignation of Various State Routes

WHEREAS, it has been the policy to redesignate by hierarchy state route numbers to be synonymous with US route designations, and

WHEREAS, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials approved the extension of US Route 191 from a point north of West Yellowstone, Wyoming, southerly via the following state routes, or portions of state routes, in Utah: 260, 44, 40, 33, 6, 70 and 163 to Chambers, Arizona, and

WHEREAS, a portion of this route (US-191) from a point near Bluff, Utah, to US-160 near Mexican Water, Arizona, is coincident with an Indian Reservation Road for which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has administrative responsibility.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

That contingent upon the Bureau of Indian Affairs granting a right-of-way easement to the State of Utah and the road being in an acceptable state of maintenance for that section of road from the Utah-Arizona state line northerly to a junction with SR-163 near Bluff, a request be submitted to the State Legislature at its next regular session for approval to have this section of road included in the State System of Highways and designated as a part of route 191, to become effective upon the approval by the Legislature, and

That present State Route 163 from a point near Bluff northerly to Crescent Junction be redesignated as part of State Route 191, and

That present State Route 33 in its entirety be designated as part of State Route 191, and

That present State Route 44 from a junction with State Route 40 in Vernal northerly to Greendale Junction be designated as part of State Route 191, and

That present State Route 260 in its entirety be designated as part of State Route 191, and

That as a result of the aforementioned revisions the state routes involved will be described as follows:

Route 44 - From a junction with Route 191 at Greendale Junction westerly and northerly to Manila on Route 43.

Route 163 - From the Utah-Arizona State line at a point southwest of Mexican Hat northeasterly to Route 191 near Bluff.

Route 191 - From the Utah-Arizona State line at a point south of Bluff northerly via Blanding, Monticello and Moab to a junction with Route 70 at Crescent Junction; then commencing again at a junction with Route 6 north of Helper northerly via Indian Canyon to a junction with Route 40 at Duchesne; then commencing again at a junction with Route 40 in Vernal northerly via Greendale Junction and Dutch John to the Utah-Wyoming State line.

The map sheet relating the action taken herewith is hereby incorporated as a part of this Resolution.

Dated this 4th day of September, 1981.

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

B. L. Cannon
Chairman

Wayne S. Whitten
Vice Chairman

Samuel Payne
Commissioner

Chas H Church
Commissioner

Charles Claybaugh
Commissioner

ATTEST:

Eva A. Anderson
Secretary

COMMISSION



Director
William D. Hurley, P.E.

Assistant Director
C.V. Anderson, P.E.

AUN COX
CHAIRMAN
NE S. WINTERS
VICE CHAIRMAN
CLEM H. CHURCH
SAMUEL J. TAYLOR
CHARLES E. WARD

RONALD A. FERNLEY
SECRETARY

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Subject: Addition and Redesignation of Various State Routes

Dear Sir:

On June 6, 1981, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials approved the extension of U.S. Route 191 to traverse various state routes in the State of Utah, as described in the enclosed resolution.


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

Very truly yours,

W. Ronald Delis


W. Ronald Delis
Engineer for Transportation Planning


Enclosure



Utah Department of Transportation
 Transportation Planning Division

STATE ROAD DESIGNATION

 Present Designation

 Recommended New Designation

Memorandum

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DATE: October 8, 1981

TO : L. R. Jester, P.E.
District 6 Director

FROM : W. Ronald Delis, P.E. *RD*
Engineer for Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Addition and Redesignation of various State Routes

On June 6, 1981, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials approved the extension of U.S. Route 191, to traverse various State Routes in the State of Utah, as described in the attached resolution.

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

The signing changes for State Routes 260, 44, 40, 33, 6, 163 and U.S. Route 163 should be completed as soon as time and money are available.

Attachment

cc: James L. Deaton P.E.
District 4 Director

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS



AN APPLICATION
FROM THE STATE HIGHWAY OR TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT OF

UTAH

FOR

- the Elimination of a U.S. (1) Route
- the Establishment of a U.S. (1) Route
- the Relocation of U.S. (1) Route
- the Extension of U.S. (1) Route 191
- the Establishment of an Alternate U.S. Route
- the Establishment of a Temporary U.S. Route
- the Recognition of a Business Route on U.S. (1) Route
- the Recognition of a By-pass Route on U.S. Route

BETWEEN
West Yellowstone
Montana and Chambers, Arizona

The Following
State or States are
Involved:

Montana

Wyoming

Arizona

Date Received 7/19/80

Date application acknowledged 10/15/80 10/26/81

Date to Route Number Committee 6/25/81

Date considered by Executive Committee 6/26/81

Action of Executive Committee Extension of U.S. Route 191 Proposed

Member Department Notified 6/30/81
(This block to be completed by AASHTO General Office)

Date Submitted:

September 10, 19 80

* A local vicinity map needed on Page 3. On Page 5 a short statement to the effect that there are no deficiencies on proposed routing, if true, will suffice. If there are deficiencies, they should be so indicated in accordance with Page 4 instructions.

