## Attachment 6 Designs



	SHEET INDEX	<u>GENERAL_NOTES</u>	GINEER
	<u>A Set Generals</u>		SIGN EN
	AI COVER SHEET, LOCATION MAPS	1. ALL UTILITY LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOTIFYING BLUE STAKES AND FOR LOCATION OF ALL UTILITIES. 1-800-662-4111.	ARKS ARKS
	A2 GENERAL NOTES, SHEET INDEX	2. TRAFFIC CONTROL IS TO CONFORM WITH MUTCD STANDARDS AND UDOT STANDARDS. CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN ALL TRAFFIC CONTROL AND SIGNAGE.	
	A4 LOCATION MAP	3. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT ALL EXISTING UTILITIES (WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICES, DRIVEWAYS, AND ACCESS ROADS, ETC.) DURING CONSTRUCTION AND ENSURE THEY REMAIN IN PLACE AND OPERATIONAL (UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTIFIED BY PROPERTY OWNER).	
	<u>D Set Channel Improvments at 200 South</u>	4. PIPE LENGTHS SHOWN ON PLAN SHEETS ARE HORIZONTAL.	
	DI SITE PLAN D2 DETAILS I	5. SAFE CONSTRUCTION PROCEDURES AND WORKING CLEARANCES ARE TO BE MAINTAINED AT ALL TIMES WHILE WORKING NEAR POWER LINES. CONTRACTOR TO FOLLOW ALL APPLICABLE OSHA STANDARDS.	
	D3 DETAILS 2	6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS BEFORE STARTING WORK AND SHALL IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE ENGINEER OF ANY DISCREPANCIES.	
	D4 RIVER BANK TRANSITION D5 PLAN SHEET STA. 0+00 - 5+00 D6 PLAN SHEET STA. 5+00 - 10+00	7. UNLESS DETAILED, SPECIFIED, OR OTHERWISE INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS, CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE AS INDICATED IN THE APPLICABLE TYPICAL DETAILS AND GENERAL NOTES. TYPICAL DETAILS ARE MEANT TO APPLY EVEN THOUGH NOT REFERENCED AT SPECIFIC LOCATIONS ON THE DRAWINGS.	COVAL DMM: DATE
	D7 PLAN SHEET STA. 10+00 - 15+00 D8 DETAILS	8. WHERE NO CONSTRUCTION DETAILS ARE SHOWN OR NOTED FOR ANY PART OF WORK, DETAILS SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR OTHER SIMILAR WORK.	APPR RECC
	E SET CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT AT 100 MORTH	9. ORDER OF PRIORITY: SPECIAL PROVISIONS, SPECS, DETAILS, PLANS, SUMMARY.	elle. 
-	E SEI CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT AT TUU NORTH	10. CONTRACTOR REQUIRED TO VIDEO TAPE PROJECT AREA PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION BEGINNING.	eMi g, Ir urves
	EL SITE PLAN	11. CONTRACTOR TO PRESERVE, PROTECT OR REPLACE ALL SURVEY MONUMENTS. REPLACEMENT SHALL BE BY STANDARD SURVEY QUALITY.	& D erin istruc
	E3 PLAN AND PROFILE	12. CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY ALL AFFECTED RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES 24 HOURS BEFORE DISCONNECTING WATER LINES. COORDINATE WITH AMERICAN FORK CITY PUBLIC	nes gine leerin
	E4 SECTIONS I E5 SECTIONS 2	WORKS.	ENGIN D
		13. CONTRACTOR MUST OBTAIN AMERICAN FORK CITY RIGHT OF WAY EXCAVATION PERMIT BEFORE STARTING WORK AND CONFORM TO ALL AMERICAN FORK CITY ORDINANCES, STANDARDS, AND POLICIES.	
	<u>G SET CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT AT 300 NORTH</u>	14. THE HORIZONTAL DISTANCE BETWEEN PRESSURE WATER MAINS AND SANITARY SEWER LINES SHALL BE AT LEAST 10 FEET. WHERE A WATER MAIN AND SEWER LINE MUST CROSS.	
	GI SITE PLAN	THE WATER MAIN SHALL BE AT LEAST 18 INCHES ABOVE THE SEWER LINE. SEPARATION DISTANCE SHALL BE MEASURED EDGE TO EDGE. IF HDPE ALTERNATIVE IS USED THE HORIZONTAL DISTANCE WILL BE DETERMINED IN THE FIELD.	,
	GZ EXCAVATION G3 PLAN AND PROFILE	15. BACTERIA TESTING: 2 TESTS A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS APART	<b>1</b> 0
1	G4 SECTIONS	16. CONTRACTOR SHALL MEET ALL AMERICAN FORK CITY STANDARDS AS OUTLINED IN THE AMERICAN FORK CITY STANDARD, DRAWINGS, AND SPECIFICATIONS. IF THERE IS A CONFLICT BETWEEN APWA AND THE CITY'S STANDARDS. THE MORE STRINGENT ONE SHALL GOVERN	NEER
	11 SET CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS AT 400 SOUTH	17 CONTRACTOR SHALL IMPORT ALL PIPE BEDDING MATERIAL AND ALL ROAD BASE MATERIAL	NGI
	HI SITE PLAN H2 DEMOLITION AND EXCAVATION PLAN	18 CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO MEET ALL AMERICAN FORK CITY STORM WATER POLILITION PREVENTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS	
	H3 CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN AND PROFILE		L NID
_			
			z
		UTILITY CONTACTS	
		COMPANY CONTACT PERSON PHONE NUMBER	<u>中</u>   <u>中</u>
		30% 15° VIEW 2023 QUESTAR GAS DANIELLE WELLS (S.L.C MAPPING DEPT.) 801-324-3970 CENTURY LINK ARLENE COMSTOCK 801-974-8130	
		Revi Antizoza	ATE KA
		Plot Date: AMERICAN FORK (WAIEK/SEWER)   JAT BREMS (A.F. PUBLIC WORKS) 801-763-3060 AMERICAN FORK (BROADBAND) GEORGE SCHADE 801-404-6396	Š   Ŀ
		COUNTY FIBER         ROBERT HANCOCK         801-851-8665           BLUE STAKES         BLUE STAKES         800-662-4111	ANOR
		COMCAST GARY GOLDSTEIN 801-401-3041	N N N
			A A
			<b> 4</b>
		CALL BEFORE YOU DIG ITS FREE AND IT'S THE LAW	



