

Resolution 02-02-2018

A RESOLUTION OF THE SANTAQUIN CITY COUNCIL TO APPROVE AN INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT WITH UTAH COUNTY FOR EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROTECTION (EWP)

WHEREAS in the summer of 2018, a there was a major wildfire in the mountainous area east of Santaquin that began on property managed by the U.S. Forest Service, a division of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), which resulted in burned over conditions in the watershed areas leading into Santaquin City; and


WHEREAS Santaquin City, a political subdivision of the State of Utah, shares responsibility with Utah County, also a political subdivision of the State of Utah, to protect the public health and welfare of the community from water and debris flows coming out of the canyons, which risk has been dramatically increased as a result of the burned over conditions; and

WHEREAS, Utah County is taking lead in working with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), a division of the USDA, on behalf of all of the affected Cities and County Areas within Utah County to jointly obtain funding to provide for Emergency Watershed Protection in our region; and


WHEREAS, to share in the cost of the "local match" requirements of said funding, Utah County and Santaquin City desire now to enter into the attached Interlocal Agreement; and

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Santaquin Council to approve the attached Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for Emergency Watershed Protection.


ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Santaquin City Council, this 5th day of February, 2019.



Attest


Susan B. Farnsworth, City Recorder

SANTAQUIN CITY


Kirk F. Hunsaker, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AN INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT WITH SANTAQUIN CITY RELATED TO THE EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Utah Interlocal Cooperation Act, Title 11, Chapter 13, Utah Code (2018), permits local governmental units including cities, counties, and political subdivision of the State of Utah, to enter into written agreements with one another for joint or cooperative action; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Utah County, Utah has determined that it is in the public interest and welfare of the residents of Utah County that Utah County engage in a cooperative effort with Santaquin City related to the Emergency Watershed Program; and

WHEREAS, Utah County and Santaquin City will establish and enter into an Agreement for the design and construction of mitigation features related to the Bald Mountain and Pole Creek Fires which occurred during September 2018, and any and all other terms and purposes as defined in the Interlocal Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement has been prepared for approval and execution by and between all parties.


NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Utah County, Utah, that the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement Between Utah County and Santaquin City as attached hereto, is hereby accepted and approved, and authorizes the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners of Utah County, Utah, to execute and the County Clerk/Auditor to

attest to the execution of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for and on behalf of Utah County.

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its approval and adoption by the Board of County Commissioners of Utah County, Utah.

RESOLVED AND ORDERED this 19 day of ^{Month}~~January~~ 2019.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
UTAH COUNTY, UTAH



WILLIAM C. LEE, Chairman

ATTEST:
AMELIA A. POWERS
Utah County Clerk/Auditor

By: 

Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:
DAVID O. LEAVITT
Utah County Attorney

By: 

Deputy Utah County Attorney

INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN UTAH COUNTY AND SANTAQUIN CITY RELATED TO THE EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROGRAM

THIS IS AN INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT made and entered into the 19th day of March, 2019 by and between Utah County, a political subdivision of the State of Utah, hereinafter referred to as County, and Santaquin City, a political subdivision of the State of Utah, hereinafter referred to as Entity.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Utah Interlocal Cooperation Act, Title 11, Chapter 13, Utah Code Annotated (2018), permits local governmental units including cities, counties, and political subdivisions of the State of Utah to make the most efficient use of their powers by enabling them to cooperate with other public entities on the basis of mutual advantage and to exercise joint cooperative action for the benefit of their respective citizens;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Act, the parties desire to work together through joint and cooperative action that will benefit the residents of Entity and County; and

WHEREAS, the parties to this Agreement are public agencies as defined in the Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties do mutually agree, pursuant to the terms and provisions of this Agreement as follows:

Section 1. EFFECTIVE DATE; DURATION.

This Agreement shall become effective as of the date the parties execute this Agreement by Resolution and it is filed with the keeper of records of each of the parties (the "Effective Date"). The term of this Agreement shall be from the Effective Date until completion of the design and construction of mitigation features related to the Bald Mountain and Pole Creek Fires which occurred during September 2018, but not to be longer than 20 years from the Effective Date.

Section 2. NO SEPARATE LEGAL ENTITY.

The parties to this Agreement do not contemplate nor intend to establish a separate legal entity under the terms of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement. The parties agree that pursuant to Utah Code section 11-13-207 the County, shall act as the administrator responsible for the administration of this Agreement. The parties further agree that this Agreement does not anticipate nor provide for any organizational changes in the parties. The administrator agrees to keep all books and records in such form and manner as the Utah County Clerk/Auditor shall specify and further agrees that said books shall be open for examination by the parties at all reasonable times.

Section 3. PURPOSES.

This Agreement has been established and entered into between the County and Entity for the design and construction of mitigation features related to the Bald Mountain and Pole Creek Fires which occurred during September 2018. These mitigation features are outlined in a Damage Survey Report prepared by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) as part of an application for funding under the Emergency Watershed Program (EWP).

Section 4. PARTIES RESPONSIBILITIES.

1. COUNTY shall:

- Act as the sponsor for the EWP projects under NRCS
- Execute a contract with the design consultant for the mitigation features requested by ENTITY as outlined in Damage Survey Report 5122-001 as shown in Exhibit "A"
- Reimburse ENTITY 75% of the eligible construction costs of the feature upon receipt of funds from NRCS as outlined in Exhibit "B". Payment shall be made to ENTITY within 30 days of receipt of funds from NRCS.

2. ENTITY shall:

- Provide a written request to utilize the design consultant retained by COUNTY
- Provide written acceptance or denial of the design within 14 calendar days of

receipt of final construction drawings.

- Execute a contract for the construction of the proposed feature
- Acquire the land and/ or easements for the proposed mitigation features requested by Santaquin City
- Reimburse COUNTY for any design costs not covered by NRCS funds

Section 5. METHOD OF TERMINATION.

This Agreement will automatically terminate at the end of its term herein, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph one (1) of this Agreement. Prior to the automatic termination at the end of the term of this Agreement, any party to this Agreement may terminate the Agreement sixty (60) days after providing written notice of termination to the other parties. The Parties of this Agreement agree to bring current, prior to termination, any financial obligation contained herein.

Section 6. INDEMNIFICATION.

