April 2022



# FARMINGTON CITY TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN

160 S. Main, Ste 200 | Farmington, Utah | 84025 801.939.5565



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
2.0	INTRODUCTION	3
3.0	EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE	4
4.0	PROPOSED LEVEL OF SERVICE	6
5.0	CAPACITY TO ACCOMMODATE FUTURE GROWTH	7
6.0	DEMANDS OF NEW DEVELOPMENT	8
7.0	MEANS BY WHICH DEMANDS FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL BE MET	13
8.0	FUNDING PLANS AND REVENUE SOURCES	15
9.0	IMPACT FEE CERTIFICATION	17
APPEN	NDICES	
А	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS	

B TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN





## **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Farmington City has retained CRS Engineers to prepare an impact fee facilities plan (IFFP) based on the improvements proposed in the 2014 Transportation Master Plan Update (TMP). The TMP identifies the improvements that will need to be made to the transportation system as the City approaches built out conditions. The TMP also projects the costs to complete the recommended improvements.

The purpose of an IFFP is to identify the portion of the improvement costs that are placed upon the City by future development. The IFFP provides a technical basis for assessing updated impact fees throughout the City. This document addresses demand that is expected to be placed on the City's roads by growth and development, the excess capacity that exists, and the need for future infrastructure to serve the City based on current land use planning and projections.

#### LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of Service (LOS) defines the minimum standard to which the transportation system will be built. The IFFP idenitifies the existing LOS and establishes the proposed LOS for future infrastructure. The existing LOS for most Farmington City is LOS C or better. LOS C is described in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) as "stable operations" with "travel speed between 50% and 67% of the base free-flow speed." It is the City's desire to maintain LOS C for all new and existing roads.

#### **REQUIRED SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS**

In order to maintain LOS C on Farmington's roadways, the City has planned the following improvements.
SUMMARY OF PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS (TABLE 1-1)

SUMINIART OF FLAMMED IMPROVEMENTS (TABLE 1-1)							
Roadway Projects	Intersections and Interchanges						
Extend 950 North from I-15 to West Davis Corridor	West Davis Corridor Interchange at 950 N						
Construct Northbound Arterial Important Local Rd	950 N and 2000 W						
Widen Burke Lane from D&RG to Station Pkwy	950 N and 1875 W						
Construct Station Pkwy from Park Ln to Burke Ln	950 N and Northbound Arterial						
Realign and Widen Park Lane	Burke Ln and D&RG Trail						
Repair 1500 West; install curb and gutter	Burke Ln and Northbound Arterial						
Extend 700 West to Lagoon Drive	Clark Ln and Park Ln						
Extend Lagoon Drive to Hwy 89 Frontage	Park Ln and Northbound Arterial						
Repair Main Street; install sidewalks	Clark Ln and Union Ave						
Repair Lower Compton Road	I-15 Interchange at 950 N						
Widen 1525 West from Clark Ln to Glovers Ln	Shepard Ln and 1500 W						
Widen Glovers Lane from 325 W to 1525 W	Main St and Mountain Rd						
Widen 1100 West from Clark Ln to Glovers Ln	Main St and 1400 N						
Widen 500 South from 650 W to 1100 W	1400 N and Cherry Blossom Dr						
Widen 650 West from State St to City Boundary	Lagoon Dr and Hwy 89 Frontage						
New Important Local Rd from Glovers Ln to 650 W	West Davis Corridor Interchange at 1525 W						
Install Sidewalks on 200 South	Glovers Ln and 650 W						
Install Sidewalks on Frontage Road	State St and 400 W						
Widen Lund Lane	Reconfigure I-15 Interchange at 200 W						
Legacy Highway Extension	I-15 Pedestrian Bridge						



## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

One of the sources of revenue for financing new public facilities or expansions to existing facilities is a onetime charge for connection to the system. This charge is often referred to as an impact fee, connection fee, or capital contribution fee. These fees are designed to recover all or a portion of the capital investment made by the City to provide sufficient capacity in a public facility system to serve new users. Revenue generated through the collection of impact fees may be used to directly offset the cost of system expansion or to repay debt issued to finance the system expansion.

Capital improvements needed to provide new capacity in a public system must generally be constructed in large increments. Therefore, system expansions are often constructed years in advance of when the added capacity will be fully used. As a result, current system users are often charged rates that are used to pay for a portion of the system capacity to serve future users. Impact fees, designed to recover the investment in this extra capacity, are often assessed to avoid charging existing users for these extra capacity costs.

Farmington City has retained CRS Engineers to prepare an impact fee facility plan (IFFP) for the areas evaluated in the 2014 Transportation Master Plan Update. The objective of the IFFP is to identify demands placed upon City facilities by future development and evaluate how these demands will be met by the City. The IFFP is also intended to outline the improvements which may be funded through impact fees.

Requirements for the preparation of an IFFP are outlined in Title 11, Chapter 36 of the Utah code (the Impact Fees Act). Under these requirements, an IFFP shall accomplish the following for each facility:

- 1. Identify the existing level of service
- 2. Establish a proposed level of service
- 3. Identify excess capacity to accommodate future growth
- 4. Identify demands of new development
- 5. Identify the means by which demands from new development will be met
- 6. Consider the following additional issues
  - a. Revenue sources to finance required system improvements
  - b. Necessity of improvements to maintain the proposed level of service
  - Need for facilities relative to planned locations of schools C.

This report has been prepared and organized to address each of these requirements.





## 3.0 EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of service (LOS) is defined in the Impact Fees Act as the "performance standard or unit of demand for each capital component of a public facility within a service area". This section discusses the level of service being currently provided to existing users.

#### PERFORMANCE STANDARD

Each road in Farmington City's transportation network is classified based on its function. Neighborhoods and subdivisions are made up of Local Roads (Local roads and Important Local Roads). Local Roads are characterized by low speeds and high accessibility. Collectors (Minor and Major) take the traffic from Local Roads and provide higher speeds and mobility. Arterials provide the greatest mobility, and the least accessibility. Each of these Functional Classifications has a predetermined cross-section, established in Farmington City's Standards.

STANDARD CROSS-SECTIONS (TABLE 3-1)									
Functional	Right-of-	Lane	Number	Shoulder	Side Treatment	Median			
Classification	Way Width	Width	of Lanes	Width	Width	Width			
Major Arterial	106'	12'	4	9.5'	12.5'	14'			
Minor Arterial	100'	12'	2	11'	20'	14'			
Major Collector	80'	12'	2	7.5'	14'	13'			
Minor Collector	66'	11'	2	7.5'	14.5'	-			
Important Local Road	60'	16'	2	-	14'	-			
Local Road	55'	13.5'	2	-	14'	-			

Traffic demand is measured by the volume of traffic that accesses a roadway. The maximum volume that a roadway can accommodate is its traffic capacity and is determined by its functional classification. Lane width, shoulder width, number and spacing of traffic control devices, and operating speed all influence the roadway's capacity. In traffic operations, the volume to capacity ratio (V/C ratio) determines the Level of Service of the road.

	VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIOS AND LOS (TABLE 3-2)							
LOS	Description of Traffic Conditions	V/C Ratio						
A	Primarily free-flow operation. Vehicles are completely unimpeded	0 – 0.29						
	in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Control delay							
	at the boundary intersections is minimal.							
В	Reasonably unimpeded operation. The ability to maneuver within	0.30 – 0.49						
	the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and control delay at the							
	boundary intersections is not significant.							
С	Stable operation. The ability to maneuver and change lanes at	0.50 – 0.75						
	midsegment locations may be more restricted than at LOS B.							
D	Less stable condition in which small increases in flow may cause	0.76 – 0.85						
	substantial increases in delay and decreases in travel speed.							
E	Unstable operation and significant delay.	0.86 – 1.00						
F	Flow at extremely low speed. Congestion is likely occurring at the	>1.00						
	boundary intersections, as indicated by high delay and extensive							
	queuing.							



## **DETERMINATION OF EXISTING LOS**

FARMINGTON ROADS: EXISTING LOS (TABLE 3-3)									
Road Name	V/C Ratio	LOS							
Main Street	Shepard Lane to Mountain Road	0.72	С						
Main Street	500 North to Shepard Lane	0.88	E						
Main Street	State Street to 500 North	0.86	E						
Shepard Lane	Main Street to 1075 West	0.56	С						
Shepard Lane	1075 West to City Boundary	0.64	С						
Park Lane	Main Street to Lagoon Drive	0.78	D						
Park Lane	Lagoon Drive to Hwy 89 Interchange	0.66	С						
Park Lane	Hwy 89 Interchange to Station Pkwy	0.85	D						
Park Lane	Station Parkway to 1100 West	0.46	В						
Station Parkway	Park Lane to Burke Lane	0.42	В						
Burke Lane	Station Parkway to 1525 West	0.42	В						
Lagoon Drive	1-15 Interchange to Park Lane	0.43	В						
Clark Lane	Lagoon Drive to 1100 West	0.56	С						
Clark Lane	1100 West to Ranch Road	0.39	В						
State Street	200 East to Lagoon Drive	0.58	С						
200 East	Lund Lane to State Street	0.58	С						
200 West	I-15 Interchange to State Street	0.61	С						
650 West	Glovers Lane to 500 South	0.21	A						
650 West	500 South to Clark Lane	0.35	В						
500 South	650 West to 1100 West	0.25	A						
1100 West	Glovers Lane to 500 South	0.25	A						
1100 West	500 South to D&RG Trail	0.35	В						
1100 West	D&RG Trail to Clark Lane	0.38	В						
1525 West	Glovers Lane to 150 South	0.19	A						
1525 West	150 South to Burke Lane	0.21	A						
Glovers Lane	200 East to Frontage Road	0.42	В						
Glovers Lane	Frontage Road to 650 West	0.43	В						
Glovers Lane	650 West to 1100 West	0.28	A						
Glovers Lane	1100 West to 1525 West	0.13	A						
Frontage Road	Lund Lane to Glovers Lane	0.43	В						

Most of the roads in Farmington operate at LOS C or better. The only exceptions are Park Lane and Main Street. Park Lane has a higher V/C ratio because it is an interchange with both I-15 and Highway 89. Main Street has a higher V/C ratio because it is the only convenient northbound route other than the highways.