	U		1			U				
NOTES NSIBLE FOR NOTIFY NDARDS. CONTRAC E SERVICES, DRIVEY ER). MAINTAINED AT ALL	VING BLUE STAK CTOR SHALL MA WAYS, AND ACC - TIMES WHILE V	ES AND FOR LOC. INTAIN ALL TRAFF SESS ROADS, ETC. WORKING NEAR PC	ATION OF ALL UTILITI TIC CONTROL AND SIC ) DURING CONSTRUCT	ES. 1-800-662-4 GNAGE. TION AND ENSURE CTOR TO FOLLOW A	4111. THEY REMAIN	IN	PROJECT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE		REMARKS REVISIONS	/G NAME: 4/11/2023 Generals PLOTTED: 4/11/2023
AND SHALL IMMEDIA	ATELY NOTIFY T	HE ENGINEER OF	ANY DISCREPANCIES.						╘┨┠	<u>8</u> 
CONSTRUCTION SH T SPECIFIC LOCATIO	ALL BE AS INDI	CATED IN THE AP AWINGS.	PLICABLE TYPICAL DI	ETAILS AND GENER	AL NOTES.		COVAL DMM:		DATE	
OF WORK, DETAILS	SHALL BE THE	SAME AS FOR OT	HER SIMILAR WORK.				RECC		2	ប៉័ន ន
RY.							lle	с Ч	AlNG	, Eg
CTION BEGINNING.							DeMi	ng, li crurv	SURVE VIMENT TESTIN	5275 Jemille.
S. REPLACEMENT S	HALL BE BY ST	ANDARD SURVEY	QUALITY.				80	eerii stru	RING - ( VVIROF RALS 1	00.748. esando
24 HOURS BEFORE	E DISCONNECTIN	NG WATER LINES.	COORDINATE WITH	AMERICAN FORK C	ITY PUBLIC		one	ngin civil 8	gineef 31S - Ep Matef	- 1.8 ww.jon
TION PERMIT BEFO	DRE STARTING	WORK AND CONFO	ORM TO ALL AMERIC	AN FORK CITY OR	DINANCES,			Ш	Ξ,	
ITARY SEWER LINES IE. SEPARATION DI	S SHALL BE AT STANCE SHALL	LEAST 10 FEET. BE MEASURED E	WHERE A WATER M DGE TO EDGE. IF H	IAIN AND SEWER L IDPE ALTERNATIVE	INE MUST CA	ROSS, E		7		
D BASE MATERIAL ATER POLLUTION P	PREVENTION PL/	AN REQUIREMENTS	5.				RAN S FRAN	CIVIL ENG	1276 South 820 Ea Suite 100	American Fork, UL of T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) ;
		UTILITY CO	NTACTS				PLAN		DEX	
COMPA	ANY	CONTA	CT PERSON	PHONE NUM	IBER		臣	百		
QUESTAR CENTURY	GAS ÚINK	DANIELLE WELLS	(S.L.C MAPPING DEP	T.) 801-324-39 801-974-81	70 30		ERSI	AND ND	₩	
ROCKY MOUNT AMERICAN FORK (	AIN POWER WATER/SEWER)	JOEL SIMMONS JAY BREMS (A.F.	PUBLIC WORKS)	503-813-699 801-763-300	93 <u></u> 60		ATE	ТҚ	<u>א</u>	
AMERICAN FORK	(BROADBAND)	GEORGE SCHADE	K	801-404-63	96		×  ×	R	TES	
BLUE ST	AKES	BLUE STAKES		800-662-41	<u>11</u>		FOR	SAN	<b>2</b>	
	451	IGARY GOLDSTEIN		]801-401-30	41		AMERICAN	AMERIC	GENERAL	
						CALL BEFORE YOU DIG. IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW.				
						BLUE STAKES OF UTAH Utility Notification Center, Inc. 1-800-662-4111				_
						Dig Safely.		T NO.	A2	

## SYMBOL LEGEND



F

Е

D

С

GAS LINE	 G	G —		G —
FIBER OPTICS	 F0	F0-		F0—
BURIED TELEPHONE LINE	 — тв —		тв -	
BURIED COMMUNICATION LINE	 с —	с —		c —
STORM DRAIN LINE	 SD	sd —		SD —
SEWER LINE	 s —	s —		s —
WATER LINE	 w ——	w —		w —
POWER LINES	 — онр –		OHP -	
TELEPHONE LINES	 т —	т —		т —
IRRIGATION LINES	 IRR		IRR -	