The Entity and the County are governmental entities and subject to the Governmental Immunity Act of Utah, Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-7-101, et seq. (GIAU). Subject to the provisions of the GIAU, the Entity and County agree to indemnify and hold harmless the other party, its agents, officers and employees from and against any and all actions, claims, lawsuits, proceedings, liability, damages, losses and expenses (including attorney's fees and costs) arising out of or resulting from the performance of this Agreement to the extent the same are caused by any negligent or wrongful act or omission of that party, its officers, agents or employees. Nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed a waiver of any rights, statutory limitations on liability, or defenses applicable to the Entity or the County under the GIAU.

Section 7. FILING OF INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT.

Executed copies of this Agreement shall be placed on file in the office of the County Clerk/Auditor of Utah County and with the official keeper of records of Entity, and shall remain on file for public inspection during the term of this Agreement.

Section 8. ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS

This Agreement shall be (a) approved by Resolution of the governing body of each of the parties, (b) executed by a duly authorized official of each of the parties (c) submitted to and approved by an Authorized Attorney of each of the parties, as required by Utah Code section 11-13-202.5, and (d) filed in the official records of each party.

Section 9. AMENDMENTS.

This Agreement may not be amended, changed, modified, or altered except by an instrument in writing which shall be: (a) approved by Resolution of the governing body of each of the parties, (b) executed by a duly authorized official of each of the parties, and (c) filed in the official records of each party.

Section 10. SEVERABILITY.

To the extent permitted by applicable law, the parties hereby waive any provision of law that would render any of the terms of this Agreement unenforceable. If any term or provision of this Agreement or its application shall be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement shall not be affected, and shall be enforced to the extent permitted by law.

Section 11. NO PRESUMPTION.

Should any provision of this Agreement require judicial interpretation, the Court interpreting or construing the same shall not apply a presumption that the terms will be more strictly construed against the party, by reason of the rule of construction that a document is to be construed more strictly against the person who himself or through his agents prepared the same, it being acknowledged that each of the parties have participated in the preparation hereof.

Section 12. HEADINGS.

Headings are for convenience and reference only and shall not be considered any interpretation of the Agreement.

Section 13. BINDING AGREEMENT.

This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, administrators, and assigns of each of the parties hereto.

Section 14. NOTICES.

All notices, demands, and other communications required or permitted to be given shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been properly given if delivered by hand or by certified mail, return receipt requested, postage paid, to the parties at their addresses first above written, or at such other addresses as may be designated by notice given hereunder.

Section 15. ASSIGNMENT.

The parties to this Agreement shall not assign this Agreement, or any part hereof, without the prior written consent of all other parties to this Agreement. No assignment shall relieve the original parties from any liability hereunder.

Section 16. GOVERNING LAW

All questions with respect to the construction of this Agreement, and the rights and liability of the parties hereto, shall be governed by the laws of the State of Utah.


[Signature on Following Page]

UTAH COUNTY


Authorized by Resolution No. 2019-30, authorized and passed on the 19 day of

March, 2019.


BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

By: 
William C. Lee, Chairman

ATTEST: AMELIA A. POWERS
Utah County Clerk/Auditor


By: 
Deputy County Clerk/Auditor


APPROVED AS TO FORM AND COMPATIBILITY
WITH THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF UTAH:
DAVID O. LEAVITT, Utah County Attorney

By: 
Deputy County Attorney


SANTAQUIN CITY

Authorized by Resolution No. 02-02-2019, authorized and passed on the 5 day of February, 2019.

By: 
Mayor

ATTEST: 
City Recorder

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND COMPATIBILITY
WITH THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF UTAH:

By: 
S. Junior Baker, City Attorney




EXHIBIT "A"

**DAMAGE SURVEY REPORT (DSR)
 Emergency Watershed Protection Program – Recovery**

Section 1A

Date of Report: 12/17/2018

DSR Number: 5122-001

Project Number:

NRCS Entry Only

Eligible: Yes

Approved:

Funding Priority Number: 2c

Limited Resource Area: No

Section 1B Sponsor Information

Sponsor Name: UTAH, COUNTY OF

Address: 100 E CENTER RM 3600

City/State/Zip: PROVO, UT 84606

Telephone Number: 8018518233

Fax: 8018518232

Section 1C Site Location Information

County: Utah

State: Utah (49)

Congressional District: District 03 (Utah 3rd Congressional District)

Latitude: 39.9983

Longitude: -111.7394

Section: 29

Township: T0090S

Range: 0020E0

UTM Coordinates: UTM Zone 12

Drainage Name: Beer Creek-Frontal Utah Lake

Reach:

Damage Description: High Sediment and debris flows due to post fire storm event, threatened several homes and streets. Proposed silt fences and geobrugg.

Section 1D Site Evaluation

All answers in this Section must be YES in order to be eligible for EWP assistance.

Site Eligibility	Yes	No	Remarks
Damage was a result of a natural disaster?	x		Wildfire was started due to lightning strike in early September which burned over 120,000 acres.
Recovery measures would be for runoff retardation or soil erosion prevention?	x		Extreme debris flow hazard throughout fire area, proposed measures would help prevent erosion and protect resource values.
Threat to life and/or property?	x		4 communities were evacuated due to threat of encroaching wildfire.
Event caused a sudden impairment in the watershed?*	x		The fire has denuded the watershed.
Imminent threat was created by this event?	x		Post fire threat of debris flows, erosion, spring water contamination.
For structural repairs, not repaired twice within ten years?	x		N/A
Site Defensibility			
Economic, environmental, and social documentation adequate to warrant action	x		Approximately 12 communities within the fire perimeter and surrounding area with utilities, springs, county roads, and highways.

DSR NO: 5122-001

Proposed action technically viable?	x	Using NRCS Specifications per NHCP and NEM.
-------------------------------------	---	---

Have all the appropriate steps been taken to ensure that all segments of the affected population have been informed of the EWP Program and its possible effects? Yes

Comments: NRCS representatives met with members of USFS BAER team, Utah Co. Emergency Manager and Public Works, Congressman Curtis, county commissioners, and Mayors of affected cities to assess damage and possible protection work. Field assessments were conducted with Utah County Public Works and Utah County Emergency Manager, community representatives, and affected canal company and water users association personal.