## 4.0 PROPOSED LEVEL OF SERVICE

The proposed level of service is the performance standard used to evaluate system needs in the future. The Impact Fee Act indicates that the proposed level of service may:

- 1. Diminish or equal the existing level of service; or
- 2. Exceed the existing level of service if, independent of the use of impact fees, the City implements and maintains the means to increase the level of service for existing demand within six years of the date on which new growth is charged for the proposed level of service.

#### **DETERMINATION OF PROPOSED LOS**

Farmington City's intent regarding the proposed LOS is to maintain all roads at LOS C. This will be accomplished by making incremental improvements to the existing system as the demands within the system grow. With the level of development that the City anticipates, this is an economical goal that will allow the City to grow and provide adequate service to current and future residents. The City has planned to increase the LOS of the roads that do not currently meet the standard by using funds other than impact fees.





## 5.0 CAPACITY TO ACCOMMODATE FUTURE GROWTH

Projected future growth will be met through a combination of available excess capacity in existing facilities and construction of additional capacity in new facilities.

#### EXISTING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE AND EXCESS CAPACITY

Traffic in Farmington City flows mostly northward or southward, depending on the time of day. I-15 divides the City in half and is the central element in Farmington's traffic. The collectors and arterials in table 5-1 constitute the primary roads in the City. Traffic data shown in table 5-1 is derived from Farmington City 2016 demographic data.

FARMINGTON EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE (TABLE 5-1)									
Road Name	Functional Classification		Historic Value	Excess Capacity (ADT)	2016 Volume (ADT)	LOS C Capacity (ADT)			
200 East	Minor Collector	\$	2,443, <sup>8</sup> 75	2,000	7,000	9,000			
Frontage Road	Major Collector	\$	2,503,800	4,500	6,000	10,500			
200 West	Minor Collector	\$	668,850	2,000	8,500	10,500			
Lagoon Drive	Minor Collector	\$	1,511,300	4,500	6,000	10,500			
Main Street	Major Collector	\$	4,590,000	0	10,600	9,000			
650 West	Minor Collector	\$	1,576,450	4,150	2,600	6,750			
Station Parkway	Major Collector	\$	802,500	4,000	5,000	9,000			
1100 West	Minor Arterial	\$	2,278,000	4,500	3,500	8,000			
1525 West	Minor Collector	\$	1,677,600	4,500	1,500	6,000			
Glovers Lane	Major Collector	\$	5,276,800	4,625	3,625	8,250			
500 South	Minor Collector	\$	471,825	4,000	2,000	6,000			
State Street	Major Collector	\$	5,182,800	2,000	7,000	9,000			
Clark Lane	Major Collector	\$	2,311,200	5,000	5,500	10,500			
Park Lane	Major Arterial	\$	8,319,300	7,600	16,900	24,500			
Burke Lane	Minor Collector	\$	1,090,800	4,000	5,000	9,000			
Shepard Drive	Major Collector	\$	4,503,800	2,425	8,825	11,250			

The TMP utilizes the excess capacity, as well as the volume and LOS capacity in the planning process. Where excess capacity exists, it has been accounted for in the division of costs between system, existing deficiencies, and project. For all proposed improvements, if system costs are included in the cost estimate, then the City anticipates that development will increase the traffic volume above the LOS capacity.





## 6.0 DEMANDS OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

Farmington City is approaching its maximum built out potential. East of I-15, there are very few areas that are not developed. There is more room for growth west of the freeway, but the City is anticipating reaching built out conditions by 2040. Most of the undeveloped areas will be in the development process within the next 10 years.

#### DEVELOPMENT PROJECTIONS AND TRANSPORTATION DEMANDS

The city has planned for both residential and private non-residential growth. Private non-residential growth is broken down into retail, industrial, institutional, and office. Residential growth is estimated based on the number of households. Non-residential growth is estimated based on building square footage. Residential unit counts and non-residential square footage information was provided by the Farmington City Planning Department. The City also provided residential and non-residential development projections. These projections assume that the City will reach built-out conditions by 2040. Table 6-1 contains the current demographic data and Table 6-2 contains the projected demographic data. This data is organized into Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ).

The demographic data was used in conjunction with the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition, Volume 2 and Volume 3 (Institute of Transportation Engineers), to estimate the current and future number of average daily trips (ADT). Current and future ADT are presented in Table 6-3 and 6-4 respectively. From these tables the demand placed on the City's roadway system by development is determined by subtracting the current number of total trips from the total future number of trips. The resulting demand from new development is projected to be <u>105,508 ADT</u>.





CURRENT DEMOGRAPHIC DATA (TABLE 6-1)										
TAZ	Retail (x1000 SF)	Industrial (x1000 SF)	Institutional (x1000 SF)	Office (x1000 SF)	Residential (Units)					
556	140.6	-	35.2	79.3	533					
557	33.1	-	22.5	17.4	681					
558	107.6	-	15.4	64.6	473					
559	1.6	-	-	-	428					
560	90.0	98.8	93.5	64.6	44					
561	-	-	21.7	2.7	259					
562	12.8	-	9.6	9.6	10					
563	1.6	-	18.1	-	1					
2900	8.4	-	-	-	242					
2901	-	-	-	-	577					
564	-	-	-	-	-					
2898	-	-	-	-	-					
2902	-	-	-	-	2					
2903	-	-	-	30.1	-					
2917	-	-	-	-	-					
2918	-	-	-	-	1					
2919	101.0	-	128.8	3.3	-					
2920	20.9	-	14.0	5.5	462					
565	1,453.2	-	-	346.0	142					
566	2.8	-	94.6	-	274					
567	-	-	16.6	-	246					
2904	-	-	21.2	-	51					
2905	-	-	84.8	-	171					
568	-	-	498.9	-	98					
2906	-	-	94.9	-	31					
2907	0.5	-	418.7	-	120					
570	14.5	10.1	126.0	13.1	326					
571	111.1	19.1	435.9	155.1	239					
572	6.2	-	68.6	10.1	190					
573	-	-	41.7	-	466					
574	-	-	27.6	-	337					
576	-	65.0	-	-	38					
578	-	11.3	17.1	-	519					
Total	2,105.9	204.4	2,305.2	801.3	6,961					



PROJECTED DEMOGRAPHIC DATA (TABLE 6-2)									
TAZ	Retail (x1000 SF)	Industrial (x1000 SF)	Institutional (x1000 SF)	Office (x1000 SF)	Residential (Units)				
556	141.8	-	35.2	79.3	562				
557	39.1	_	22.5	40.4	690				
558	127.6	_	15.4	84.6	637				
559	1.6	_	-	-	496				
560	122.0	98.8	111.5	350.0	260				
561	_		21.7	17.4	378				
562	62.8	_	9.6	9.6	15				
563	1.6	_	18.1		1				
2900	8.4	_	-	_	244				
2901	-	_	21.0	_	591				
564	_	_	-	50.6	70				
2898	_	_	_	-	-				
2902	19.2	_	_	286.2	961				
2903	-	_	_	968.7	834				
2917	69.0	_	_	230.6	250				
2918	36.8	_	_	-	1.084				
2919	186.0	_	128.8	158.3	682				
2920	25.9	_	14.0	49.9	725				
565	1.458.2		-	506.0	442				
566	2.8	_	94.6	_	366				
567		_	16.6	_	307				
2904	-	-	21.2	-	125				
2905	-	-	84.8	-	192				
568	15.5	_	498.9	_	112				
2906	-	-	94.9	-	117				
2907	0.5	-	418.7	-	216				
570	29.5	10.1	126.0	23.1	452				
571	111.1	19.1	435.9	169.8	292				
572	6.2	-	68.6	10.1	218				
573	-	-	41.7	-	487				
574	-	-	27.6	-	386				
576	-	217.4	-	-	73				
578	-	11.3	17.1	-	836				
Total	815.9	98.8	383.7	2,275.7	13,101				