4

5





7

	1	I	U				
ΔRR	REVIATIONS			l			
							ន្តន្ត
AC	ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT						11/2
BV	BUTTERFLY VALVE			đ	il I		44
LDG. Cl	BUILDING CAST IRON			NGIN			Ë
Ģ.	CENTER LINE			SIGN F			uro Pro
CLR						SX SX	
сом	COMPRESSION FITTING					N EN	
ONC	CONCRETE			L L		8	
CTS	COPPER TUBE STEEL					Ē	
C.Y.	CUBIC YARD					"	lerais
d D	DEPTH OF FLOW DIAMETER OF PIPE						9
DWĞ	DRAWING						Ψ.
	DIAMETER						2 Q
DI	DUCTILE IRON PIPE						5
E	EAST					-1	
	ELEVATION			l. '		DATE	Ž
SMT				NMN:		_	ÿ⊻∣
EW	EXISTING			APPF RECC		ž	រ ប្ត
FIP	FEMALE IRON PIPE FITTING						
FRP	FORCE MAIN FIBERGLASS REINFORCED PLAST	c		e	υ.	Ľ ≚	ε
, FL	FLOW LINE	-		lii	드ൔ	₽ ¥ 8	2 <u>6</u>
FLG	FLANGE FITTING			Je l	g, g	SUR NO	222 E
FT	FOOT			~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	eri TRU	<u>.</u> 2	and 48
FPS	FEET PER SECOND			Se	De ss		2 00 Sel
ORIZ	HORIZONTAL			Jug	ig gi	ENE SI SI	
ID	INSIDE DIAMETER			٦	μĩ	Ч Ц Ц Ц Ц Ц Ц Ц	- ≯
', IN INV							
LT	LEFT						
					T		
MIP	MALE IRON PIPE FITTING						
MH	MANHOLE						
MJ	MECHANICAL JOINT FITTING			7	l s		
N	NORTH, FRICTION FACTOR			ō	Ш		481
NO	NUMBER			ŭ	z	÷	56-0
NTD	NOTED			Z	U	Eas	1)7
ERM	PERMANENT			4	μ	820 00	T08
OC	ON CENTER			C	Ę	ite 1	39 Fork
OD OH	OUTSIDE DIAMETER			L	15	6 Su Su	an F -030
۳ <u>.</u>	PROPERTY LINE				RA.	127	756 756
PVC	POLYVINYL CHLORIDE						01) 301)
Q	RATE OF FLOW			M	21		Т: (8
	REINFORCEMENT, REINFORCING						
RES	RESERVOIR				1	1	
REV	REVISION						
R/W	RIGHT OF WAY						
Ś	SOUTH, SLOPE			Z			
STD	STAINLESS STEEL STANDARD			2			
STA	STATION			L L	エ		
TB	TELEPHONE BOX			山口	Ш		
EMP	TEMPORARY			5			
TBM	TEMPORARY BENCH MARK			l H	A		
UBC	UNTREATED BASE COURSE			F	×	9	
	UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE			l ≥	Ю	Ξ.	
v	VELOCITY			×	ЦЦ,	Щ	
/ERT W	VERTICAL			j D	A		
**	WEST			느	⊇		
				×	近		
				S S	₹		
PPE	ABBREVIATIONS			山			
PVC		PIPF		₹	1		
RCP	REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE						
VCP	VITRIFIED CLAY PIPE	1			1		
DPE	HIGH DENSITY POLYETHYLENE		IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW.		1	L	
	DUCTILE IRON PIPE		BLUE STAKES OF UTAH		UT	AH	
CPP	CORRUGATED METAL PIPE	PE	1-800-662-4111 www.bluestakes.org		COL	INTY -	
OLY	POLYETHYLENE PIPE		🔍 Dig Safely. 🕘	SHEE		- A3	5 I



















C PLAN VIEW STA. 10+00 - 15+00

5

6

### NOTES:

1

С

В

Α

- I. ALONG THE LENGTH OF THE RIVER CHANNEL A TRENCH OF VARYING DEPTH HAS ERODED INTO THE CONCRETE FLOOR.
- 2. The Trench Along the Entire Length of This River Section is to be Repaired.
- 3. It is the Contractors Responsibility to Manage the River Flows With Sandbags or Coffer Dams to Protect the work Area.
- 4. Repair can be Done in sections as is Convenient and Manageable for the Contractor.
- Access to the Channel from 30 South and 200 South is Difficult. T HE Easiest Access Would be Through Superior Concretes's Yard.

2

3

4

Image: State of the channel of the	1 0				
A       A         A       A         A       A         A       A         A       A         A       A         A       A	ULVERT	PROJECT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE		REMARKS REVISIONS	DWG NAME: 4/11/2023 PLOTTED: 4/11/2023 PLOTTED: 4/11/2023
A       A         A       A         A       A         A       A         A       A		APPROVAL RECOMM:		NO. DATE	SCALE: NONE
A TOPO 15-000 TOPO 15-000 TO	EA WILL BE THROUGH T REPLACEMENT SITE SEE DRAWING SET D ER IS FENCED TO THE TO GAIN ACCESS OR T INTO THE CHANNEL	Jones & DeMille	CWIL & STRUCTURAL	ENGINEERING - SURVEYING - GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL -	MATERIALS TESTING 1.800.748.5275 www.jonesanddemille.com
o ISSUED FOR Review ot Date: 4/11/2023 ot Date: 4/11/2023 OT Date: 4/11/2023 CALL BEFORE YOU DIG TS FREE AND ITS THE LAW WWE BEFORE YOU DIG 1-900-662-4111 Dig Safety. WITH Dig Safety. Dig Safet		FRANSON	CIVIL ENGINEERS	1276 South 820 East Suite 100	
CALL BEFORE YOU DIG. IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW. IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW. USUE STAKES OF UTAH USUE STAKES OF UTAH In SOC -662-4111 Work Museuking Arts Dig Safely.       T       8	Jissued For Review of Date: 4/11/2023	AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	PLAN VIEW STA. 10+00 15+00	
Dig Safely. SHEET NO. D7	CALL BEFORE YOU DIG. IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW. BLUE STAKES OF UTAH Utility Verification Centre, In. 1-800-662-4111		UT		
	7 8	SHEET	NO.	D	7