* Statutory

** Regulation

*** DSR Pages 3 through 5 are required to support the decisions recorded on this summary page. If additional space is needed on this or any other page in this form, add appropriate pages

Section 1E Proposed Action

Describe the preferred alternative from Findings: Section 5 A: 1. Approx. 2600 LF silt/debris fencing; 2. Sediment removal in East Side Park basin; 3. 2 geobruggs; 4. Debris and sediment removal in Santaquin Canyon basin; 5. Grade stabilization structure at City pipeline crossing in Summit Creek; 6. Approx. 3-5 bank stabilization sites along Summit Creek.

Total installation cost identified in this DSR: Section 3: \$3,350,220

Section 1F NRCS State Office Review and Approval

Reviewed By: BRNISON SMART
State EWP Program Manager

Date Reviewed: 12/17/2018

Approved By: TIMOTHY
WILSON
State Conservationist

Date Approved: 12/17/2018

PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENT

NOTE: The following statement is made in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, (5 U.S.C. 552a) and the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, as amended. The authority for requesting the following information is 7 CFR 624 (EWP) and Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, Public Law 81-516, 33 U.S.C. 701b-1; and Section 403 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978, Public Law 95334, as amended by Section 382, of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, Public Law 104-127, 16 U.S.C. 2203. EWP, through local sponsors, provides emergency measures for runoff retardation and erosion control to areas where a sudden impairment of a watershed threatens life or property. The Secretary of Agriculture has delegated the administration of EWP to the Chief or NRCS on state, tribal and private lands.

Signing this form indicates the sponsor concurs and agrees to provide the regional cost-share to implement the EWP recovery measure(s) determined eligible by NRCS under the terms and conditions of the program authority. Failure to provide a signature will result in the applicant being unable to apply for or receive a grant the applicable program authorities. Once signed by the sponsor, this information may not be provided to other agencies, IRS, Department of Justice, or other State or Federal Law Enforcement agencies, and in response to a court or administrative tribunal.

The provisions of criminal and civil fraud statutes, including 18 U.S.C. 286, 287, 371, 641, 651, 1001; 15 U.S.C. 714m; and 31 U.S.C. 3729 may also be applicable to the information provided. According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0578-0030. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 117/1.96 minutes/hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, field reviews, gathering, designing, and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection information.

USDA NONDISCRIMINATION STATEMENT

"The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202)720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (800)795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Civil Rights Statement of Assurance

The program or activities conducted under this agreement will be in compliance with the nondiscrimination provisions contained in the Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-259); and other nondiscrimination statutes: namely, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title IX of the Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. They will also be in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture (7 CFR 15, 15a, and 15b), which provide that no person in the United States shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age or disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture or any agency thereof.

Section 2 Environmental Evaluation

2A Resource Concerns	2B Existing Condition	2C Alternative Designation		
		Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative
		1. Approx. 2600 LF silt/debris fencing; 2. Sediment removal in East Side Park basin; 3. 2 geobruggs; 4. Debris and sediment removal in Santaquin Canyon basin; 5. Grade stabilization structure at City pipeline crossing in Summit Creek; 6. Approx. 3-5 bank stabilization sites along Summit Creek.	Utah County and affected communities will deal with affects from fire and current/future floods as best they can within their existing budgets. Risks include, but are not limited to, debris flows, sedimentation, scour, erosion, landslides, and flooding off the burn scar for the next 5 years or more. Communities would attempt to recover with the limited funds available to them. Conditions may continue to degrade and worsen.	
2D Effects of Alternatives				
Soil				
Soil Erosion - Classic Gully Erosion	Denuded Watershed with very steep slopes = Extreme runoff and erosion	Installation of silt fencing and geobrugg will control gully erosion, thus reducing downstream debris flows and sedimentation.	Scour and grade control will increase risk of gully erosion.	x
Soil Erosion - Streambank, Shoreline, Water Conveyance Channels	Denuded Watershed = High runoff and erosion.	Stream banks will be armored to control accelerated streambank erosion, thus protecting downstream sedimentation.	Streambank erosion will continue to occur until re-vegetation occurs to stabilize streambanks	x
Water				
Water Quality Degradation - Excessive Sediment in Surface Water	Due to impaired watershed conditions excessive sediment and debris may damage culinary springs and other water bodies.	Erosion control measures will reduce erosion and sedimentation, thus improving water quality.	Without protection measures excessive runoff and flooding will be excessive until vegetation is established	x
Excess Water - Runoff, Flooding, or Ponding	Excessive runoff due to watershed impairment.	Silt fencing and removing sediment and debris from existing structures to restore capacity will attenuate	Sediment loading will continue until vegetation is established	x

		runoff and reduce flooding and ponding.		
Air				
Air Quality Impacts - Emissions of Particulate Matter (PM) and PM Precursors	Dust from impaired watershed slopes with winds, and fugitive dust and emissions during construction.	Areas disturbed during construction will be revegetated to control temporary dust.	Dust, ash, emissions will continue until vegetation on the watershed is established	x
Animal				
Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat - Water	Fish habitat has been severely impaired due to sediment and debris flows from post fire runoff.	Erosion control measures will improve water quality, thus improving and protecting fish habitat.	Habitat will remain diminished until natural regeneration (3-5 years)	x
Other				
	Human life; Serious threats to health and safety due to watershed impairment.	Protection measures will help protect life and property.	Human health and safety will continue to be at severe risk while community tries to recover with limited funds.	x

Section 2E Special Environmental Concerns

Resource Consideration	Existing Condition	Alternatives and Effects		
		Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative
Clean Water Act Waters of the U.S.	Rivers and streams in areas are under threat with excess runoff and debris potential.	Protection measures will reduce excessive runoff and flooding. All state and federal permitting will be acquired prior to construction.	Excess erosion and flooding will continue until natural regeneration occurs.	x
Coastal Zone Management Areas	None present.	N/A	N/A	x
Coral Reefs	None present.	N/A	N/A	x
Cultural Resources	Unknown at this time	Unknown at this time but if EWP funding becomes available APE's will be surveyed for cultural resources and if present will be avoided (preferred) or dealt with as per policy and regulation.	Presence is unknown at this time. Cultural resources may not be considered if there is no federal nexus.	x
Endangered and Threatened Species	IPAC and Utah Conservation Data Center (UCDC) were consulted. IPAC report is attached and noted 1 Mammal, 1 Fish, and 2 Plants T&E species. The report noted no habitat and no critical habitat. The following list from the UCDC lists both T&E and state sensitive species: Payson Lakes quad listed, Ute Ladies' Tresses LT, Smooth Greensnake SPC, Brown (Grizzly) Bear LT (extirpated), Northern Goshawk CS, Bonneville Cutthroat Trout CS, Lewis's Woodpecker SPC, American Three-toed Woodpecker SPC, Bonneville	May effect: Effects will be determined when APE's are defined, and any necessary section 7 consultation will take place prior to construction.	Habitat will continue to be impacted until vegetation reestablishment	x