CURRENT TRIPS (TABLE 6-3)									
TAZ	Retail	Industrial	Institutional	Office	Residential	Total Trips			
556	10,804	-	453	1,100	4,896	17,254			
557	3,609	-	290	347	6,134	10,381			
558	8,599	-	199	942	4,387	14,126			
559	1,500	-	-	-	4,001	5,501			
560	7,416	1,171	1,205	942	493	11,228			
561	-	-	280	84	2,521	2,885			
562	2,249	-	123	222	126	2,721			
563	1,498	-	233	-	15	1,746			
2900	1,952	-	-	-	2,368	4,320			
2901	-	-	-	-	5,267	5,267			
564	-	-	-	-	-	-			
2898	-	-	-	-	-	-			
2902	-	-	-	-	29	29			
2903	-	-	-	527	-	527			
2917	-	-	-	-	-	-			
2918	-	-	-	-	15	15			
2919	8,153	-	1,660	98	-	9,911			
2920	2,794	-	180	145	4,293	7,412			
565	98,683	-	-	3,372	1,450	103,505			
566	1,578	-	1,220	-	2,655	5,453			
567	-	-	214	-	2,404	2,618			
2904	-	-	274	-	565	839			
2905	-	-	1,093	-	1,720	2,813			
568	-	-	6,431	-	1,031	7,462			
2906	-	-	1,223	-	358	1,580			
2907	1,422	-	5,397	-	1,242	8,062			
570	2,363	729	1,624	280	3,115	8,110			
571	8,831	774	5,619	1,832	2,341	19,396			
572	1,804	-	884	229	1,896	4,813			
573	-	-	537	-	4,327	4,864			
574	-	-	356	-	3,211	3,568			
576	-	1,003	-	-	431	1,434			
578	-	735	221	-	4,778	5,733			
Total	163,256	4,411	29,714	10,120	66,070	273,572			



FUTURE TRIPS (TABLE 6-4)								
TAZ	Retail	Industrial	Institutional	Office	Residential Trips	Total Trips		
556	10,883	-	453	1,100	5,141	17,577		
557	4,010	-	290	659	6,209	11,169		
558	9,938	-	199	1,156	5,769	17,061		
559	1,500	-	-	-	4,583	6,083		
560	9,559	1,171	1,437	3,402	2,530	18,099		
561	-	-	280	348	3,569	4,197		
562	5,597	-	123	222	183	6,125		
563	1,498	-	233	-	15	1,746		
2900	1,952	-	-	-	2,386	4,338		
2901	-	-	271	-	5,384	5,655		
564	-	-	-	783	756	1,539		
2898	-	-	-	-	-	-		
2902	2,677	-	-	2,919	8,421	14,018		
2903	-	-	-	7,374	7,392	14,766		
2917	6,011	-	-	2,477	2,440	10,929		
2918	3,855	-	-	-	9,408	13,264		
2919	13,844	-	1,660	1,861	6,143	23,508		
2920	3,129	-	180	774	6,498	10,581		
565	99,018	-	-	4,501	4,122	107,641		
566	1,578	-	1,220	-	3,465	6,263		
567	-	-	214	-	2,947	3,161		
2904	-	-	274	-	1,290	1,563		
2905	-	-	1,093	-	1,914	3,006		
568	2,429	-	6,431	-	1,166	10,026		
2906	-	-	1,223	-	1,213	2,436		
2907	1,422	-	5,397	-	2,133	8,952		
570	3,367	729	1,624	431	4,207	10,357		
571	8,831	774	5,619	1,963	2,815	20,001		
572	1,804	-	884	229	2,151	5,068		
573	-	-	537	-	4,506	5,043		
574	-	-	356	-	3,639	3,995		
576	-	1,763	-	-	786	2,549		
578	-	735	221	-	7,408	8,364		
Total	192,903	5,171	30,216	30,199	120,590	379,080		



## 7.0 MEANS BY WHICH DEMANDS FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL BE MET

To satisfy the requirements of state law, demand placed upon system facilities by future development was projected using the process outlined below.

- 1. Existing Capacity—The capacities of the existing facilities were evaluated using a transportation model as part of the master plan.
- 2. Existing Deficiencies—No major deficiencies were identified that are not already part of the planned improvements.
- 3. Future Demand—The demand that future development will place on the system was estimated based on development projections as discussed in Section 6.0.
- 4. Future Deficiencies—Future deficiencies in the transportation network were identified based on the defined level of service.
- Recommended Improvements—Needed transportation improvements were identified to resolve the future deficiencies.

#### TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Following the methods outlined above, Farmington City and its consultants prepared the TMP and the CIP. The TMP identifies the infrastructure that Farmington City plans to construct over the next 20 years. These improvements will accommodate the projected growth and maintain LOS C on all Farmington roads.

The CIP assesses each of the projects from the TMP and prioritizes the projects into three time-frames: 0-6 years, 7-12 years, and 13+ years. It also provides an estimate of the project costs and breaks those costs into 4 categories: System Costs, Existing Deficiencies, Project Costs, and State or Federal Funds.

#### System Costs

System Costs reflect the cost of proposed infrastructure which is necessary due to development. These projects will be constructed by the City to serve multiple developments. The City will collect impact fees in order to cover these costs.

Many of the projects associated with the system costs will be necessary within the next ten years. Some of those projects will add capacity to the roadway system that won't be fully utilized immediately. Only the portion of the improvement that is utilized within the next ten years can be included in the impact fee calculation. In Appendix A, the system costs are separated into two categories: System (10-Year) and System (Beyond 10-Year). The System (10-Year) costs are intended to be included in the impact fee calculation.

#### **Existing Deficiencies**

Existing Deficiencies are the costs to improve or repair existing infrastructure that is substandard. These improvements will be constructed or paid for by the City. Impact fees will not be used to fund these projects.





#### **Project Costs**

Project costs are used to build the infrastructure that provides direct access to properties being developed by private developers. Impact fees and other City funds will not be used to pay for project costs. These projects are included in the TMP to ensure that the roads constructed by developers are consistent with the City's long-term plans.

#### State or Federal Funds

State or Federal Funds pay for infrastructure that is owned by UDOT or for City owned roads where the City expects to receive State or Federal funding to pay for all or a portion of the proposed project. Impact fees will not be collected to pay for state or federally funded projects. However, some state or federally funded projects require that a percentage of the total project cost be funded by the City. Impact fees can be used as matching funds if the Impact Fee Act rules are followed. These costs shown in this section are not intended to be funded with impact fees and are included for planning purposes only.

#### **BASIS OF CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATES**

The cost estimates included in the CIP, prepared by CRS, are based on the standard road sections (see Table 3-1). Using the functional classifications, the costs are estimated on a per-unit basis. Unit costs were obtained from previous projects that CRS has designed in the area. A summary of the projects and their costs is provided in Appendix A.





## 8.0 FUNDING PLANS AND REVENUE SOURCES

#### MANNER OF FINANCING (11-36A-302.2)

#### Federal and State Grants and Donations

There are several projects identified in the TMP that will be funded and constructed by UDOT. These projects are related to the West Davis Corridor expansion and new interchanges. These projects are included for planning purposes. They will be funded by the State, and are ineligible for impact fees.

#### Bonds

None of the costs contained in this IFFP include the cost of bonding. The cost of bonding required to finance impact fee eligible improvements identified in the IFFP may be added to the calculation of the impact fee. This will be considered in the impact fee analysis.

#### Interfund Loans

Because infrastructure must generally be built ahead of growth, there often arises situations in which projects must be funded ahead of expected impact fee revenues. In some cases, the solution to this issue will be bonding. In others, funds from existing user rate revenue will be loaned to the impact fee fund to complete initial construction of the project and will be reimbursed later as impact fees are received. Consideration of potential interfund loans will be included in the impact fee analysis and should also be considered in subsequent accounting of impact fee expenditures.

#### **Impact Fees**

It is recommended that impact fees be used to fund growth-related capital projects as they help to maintain the proposed level of service and prevent existing users from subsidizing the capital needs for new growth. Based on this IFFP, an impact fee analysis will be able to calculate a fair and legal fee that new growth should pay to fund the portion of the existing and new facilities that will benefit new development.

#### **Developer Dedications and Exactions**

Developer exactions are not the same as grants. Developer exactions may be considered in the inventory of current and future transportation infrastructure. If a developer constructs facility or dedicates land within the development, the value of the dedication is credited against that particular developer's impact fee liability.

If the value of the dedication/exaction is less than the development's impact fee liability, the developer will owe the balance of the liability to the City. If the value of the improvements dedicated is worth more than the development's impact fee liability, the City will reimburse the difference to the developer from impact fee revenues collected from other developments.

It should be emphasized that the concept of impact fee credits pertains to system level improvements only. For project level improvements (i.e. projects not identified in the IFFP), developers will be responsible for the construction of the improvements without credit against the impact fee.

No developer dedications are expected for transportation infrastructure.





#### **Pass Through Reduction**

In evaluating costs to be paid for with impact fees, the City has addressed pass through trips that will be generated by existing users and made adjustments to overall project costs to be borne by impact fees. This reduction percentage has been generated by traffic modeling and provide by the Wall Consulting Group (WCG) to CRS. These percentages and the reduction in overall impact fees for the next 6 years is shownin Appendix C.