30%











U				
	sign Engineer Date			UPDATED: 4/11/2023 PLOTTED: 4/11/2023
	PROJECT DE		REMARKS	DWG NAME: Plan Sheets 100 North
	APPROVAL RECOMM:		NO. DATE	SCALE: NONE
	Jones & DeMille	Engineering, Inc.	ENGINEERING - SURVEYING - GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL -	MATERIALS TESTING 1.800.748.5275 www.jonesanddemille.com
	ERANSON	CIVIL ENGINEERS	1276 South 820 East	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481
	AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	INLET PLAN AND PROFILE	
CALL BEFORE YOU DIG. IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW.		 	AH	
1-800-662-4111 www.bluestakes.org Dig Safely.	SHEE	COI T NO.	UNTY E	3
8				









r U				
	PROJECT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE		REMARKS REVISIONS	DWG NAME: UPDATED: 4/11/2023 Plan Sheets 300 North G Set PLOTTED: 4/11/2023
金を行うの目で	PROVAL COMM:		VO. DATE	CALE: NONE
· 在1.12 + 185-25	KEC V		 ق '	<u>ທ</u>
	Jones & DeMille	CIVIL & STRUCTURAL	ENGINEERING - SURVEYI - GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL	MAIEKIALS IESIING 1.800.748.5275 www.jonesanddemille.cor
Issued For Review A Date: 4/11/2023	FRANSON	CIVIL ENGINEERS	1276 South 820 East Suite 100	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481
	AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	EXCAVATION	
CALL BEFORE YOU DIG. ITS FREE AND IT'S THE LAW.		UT	AH	
Utility Notification Centra, Inc. 1-800-662-4111 www.bluestates.org Dig Safely.	SHEE	COL	JNTY G2	 2
7				











		APPROVAL RECOMM: PROJECT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE		NO. DATE REMARKS REVISIONS	SCALE: DWG NAME: UPDATED: 4/11/2023 NONE H Set Chennel Improvements 400 South PLOTTED: 4/11/2023
		Jones & DeMille	CIVIL & STRUCTURAL	ENGINEERING - SURVEYING - GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL - - 444 TEDIAL 5 TEGTALO	WALEXALS LESTING 1.800.748.5275 WWW.Jonesanddemille.com
TEAM CHANNEL MEMENTS TO EXTEND 000' REAM OF ROAD CROSSING LISH AND REMOVE ING RETAINING WALL ALL TREES WITHIN & CHANNEL		ERANSON	CIVIL ENGINEERS	1276 South 820 East Suite 100	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481
		AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	DEMOLATION & EXCAVATION PLAN	
and the second second	BLUE STAKES OF UTAH Utility Notification Centrar, Inc. 1-800-662-4111 www.blustates.org Dig Safahy		UT		
and the second day of		SHEET	NO.	- 112	.



U							
		ECT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE			IARKS	0	UPDATED: 4/11/2023 South PLOTTED: 4/11/2023
		DRQ			REN	REVISIONS	DWG NAME: H Set Channel Improvements 400 5
	VAL MA:	l			DATE		NONE I
	APPRC				ġ		SCA
	Innes & DeMille		Engineering, Inc.	CIVIL & STRUCTURAL	ENGINEERING - SURVEYIN(	- GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL -	MALEKIALS I ES LING 1.800.748.5275 www.jonesanddemille.com
		NOCNART	CIVIL ENGINEERS		1276 South 820 East	Suite 100	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481
CALL BEFORE YOU DIG.	AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PI AN					CHANNEL IMPROVEMEN IS FLAN AND PROFILE	
IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW. BLUE STAKES OF UTAH Utility Notification Center, Inc. 1-800-662-4111			l		A	H Y	·
Dig Safely.	SHE	EET				H	3

# AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI 2023













Natural Resources Conservation Service THIS PROJECT IS PARTIALLY FUNDED BY NRCS THROUGH THE EWP PROGRAM

APPROVAL:

NCRS

DATE

h:\jd\proj\2004-028\dwg\ttle.dwj



X TO SHEETS
SHEET TITLE
COVER SHEET
SHEET INDEX & STAMP SHEET
LEGEND & ABBREVIATIONS
INDEX
FRANSON DRAWING INDEX
J.D.E. DRAWING INDEX
AMERICAN FORK PLAN SHEETS
DETAILS
LEHI CITY PLAN SHEETS
DETAILS