DSR NO: 5122-001

	Cutthroat Trout CS. And the Santaquin quad listed, Long-billed Curlew SPC, Western Toad SPC, Short-eared Owl SPC, Black Swift SPC.			
Environmental Justice	No environment justice populations present.	N/A	N/A	x
Essential Fish Habitat	Habitat destroyed by fire and flash flooding events that occur after the fire.	Erosion control measures will stabilize stream banks and channels, thus reducing sedimentation, thereby improving water quality and improving fish habitat.	Habitat will continue to be impacted until vegetation and channel reestablishment	x
Fish and Wildlife Coordination	Coordination with USFS, UDWR and USFWS per policy.	Coordination per policy before construction activity.	N/A	x
Floodplain Management	Upper watershed areas impaired due to fire causing high sediment debris flows into downstream flood plains.	Protection measures proposed will help reduce erosion and damaging runoff.	Floodplain remain at risk until re-vegetation	x
Invasive Species	Increased risk due to fire, reduced cover and extreme runoff.	Re-vegetation will increase cover and reduce risk of invasive encroachment. Construction areas will be reseeded to help prevent invasive species encroachment. Construction specifications will require equipment to be cleaned prior to being used on site. Areas disturbed by construction will be reseeded to reduce the chance of invasive species becoming established.	Continued risk of encroachment	x
Migratory Birds	Loss of canopy cover, brush and other ground cover.	If construction activities occur between April 1 and August 31, the project area will be	Short term loss; Long Term - return to normal with re-vegetation	x

DSR NO: 5122-001

		surveyed by a qualified biologist for active nests no more than 5 days prior to the commencement of work. Project impacts on migratory birds is not expected to be adverse. Protection work will help habitat recover more quickly.		
Natural Areas	Not present.	N/A	N/A	x
Prime and Unique Farmlands	Not present.	N/A	N/A	x
Riparian Areas	Areas are burned.	Long term restoration with natural regeneration and some seeding in high intensity burn areas.	Degradation until natural regeneration.	x
Scenic Beauty	Denuded watershed	Views will regenerate with time, reseeding in appropriate areas.	Degradation until natural regeneration.	x
Wetlands	Proposed project areas will be evaluated	Proposed project areas to be evaluated per NRCS policy	No consultation required without construction activity.	x
Wild and Scenic Rivers	Not present.	N/A	N/A	x

Completed By: KATHRYN QUAY

Date: 12/17/2018

DSR NO: 5122-001

Section 2F Economic

This section must be completed by each alternative considered (attach additional sheets as necessary).

	Future Damages (\$)	Damage Factor (%)	Near Term Damage Reduction
Properties Protected (Private)			
30 houses at approximately \$300,000 per house	\$9,000,000.00	50 %	\$4,500,000.00
Properties Protected (Public)			
1.5 miles of loss of aquatic habitat, fish population, angler use. Loss of use, revenue to the community and to restore approximates \$38,000 per mile. Loss of habitat on 1.5 miles of stream.	\$57,000.00	100 %	\$57,000.00
Business Losses			
Other			
Total Near Term Damage Reduction			\$4,557,000
Net Benefit (Total Near Term Damage Reduction minus Cost from Section 3)			\$1,206,780

Completed By: KATHRYN QUAY

Date: 12/17/2018

Section 2G Social Consideration This section must be completed by each alternative considered
 (Attach additional sheets as necessary).

	YES	NO	Remarks
Has there been a loss of life as a result of the watershed impairment?		x	N/A
Is there the potential for loss of life due to damages from the watershed impairment?	x		Severe debris flow hazard from all burned areas due to extreme slopes.
Has access to a hospital or medical facility been impaired by watershed impairment?	x		Due to repeated closures of highways, access to medical facility may have been affected.
Has the community as a whole been adversely impacted by the watershed impairment (life and property ceases to operate in a normal capacity)	x		Entire communities were evacuated for at least one week or more. High risk houses, roads, bridges, and utilities within the burned area and surrounding communities.
Is there a lack or has there been a reduction of public safety due to watershed impairment?	x		Evacuations due to the fire and recent storm events that have caused high sediment and debris flows.

Completed By: KATHRYN QUAY

Date: 12/17/2018

Section 2H Group Representation and Disability Information

This section is completed only for the preferred alternative selected.

Group Representation	Number
American Indian/Alaska Native Female Hispanic	N/A
American Indian/Alaska Native Female Non-Hispanic	0.4
American Indian/Alaska Native Male Hispanic	N/A
American Indian/Alaska Native Male Non-Hispanic	0.4
Asian Female Hispanic	N/A
Asian Female Non-Hispanic	0.8
Asian Male Hispanic	N/A
Asian Male Non-Hispanic	0.8
Black or African American Female Hispanic	N/A
Black or African American Female Non-Hispanic	0.4
Black or African American Male Hispanic	N/A
Black or African American Male Non-Hispanic	0.4
Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander Female Hispanic	N/A
Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander Female Non-Hispanic	0.4
Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander Male Hispanic	N/A
Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander Male Non-Hispanic	0.4
White Female Hispanic	4
White Female Non-Hispanic	44
White Male Hispanic	6
White Male Non-Hispanic	46
Total	100

Census tract(s) <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/utahcountyutah,ut/PST045217>

Completed By: KATHRYN QUAY

Date: 12/17/2018

DSR NO: 5122-001

Section 21. Required consultation or coordination between the lead agency and/or the RFO and another governmental unit including tribes:

Easements, permissions, or permits:
Sponsor for the project will acquire all permits rights of ways and easements.
Mitigation Description:
None anticipated.
Agencies, persons, and references consulted, or to be consulted:
US Forest Service; Bureau of Land Management; Army Corps of Engineers; State Historic Preservation Office; Utah State Stream Alteration Office; Utah County; SITLA; Utah Division of Wildlife Resources; Utah Division of Natural Resources; surrounding community leaders, affected utilities entities.