#### NECESSITY OF IMPROVEMENTS TO MAINTAIN LEVEL OF SERVICE (11-36A-302.3)

Per State statute, impact fees cannot be used to correct deficiencies in the system and must be necessary to maintain the proposed level of service established for all users. Only those projects or portions of projects that are required to maintain the proposed level of service for future growth have been included in this IFFP. This will result in an equitable fee as future users will not be expected to fund any portion of the projects that will benefit existing residents.

## SCHOOL RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE (11-36A-302.4)

As part of the noticing and data collection process for this plan, information was gathered regarding future school district and charter school development. Where the City is aware of the planned location of a school, required public facilities to serve the school have been included in the impact fee analysis.

#### NOTICING AND ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS (11-36A-502)

The Impact Fees Act requires that entities must publish a notice of intent to prepare or modify any IFFP. If an entity prepares an independent IFFP rather than include a capital facilities element in the general plan, the actual IFFP must be adopted by enactment. Before the IFFP can be adopted, a notice of the public hearing must be published in a local newspaper at least 10 days before the actual hearing. A copy of the proposed IFFP must be made available in each public library within the City during the 10-day noticing period for public review and inspection. Utah Code requires that the city must post a copy of the ordinance in at least three places. These places may include the City offices and the public libraries within the City's jurisdiction. Following the 10-day noticing period, a public hearing will be held, after which the city may adopt, amend and adopt, or reject the proposed IFFP.





## 9.0 IMPACT FEE CERTIFICATION

This report has been prepared in accordance with Utah Code Title 11 Chapter 36a (the "Impact Fees Act"), which prescribes the laws pertaining to Utah municipal capital facilities plans and impact fee analyses. The accuracy of this report relies upon the planning, engineering, and other source data, which was provided by the City and their designees.

In accordance with Utah Code Annotated, 11-36a-306(1), CRS Engineers makes the following certification:

I certify that this impact fee facilities plan:

- 1. Includes only the cost of public facilities that are:
  - a. Allowed under the Impact Fees Act; and
  - b. Actually incurred; or
  - c. Projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after the day on which each impact fee is paid;
- 2. Does not include:
  - a. Costs of operation and maintenance of public facilities;
  - b. Cost of qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fee, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents;
  - c. An expense for overhead, unless the expense is calculated pursuant to a methodology that is consistent with generally accepted cost accounting practices and the methodological standards set forth by the federal Office of Management and Budget for federal grant reimbursement: and
- 3. Complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.

This certification is made with the following caveats:

- 1. All the recommendations for implementations of the IFFP made in the IFFP or in the impact fee analysis are followed in their entirety by the City.
- 2. If all or a portion of the IFFP or impact fee analysis is modified or amended this certification is no longer valid.
- 3. All information provided in this preparation of this IFFP is assumed to be correct, complete and accurate. This includes information provided by the City and outside sources.

Dated: April 2022





APPENDIX A

## FARMINGTON CITY TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COSTS

CRS ENGINEERS



Farmington City Transportation Capital Improvement Projects Estimate of Probable Costs											
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
<b>SECTION 1</b>	PROJECTS				•	•					
1-1	UDOT North Legacy Connection Interchange at 95	0 N									
1.1	Interchange	1	LS	\$6,000,000.00	\$6,000,000						1
1.2	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000						
1.3	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$350,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,720,375	0.6.1/0.070
1.4		1370	70	Land Cost =	\$0	-					0-6 years
		Desi	ign and C	construction Cost =	\$8.452.500						
			•	15% Contingency =	\$1,267,875	00/	00/	09/	00/	100%	
				Subtotal =	\$9,720,375	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
1-2	Extension of 950 N from 2000 W to Future West Da	vis Corridor In	terchang	e - New road constru	uction	1			-		1
2.1	Land acquisition	2.90	ACRE	\$200,000.00	\$580,349						
2.2	Clear and grub	2.90	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$29,017						
2.3	Curb and gutter	3160		\$18.00	\$56,880						
2.4	Base course	6442		\$35.00	\$110,000						
2.5	Sub base (12")	5792	TON	\$25.00	\$144 807						
2.0	Asphalt (4")	2095	TON	\$85.00	\$178.082						
2.8	Landscaping	0.47	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$4,715	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,104,419	
2.9	Erosion Control	2.90	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$29,017						0-6 years
2.10	Striping	1,580	LF	\$1.00	\$1,580						
2.11	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$50,000.00	\$50,000						
2.12	Mobilization	7%	%	-	\$98,736						
2.13	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$139,336	4					
		Deci	ian and (		\$580,349						
		Desi	ign anu c	15% Contingency =	\$2,040,000 \$684,070						
				Subtotal =	\$4 104 419	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
1-3	Extension of 950 N from 2000 W to future intersect	ion with Road	to the No	rth - New road cons	truction and Exist	ing road widening			1		
3.1	Clear and grub	2.70	ACRE	\$2,500.00	\$6,749						1
3.2	Curb and gutter	2940	LF	\$20.00	\$58,800						
3.3	5' Sidewalk	2940	LF	\$35.00	\$102,900						
3.4	Base Course	3149	CY	\$35.00	\$110,205						
3.5	Sub base (12")	2831	CY	\$25.00	\$70,778						
3.6	Asphalt (4")	1949	ION	\$85.00	\$165,684						
3.7	Drainage	0000		\$15.00	\$99,089						
3.0	Litility Relocation	1		\$231,000.00	\$231,000						
3.9	Landscaping	0 44	ACRE	\$10,000,00	\$4 387	\$143,873	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,294,857	0-6 vears
3.10	Erosion Control	3	ACRE	\$3.000.00	\$8,100						0-0 years
3.12	Striping	8.820	LF	\$1.50	\$13,230						
3.13	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$7,500.00	\$7,500				1		
3.14	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$51,421						
3.15	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$161,976						
				Land Cost =	\$0						
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$1,241,819						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				Subtotal =	\$186,273	10%	0%	0%	0%	90%	
1				Gubtotal -	φ1,400,700	1	1		1	1	1



		Farm	ningtor	n City Transpo Estima	rtation Capita te of Probable	al Improvemo Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	) System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
1-4	Extension of 950 N from future intersection with Ro	ad to the Nort	h to Futu	re I-15 Interchange -	New road constru	uction	•		•		
4.1	Clear and grub	3.21	ACRE	\$2,500.00	\$8,035						
4.2	Curb and gutter	2800	LF	\$20.00	\$56,000						
4.3	6' Sidewalk	2800	LF	\$42.00	\$117,600						
4.4	Base course	3448	CY	\$35.00	\$120,685						
4.5	Sub base (12")	3111	CY	\$25.00	\$77,778						
4.6	Asphalt (4")	2142	TON	\$85.00	\$182,070						
4.7	Drainage	1	LS	\$231,000.00	\$231,000						
4.8	Landscaping	0.74	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$7,392	\$172,947	\$57,649	\$0	\$0	\$922,382	0.6
4.9	Erosion Control	3.21	ACRE	\$3,000.00	\$9,642						0-6 years
4.10	Striping	8400	LF	\$1.50	\$12,600						
4.11	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$7,500.00	\$7,500						
4.12	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$41,515						
4.13	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$130,773						
				Land Cost =	\$0						
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$1,002,589						
			-	15% Contingency =	\$150,388	4.50/	50/	00/	00/	000/	
				Subtotal =	\$1,152,978	15%	5%	0%	0%	00%	
1-5	New intersection improvements at 950 N and 2000	W - Add signal									
5.1	Remove and dispose curb and gutter	160	LF	\$8.00	\$1,280						
5.2	Clear and grub	0.10	ACRE	\$2,500.00	\$250						
5.3	Base Course	38	CY	\$35.00	\$1,330						
5.4	Traffic Signal	1	LS	\$250,000.00	\$250,000						
5.5	Sub Base (12")	4	CY	\$25.00	\$100						
5.6	5' Sidewalk	160	LF	\$35.00	\$5,600						
5.7	Curb and gutter	160	LF	\$18.00	\$2,880						
5.8	Asphalt (4")	50	TON	\$85.00	\$4,250						
5.9	Drainage	1	LS	\$15,000.00	\$15,000	\$43.027	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$387.240	
5.10	ADA Ramps	3	EA	\$3,500.00	\$10,500	φ43,027	ΨΟ	φυ	ψυ	\$J07,240	0 - 6 years
5.11	Signs	4	EA	\$500.00	\$2,000						
5.12	Striping	1	LS	\$1,500.00	\$1,500						
5.13	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$7,500.00	\$7,500						
5.14	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$15,110						
5.15	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$47,595						
				Land Cost =	\$0						
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$364,894						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$54,734	10%	0%	0%	0%	00%	
				Subtotal =	\$430,267	1070	070	0.70	070	3070	