The purpose of the U. S. Numbering and Marking is to facilitate movement along the general direction of desire lines of travel over the shortest and best available roads, and a route should form continuity of available facilities through two or more States that accommodate the most important and heaviest motor traffic flow in the area.

The system was established in 1926 and the U. S. Route System has reached the point of review, revision, consolidation, and perfecting, rather than continuous expansion. Therefore, any proposed alteration in the established system should be extremely meritorious and thoroughly, though concisely, explained in order that the Route Numbering Committee and the Executive Committee of the Association may give prompt and proper consideration to each and every request made by a Member Department.

Explanation and Reasons for the Request: (Keep Concise and Pertinent)






The extension of this route would provide a continuous north and south U.S. route through the eastern part of Utah. Thus, being in keeping with AASHTO Route Numbering policy providing a U.S. route connecting four States, Montana, Wyoming, Utah and Arizona. This extension of U.S. 191 would also result in the deletion of U.S. 187 that is entirely within the State of Wyoming. Thus, in keeping with AASHTO Route Numbering policy of eliminating U.S. routes entirely within one state.


Date facility available to traffic The section of highway from Bluff to US-160 will be open to traffic by November 1980. All other sections are open to traffic now.


Does the petition propose a new routing over a portion of an existing U.S. Route Yes? If so, where: US-163, Bluff to Crescent Jct. - US-6 & 50, Crescent Jct. to west of Green River, US-6 west of Green River to Junction SR-33 - US-40, Duchesne to Vernal.

Does the petition propose a new routing over a portion of an existing Interstate Route Yes? If so, where: I-70, Crescent Junction to a point west of Green River.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF U.S. 191

-  U.S. NO ROUTES
-  EXISTING STATE ROUTES
-  TO BE ADDED TO STATE SYSTEMS
-  PROPOSED EXTENSION U.S. 191
-  CONTROL POINTS





POINT MILE	PAVEME TYPE	PAVEME CONDI	TRAFF ADT	PAVEMENT WIDTH DEFICIENCY		SHOULDER WIDTH DEFICIENCY		ROADWAY WIDTH DEFICIENCY		H-LOADING DEFICIENCY		VERTICAL SIGHT DISTANCE DEFICIENCY		STANDARD		
				PERCENT		PERCENT		PERCENT		PERCENT		PERCENT		HORI-ZONTAL CURVA-TURE DEGREE	PER-CENT GRADE LENGTH	
				10	20	30	40	10	40	40	80	10	20			30
(10)	UTAH-WYOMING STATE LINE	H	G	375	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
16.9	(11) JUNCTION SR-24 GREENDALE JUNCTION			755												
20				1200												
34.8				3350												
40	(12) JUNCTION US-40 IN VERNAL			14500												
				13000												
60				2800												
57.9				6500												
80				3400												
				2700												
100				4200												
(13)	JUNCTION SR-33 IN DUCHE SNE			900												
120				265												
43.6				RXR 1590												
140	(14) JUNCTION US-6 NORTH OF HELPER			12000												
11.0				7100												
160	(15) JUNCTION SR-10 IN PRICE			8200												
				5900												
				4000												
180				2100												
59.5																
200																

3.8	(7)	JUNCTION 70 WEST ON GREEN RIVER							
22.0		GREEN RIVER	2970						
240			2275						
	(8)	JUNCTION US-163 CRESCENT JUNCTION	1750						
260									
31.5			2900						
	(9)	MOAB	6950						
280			3100						
300									
53.9									
320			3380						
	(10)	MONTICELLO	2570						
20.9									
340			1540						
	(11)	BLANDING	2295						
			1780						
360									
29.4			1255						
			900						
380									
	(12)	JUNCTION INDIAN ROAD WEST OF BLUFF	700 Est.						
24.6									
400									
406.9	(13)	UTAH-ARIZONA STATE LINE							

The State agri
facts on any to
cation of Stat
ly within this S

45-
191

The State agrees and pledges its good faith that it will not erect, remove, or change any U.S. or Interstate Route Markers on any road without the authorization, consent, or approval of the Executive Committee of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, nor withstanding the fact that the changes proposed are entirely within this State.

The weighted average daily traffic volume along the proposed route, as shown on the map on page 3, is 2480 as compared to 6280 for the year 1979 for all other U.S. Numbered routes in the State.

The "Purpose and Policy in the Establishment and Development of United States Numbered Highways, as Revised September 15, 1970" or the "Purpose and Policy in the Establishment of a Marking System of the Routes Comprising the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways" as revised August 10, 1973 has been read and is accepted.

In our opinion, this petition complies with the above applicable policy:

.....
(Signature)

Chief Administrative Official, Utah Department of Transportation
(Member Department)

This petition is authorized by official action of Utah Department of Transportation Commission under date of August 15, 1980 as follows: (Copy excerpt from Minutes)

US 191 PROPOSAL

Howard Leatham said he had the oppoutunity to meet personally with the Planning Directors of all the states involved and discuss it with them. Montana and Wyoming are very favorable to the proposal. The State of Arizona has agreed to go along with the modifications we show.

Arizona and Utah have the same problem. The only piece of road that is a problem is the piece from Mexican Water up to Bluff across the Navajo Reservation. It is not on the state highway system in either state.

