

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

PROJECT INFORMATION

2018-6: Spring Creek Parkway, Providence City, new road segment

FINAL CTAC SCORING RECOMMENDATION

Congestion Score	Advance Corridor Preservation Score	Safety Score	Final CTAC Scoring Criteria Score
15 Possible	9 Possible	15 Possible	39 Possible
10	0	0	10

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 has minor deficiencies. Correct prior to CCCOG recommendation.

Initial other findings, observations and technical considerations:

- No pavement design (required by COG policy for new road construction).
- No opinion of probable cost

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 Project Eligibility Review

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

**CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
CACHE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

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.

Project: 2018-6 Providence Spring Creek Parkway
New road segment

Project Eligibility Review

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

Project has minor deficiencies. Correct prior to CCCOG recommendation.

Additional Findings and Technical Considerations:

- 1) No pavement design (required by COG policy for full depth reconstruction).
- 2) No opinion of probable cost
- 3)
- 4)
- 5)
- 6)

Detailed reviews provided by consulting engineer attached.

Cache County Council of Governments (COG)

Project Oversight & Cache County Stewardship Memo

Project Name: Spring Creek Crossing West (100 West)

Project Sponsor: Providence City

Memo is to include 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"*

Application and Plan Set Checklist

- Verify that plans are to 90% design for construction projects and 30% for ROW only projects (if engineering is required).*

90% Comments:

1. What material QC/QA testing frequency and requirements will be followed for construction? Utah APWA or other?
2. No specifications or measurement & payment documentation has been provided.
3. No Opinion of Probable Cost provided.
4. A typical section needs to be provided showing material thicknesses and side slopes grades.
5. Survey Control Points are not shown
6. Horizontal control for the roadway is needed.
7. CU501 – Detail 2: Geotextile fabric should be used to prevent sediment transfer.

- Provide a sampling (spot check) review of the design. Check if something is being oversized or undersized (e.g. retaining walls, pipes, culverts, etc).*

Sampling Review Comments:

1. Side slopes seem steep (3:1). Especially adjacent to the pond.
2. Verify existing elevations that the roadway is tying into on the ends. The profile makes it appear questionable.
3. Has a wetland delineation taken place? Have environmental permits been acquired for the wetland, pond and stream impacts?

- Verify that project has been designed, reviewed and stamped by licensed professional engineers.*

PE Verification Comments:

1. Plans appear to have been reviewed and stamped by a PE.

Verify what design standard is being followed and that it is being met. A minimum is to adhere to Cache County road standards.

Design Standard Comments:

1. It appears that Providence City Standards are referenced in the drawings.
2. Horizontal alignment appears to meet minimum requirement for 35 mph design speed.

Review geotechnical report/pavement design.

Geotechnical/Pavement Design Comments:

1. Was a geotechnical report/pavement design completed?

Review structural design.

Structural Review Comments:

1. None

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.*

Eligibility Comments:

1. Need detailed cost estimates with items included in the costs, including right-of-way, etc. to complete a verification of eligible items.
2. The application lists sidewalk and ADA ramps as a betterment, which could be eligible items.

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*

OPC Comments:

1. No OPC was provided.

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.

ROW Comments:

1. The county records show a 66-foot right-of-way owned by Providence City.
2. Are the slope easements being paid for by the project? If so, what quantity?

- a. Would the slope easements be considered an eligible item? Per the wording in the COG manual they would not be.

Recommendations:

1. A detailed Opinion of Probable Cost needs to be provided before a project recommendation can be provided.
2. Environmental permitting needs to be completed for this project.