DSR NO: 5122-001

Section 3 Engineering Cost Estimate

Completed By: KATHRYN QUAY

Date: 12/17/2018

This section must be completed by each alternative considered (attach additional sheets as necessary).

Proposed Recovery Measure (including mitigation)	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost (\$)	Amount (\$)
Mob/Demob	1	LS	\$299,075.00	\$299,075.00
Rock RipRap	165	CY	\$50.00	\$8,250.00
Critical Area Seeding	13	AC	\$550.00	\$7,150.00
Low Water Crossing	1	EA	\$12,500.00	\$12,500.00
Excavation	151265	CY	\$15.00	\$2,268,975.00
Silt/Debris Fences	2600	LF	\$60.00	\$156,000.00
Geobrugg	2	EA	\$20,000.00	\$40,000.00
Contingency	1	LS	\$558,270.00	\$558,270.00
			Total	\$3,350,220

Unit Abbreviations:

AC	Acre	LS	Lump Sum
CY	Cubic Yard	SF	Square Feet
EA	Each	SY	Square Yard
HR	Hour	TN	Ton
LF	Linear Feet		Other (Specify)

DSR NO: 5122-001

Section 4 NRCS EWP Funding Priority

Complete the following section to compute the funding priority for the recovery measures in this application (see instructions on page 10).

Priority Ranking Criteria	Yes	No		Ranking Number Plus Modifier
1. Is this an exigency situation?		x		
2. Is this a site where there is serious, but not immediate threat to human life?	x			
3. Is this a site where buildings, utilities, or other important infrastructure components are threatened?	x			
4. Is this site a funding priority established by the NRCS Chief?	x			
The following are modifiers for the above criteria			Modifier	
a. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve federally-listed threatened and endangered species or critical habitat?				
b. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve cultural sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places?				
c. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve prime or important farmland?				
d. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve existing wetlands?				
e. Will the proposed action or alternatives maintain or improve current water quality conditions?			x	
f. Will the proposed action or alternatives protect or conserve unique habitat, including but not limited to, areas inhabited by State-listed species, fish and wildlife management area, or State identified sensitive habitats?				

Enter priority computation in Section 1A, NRCS Entry, Funding priority number.

Remarks:

Section 5A Findings

Finding: Indicate the preferred alternative from Section 2 (Enter to Section 1E):

I have considered the effects of the action and the alternatives on the Environmental Economic, Social; the Special Environmental Concerns; and the extraordinary circumstances (40 CFR 1508.27). I find for the reasons stated below, that the preferred alternative:

___ Has been sufficiently analyzed in the EWP PEIS (reference all that apply)

Chapter _____

Chapter _____

Chapter _____

Chapter _____

Chapter _____

___ May require the preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

The action will be referred to the NRCS State Office on this date:

NRCS representative of the DSR team

Title: _____ Date: _____

Section 5B Comments:

Section 5C

Sponsor Concurrence:

Sponsor Representative

Title: _____ Date: _____

Section 6 Attachments:

A. Location Map

B. Site Plan or Sketches

C. Other (explain)

DSR NO: 5122-001

Section Attachments

A. Site Location Aerial Map

B. Site Location Damage Photo

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE NRCS-PDM-20, DSR

	Explanation of Requested Item	Who Completes
Section 1	Enter Site Sponsor, Location, Evaluation, Selected Alternative, and Reviewed and Approval Signatures.	NRCS completes with voluntary assistance from Sponsor except for NRCS only portion of Section 1A.
1A	Enter the Date, DSR Number, Project Number. For NRCS only enter Eligible Yes/No, Approved Yes/No, Funding Priority Number, and Limited Resource Area Yes/No.	
1B	Enter Sponsor Name, Address, Telephone, Fax	
1C	Enter site location County, State, Congressional District, Latitude, Longitude, Section, Township, Range, UTM Coordinates, Drainage Name, Reach within drainage, and Damage Description.	
1D	Enter Yes/No and any Remarks for the Site Evaluation information.	
	Any No response means the site is not eligible for EWP assistance and no further information is necessary to complete the DSR. (See NEWPPM 390-502.03 and 390-502-04) Enter Yes/No regarding whether the affected public has been informed of the EWP program.	
1E	Enter the proposed treatment and the cost of installation.	NRCS only.
1F	NRCS Review and Approval.	

	Explanation of Requested Item	Who Completes
Section 2	Use available natural resource, economic, and social, information, including the EWP Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), to <u>briefly</u> describe the effects of the alternatives to the proposed action including the "no action" alternative. Typically, the proposed action and no action are the alternatives considered for EWP recovery measures due to the focus on repairing or preventing damages within a watershed. However, in cases where additional alternatives are considered, include all pertinent information to adequately address the additional alternatives (e.g., proposed action would be bio-engineering for bank stabilization, no action alternative, and an additional alternative may be riprap for bank stabilization). Do not leave blanks where a consideration is not applicable, use NA to indicate the factor was considered but not applicable for the alternative.	alternatives.
2A	List all resource concerns which are relevant to the area of the proposed action and alternatives. Refer to National Bulletin 450-5-8 TCH-COMPLETING AND FILING MEASUREMENT UNITS FOR RESOURCE CONCERNS IN THE FIELD OFFICE TECHNICAL GUIDE (FOTG). Note: the affected area may extend beyond the construction foot print (ex. where water quality or water rights are affected downstream of the site).	
2B	Provide a brief description of the present condition of each resource concern listed in 2A. Quantify conditions where possible. Reference accompanying photo documentation.	
2C	Briefly summarize the practice/system of practices being proposed, as well as the "no action" alternative, and any other alternatives being considered. The "no action" alternative is the predicted future condition if no action is taken.	
2D	Document the efforts of the proposed action and alternatives for the considerations listed in 2A. Reference applicable quality criteria, information in the CPPE, and quantify effects whenever possible. Consider both long-term and short-term effects. Consider any effects which may be individually minor but cumulatively significant at a larger scale or over an extended time period. Clearly define the differences between proposed action, no action, and the other	

NRCS completes with INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE NRCS-PDM-20 DSR
Sponsor.

