CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (COG)  
CACHE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC)

PROJECT INFORMATION

2018-1: 800 West-Right of Way Acquisition, Cache County

FINAL CTAC SCORING RECOMMENDATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congestion Score</th>
<th>Advance Corridor Preservation Score</th>
<th>Safety Score</th>
<th>Final CTAC Scoring Criteria Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Possible</td>
<td>9 Possible</td>
<td>15 Possible</td>
<td>39 Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INITIAL APPLICATION/PLAN REVIEW FINDINGS

Technical Review for CCCOG Applications: This review has been provided by the CMPO, County staff, and consulting engineers (CRS & JUB Engineers) to determine the eligibility and outline technical considerations for each project. All reviews are done to maintain compliance with the Local Transportation Funds Program Manual and best engineering and transportation practices.

Initial application/plan review determination: Project Appears to meet all COG requirements

Initial other findings, observations and technical considerations:

- There are no construction or slope easements identified
- It may make sense to obtain utility easement (this would also cover construction/slope easement)
- Consult attached project engineering memo for other minor issues

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REVIEW

Applicants were given an opportunity to provide additional information in response to the initial review findings.

Subsequent staff review determination: Project Appears to meet all COG requirements

- Information provided by applicant adequately responded to all substantial and minor issues identified (see attached applicant response memo and plan/documentation updates at http://cachempo.org/?page_id=1731).

Final Core Eligibility Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regionally Significant Transportation Facility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial, Collector, or Logan-Cache Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot Improvement ($200,000 Limit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Set Aside (Outside MPO Boundaries)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included within the CMPO Transportation Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Jurisdictional Letters of Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Road or full depth reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Design for Construction Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% Design for Right-of-Way Projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Cost Estimate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bids, Opinion of Probable Cost, non-COG betterments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 2, 2018

COG/CMPO
179 North Main
Logan UT 84321

To Whom it may concern,

I have been asked to respond to the findings of the technical committee regarding Cache County’s right of way (ROW) purchase plan on 800 West near Nibley. The only finding was the observation that construction and slope easements had not been considered in the ROW purchase. In talking with the leadership at the county the proposed plan adjustment is to try to purchase a utility easement along with the ROW purchase with the current requested funds.

Hopefully, this resolves all concerns and makes this a better project.

If there are any other concerns or clarifications please feel free to contact me at (435) 755-1639.

Sincerely,

Jonathan D. Bingham, P.E.
Cache County Engineer
CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
CACHE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Technical Review for CCOG Applications: This review has been provided by the CMPO, County staff, and consulting engineers (CRS & JUB Engineers) to determine the eligibility and outline technical considerations for each project. All reviews are done to maintain compliance with the Local Transportation Funds Program Manual and best engineering and transportation practices.

Project: 2018-1 800 West
Right-of-Way Acquisition

Project Eligibility Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regionally Significant Transportation Facility Arterial, Collector, or Logan-Cache Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot Improvement ($200,000 Limit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Set Aside (Outside MPO Boundaries)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included within the CMPO Transportation Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Jurisdictional Letters of Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Design New Road or full depth reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% Design for Construction Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% Design for Right-of-Way Projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Cost Estimate Bids, Opinion of Probable Cost, non-COG betterments</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project meets all requirements.**

Additional Findings and Technical Considerations:
1) There are no construction or slope easements identified.
2) It may make sense to obtain utility easement (this would also cover construction/slope easement.
3)
4)
5)
6)

Detailed reviews provided by consulting engineer attached.
July 23, 2018

Jeff Gilbert
Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization
379 North Main, Suite 300
Logan, Utah 84321

Re: Cache County 800 West COG Application Review

Dear Jeff:

This memo is a summary of our review of the Cache County 800 West Right of Way (ROW) submittal for COG funding. The review procedure followed the steps outlined in the attached Checklist. A significant portion of the checklist applies to Construction projects and did not apply to the review of this ROW submittal.

Project Eligibility

The project is identified on UDOT's Functional Classification Map. Roads shown on this map are considered regionally significant roads as required to submit for COG funding. This project is identified on the Cache County Regional Transportation plan as a Phase 1 project. The project does cross multiple jurisdictions, but letters of support have been provided from each City. Based on our review, the project appears to meet the eligibility requirements necessary for COG funding.