# **LEGEND & ABBREVIATIONS**

SWITAM SEVER LURE     SWITAM SEVER MANAGE       CULMARY MA EX NAVE     SWITAM SEVERANA       SUBMARY SEVER MANAGE	EXISTING FEA	TURES		MISC. FEA	TURES	3	PF	(OPO
CONCRETE SUPFACING CONCRETE SUPFACING FLOW LINE OF DITCH EDGE OF APPHALT SURFACING EDGE OF GRAVEL SURFACING EDGE OF GRAVEL SURFACING EDGE OF ORAPHALT SURFACING WATER METER W WATER METER POWER POLE & GUY WIRE STRUCTURE POWER POLE & GUY WIRE TREE POWER POLE & GUY WIRE CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT CONSTRUCTION EASE	swr       SM/h       wtr       be       e       btel       tel       bctv       ctv       fo       gas       ir       sd       X     X       X     X	SANITARY SEWER LINE SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE CULINARY WATER LINE CULINARY WATER VALVE BURIED POWER LINE OVERHEAD POWER LINE BURIED TELEPHONE LINE OVERHEAD TELEPHONE LINE BURIED CABLE TV LINE OVERHEAD CABLE TV LINE FIBER OPTIC LINE NATURAL GAS LINE IRRIGATION LINE STORM DRAIN FENCE LINE (BARBED OR STOCKTIGHT) FENCE LINE (CHAIN LINK) DRAINAGE CULVERT		r/wr/w r/wr/w BLOCK LINE	- SUB - LOT - EXIS - EX	DIVISION BOUNDARY LINE LINES STING RIGHT OF WAY LINE STING N/A LINE STING CITY BLOCK LINES POSED RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE TION LINE RTER SECTION LINE .E.) PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT D LINE PERTY LINE PERTY LINE	T	
		CONCRETE SURFACING (SIDEWALK, CURB, GUTTER, ETC.) FLOW LINE OF DITCH EDGE OF ASPHALT SURFACING EDGE OF GRAVEL SURFACING EDGE OF DIRT SURFACING FIRE HYDRANT WATER METER STRUCTURE POWER POLE & GUY WIRE TREE DELINEATOR POST STREET SIGN TELEPHONE PEDESTAL MAILBOX WATER MANHOLE LIGHT POLE	TBC FLG LOC TSW TOC EOA TOA TOA FLC SW FG	Abbrevia Top back of curb Flow line of gutter Lip of curb Top of sidewalk Top of concrete Edge of Asphalt Top of grate Flow line of culvert Sidewalk Finished ground	ATIONS EPP SMH CMH R/W T.C.E. P.U.E. STA L/LT R/RT	POWER POLE SEWER MANHOLE COMMUNICATION MANHOLE RIGHT-OF-WAY TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT STATION LEFT RIGHT		
				4		E I		























8				
<ul> <li>0 100 200 Feet</li> <li>SCOPE OF WORK</li> <li>1 717 L.F. CHANNEL CLEARING. SEE DETAIL ON DT-05. (STA 19+89 TO STA 27+06)</li> <li>2 108 L.F. TYPE 3 BOX CULVERT. BY OTHERS. SEE DETAIL ON DT-01. (STA 30+00 TO STA 31+08)</li> <li>3 LARGE TREE REMOVAL (13)</li> <li>4 294 L.F. TYPE 2 GABION LINED CHANNEL. SEE DETAIL ON DT-05. (STA 27+06 TO STA 30+00)</li> </ul>	PROJECT DESIGN ENCINEER DATE		REMARKS REVISIONS	DWG NAME: UPDATED: 2/22/2023 SP-10 PLOTTED: 2/27/2023
	ROVAL OMM:		D. DATE	ALE: 1" = 100'
	Jones & DeMille	Engineering, Inc.	ENGINEERING - SURVEYING - GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL - MATERIAL S TESTING	1.800.748.5275 SC www.jonesanddemille.com
	RANSON	CIVIL ENGINEERS	1276 South 820 East Suite 100	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481
	AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	PLAN SHEET	
TI'S FREE AND ITS THE LAW.	_		AH JNTY	
Dig Safely. Automatic	SHEE	T NO.	PL-C	)6



0       100       200         YPE & SOCK DUVERNING SEE NOTE 2 ON SHEET PL-06. SEE DETAIL ON DT-01. (STA 30-00 TO STA 31-08)       Image: Society of the society of	8				
	0       100       200         Feet         SCOPE OF WORK         1       TYPE 3 BOX CULVERT. IMPROVEMENTS BY OTHERS. SEE NOTE 2 ON SHEET PL-06. SEE DETAIL ON DT-01. (STA 30+00 TO STA 31+08)         2       LARGE TREE REMOVAL (5)         3       300 L.F. TYPE 3 GABION LINED CHANNEL. SEE DETAIL ON DT-05. (STA 30+78 TO STA 33+78)	PROJECT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE		REMARKS REVISIONS	-10 UPDATED: 2/22/2023 PLOTTED: 2/27/2023
		RECOMM:		NO. DATE	SCALE: DWG NAME: 1" = 100' BWG NAME: SP
Image: Construction of the state of the		Jones & DeMille	CIVIL & STRUCTURAL	ENGINEERING - SURVEYING - GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL - MATEBIALS TESTING	www.jonesanddemille.com
CALL BEFORE YOU DIG US REEE AND ITS THE LAW UN SHEET NO. PL-07		KANSON	CIVIL ENGINEERS	1276 South 820 East Suite 100	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481
CALL BEFORE YOU DIG. IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW. BLUE STAKES OF UTAH Utily Monteation Control, Int. 1-800-662-4111 COUNTY Dig Safely. SHEET NO. PL-07		AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	PLAN SHEET	
Dig Safely. SHEET NO. PL-07	CALL BEFORE YOU DIG. IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW. BULES TAKES OF UTAH				
	Dig Safely. # "crawbare	SHEET NO. PL-07			