2E	<p>Enter Special Environmental Concerns for Clean Water Act Waters of the U.S., Coastal Zone Management Areas, Coral Reefs, Cultural Resources, Endangered and Threatened Species, Environmental Justice, Essential Fish Habitat, Fish and Wildlife Coordination, Floodplain Management, Invasive Species, Migratory Birds, Natural Areas, Prime and Unique Farmlands, Riparian Areas, Scenic Beauty, Wetlands, and Wild and Scenic Rivers for each alternative considered. In the case where the selected alternative from Section 5A impacts a Special Environmental Concern, additional information, coordination, permitting or mitigation may be required and adequate documentation should be prepared and attached to the DSR to identify how NRCS or the Sponsor addressed the concern</p>	
2F	<p>Identify Property Protected both private and public, business losses and other economic impacts considered for each alternative. Enter the dollar value of the potential future damages if no action is taken in the Future Damage (\$) column. This would be the estimate of the value lost if the EWP recovery measure is not installed. Use the repair cost or damage dollar method to determine the estimate of future damages. The repair cost method uses the costs to return the impaired property, good, or services based on their original pre-event condition or value. The damage dollar method uses an estimate of the future damage to value (e.g. if the structure is condemned, then enter the value of the structure). Enter the estimated amount based upon existing information or information furnished by the sponsor, contractors or others with specific knowledge for recovery from natural disasters for each alternative considered. Often market values for properties or services can be obtained from personnel at the local county/parish tax assessment office. The DSI team needs to determine the Damage Factor (%) which is a coefficient that indicates the degree of damage reduction to a property that is attributed to the effect of the proposed EWP recovery measures. Use an appropriate estimate of how much of the damage the EWP recovery measure will avoid for the alternative being considered. If the recovery measures from a single site will prevent 100 percent of the damage use 100 percent. The Near Term Damage Reduction is the Future Damage (\$) times the Damage Factor (%). Sum the Near Term Damage Reduction values to calculate the Total Near Term Damage Reduction. Enter the Net Benefit which is computed by subtracting the Cost from section 3 from the total near term damage reduction. The economic section must be completed for each alternative considered. Attach additional sheets as necessary.</p>	
2G	<p>Enter information to describe the potential social impacts and considerations for each alternative. Answer Yes or No and any remarks necessary to adequately address each question. The information may be obtained through interviews with community leaders, government officials or sponsors. Factors such as road closures, loss of water, electricity, access to emergency services are used when answering whether the community as a whole has been impaired. This information is part of the environmental evaluation portion of the DSR but may be pertinent in Section 4 regarding priorities. The Social Considerations Section must be completed for each alternative considered. Attach additional sheets as necessary.</p>	
2H	<p>Enter the Group Representation Information for the preferred alternative. Use the most recent census tract information based upon where the EWP recovery measures are located.</p>	<p>Sponsor completes.</p>

2I	Enter whether easement, permissions, or permits, and mitigation will require consultation or coordination for the selected alternative (e.g., Clean Water Act section 404 permit, Endangered Species Act section 10 permits, and any State or county permits or requirements). Describe mitigation to be applied that will offset any adverse impacts and attach any documentation from other agencies regarding mitigation requirements.	NRCS completes with voluntary assistance from Sponsor.
----	---	--

	Explanation of Requested Item	Who Completes
Section 3	Enter Proposed Recovery Measure(s) including Quantity, Units, Unit Cost, and Total Amount Cost. Enter sum of all Proposed Recovery Measure Costs to calculate Total Costs. Enter Total Installation Costs in Section 1F. The Engineering Cost Estimate must be completed for each alternative considered. Attach additional sheets as necessary.	NRCS completes with voluntary assistance from Sponsor.

	Explanation of Requested Item	Who Completes
Section 4	This section is used to determine the Funding Priority for the preferred alternative and sequence for initiating recovery measures. Enter Yes/No for questions 1 through 4 and enter the number (exigency 1, serious threat to human life 2, etc.) in the right column, Ranking Number Plus Modifier. Complete the Modifier portion by placing the alphabetic indicator a. through f. in the Modifier column. Complete the Ranking Number Plus Modifier column by entering the alphabetic indicator(s) that exists within the site. The number of the site designates the priority (e.g., a site with a designation of 2 is a higher priority than a site with a designation of 3). The modifiers increase the priority for the same numeric site (e.g., a site with a designation of 1a, would be a higher priority than a site with a designation of 1, a site with a designation of 2bc would be a higher priority than a site designated as 2b). Enter the Funding Priority in Section 1A.	NRCS completes with voluntary assistance from Sponsor.

	Explanation of Requested Item	Who Completes
Section 5	Enter the Findings, Rationale Supporting Findings, NRCS Representative signature and Comments, and Concurrence signature by the Sponsor(s).	NRCS completes. Sponsor(s) signature.
5A	Indicate the preferred alternative and check the applicable finding being made. The NRCS Representative signs indicating the Finding selected. If the proposed action was adequately addressed in the PEIS, check all appropriate chapter paragraphs.	
5B	Enter any additional Comments.	
5C	Sponsor(s) review and concurrence.	
Section 6	Include attachments for location map, site sketch or plan and other information as needed.	NRCS completes with voluntary assistance from Sponsor.