		Farm	ningtor	n City Transpo Estima	rtation Capit te of Probable	al Improvemo Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
1-6	New intersection improvements at 950 N and 1875	Ŵ									
6.1	Remove and dispose curb and gutter	110	LF	\$8.00	\$880						
6.2	Excavate and dispose of waste material	2285	TON	\$12.00	\$27,420						
6.3	Clear and grub	0.06	ACRE	\$3,500.00	\$210						
6.4	Base Course	611	CY	\$35.00	\$21,382						
6.5	Sub base (12")	556	CY	\$25.00	\$13,907						
6.6	Curb and gutter	480		\$18.00	\$8,640						
6.7	Sidewalk (5')	525		\$35.00	\$18,375						
6.8	ASphall (4)	1149		\$85.00	\$97,008						
6.9	Signs	3		\$3,500.00	\$10,500	\$405.470	¢172 777	02	02	¢0	
6.10	Strining	1		\$300.00	\$1,500	\$405,479	\$173,777	φU	φυ	φU	0-6 years
6.12	BR Crossings Improvements	1	ΕΔ	\$1,000.00	\$1,00						
6.13	Drainage and Utility Relocation	1		\$100,000.00	\$100,000						
6 14	Traffic Control	1	IS	\$7,500,00	\$7 500						
6 15	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$20,474						
6.16	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$64,493						
				Land Cost =	\$0	-					
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$494,450						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$74,167	70%	200/	0%	0%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$579,255	7070	50 %	0 /0	070	070	
1-7	Road to North from future 950 N to Kaysville bound	dary w/traffic c	alming -	New road constructi	on	•					
7.1	Land acquisition	1.90	ACRE	\$350,000.00	\$665,289						
7.2	Clear and grub	1.90	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$19,008						
7.3	Curb and gutter	2760		\$18.00	\$49,680						
7.4	4 Sidewalk	2760		\$28.00	\$77,280						
7.5	Base Course	1900	CY	\$35.00	\$66,487						
7.0	Sub base (12)	1030		\$25.00 \$25.00	\$40,009 \$05,717						
7.1	Aspiral (4)	1120		\$60.00	\$95,717						
7.0	Litility Relocation			\$100,000.00	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1 522 553	02	
7.9		0.48	ACRE	\$10,000,000	\$4 752	ψυ	ΨΟ	φυ	ψ1,022,000	ΨΟ	0-6 years
7.10	Erosion Control	1 90	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$19,008						
7.11	Traffic Control	1.00	IS	\$15,000.00	\$15,000						
7.13	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$26.891						
7.14	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$84,707						
				Land Cost =	\$665,289	1					
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$649,419						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$197,206	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$1,522,553	0 %	070	070	10070	070	



		Farn	ningtor	n City Transpo Estima	rtation Capit te of Probable	al Improveme Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
1-8	Loop Road to Road to north - New road constructi	on			1				•		
8.1	Land acquisition	12.86	ACRE	\$350,000.00	\$4,499,541						1
8.2	Clear and grub	12.86	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$128,558						
8.3	Roadway Excavation	39000.00	CY	\$10.00	\$390,000						
8.4	Curb and gutter	11200	LF	\$18.00	\$201,600						
8.5	5' Sidewalk	11200	LF	\$35.00	\$392,000						
8.6	Base Course	13654	CY	\$35.00	\$477,901						
8.7	Sub base (12")	12444	CY	\$25.00	\$311,111						
8.8	Asphalt (4")	8568	TON	\$85.00	\$728,280						
8.9	Geotextile fabric	31110	SY	\$2.40	\$74,664						
8.10	Drainage	1	LS	\$900,000.00	\$900,000	\$4,700,108	\$0	\$0	\$5,744,577	\$0	0-6 vears
8.11	Landscaping	2.31	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$23,140						0=0 years
8.12	Erosion Control	12.86	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$128,558						
8.13	Striping	16800.0	LF	\$1.00	\$16,800						
8.14	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$15,000.00	\$15,000						
8.15	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$189,381						
8.16	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$596,549						
				Land Cost =	\$4,499,541						
		Des	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$4,573,543						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$1,360,963	45%	0%	0%	55%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$10,444,685	4070	0,0	0,0	0070	0,0	
1-9	Road to north from Park Lane to future 950 North -	New road con	struction		<b>F</b> .	1	1 1		1	r	
9.1	Land acquisition	15.15	ACRE	\$400,000.00	\$6,060,606						
9.2	Clear and grub	15.15	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$151,515						
9.3	Roadway Excavation	50000	CY	\$12.00	\$600,000						
9.4	Curb and gutter	13200	LF	\$18.00	\$237,600						
9.5	6' Sidewalk	13200	LF	\$42.00	\$554,400						
9.6	Base Course	20411	CY	\$35.00	\$714,389						
9.7	Sub base (12")	18822	CY	\$25.00	\$470,556						
9.8	Asphalt (4")	10098	TON	\$85.00	\$858,330						
9.9	Geotextile fabric	73330	SY	\$2.40	\$175,992						
9.10	Imported Fill	135500	TON	\$15.00	\$2,032,500	\$7 647 448	\$0	\$0	\$9 346 880	\$0	
9.11	Drainage	1	LS	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,200,000	¢1,011,110	, vo	ψŪ	\$0,010,000	ΨŬ	0-6 years
9.12	Landscaping	3.48	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$34,848						
9.13	Erosion Control	15.15	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$151,515						
9.14	Striping	19800	LF	\$1.00	\$19,800						
9.15	I rattic Control	1	LS	\$10,000.00	\$10,000						
9.16	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$360,572						
9.17	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$1,135,803	4					
		-		Land Cost =	\$6,060,606						
		Des	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$8,707,820						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$2,215,264	45%	0%	0%	55%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$16,994,328	1		0.0		0.0	



		Farn	ningtor	n City Transpo Estima	rtation Capit te of Probable	al Improvemo Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	) System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
1-10	Intersection of future Road to North future 950 N									•	
10	Land Acquisition	0.23	ACRE	\$350,000.00	\$80,349						
10.1	Clear and grub	0.23	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$2,296						
10.2	Base Course	246.91	CY	\$35.00	\$8,642						
10.3	Sub base (12")	370.37	CY	\$25.00	\$9,259						
10.4	Curb and gutter	120	LF	\$18.00	\$2,160						
10.5	Asphalt (4")	255	TON	\$85.00	\$21,675						
10.6	ADA Ramps	4	EA	\$3,500.00	\$14,000						
10.7	Signs	4	EA	\$500.00	\$2,000	\$218.224	\$54,556	\$0	\$272.780	\$0	
10.8	Striping		LS	\$1,500.00	\$1,500	,			. ,		0-6 years
10.9	Drainage and Utilities		LS	\$20,000.00	\$20,000						
10.10		1	LS	\$250,000.00	\$250,000						
10.11		5%	%	-	\$3,077						
10.12	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$30,191	-					
		Dee			\$80,349						
		Des	Ign and C		\$384,800						
			Enginee	15% Contingonov =	\$10,638						
				Subtotal =	\$69,772	40%	10%	0%	50%	0%	
4.44	Burke Lane D&PC to 1525 W - Read widening			Subiolai -	\$545,559						
1-11	Slone Easement	0.20		\$350,000,00	\$70.305	1	1 1		1		-
11.1	Clear and grub	0.20	ACRE	\$10,000,000	\$781						
11.2	Curb and gutter	1700	IF	\$18.00	\$30,600						
11.0	5' Sidewalk	1700	I IF	\$35.00	\$59,500						
11.4	Base Course	1348	CY	\$35.00	\$47,196						
11.6	Sub base (12")	1165	CY	\$25.00	\$29 120						
11.0	Asphalt (4")	802	TON	\$85.00	\$68 168						
11.8	Geotextile fabric	3490	SY	\$2.40	\$8,376						
11.9	Drainage and Utility	1	LS	\$60.000.00	\$60,000	\$70.305	\$0	\$0	\$485.067	\$0	
11.10	Landscaping	0.25	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$2,537						0-6 years
11.11	Erosion Control	1.29	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$12,879						
11.12	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$15,000.00	\$15,000						
11.13	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$16,708						
11.14	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$52,513						
				Land Cost =	\$70,305	1					
		Des	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$403,377						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$71,052	45%	0%	0%	559/	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$555,372	40%	070	0.70	55%	0.70	