	8				
Image: State of the state	0 100 200   Feet Feet   SCOPE OF WORK   1 1750 L.F. TYPE 2 GABION LINED CHANNEL. SEE   DETAIL ON DT-05. (STA 76+40 TO STA 78+40)   2 CHANNEL CLEARING. SEE NOTE 6 ON PL-10. SEE DETAIL ON DT-05. (STA 70+40 TO STA 76+40)   3 LARGE TREE REMOVAL (8)	REPROVAL RECOMM: PROJECT DESIDY ENGINEER DATE		NO. DATE REMARKS REVISIONS	SCALE: DWG NAME: UPDATER: 2/22/2023 1* = 100' SP-10 PLOTTER: 2/27/2023
Image: State Stat		Jones & DeMille		ENGINEERING - SURVEYING - GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL - MATEENNIS TECTING	www.jonesanddemille.com
CALL BEFORE VOUDIG SFREE AND ITS THE LAW UTAH UTAH UTAH COUNTY UNIT STREES OF UTAN UTAH COUNTY UNIT UNIT UNIT UNIT UNIT UNIT UNIT UNIT		RANSON	CIVIL ENGINEERS	1276 South 820 East Suite 100	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481
UTAH UTAH UIDENTAKES OF UTAH UIDENTAGENE CONTEXP UIDENTAGENE CONTEXP UIDENTAGENE Dig Safely. UTAH SHEET NO. PL-11		AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	PLAN SHEET	
Dig Safely. SHEET NO. PL-11	IT'S FREE AND IT'S THE LAW.			AH JNTY	
	Dig Safely.	SHEE	T NO.	PL-′	11















	JECT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE		MARKS	S	UPDATED: 2/27/2023 Р∟ОТТЕD: 2/27/2023	
			REN	REVISION	DWG NAME: DT-01	
	PROVAL COMM:		VO. DATE		CALE: NONE	
	Jones & DeMille			- GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL - MATEDIALS TESTING	WAT ENALS TESTING 1.800.748.5275 www.jonesanddemille.com	
	🔬 🏤 FRANSON	CIVIL ENGINEERS	1276 South 820 Fast	Suite 100	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481	
	AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	0	DEIAILS		
		U.		H Y		
8	SHEE	T NO.	U	-(	JZ	







7	8				
		PROJECT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE		REMARKS REVISIONS	AME: UPDATED: 2/27/2023 DT-01 PLOTTED: 2/27/2023
***		APPROVAL RECOMM:		NO. DATE	SCALE: DWG N NONE
		Jones & DeMille	Engineering, Inc.	ENGINEERING - SURVEYING - GIS - ENVIRONMENTAL -	WALEKINLS 15311NG 1.800.748.5275 Www.jonesanddemille.com
		📌 🏤 FRANSON		1276 South 820 East Suite 100	American Fork, UT 84003 T: (801) 756-0309 F (801) 756-0481
		AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PLAN	AMERICAN FORK AND LEHI	DETAILS	
		-	L UT	I AH	
		QUEE		DT-(	 )5
7	8	SHEE	I NU.		

# Attachment 6

Economic Investigations & Analysis Report

**Economic Investigation and Analysis Report** 

# American Fork—Dry Creek Supplemental Watershed Plan-Environmental Assessment

**Proposed Floodwater Retarding Structures** 

Utah County, Utah

Prepared for:



January 2025

Prepared by:

Hal Gordon, Economist

# Contents

1.0	SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES
2.0	ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL BENEFITS
4.0	PERIOD OF ANALYSIS
5.0	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENTATION
6.0	RURAL COMMUNITY AND AGRICULTURAL DAMAGES
6.1 6.2	Structure, Content & Vehicle Damages
6.3	Bridge & Culvert Damages
6.4 6.5	Other Damages
6.6	Recreation
6.7	Scour & Sediment Damages17
7.0	WATERSHED PROJECT COSTS 19
8.0	WATERSHED PROJECT BENEFITS AND COSTS 20
9.0	FINAL TABLES

#### **1.0 SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES**

The NRCS National Watershed Program Manual (NWPM) was used as a reference for the economic analysis along with three other documents: the National Resource Economics Handbook, Part 611 Water Resources Handbook for Economics, USDA/Natural Resources Conservation Service, July 1998; Principles and Guidelines for Water and Land Related Resources Implementation Studies (P&G), December 1983; and Guidance for Conducting Analyses Under the Principles, Requirements, and Guidelines for Water and Land Related Resources Implementation Studies and Federal Water Resource Investments (PR&G), DM 9500-013. The latter includes requirements set forth in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Principles and Requirements for Federal Investments in Water Resources (P&R) and Interagency Guidelines (IAG). DM 9500-013 provides guidance on completing a PR&G analysis, including steps in the planning and evaluation process, differences between project- and programmatic-level evaluations, direction on incorporating an ecosystem services framework, and techniques for economic analysis. NRCS's Nine Steps of Conservation Planning were broadly followed while developing the watershed plan, as described in the National Planning Procedures Handbook (180-VI-NPPH, Amend. 4, March 2003).

According to the P&G, the alternative that maximizes net economic benefits is referred to as the National Efficiency Evaluation (NEE) alternative and will be the preferred alternative. In addition to P&G requirements, PR&G requires that public benefits (monetary and non-monetary) be maximized relative to cost. Furthermore, there is no hierarchal relationship among the economic, social, or environmental goals, regardless of whether they can be monetized. Agency policy allows for the use of social effect goals to make the case for flood control activities, even if the associated benefit-cost (B/C) ratio is less than 1:1. This is due to the difficulty in monetizing the value of life and quality of life, which is laden with subjective value judgments. Therefore, threats to human life and quality factors can be used to outweigh purely economic considerations when appropriate. PR&G allows a wide range of alternatives to illustrate the range of potential tradeoffs among environmental, economic, and social goals.