EXHIBIT "B"

5122-001 Santequin/Crooked Canyon

Item	Total Quantity	Unit	\$/Unit	Total Cost
Low Water Crossing	1.00	EA	\$ 12,500.00	\$ 12,500.00
Silt Fence	260.00	FT	\$ 60.00	\$ 15,600.00
Excavation	151260.52	CY	\$ 15.00	\$ 2,268,907.78
Seeding	12.10	AC	\$ 550.00	\$ 6,654.03
Rock Rip Rap	163.89	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 8,194.44
Geobagg	2.00	EA	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
Mo/Demob	1.29	LS	\$ 229,070.25	\$ 295,386.40
Contingency	20%	LS	\$ -	\$ 58,998.10
Total Estimated Cost:				\$ 3,349,592.40
25% March				\$ 837,398.10

EXHIBIT "B"

Item	Utah County	Utah County	Utah County
Santequin	\$ 12,500.00	\$ 63,000.00	\$ 1,136,453.69
Payson City	\$ 98,000.00	\$ 3,327.01	\$ 8,194.44
Utah County	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 145,493.71	\$ 273,454.82
Utah County	\$ 284,810.48	\$ 1,640,725.53	\$ 3,349,592.40
25%	\$ 427,215.72	\$ 410,182.38	

Comments	Utah County	Utah County
50/50 split on Crooked Canyon	\$ 1,136,453.69	\$ 1,136,453.69
50/50 split	\$ 3,327.01	\$ 3,327.01
50/50 split	\$ 8,194.44	\$ 8,194.44
Ut County in Crooked Canyon	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00

5122-002 Payson/Highline Canal/Strawberry

Item	Total Quantity	Unit	\$/Unit	Total Cost
Excavation	54389.85	CY	\$ 15.00	\$ 815,847.78
Seeding	33.70	AC	\$ 550.00	\$ 18,534.67
Ditch Removal	23.52	FT	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 141,095.04
Fencing	950.00	FT	\$ 75.00	\$ 71,250.00
Overlaid (Reinforced Concrete)	361.11	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 288,888.89
Direction Structure	1.00	EA	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
Head Gates	5.00	EA	\$ 102,000.00	\$ 510,000.00
5th Flans	1060.00	FT	\$ 60.00	\$ 63,600.00
Head Gates	2855.33	CY	\$ 62.00	\$ 177,216.67
Fill	700.00	CY	\$ 15.00	\$ 10,500.00
Impermeable Liner	3150.00	FT*2	\$ 4.00	\$ 12,600.00
Grouted Rock Wall	62.96	CY	\$ 350.00	\$ 22,037.24
Rock Rip Rap	4205.00	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 215,250.00
Constructed Ditch	1211.26	CY	\$ 15.00	\$ 18,168.89
Concrete Structure (N/C/S)	10.00	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 8,000.00
Concrete Structure (N/C/S)	100.00	FT	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 100,000.00
Trash Rack	2701.88	CY	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,350,937.78
Concrete Liner	1.00	EA	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Geobagg	200.00	EA	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
Actuator	2.00	EA	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
Head Gates	1.00	EA	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
Mo/Demob	472.55	LS	\$ -	\$ 472,551.21
Contingency	20%	LS	\$ -	\$ 837,085.95
Total Estimated Project Cost:				\$5,292,573.55
25% March				\$1,323,143.39

Item	Payson City	Utah County	Strawberry Water Users
Payson City	\$ 260,790.00	\$ 510,237.78	\$ 44,380.00
Utah County	\$ 9,343.67	\$ 204.00	\$ 8,287.00
Utah County	\$ 70,547.52	\$ 70,547.52	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 288,888.89	\$ -	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -	\$ 360,000.00
Utah County	\$ 63,600.00	\$ -	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 177,216.67	\$ -	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 10,500.00	\$ -	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 12,600.00	\$ -	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 22,037.24	\$ -	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 104,166.67	\$ 104,166.67	\$ 56,916.67
Utah County	\$ 14,168.89	\$ 14,168.89	\$ -
Utah County	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 8,000.00
Utah County	\$ 691,231.11	\$ -	\$ 691,231.11
Utah County	\$ 240,290.21	\$ 91,343.16	\$ 20,000.00
Utah County	\$ 459,430.57	\$ 170,507.23	\$ 4,000.00
Utah County	\$ 2,720,683.15	\$ 1,023,043.39	\$ 1,548,347.01
25%	\$ 680,145.79	\$ 255,760.85	\$ 387,236.75

Comments	Utah County	Utah County
50/50 split on Crooked Canyon	\$ 1,136,453.69	\$ 1,136,453.69
50/50 split	\$ 3,327.01	\$ 3,327.01
50/50 split	\$ 8,194.44	\$ 8,194.44
Ut County in Crooked Canyon	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00

OSR	Local Name	Actual OSR Request	March (25%)
5122-001	Santequin/Crooked Canyon	\$ 3,349,592.40	\$ 837,398.10
5122-002	Payson/Highline Canal	\$ 5,292,573.55	\$ 1,323,143.39
5122-003	Elridge/Laifer Canyon	\$ 1,783,240.00	\$ 445,810.00
5122-004	Salem	\$ 2,150,740.00	\$ 548,685.00
5122-005	Spanish Fork/Crab Creek/Strawberry	\$ 1,904,070.00	\$ 476,017.50
5122-006	Woodland Hills	\$ 1,892,025.00	\$ 458,006.25
5122-007	Utah County	\$ 8,254,755.00	\$ 2,063,688.75
GRAND TOTAL		\$ 24,620,350.00	\$ 6,159,082.50

OSR	Local Name	Actual OSR Request	March (25%)
5122-001	Santequin/Crooked Canyon	\$ 3,349,592.40	\$ 837,398.10
5122-002	Payson/Highline Canal	\$ 5,292,573.55	\$ 1,323,143.39
5122-003	Elridge/Laifer Canyon	\$ 1,783,240.00	\$ 445,810.00
5122-004	Salem	\$ 2,150,740.00	\$ 548,685.00
5122-005	Spanish Fork/Crab Creek/Strawberry	\$ 1,904,070.00	\$ 476,017.50
5122-006	Woodland Hills	\$ 1,892,025.00	\$ 458,006.25
5122-007	Utah County	\$ 8,254,755.00	\$ 2,063,688.75
GRAND TOTAL		\$ 24,620,350.00	\$ 6,159,082.50

5122-003 Elridge/Laifer Canyon

Item	Total Quantity	Unit	\$/Unit	Total Cost
Mo/Demob	76474.44	LS	\$ -	\$ 159,182.59
Excavation	10367.78	CY	\$ 12.00	\$ 124,413.33
Earthfill	12.74	AC	\$ 550.00	\$ 7,005.45
Seeding	322.22	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 16,111.11
Riprap	300.00	LF	\$ 60.00	\$ 18,000.00
Silt Fence	185.00	CY	\$ 75.00	\$ 13,875.00
Low Water Crossing	20%	LS	\$ -	\$ 297,140.83
Contingency	25%	LS	\$ -	\$ 445,711.25
Total Estimated Cost:				\$ 1,792,844.99
25% March				\$ 445,711.25