		Farn	ningtor	i City Transpo Estima	rtation Capit te of Probable	al Improveme Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
1-12	Burke Lane 1525 W to Station Pkwy - Road widening	ng	• •				•				
12.1	Clear and grub	2.18	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$21,809						
12.2	Curb and gutter	3800	LF	\$18.00	\$68,400						
12.3	Excavate and dispose of waste material	10175	TON	\$12.00	\$122,094						
12.4	5' Sidewalk	3800	LF	\$35.00	\$133,000						
12.5	Base Course	4070	CY	\$35.00	\$142,441						
12.6	Sub base (12")	3659	CY	\$25.00	\$91,481						
12.7	Asphalt (4")	2519	TON	\$85.00	\$214,149						
12.8	Geotextile fabric	10980	SY	\$2.40	\$26,352						
12.9	Drainage and Utility	1	LS	\$100,000.00	\$100,000	0005 000	A04.045.00	<b>^</b>	<b>*</b> ****	<b>^</b>	
12.10	Landscaping	0.57	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$5,670	\$365,060	\$94,645.28	\$0	\$892,370	\$0	0-6 vears
12.11	Erosion Control	3.49	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$34,894						
12.12	Striping	11400	LF	\$1.50	\$17,100						
12.13	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$15,000.00	\$15,000						
12.14	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$49.620						
12.15	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$124,456						
-				Land Cost =	\$0	1					
		Des	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$1,166,467						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10.638						
				15% Contingency =	\$174,970						
				Subtotal =	\$1,352,075	27%	7%	0%	66%	0%	
1-13	Station Parkway from Park Lane to Burke Lane - N	ew road const	ruction		¢.,cc_,c.c		<u> </u>				
13.1	Curb and gutter	2300	LF	\$18.00	\$41,400						1
13.2	5' Sidewalk	2300	LF	\$35.00	\$80,500						
13.3	Asphalt (4")	306	TON	\$85.00	\$26,010						
13.4	12' wide turn lane and concrete barrier	1	LS	\$12,000.00	\$12,000						
13.5	Drainage and Utility	1	LS	\$80,000,00	\$80,000						
13.6	Landscaping	0.34	ACRE	\$10,000,00	\$3,432						
13.7	Erosion Control	0.74	ACRE	\$10,000,00	\$7.392	\$100.629	\$26.089	\$0	\$245.982	\$0	
13.8	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$10,000.00	\$10,000	+,	+==,===		+=,	, · ·	0 - 6 years
13.9	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$13.037						
13.10	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$41,066						
10.10		1070	70	Land Cost =	\$0	-					
		Des	ion and C	onstruction Cost =	\$314 836						
		200	Fnginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$47 225						
				Subtotal =	\$372 700	27%	7%	0%	66%	0%	
				Gubtotal -	\$312,10 <b>0</b>						



		Farm	ningtor	i City Transpo Estima	rtation Capit	al Improveme	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
1-14	Trail and road intersection improvements at Burke	Ln and D&RG									
14.1	Slope Easement	0.02	ACRE	\$350,000.00	\$6,428						1
14.2	Remove and dispose of concrete sidewalk	400	SF	\$6.00	\$2,400						
14.3	Excavate and dispse of waste material	2577	TON	\$11.00	\$28,342						
14.4	Asphalt (4")	75	TON	\$85.00	\$6.416						
14.5	Base course	90	CY	\$35.00	\$3,163						
14.6	Sub base (12")	110	CY	\$25.00	\$2,741						
14 7	Fill	3408	TON	\$15.00	\$51,120						
14.8	Frosion Control	0.25	ACRE	\$10,000,00	\$2,500						
14.9	Curb and gutter	160	IF	\$18.00	\$2,880						
14.10	Sidewalk (5')	160	IF	\$35.00	\$5,600						
14.10	Remove and relocate fence	24	IF	\$10.00	\$240	\$180,779	\$45,195	\$0	\$0	\$0	0 - 6 years
14.11	ADA Ramps	2	FΔ	\$3 500 00	\$7,000						
14.12	Drainage and Litility	1		\$30,000,00	\$30,000						
14.13	Traffic control	1		\$10,000.00	\$10,000						
14.14	Mobilization	5%	06	φ10,000.00	\$10,000						
14.15	Engineering	15%	70 0/.	-	\$4,034 \$22,505						
14.10		1370	70	- Land Cost =	\$23,303	-					
		Deci	ian and C		Φ0,420 ¢400.004						
		Desi	Ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$180,821						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
			1	15% Contingency =	\$28,087	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$225,974			-			
1-15a	Intersection at 1525 W and Burke Lane	1	1				т — т		1	1	
15.1	Land Acquisition	0.23	ACRE	\$350,000.00	\$80,349						
15.2	Clear and grub	0.23	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$2,296						
15.3	Base Course	247	CY	\$35.00	\$8,642						
15.4	Sub base (12")	370	CY	\$25.00	\$9,259						
15.5	Curb and gutter	120	LF	\$18.00	\$2,160						
15.6	Asphalt (4")	255	TON	\$85.00	\$21,675						
15.7	ADA Ramps	3	EA	\$3,500.00	\$10,500						
15.8	Signs	3	EA	\$500.00	\$1,500	\$71 512	\$15,802	\$0	¢177.455	\$0	
15.9	Striping	1	LS	\$1,500.00	\$1,500	φ/1,J1Z	φ13,032	φυ	φ177,400	ψυ	0 - 6 years
15.10	Drainage and Utility	1	LS	\$50,000.00	\$50,000						
15.11	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$9,000.00	\$9,000						
15.12	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$5,827						
15.13	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$18,354						
				Land Cost =	\$80,349						
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$140,712						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
			- 1	15% Contingency =	\$33,159	070/		00/	070/	00/	
				Subtotal =	\$264.858	- 27%	6%	0%	67%	0%	
1-15b	Signal 1525 W and Burke Lane Intersection				+===,===						
15.1	Traffic Signal	1.00	LS	\$250.000.00	\$250.000						1
15.2	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$25,000,00	\$25,000						
15.3	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$13,750						
15.2	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$43,313	\$314.008	\$78.502	\$0	\$0	\$0	
10.2		1070	/0	Land Cost =	\$0	Ψοιπ,000	\$10,002	ΨŬ	ΨŬ	ΨŬ	0 - 6 years
		Desi	ion and C	onstruction Cost =	\$332.063						
		ring and Planning=	\$10 639								
			Liginee	15% Contingency =	¢ 10,030						
				Subtotol =	943,003 \$200 540	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	
				Subiotal =	<b></b> \$392,510						



		Farm	ningtor	n City Transpor Estimat	rtation Capit te of Probable	al Improveme Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
1-16	Park Ln extension to 1525 W - New road constructi	on and existing	g road wi	dening		-	I				
16.1	Clear and grub	1.13	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$11,329						1
16.2	5' Sidewalk	3525	LF	\$35.00	\$123,375						
16.3	Median	1	LS	\$115,000.00	\$115,000						
16.4	Base Course	414	CY	\$35.00	\$14,497						
16.5	Drainage and Utility	1	LS	\$20,000.00	\$20,000						
16.6	Landscaping	0.73	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$7,283	\$117 104	\$26.023	\$0	\$290 592	\$0	
16.7	Erosion Control	1.13	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$11,329	φ111,104	\$20,020	ψŬ	\$200,002	ψ <sup>ψ</sup> υ	0 - 6 years
16.8	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$10,000.00	\$10,000						
16.9	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$15,141						
16.10	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$49,193						
		_		Land Cost =	\$0						
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$377,147						
				15% Contingency =	\$56,572	27%	6%	0%	67%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$433,719		•	••••			
1-17	Intersection at Clark Lane and Park Lane	0.00		<b>*</b> 405 000 00	<b>\$</b> 04,000	1	1 1		I	1	
17.1	Land acquisition	0.06	ACRE	\$435,600.00	\$24,000						
17.2	Excavate and dispse of waste material	487		\$11.00	\$5,352						
17.3	Curb and guiller	255		\$18.00	\$4,590						
17.4	Base Course	175		\$35.00	\$0,120 \$6,090						
17.5	Sub base (12")	207		\$35.00	\$0,000 \$5,000						
17.0	Sub base (12)	156		\$25.00	\$3,007						
17.0	Striping	100		\$2,000,00	\$13,200						
17.0	Drainage and Litility	1		\$2,000.00	\$2,000	\$170,389	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0 - 6 vears
17.9	Landscaping	0 15	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$1 /Q2						0 - 0 years
17.10	Erosion Control	0.13	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$4 132						
17.11	Traffic Control	1	IS	\$10,000,00	\$10,000						
17.12	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$6 135						
17.13	Engineering	15%	%		\$19,326						
		10/10	<i>,</i> ,,	Land Cost =	\$24.000						
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$124,164						
			• •	15% Contingency =	\$22.225	40000		001	00/	001	
				Subtotal =	\$170,389	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
1-18	Intersection and signal at Park Lane & Road to the	North					•		-		
18.1	Traffic Signal	1	LS	\$75,000.00	\$75,000						]
18.2	Striping	1	LS	\$2,000.00	\$2,000						
18.3	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$30,000.00	\$30,000						
18.4	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$5,350	\$150.221	¢0	¢0	\$0	\$0	
18.5	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$16,853	φ133,221	φυ	φυ	φυ	φυ	0 - 6 years
				Land Cost =	\$0						
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$129,203						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$19,380	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$159,221	10070	0,00	0.0	<b>v</b> /v	0,0	



