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

PROJECT INFORMATION
2018-7: 3200 South/Hwy 165, Nibley, Right-of-way acquisition for intersection realignment

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>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</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 has minor deficiencies. Correct prior to CCCOG recommendation.

Initial other findings, observations and technical considerations:
- Concerned with multiple, close proximity, non 4-legged roundabouts.
- Unsure of how the north roundabout will function with the close proximity of the bridge, Maverick access, and the existing horizontal and vertical alignments.
- UDOT needs to be consulted as to the proximity of the new 3200 South access with 3011 South. Past discussions have indicated that a closure of 3100 South may be required.
- 3100 South is a County Road and no letter has been submitted by the County. Additionally, changes to this road may have an adverse impact to Millville City.
- No construction or slope easements are included.

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).
- Applicant indicated that project is 10 or more years from construction and they are seeking the CTAC points for “advanced corridor preservation”. Therefore, these points were awarded by the CTAC. However, this project will not be eligible for additional construction COG funds until the year 2028.
- Applicant indicated that the final configuration of the realignment has yet to be determined and will be reassessed at time of final project design. This may present a timing issue depending on when the final design will be completed (given the project is not expected to be constructed for 10 year and any design completed now would be outdated).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Project Eligibility Review</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regionally Significant Transportation Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included within the CMPO Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Jurisdictional Letters of Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% Design for Right-of-Way Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Cost Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bids, Opinion of Probable Cost, non-COG betterments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTEROFFICE MEMO

DATE      July 31, 2018
FROM      Shaun Dustin, Mayor
TO        CCCOG & CTAC

SUBJECT   Nibley 3200 South Realignment Right-of-Way Project

This memo is being provided in response to requests for additional information from the Cache Technical Advisory Committee regarding Nibley’s COG application for right-of-way acquisition funds for the 3200 South realignment project.

First, Nibley would like to clarify that this project is an Advanced Corridor Preservation project. Nibley does not anticipate constructing this project within the next ten years. Therefore, the project is eligible for Advanced Corridor Preservation points.

Next, we would like to address the specific requests for more information. Several of the questions were related to construction of the project. Considering that this project is more than a decade away from construction and has only been designed to 30%, these questions cannot be resolved until we have a final design. The purpose of the 30% design is to identify the maximum right-of-way requirements in order to determine what needs to be acquired to preserve the real estate for the future project. When the project gets designed to 90%, prior to construction, all of those questions will be answered. Nevertheless, the following are our current opinions about the questions.

In reference to the question about the non-4-legged roundabouts, the roundabout on the south end is not proposed to be constructed initially. The intent is to show the maximum intersection ROW requirement, not a specific intersection design. The actual intersection design will be dependent on actual conditions at the time of construction, which may include a simple curve, a 3-way intersection, or a 4-way intersection.

The north roundabout, at 3100 South, may or may not end up being a roundabout as well. Once the project proceeds to a higher level of design, there will be a determination of whether or not that intersection will be a roundabout or a standard intersection. This response also applies to the question about the proximity of that roundabout to the 3100 South bridge. Final design will incorporate mitigation for concerns about sight lines, proximity and horizontal and vertical curves.

The COG previously funded a study of this intersection realignment, which was conducted by Civil Solutions Group in 2014. The final study can be found at this link: http://nibleycity.com/images/homepage/2014/Nibley_Intersection_Concept_Report_Final_Draft.pdf This study addressed the challenges that were raised by CRS in relation to
how the 3100 South intersection would need to be addressed after extending 3200 South east across SR 165. Civil Solutions and Nibley had conversation with UDOT as part of that study and discussed several options for that intersection, including closing it, making it right-in-right-out only, or making it a full four-legged intersection. Although those options have been discussed, the final plan would not be determined until final design.

Another question that was raised in relation to Nibley’s application was the relocation cost related to the full take of one home in this alignment. It is not known at this time whether or not relocation costs would be necessary, however, Nibley is planning for the total possible cost at this time and would therefore request those funds be authorized. Nibley has already successfully purchased the other two homes along this alignment without the need to pay relocation costs. If those costs are not necessary with the purchase of this third home, they will not be used and will not be requested from the COG.

Nibley is in the process of securing a support letter from Cache County in relation to their ownership of 3100 South.

If slope or constructions easements are necessary, that will be determined in final design and they would be acquired at that time.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

cc: Jim Gass
    Jeff Gilbert
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project: 2018-7 Nibley 3200 South Right-of-Way Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Project Eligibility Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regionally Significant Transportation Facility</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial, Collector, or Logan-Cache Airport</td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Cost Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bids, Opinion of Probable Cost, non-COG betterments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Project has minor deficiencies. Correct prior to CCCOG recommendation.*

Additional Findings and Technical Considerations:

1) Concerned with multiple, close proximity, non 4-legged roundabouts.
2) Unsure of how the north roundabout will function with the close proximity of the bridge, Maverick access, and the existing horizontal and vertical alignments.
3) UDOT needs to be consulted as to the proximity of the new 3200 South access with 3011 South. Past discussions have indicated that a closure of 3100 South may be required.
4) Requires a relocation of a full property take.
5) 3100 South is a County Road and no letter has been submitted by the County. Additionally, changes to this road may have an adverse impact to Millville City.
6) No construction or slope easements are included.

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

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

Re: Nibley 3200 South COG Application Review

Dear Jeff:

This memo is a summary of our review of the Nibley 3200 South 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 application states, this project was identified on UDOT’s Functional Classification Map. However, the roadway is not shown on UDOT’s map, but connects two roads that are identified on the UDOT map. However, the roadway does meet the four other requirements identified to be considered a “regionally significant transportation facility”. The project is also identified in Phase 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan.

Although it appears that there are errors on the submitted application, 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 3200 South in Nibley City, we feel the packet meets the 30% design requirement. The request is for a new 80 foot right of way which meets Nibley City’s arterial street standard. The ROW is for a new road which will connect 3200 South and Mill Road. This road is shown in both Nibley City’s and CMPO’s Regional Transportation Master Plans. It appears that property acquisition has been limited to the 80-foot ROW and full property “takes” have been separated from the ROW acquisition. Therefore, in our opinion only eligible ROW purchases have been applied for and no relocation costs would be required for this application. However, it should be noted that no construction or slope easements have been included in this application, but may be required for construction of the roadway.

Opinion of Probable Cost Review

The cost associated with acquiring ROW has been broken out for each property. Although full property “takes” were required on two properties, the City did not include these costs in the
application. Unit costs appear to be reasonable for ROW acquisition. Nibley City is proposing a 7 percent cash contribution of $31,787 of the total $454,100 estimated cost of the project.

The $30,000 cost associated with relocation of one homeowner will need to be reviewed by the County Executive Committee as outlined on the attached checklist.

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: Nibley 3200 South

PROJECT SPONSOR: Nibley City

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”.