The Federal Objective, as set forth in the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, specifies that Federal water resources investments shall reflect national priorities, encourage economic development, and protect the environment by: (1) seeking to maximize sustainable economic development; (2) seeking to avoid the unwise use of floodplains and flood-prone areas and minimizing adverse impacts and vulnerabilities in any case in which a floodplain or flood-prone area must be used; and (3) protecting and restoring the functions of natural systems and mitigating any unavoidable damage to natural systems.

3

The guiding principles in P&G and PR&G constitute the concepts that should be considered when analyzing Federal investments in water resources, and the P&G and PR&G General Requirements are topics that agencies must consider when analyzing Federal investments in water resources. The following Principles constitute the overarching concepts the Federal government seeks to promote through Federal investments in water resources now and into the foreseeable future.

A. Healthy and Resilient Ecosystems. Federal investments in water resources should protect and restore the functions of ecosystems and mitigate any unavoidable damage to these natural systems.

B. Sustainable Economic Development. Federal investments in water resources should encourage sustainable economic development.

C. Floodplains. Federal investments in water resources should avoid the unwise use of floodplains and flood-prone areas and minimize adverse impacts and vulnerabilities in any case in which a floodplain or flood-prone area must be used.

D. Public Safety. Threats to people, including loss of life and injury from natural events, should be assessed in determining existing and future conditions and, ultimately, in the decision-making process.

E. Environmental Justice. Environmental justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Agencies should ensure that Federal actions identify any disproportionately high and adverse public safety, human health, or environmental burdens of projects on minority, Tribal, and low-income populations.

F. Watershed Approach. A watershed approach to analysis and decision-making facilitates evaluating a more complete range of potential solutions. It is more likely to identify the best means to achieve multiple goals over the entire watershed.

The project sponsors include American Fork City, Lehi City, and Saratoga Springs City. The Project incorporates waterway improvements along the American Fork River in American Fork City, Upper Dry Creek and Waste Ditch in Lehi City, and Lower Dry Creek in Lehi and Saratoga Springs Cities for flood protection. The proposed improvements for the American Fork City area include four

4

sections of channel improvements, totaling approximately 1,000 feet, at locations of insufficiently sized under crossings to improve the channel capacity. The proposed improvements for the area would reconstruct approximately 12,000 feet of the existing channel to improve the channel capacity and hydraulics through Lehi Elementary School's property, public transportation corridors, private property, and parks. The Project is anticipated to cost approximately \$16,207,0000, which includes construction (\$11,542,000), engineering (\$1,721,000), and real property (\$2,944,000).

The installation costs of the Preferred Alternative equate to an average annual cost of \$656,800. PL-566 funds would cover \$13,263,000. The sponsors and/or other nonfederal funds would contribute \$2,944,000 of the total project cost. While flood prevention measures are covered at 100%, improvements to existing culverts are considered "real property" and not covered by PL-566.

# 2.0 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED

According to the P&G and the NWPM, "Flood Prevention" was the purpose analyzed for the American Fork Watershed Plan-EA. Table 7, Comparison of NED Benefits and Costs, contains a summary of the average annual project costs and benefits. The Excel Workbook "DryCreekBenefitsCosts.xml," with associated sheets within the workbook, provides the details for the complete economic analysis.

In accordance with the NRCS and PR&G step processes, the formulation of alternatives seeks to achieve the sponsor's objectives, solve identified concerns, take advantage of opportunities to improve or protect resource conditions (NRCS Nine-Step Conservation Planning Process), identify tradeoffs between environmental, economic, and social goals and objectives (DM 9500-013, page 16). To facilitate these processes, the following considerations have been developed to help emphasize specific goals to illustrate the potential tradeoffs as part of the ecosystem services framework.

- No Action Alternative (FWOFI): This is the baseline against which all other alternatives are compared and evaluated. NEPA requires this and it should always be included as part of PR&G.
- Nonstructural Alternative (FWFI): These are alternatives that alter the use of existing infrastructure or human activities to avoid or minimize adverse changes to existing hydrologic, geomorphic, and ecological processes. They usually include modifications to public policy,

regulatory policy, pricing policy, management practices, land cover practices, or the use of green infrastructure.

 Additional Alternatives (FWFI): These are alternatives that are needed to address additional Federal, State, or local concerns not addressed by the alternatives above.

During the process of alternative formulation, it is very common for alternatives to meet more than one of the definitions described above. As stated in the PR&G guidance, "the alternatives listed above, and any other alternatives included in the PR&G analysis may overlap in whole or in part. (USDA-NRCS, DM9500-013, pg.17, 2017)." As an example, when the PR&G process is fully implemented, it is very common for the Environmentally Preferrable Alternative (LEDPA) and the Locally Preferred Alternative to be the same. Additionally, this is often the alternative with the highest National benefit/cost ratio due to the desire of the local sponsors to minimize their own capital investment while maximizing their own returns.

For this Plan-EA, the alternatives evaluated during formulation included the following:

- Alternative 1 -- No Action Alternative (FWOFI): The No Action Alternative (FWOFI) is the most likely future condition without any developed Federal alternative or changes in law or public policy. It is what could be expected if NRCS takes no action.
- Alternative 2 Proposed Action Flood Reduction Alternative (FWFI): The Flood Reduction Alternative is the Action Alternative that structurally addresses the flooding issues along the waterways while providing channel improvements at specific locations. It includes four locations in American Fork, three locations in Lehi City, and one location along lower Dry Creek that stretches between Lehi City and Saratoga Springs City. See Map B-2 in Appendix B. The design improvements for American Fork City are based on the 100-year storm, and for Lehi City/Saratoga Springs City are based on the 50-year storm, as per each city's design standards.
- Alternative 3 Proposed Action Property Buyouts Alternative (Nonstructural) (FWFI): The Nonstructural Alternative includes acquiring easements for property located within the 50-year recurrence interval floodplain that would otherwise be protected by channel improvements. Alternative 4 – Proposed Action – 500-year Storm Event Alternative (FWFI): This alternative included measures to address the flooding issues associated with the 500-year storm event along the waterways.