		Farn	ningto	n City Transpo Estima	rtation Capit te of Probable	al Improveme Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
SECTION 2	PROJECTS				•		• • • •			•	
2-1	New I-15 interchange at Shepard Lane										
1.1	Interchange	1	LS	\$6,000,000.00	\$6,000,000						
1.2	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000						
1.3	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$350,000	02	\$0	02	\$0	\$9,720,375	
1.4	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$1,102,500		ΨŬ	ψŬ	ψŪ	<i>\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\</i>	0 - 6 years
		_		Land Cost =							
		Des	ign and C	Construction Cost =	\$8,452,500						
				15% Contingency =	\$1,267,875	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
			14/	Subtotal =	\$9,720,375						
2-2	Intersection improvements at Snepard Lane/Fronta	age Road/1500		¢450.000.00	\$150,000	1			1		-
2.1	Dealian Intersection	0.33	ACRE	\$450,000.00	\$150,000						
2.2	Realign Intersection	1	LS	\$200,000.00	\$200,000						
2.3	Mobilization	E9/	LS 0/	\$50,000.00	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$555.450	
2.4	Engineering	15%	- 70 9/2	-	\$20,000	φυ	ΨΟ	ψŪ	φυ	\$JJJ,4JU	0 - 6 years
2.5		1370	70	- Land Cost =	\$150,000	-					
		Des	ian and (	Construction Cost =	\$150,000						
		200	ign and c	15% Contingency =	\$72.450						
				Subtotal =	\$555.450	- 0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
2-4	New signal at South Mountain Road and Main Stree	et			\$000,400		I				
4 1	Traffic Signal	1	LS	\$250.000.00	\$250,000						1
42	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$20,000,00	\$20,000						
4.3	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$13,500						
4.4	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$42,525	\$385,567	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
		•	•	Land Cost =	\$0						0 - 6 years
		Des	ign and C	Construction Cost =	\$326,025						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$48,904	100%		0%	0%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$385,567				0,0	0,0	
2-7	700 W Extension - New road construction	1 1 10	1.000			-	1		1	[	
7.1	Land acquisition	1.13	ACRE	\$250,000.00	\$282,369						
7.2	Clear and grub	1.13	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$11,295						
7.3	Curb and gutter	1640		\$18.00	\$29,520						
7.4	4 Sidewalk	1640		\$28.00	\$45,920						
7.5	Base Course	1129		\$35.00	\$39,507						
7.6	Sub base (12)	972		\$25.00	\$24,290						
7.7	Drainago and Litility	009		00.000 00	\$30,075						
7.8	Landscaping	0.29		\$90,000.00	\$90,000	\$70,991	\$0	\$0	\$717,801	\$0	0 6 1/0010
7.9	Frosion Control	1 12	ACRE	\$10,000.00	φ2,024 \$11 205						
7.10	Traffic Control	1		\$15,000.00	\$15,000						
7.12	Mobilization	5%	%	φ10,000.00 -	\$16.327						
7.12	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$51 429						
1.15		1 10/0		Land Cost =	\$282,369	1					
		Des	ion and C	Construction Cost =	\$394,287						
		200	Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10.638						
				15% Contingency =	\$101.498						
				Subtotal =	\$788,792	9%	0%	0%	91%	0%	



		Farm	ningtor	n City Transpo Estima	rtation Capit te of Probable	al Improveme Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
2-8	Lagoon Drive extension - new road construction										
8.1	Land acquisition	4.24	ACRE	\$250,000.00	\$1,060,606						1
8.2	Clear and grub	4.24	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$42,424						
8.3	Curb and gutter	5600	LF	\$18.00	\$100,800						
8.4	5' Sidewalk	5600	LF	\$35.00	\$196,000						
8.5	Base Course	5393	CY	\$35.00	\$188,741						
8.6	Sub base (12")	5393	CY	\$25.00	\$134,815						
8.7	Asphalt (4")	2642	TON	\$85.00	\$224,553						
8.8	Geotextile fabric	2300	SY	\$2.40	\$5,520			•••	AD 050 000	<b>^</b>	
8.9		1	LS	\$300,000.00	\$300,000	\$713,460	\$0	\$0	\$2,259,289	\$0	0 - 6 years
8.10		0.90	ACRE	\$5,000.00	\$4,500						
8.11	Troffie Control	4.24	AURE	\$10,000.00 \$15,000.00	\$42,424 \$15,000						
8.12	Mobilization	F0/	L3 0/	φ15,000.00	\$15,000						
0.13	Engineering	15%	70 0/2	-	\$107,627						
0.14		1370	70	Land Cost =	\$1 060 606	-					
		Desi	ion and C	onstruction Cost =	\$1 515 143						
		200	Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10 638						
				15% Contingency =	\$386.362						
				Subtotal =	\$2.972.749	- 24%	0%	0%	76%	0%	
2-9	Main Street drainage, surface, sidewalk, and relate	d improvemen	ts from S	hepard Ln to Park L	n						
9.1	Driveway reconstruction	50	EA	\$7,000.00	\$350,000						1
9.2	SD Inlets	25	EA	\$3,000.00	\$75,000						
9.3	18" SD Pipe	4000	LF	\$85.00	\$340,000						
9.4	Clear and grub	2.10	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$20,987						
9.5	Curb and gutter	7500	LF	\$20.00	\$150,000						
9.6	5' Sidewalk	7500	LF	\$35.00	\$262,500						
9.7	Excavation	5000	TON	\$15.00	\$75,000						
9.8	Sub base (12")	1452	CY	\$25.00	\$36,310						0 - 6 vears
9.9	Base Course	1452		\$35.00	\$50,834	¢000 700	<b>*</b> 0	<b>*</b> 0	<b>*</b> 0	¢0.404.470	
9.10	Aspnait (6") Retaining Wall Medular Block Wall	1500	IUN	\$150.00	\$225,000	\$603,789	\$U	<b>\$</b> 0	\$0	\$3,421,472	STP Funds
9.11		1		\$400,000.00	\$400,000						
9.12	Litility Pelocation			\$250,000.00	\$250,000						
9.13	Traffic and Safety and ITS			\$350,000.00	\$350,000						
9.14	Mobilization			\$200,000.00	\$200,000						
9.15	Engineering	15%	%	φ200,000.00 -	\$455,345						
0.10		10,0	/0	Land Cost =	\$0	1					
		Desi	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$3.490.976						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10.638						
				15% Contingency =	\$523,646	450/	00/	00/	00/	05%	
				Subtotal =	\$4,025,261	15%	0%	0%	0%	85%	



		Farm	ingto	n City Transpo	rtation Capit	al Improveme	ent Projects				
				Estima	te of Probable	Costs					
ltem No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10- Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
2-10	Lower Compton Road curb, gutter, sidewalk and s	surface improve	ements f	rom 1000 N to Main S	Śt				•		
10.1	Grind Asphalt	2830	LF	\$6.00	\$16,980						
10.2	Curb and gutter	1250	LF	\$18.00	\$22,500						
10.3	4' Sidewalk	555	LF	\$28.00	\$15,540						
10.4	2" Overlay	1310	TON	\$85.00	\$111,350						
10.5	Base Course (6")	67	TON	\$35.00	\$2,345						
10.6	Modular block retaining wall	11250	SF	\$15.00	\$168,750						
10.7	Drainage and Utility	1	LS	\$50,000.00	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$111,125	\$444,500	\$0	
10.8	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000						0 - 0 years
10.9	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$19,623						
10.10	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$61,813						
				Land Cost =							
		Desi	gn and C	construction Cost =	\$473,901						
			Enginee	ring and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$71,085	0%	0%	20%	80%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$555,625	070	0,0	20%	0070	070	
2-11	Lagoon Drive & Hwy 89 Frontage Rd - Right-in Rig	ht-out intersect	tion								
11.1	Construction Costs (per Contractor Bid)	1.00	LS	\$358,935.00	\$358,935	\$165,110	\$0	\$0	\$193,825	\$0	0 - 6 vears
						46%	0%	0%	54%	0%	e eyeare
				Subtotal =	\$358,935	.570	2,0	270	0170	270	



		Farm	ningto	n City Transpo Estima	rtation Capita te of Probable	al Improveme Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
SECTION 3	PROJECTS									•	
3-1	UDOT North Legacy Connection										
1.1	Legacy Highway	1	LS	\$300,000,000.00	\$300,000,000						
1.2	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$10,000,000.00	\$10,000,000						
1.3	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$15,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$430,473,750	
1.4	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$48,825,000		,			,	0 - 6 years
		Deel	an and (		\$0						
		Desi	ign and C	15% Contingonou =	\$374,325,000						
				Subtotal =	\$30,140,750	- 0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	
3_2	1525 W curb, gutter, sidewalk and widening impro	vements from (	Clark Lar	e to Legacy Overpa	\$430,473,750 SS						
2.1	Land acquisition	1.86	ACRE	\$150.000.00	\$279.442	[	1		1		1
2.2	Clear and grub	1.86	ACRE	\$10.000.00	\$18.629						
2.3	Saw Cut Asphalt	4850	LF	\$1.00	\$4.850						
2.4	Curb and gutter	4850	LF	\$18.00	\$87,300						
2.5	5' Sidewalk	4850	LF	\$35.00	\$169,750						
2.6	Base Course	4155	CY	\$35.00	\$145,439						
2.7	Sub base (12")	3631	CY	\$25.00	\$90,787						
2.8	Asphalt (4")	2500	TON	\$85.00	\$212,523						
2.9	Geotextile fabric	1803	SY	\$2.40	\$4,328						
2.10	Utility Relocation	1	LS	\$20,000.00	\$20,000	\$301,698	\$60,340	\$377,123	\$769,330	\$0	0 - 6 years
2.11	Drainage	1	LS	\$60,000.00	\$60,000						
2.12	Landscaping	0.78	ACRE	\$0.00	\$0						
2.13	Erosion Control	1.86	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$18,629						
2.14	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$15,000.00	\$15,000						
2.15	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$42,362						
2.16	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$133,440	4					
		Deel	an and (		\$279,442						
		Desi	Engine	ing and Diagning	\$1,023,038						
			Enginee	15% Contingoncy =	\$10,638	20%	1%	25%	51%	0%	
0.1	Sow Cut Apphalt	1400	LIE		\$195,37Z	2070	4 /0	2370	5170	070	{
82	Curb and outter	2970		\$18.00	\$53.460						
83	5' Sidewalk	2970		\$35.00	\$103,950	1					
84	Base Course	1198	CY	\$35.00	\$41 929	1					
8.5	Sub base (12")	923	CY	\$25.00	\$23,074						
8.6	Asphalt (4")	635	TON	\$85.00	\$54.014						
8.7	Utility Relocation	1	LS	\$5.000.00	\$5.000						
8.8	Drainage	1	LS	\$90,000.00	\$90,000	\$555,338	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
8.9	Landscaping	0.44	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$4,432						0 - 6 years
8.10	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$15,000.00	\$15,000	1					
8.11	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$19,613	1					
8.12	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$61,781	1					
		_		Land Cost =	\$0						
		Desi	ign and C	Construction Cost =	\$473,652	1					
1			Enginee	ering and Planning=	\$10,638						
				15% Contingency =	\$71,048	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$555,338						