Mr. Leatham talked with the Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Shiprock, and he said that piece of road will be completed south of the bridge to a 34 ft. width standard by this October. We are cooperating with San Juan County from the bridge north.

Mr. Leatham said that his recommendation would be to make our application to AASHTO and contingent on whether or not they approved the route we could come back and add it to the system afterwards. Commissioner Taylor agreed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Taylor, seconded by Commissioner Church, and unanimously passed:

That approval be granted to proceed with the US 191 proposal and submit it to the AASHTO Numbering Committee

10-6

Redesig
note SR-170
to 260

RESOLUTION

Re-designate Route SR-170 to SR-260
Sevier County

WHEREAS, Section 27-12-27 of the Utah Code 1993, provides for additions to or deletions from state highway system, and

WHEREAS, Assigning the proposed SR-170 to a roadway in close proximity to the alignment of I-70, creates confusion and misunderstanding to the general public, and

WHEREAS, The District 3 Director, perceiving the related problems associated with assignment of proposed SR-170 in its present location, requests reassignment of stated route, and

WHEREAS, The appropriate staff of the Transportation Planning Division, having reviewed the problems associated with assigning proposed SR-170 at its present location, concurs with the District 3 Director for the need to re-designate the route.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved as follows:

1. The Utah Transportation Commission hereby re-designates and assigns said roadway in its entirety to reside as SR-260 becoming effective upon passage of this resolution.
2. The accompanying map be made part of this resolution.

Dated on this 15th day of October 1993

UTAH TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Samuel G. Payne
Chairman

Vice-Chairman
Lois D. Weston
Commissioner

James H. Jackson
Commissioner


John Lewis
Commissioner

Attest: Shirley J. Swanson
Secretary

SR-260


10-6

Redesig
date 5/17/70
to 260



Re-designate SR-170

as SR-260



10-6
note 5/17/70
to 260



State of
UTAH DEPARTMENT

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
W. Craig Zwick
Executive Director

4501 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119-5998
(801) 965-4000
FAX: (801) 965-4338

Glen Nielsen
(Black Box)
Please put this in
the Aurora Main Street
File -
Club

Transportation Commission
Samuel J. Taylor
Chairman
Wayne S. Winters
Vice Chairman
Todd G. Weston
James G. Larkin
Ted D. Lewis
Shirley J. Iverson
Secretary

Ap

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Dan F. Nelson, P.E.
Southern Region Director

FROM: H.H. Richardson, P.E.
Assistant Director

SUBJECT: Aurora Main Street

I was able to inspect the pavement surface of Aurora Main Street last Saturday, and there was more pavement loss than I had expected. There are many places where there has been over break beyond the saw cut lines and left the area jagged and irregular.

If Aurora Town would be open to suggestions offered by you and Sterling to require their contractor to make effective repair, you should move right out and assist them by some field inspections, lab testing, etc., that would identify reasonable actions to optimize the pavement surface repairs and ensure a quality surface for their main street.

You can honestly represent that reconstruction and/or overlaying of their main street, with state funds, is definitely in the long-range program. Their street is not currently even on the State Highway System. They cannot count on UDOT to move in and rescue a lousy utility backfill.

If the City and/or contractor are not open to suggestions, then you may wish to advise them that we would expect them to be responsible for the condition of the trench for three years, the same as we require on our permitting.

We should seek to help the city make a competent analysis of their situation if they are open to discussion. I am sure you and Sterling's joint effort to help them obtain a good measure of performance from their contractor will be appreciated.

HHR/jbl

cc: Sterling Davis, District Three Director
Clint Topham, Director of Planning

10-6

Relating
to 5470
to 260

RECEIVED

Memorandum

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
94 APR -8 A8:35



UTAH STATE
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
CENTRAL RECORDS

DATE: April 5, 1994

TO : H.H. Richardson, P.E.
Assistant Director

FROM : Dan F. Nelson, P.E. *Dan F. Nelson*
Southern Region Director

SUBJECT : Aurora Main Street

In reference to the letter written to you yesterday by Sterling Davis about taking this county road on the State system, I agree with Sterling and his concerns. In addition, that portion through the City of Aurora has problems which may be resolved by the contractor when the sewer project is complete; however, I would hope that the material that has been used for back filling of the excavated areas will be replaced. The top 10 or 12 inches should be granular untreated base course, rather than the existing material which appears to have a high percentage of plastic properties. Otherwise, I am afraid the surface, when it is patched, may rut or shove as it currently does each time it becomes wet.

I realize it is the local jurisdiction's responsibility to approve the contractor's completed project, but with the prospect of the State taking over this section of highway, I feel we need to be involved in the final inspection and acceptance. If you concur, I would be happy to work with Sterling and provide support personnel from construction in conjunction with maintenance forces to assist in evaluating the final product. Please let us know if you agree with this at your convenience.

- cc: Sterling Davis, P.E.
- Robert Fox, Chief, Right of Way Division
- James Nelson, Utilities Engineer
- Gene Mendenhall, Sevier County Commissioner
- Lawrence Mason, Aurora Mayor
- Darwin Hunt, Region Construction Engineer