5122-004 Salem

Item	Total Quantity	Unit	\$/Unit	Total Cost
Mo/Demob	12%	LS	\$ -	\$ 195,592.94
Concrete	25,929,259	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 20,740,74
Excavation	19447,59259	CY	\$ 65.00	\$ 1,264,093.52
Piled Earthfill	21348,88889	CY	\$ 15.00	\$ 320,293.33
Seeding	7,343,52417	AC	\$ 550.00	\$ 4,039,59
Riprap	266,666667	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 13,333.33
Water Control Structure Inlet	1	EA	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 7,500.00
Contingency	20%	LS	\$ -	\$ 365,106.63
Total Estimated Cost:				\$ 2,190,639.79
25% March				\$ 547,659.95

Item	Salem	Elk Ridge	Woodland Hills	Utah County
Salem	\$ 447,659.95	\$ 547,659.95	\$ 547,659.95	\$ 447,659.95
Elk Ridge	\$ -	\$ 547,659.95	\$ -	\$ -
Woodland Hills	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 547,659.95	\$ -
Utah County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 447,659.95
25%	\$ 136,914.99	\$ 136,914.99	\$ 136,914.99	\$ 136,914.99

OSR	Local Name	Actual OSR Request	March (25%)
5122-001	Santequin/Crooked Canyon	\$ 3,349,592.40	\$ 837,398.10
5122-002	Payson/Highline Canal	\$ 5,292,573.55	\$ 1,323,143.39
5122-003	Elridge/Laifer Canyon	\$ 1,783,240.00	\$ 445,810.00
5122-004	Salem	\$ 2,150,740.00	\$ 548,685.00
5122-005	Spanish Fork/Crab Creek/Strawberry	\$ 1,904,070.00	\$ 476,017.50
5122-006	Woodland Hills	\$ 1,892,025.00	\$ 458,006.25
5122-007	Utah County	\$ 8,254,755.00	\$ 2,063,688.75
GRAND TOTAL		\$ 24,620,350.00	\$ 6,159,082.50

5122-005 Spanish Fork/Crab Creek/Strawberry

Item	Total Quantity	Unit	S/Unit	Total Cost
Mob/Demob	12%	LS	\$ -	\$ 169,653.70
Earthfill	561.78	CY	\$ 12.00	\$ 6,741.33
Low Water Crossing	183.33	CY	\$ 75.00	\$ 13,750.00
Riprap	4360.67	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 218,033.33
Excavation	6810.15	CY	\$ 12.00	\$ 81,721.78
Impervious Geotextile	37188.00	SF	\$ 4.00	\$ 148,752.00
Geotextile	4410.00	SF	\$ 2.00	\$ 8,820.00
Seeding	2.31	AC	\$ 550.00	\$ 1,270.71
Silt Fencing	700.00	LF	\$ 60.00	\$ 42,000.00
Trash Rack	277.00	LF	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 277,000.00
Radial Gates and Actuators	2	EA	\$ 207,202.00	\$ 414,404.00
Overshot/Flume Gate	1	EA	\$ 104,351.00	\$ 104,351.00
Actuators	2	EA	\$ 48,510.00	\$ 97,020.00
Contingency	20%	LS	\$ -	\$ 316,705.57
Total Estimated Costs				\$ 897,858.42
25% Match				\$ 475,058.35

Item	Total Quantity	Unit	S/Unit	Total Cost
Spanish Fork	95,770.70			\$ 73,833.00
Strawberry Water Users	6,741.33			\$ -
	157,500.00			\$ -
	218,033.33			\$ -
	81,721.78			\$ -
	148,752.00			\$ -
	8,820.00			\$ -
	1,270.71			\$ -
	42,000.00			\$ -
	277,000.00			\$ -
	414,404.00			\$ -
	104,351.00			\$ -
	97,020.00			\$ -
	137,933.60			\$ -
	1,077,631.82			\$ 827,801.60
25% Match				\$ 268,157.95
Total				\$ 1,095,959.55

5122-006 Woodland Hills

Item	Total Quantity	Unit	S/Unit	Total Cost
Mob/Demob	12%	LS	\$ -	\$ 151,883.23
Excavation	75895.52	CY	\$ 15.00	\$ 1,138,432.78
Seeding	6.96	AC	\$ 550.00	\$ 3,830.04
Constructed Dike	2011.11	CY	\$ 15.00	\$ 30,166.67
Low Water Crossing	222.22	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 11,111.11
Riprap	1015.37	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 50,768.52
Geotextile	3608.89	SF	\$ 2.00	\$ 7,217.78
Geobrugs	1	EA	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Concrete Channel (reinforced)	170	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 136,000.00
Contingency	20%	LS	\$ -	\$ 282,982.02
Total Estimated Costs				\$ 1,831,492.14
25% Match				\$ 457,873.03

5122-007 Utah County (Egletes Landing, Spring Lake/Polysync Canyon, Diamond Fork, Thistle, Nebo Creek)

Item	Total Quantity	Unit	S/Unit	Total Cost
Mob/Demob	12%	LS	\$ -	\$ 786,512.31
Silt Fence	3046.58	LF	\$ 60.00	\$ 182,794.80
Trash Rack	1037.00	LF	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,037,000.00
Riprap	503.70	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 25,185.19
Concrete	205.33	CY	\$ 250.00	\$ 51,333.33
Geotextile	28250.00	SF	\$ 2.00	\$ 56,500.00
Seeding	27.81	AC	\$ 550.00	\$ 15,295.58
Armored Channel	1182.16	CY	\$ 62.00	\$ 73,293.78
Earthfill	4219.63	CY	\$ 12.00	\$ 50,635.56
Excavation	223204.22	CY	\$ 15.00	\$ 3,349,563.33
Aerial Seeding	20000.00	AC	\$ 50.00	\$ 1,000,000.00
Sediment Retention	13.00	EA	\$ 18,000.00	\$ 234,000.00
Check Dams	2.00	EA	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 16,000.00
Large Woody Debris	1.00	EA	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Contingency	20%	LS	\$ -	\$ 1,374,822.58
Total Estimated Costs				\$ 9,248,877.83
25% Match				\$ 2,062,234.46