		Farn	ningtor	n City Transpo Estima	rtation Capit te of Probable	al Improveme Costs	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
3-9	1100 W extension from 500 S to Glovers Lane										
9.1	Land acquisition	0.58	ACRE	\$65,000.00	\$37,603						
9.2	Clear and grub	0.58	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$5,785						
9.3	Curb and gutter	1800	LF	\$18.00	\$32,400						
9.4	5' Sidewalk	1800	LF	\$35.00	\$63,000						
9.5	Base Course	1283	CY	\$35.00	\$44,917						
9.6	Sub base (12")	1089	CY	\$25.00	\$27,222						
9.7	Asphalt (4")	750	TON	\$85.00	\$63,725						
9.8	Drainage	1	LS	\$100,000.00	\$100,000	\$420,161	\$0	\$0	\$132.682	\$0	
9.9	Utility Relocation	1	LS	\$10,000.00	\$10,000	, .	,				0 - 6 years
9.10		0.27	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$2,686						
9.11		0.58	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$5,785						
9.12	I ramic Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000						
9.13		5%	%	-	\$19,906						
9.14	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$62,704	-					
		Dee			\$37,603						
		Des	ign and C		\$443,130						
				Subtotal =	\$72,110	76%	0%	0%	24%	0%	
0.40	500 S curb gutter sidewalk and widening improve	monte from 1	100 W to 1	50 W	\$332,043						
<u>3-12</u>	Land acquisition		ACRE	\$200,000,00	\$01.827	1	1 1		1		-
12.1	Clear and grub	0.40	ACRE	\$10,000,000	\$5,060						
12.2	Saw Cut Asphalt	4000	LE	\$1.00	\$4,000						
12.5	Curb and gutter	2600	LI	\$18.00	\$46 800						
12.4	5' Sidewalk	4000	I.F.	\$35.00	\$140,000						
12.5	Base Course	1034	CY	\$35.00	\$36 188						
12.0	Sub base (12")	667	CY	\$25.00	\$16,667						
12.8	Asphalt (4")	620	TON	\$85.00	\$52 670						
12.0	Box Culvert Extension	20	IF	\$5,000,00	\$100,000						
12.0	Level Course	344	TON	\$85.00	\$29,261	\$523,791	\$0	\$52.379	\$471.412	\$0	
12.10	Utility Relocation	1	LS	\$50.000.00	\$50,000	<b>**</b>	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	+,	+,=		0 - 6 years
12 12	Drainage	1	LS	\$150.000.00	\$150,000						
12.13	Landscaping	0.64	ACRE	\$10.000.00	\$6.428						
12.14	Erosion Control	0.46	ACRE	\$10,000,00	\$4,591						
12 15	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$20.000.00	\$20,000						
12.16	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$37,720						
12.17	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$118,818						
· ·		•		Land Cost =	\$91,827	1					
		Des	ign and C	onstruction Cost =	\$819,113						
			-	15% Contingency =	\$136,641	E00/	00/	E0/	450/	00/	
				Subtotal =	\$1,047,581	50%	U%	3%	40%	070	



		Farn	ningtor	n City Transpor Estimat	rtation Capita te of Probable (	al Improveme	ent Projects				
Item No.	Improvement Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	System (10 Year)	System (Beyond 10-Year)	Existing Deficiency	Project	State or Federal Funds	Priority
4-2	Sidewalk improvements on Main St and 200 S										
2.1	Clear and grub	0.09	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$918						
2.2	Base course (8")	49	CY	\$35.00	\$1,728						
2.3	4' Sidewalk	1000	LF	\$30.00	\$30,000						
2.4	Landscaping	0.23	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$2,296						
2.5	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$63.059	\$0	\$0	
2.6	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$1,997	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	+-	+,		<i></i>	0 - 6 years
2.7	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$6,291						
		Dee	ian and C		<b>Φ</b> υ \$45 594						
		Des	Enginee	ring and Blanning=	\$40,004						
			Enginee	15% Contingoncy =	\$10,030						
				Subtotal =	\$63.050	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	
4-4	Frontage Road sidewalk on east side from Lund L	ane to 200 W		Oubtotal -	\$03,039						
4.1	Clear and grub	0.44	ACRE	\$10.000.00	\$4,408						1
4.2	Base Course	356	CY	\$35.00	\$12,460						
4.3	8' Sidewalk	2400	LF	\$56.00	\$134,400						
4.4	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000						
4.5	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$7,813	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$227,635	\$0	
4.6	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$24,612						0 - 6 years
				Land Cost =	\$0						
		Des	Design and Construction Cost =		\$188,693						
		Engineering and Planning=		\$10,638							
				15% Contingency =	\$28,304	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	
				Subtotal =	\$227,635	0,0	0,0	0,0		0,0	
4-5	Lund Lane Improvements - Existing road widening	3		<b>*</b> 05 000 00	<u> </u>						
5.1	Land acquisition	0.17	ACRE	\$65,000.00	\$11,191						
5.2	Cirear and grub	0.57	ACRE	\$10,000.00	\$5,682						
5.3	4' Sidowelk	1500		\$18.00	\$27,000						
5.4	Poor Course	1000		\$20.00 \$25.00	\$42,000						
5.5	Sub base (12")	880	CV	\$25.00	\$30,134 \$22,222						
5.0	Asphalt $(A^{"})$	612	TON	\$25.00 \$85.00	\$52,020						
5.8	Drainage	1		\$75,000,00	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$54,770	\$336,447	\$0	
5.0	Landscaping	0.34	ACRE	\$5,000,00	\$1 722						0 - 6 years
5 10	Erosion Control	0.57	ACRE	\$10.000.00	\$5,682						
5.11	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$5.000.00	\$5,000						
5.12	Mobilization	5%	%	-	\$13,623						
5.13	Engineering	15%	%	-	\$42,913						
				Land Cost =	\$11,191						
		Design and Construction Cost =									
		15% Contingency =					\$0	1/10/4	86%	0%	
		\$391,218	070	ψυ	14 /0	0070	070				
						¢00.447.505	¢0.747.007	¢4 450 040	¢00 007 045	¢ 400 570 070	
							\$2,747,207	\$1,153,646	\$29,397,215	\$480,573,376	
	Totals					Percentage					
	Total of all Projects:					100%	1				
	Total System Costs:					4.7%	1				
	Total Existing Deficiencies:					0.2%					
	Total Project Costs:					5.5%					
		,		1							



APPENDIX B

FARMINGTON CITY TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS MAP



## FARMINGTON CITY TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN





APPENDIX C

FARMINGTON CITY TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

PASS THROUGH TRIP ADJUSTMENTS



This table provides the adjustment for the pass-through trip usage of the projects in Appendix A for the next 0-6 year outlook.

Project	Sun	n Total	Pass Thru %	Reduced project total			
1-2	\$	4,104,418.73	17%	\$	3,406,667.55		
1-3	\$	1,438,729.61	17%	\$	1,194,145.58		
1-4	\$	1,152,977.88	17%	\$	956,971.64		
1-7	\$	1,522,552.78	50%	\$	761,276.39		
1-8	\$	10,444,684.74	13%	\$	9,086,875.72		
1-9	\$	16,994,328.11	13%	\$	14,785,065.45		
1-11	\$	555,372.00		\$	555,372.00		
1-12	\$	1,352,075.49		\$	1,352,075.49		
1-13	\$	372,699.96		\$	372,699.96		
1-16	\$	433,718.73		\$	433,718.73		
2-7	\$	788,792.34		\$	788,792.34		
2-8	\$	2,972,749.10		\$	2,972,749.10		
2-11	\$	358,935.00		\$	358,935.00		
3-2	\$	1,508,490.13	11%	\$	1,342,556.21		
3-8	\$	555,338.23	16%	\$	466,484.11		
3-9	\$	552,843.40	16%	\$	464,388.46		
3-12	\$	1,047,581.29		\$	1,047,581.29		
4-5	\$	391,217.56	-	\$	391,217.56		
	<u> </u>						
	\$	46,547,505.07	TOTAL	\$	40,737,572.58		