Plan-Set Review

After a review of the submitted ROW application and plan-set for 800 West in Cache County, we feel the packet meets the 30% design requirement. The request is for an expansion of the existing varying width right of way to the County's current standard of 66 feet along approximately 2600 feet of roadway near 2200 South. It should be noted that no construction or slope easements have been considered and may be required. It appears that property acquisition has been limited to the County’s standard 66-foot ROW and no full property “takes” are required. Therefore, in our opinion only eligible ROW purchases have been applied for and no relocation costs would be required for this application.

Opinion of Probable Cost Review

The cost associated with acquiring ROW has been broken out for each property. Cost appear to be reasonable for ROW acquisition. The application shows a match of $27,300, which is 7 percent of the total $390,000.00 estimated cost of the project. No relocation costs or betterments are requested as part of this application.
Sincerely,
CRS Engineers

Max Pierce, P.E.
Project Manager
(435) 374-4670
max.pierce@crsengineers.com
Cache County Council of Governments (COG)

Project Oversight & Cache County Stewardship Assistance

Consultant Scope Checklist

PROJECT NAME: Cache County 800 West

PROJECT SPONSOR: Cache County

Definitions:

- Project Sponsor – A city or county government who has applied for COG funding. In the case of multiple agencies submitting a combined application it would be the lead sponsor.
- Oversight Consultant – A consultant selected by Cache County to provide an oversight review of a project funded by the COG and to provide support to the COG staff.
- Sponsor Consultant – A consultant selected by the Project Sponsor to design and/or provide construction engineering management services for a project funded by the COG.
- Betterment – should we define it here or just later?

Project Application Screening

The project application and plan set review is to help COG staff and COG members ensure that application and plans are complete and meet COG standards as provided in the Local Transportation Fund Program Manual (see http://cachempo.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Local-Transportation-Funds-Program-Manual-2018-Executive-Committee-Approved.pdf).

Application and Buildable Plan-set Checklist

☑ Verify that plans are to 90% design for construction projects and 30% for ROW only projects (if engineering is required).
☐ Provide a sampling (spot check) review of the design. Check if something is being oversized or undersized (e.g. retaining walls, pipes, culverts, etc).
☐ Verify that project has been designed, reviewed and stamped by licensed professional engineers.
☐ Verify what design standard is being followed and that it is being met. A minimum is to adhere to Cache County road standards.
☐ Review geotechnical report/pavement design.
☐ Review structural design.
Review eligible versus non-eligible costs.

- Verify that the betterments have been correctly identified.
- Eligible items include:
  - All roadway construction activities that are associated with constructing the roadway pavement section (including bike lanes).
  - Any required utility system relocations (does not include utility upgrades or improvements).
  - Sidewalks or shared use paths (within same project limits and contribute to transportation function).
  - Road right-of-way purchase (limited to width needed for road pavement and sidewalks or pathways).
  - Drainage system improvements (required as a result of the project, but does not include curb and gutter).
  - Residential or business relocation costs required by roadway improvement (requires approval of the COG Executive Committee on a case-by-case basis at time of application).
  - Roadway safety elements (e.g. guardrail, signals, cross-walks, signage and pavement marking etc).
  - Site environmental cleanup or remediation costs will be considered on a case-by-case basis by the COG Executive Committee for eligibility.

- Non-eligible items include (to be considered a betterment):
  - Curb, gutter or decorative landscaping (beyond that required for soil stabilization with native seeding).
  - Right of way cost beyond that needed to accommodate the actual road cross-section (the local jurisdiction must pay the cost difference of remnant property or full property “takes”).
  - Project design or COG application development costs.
  - Utility system upgrades.
  - Roadway lighting.

Review Opinion of Probable Cost.

- Verify that betterments are broken out separately.
- Verify that necessary project costs are accounted for, including but not limited to:
  - Construction costs
  - Utility relocations
  - ROW acquisitions and easements
- Design Engineering (applicable as match)
- Construction Engineering Management services
- Permitting
- Project Sponsor cost match

☑ Review right-of-way (ROW) needs and process.

☑ Verify appropriate amount of ROW width being acquired for construction.

☑ Review full takes and partial takes being acquired and verify what portion of it will be needed for the project. Verify that the additional amount is included as a betterment.

☑ Verify that the ROW is consistent with the COG ROW purchase policy (see COG program manual).

☐ Verify that relocation costs have been approved by the County Executive Committee.

Deliverables:

☑ One DRAFT application/plan review memo for each project with a list of concerns/recommendations based on checklist items. In addition, the draft memo should provide the following:

1. Professional opinion of issues related to the overall functionality of the design.
2. Professional opinion of the project independent utility (if part of a phased project)
3. Professional opinion as to design elements that fail to incorporate “best design practices”.