The project area contained three sub-basins: American Fork, Lehi Upstream, and Lehi Downstream. These areas have been flooded or are at risk of flooding. This analysis identified that the enlargement of some of the structures and channel improvements are needed to reduce the risk of flooding. Incremental analysis was conducted considering each sub-basin. There were no increments within each sub-basin. There are eight project areas: Four in American Fork and four total in Lehi/Saratoga Springs Cities, comprised of the Upstream and Downstream Lehi sub-basins. The project areas work in conjunction with each other in the sub-basin and the omission of any project area within any sub-basin would render the remaining project areas ineffective. As such, the project areas for American Fork, Lehi Upstream, and Lehi Downstream sub-basins are inclusive as a single alternative increment for each sub-basin. The first increment was American Fork, the second increment was Lehi Upstream, and the third increment was Lehi Downstream:

The American Fork Alternative includes five project locations:

Location 1 Channel Improvements at 300 North Location 2 Channel Improvements at 100 North and 200 East Location 3 Channel Improvements at 200 South Location 4 Channel Improvements at 400 South

The Lehi Upstream Alternative includes three project locations:

Location 5 Upper Dry Creek Location 6: Upper Waste Ditch Location 7 Waste Ditch at Willow Park

The Lehi/Saratoga Springs Downstream Alternative includes one project location:

Location 8: Lower Dry Creek

As described in the Plan-EA, the main purpose of the watershed plan is to reduce the average annual flood damage within the watershed. While only flood-damage related benefits were quantified, other types of benefits serving the project purposes were still considered qualitatively when evaluating the costs and benefits of project alternatives.

According to PR&G, after preliminary consideration, agencies may remove from detailed study those alternatives that do not achieve the Federal Objective and Guiding Principles. In addition, alternatives that may at first appear reasonable but clearly become unreasonable because of cost, logistics, existing technology, and social or environmental reasons may also be eliminated from further analysis. These

alternatives should be briefly discussed to indicate that they were considered, and the analysis should document the reason(s) why they were eliminated (e.g., they do not achieve the Federal Objective and Guiding Principles).

In general, the NEE alternative was developed in accordance with PR&G by evaluating the economic, social, and environmental impacts of flood damage reduction in the rural community. Given the emphasis placed on the construction of flood protection structures by the local steering committee to provide flood mitigation, the geographic extents of evaluated alternatives are limited to the area where one or more of the proposed structural alternatives would have an estimated impact to the 500-year flood depth. The annual benefits of the project alternatives are based on the estimated reduction in average annual floodwater damages with proposed flood control measures in place compared to future conditions without mitigative action (No Action Alternative).

Alternatives considered included the No-Action Alternative, nonstructural alternatives, the locally preferred alternative, and the NEE Alternative. Alternatives were compared against the No-Action Alternative, which involved projecting existing resources and conditions into the future to establish a benchmark against which alternatives were evaluated. Tradeoffs between alternatives with respect to environmental, economic, and social goals were identified.

This planning study evaluated both structural and nonstructural alternatives. However, the planning team eliminated nonstructural alternatives from the detailed study due to their exorbitant costs compared to the potential benefits. One structural alternative was eliminated because the monetary benefits were well below the costs. The following are summaries of eliminated alternatives, which propose to mitigate damages from the 100-year flood.

Alternative 3. Property Buyouts Alternative- The alternative to relocate the residences, improvements, structures, and other land value uses to a location outside of the floodplain has been analyzed. There are 994 residences, 91 commercial businesses, and 4 public properties in the 100-year floodplain. Costs for such relocation include the purchase of new property for the relocated items, the logistical, labor, and material costs associated with relocating and constructing new facilities, and the demolition and cleanup of the existing improvements and structures. Costs to complete this have been estimated at two times the current assessed value of the properties. Relocating the affected properties in all three sub-basins would require costs of almost \$394,346,259. Further, the demolition and cleanup of the existing properties and the development

8

of properties elsewhere create a larger impact on the environment and communities. This alternative is economically and culturally unreasonable and does not provide any additional flood protection benefit. The table below summarizes the average annual costs and benefits of the Property Buyouts Alternative:

Costs/Benefits	Value
Total Project Investment	\$394,346,259
Annual Project Investment	\$14,606,948
Annual OM&R Costs	\$0
Flood Damage Reduction Benefit (Monetized Regulating Service)	\$7,396,733
Total Annual Project Costs	\$14,606,948
Total Annual Project Benefits	\$7,396,733
Benefit-Cost Ratio	0.51
Annual Monetized Net Benefit	-\$7,210,215

|--|

**Alternative 5.** Floodproofing - To protect areas that would be affected by flooding, individual properties could be floodproofed, or floodwalls could be constructed within the floodplain boundary. The area protected includes portions of the communities of American Fork and Lehi. Floodproofed structures would include 994 residences, 91 commercial businesses, and 4 public properties in the 100-year floodplain. Floodwalls would be required along roadways and developed areas throughout the floodplain. This alternative is unreasonable because the community and environmental impacts are significantly greater than in other alternatives. Additionally, floodproofing structures is not feasible given the sheer amount of structures that would have to be floodproofed. It is not acceptable to the NRCS or the sponsor.

**Alternative 2.** Flood Protection. Along with the No Action Alternative, one alternative proposing the construction of several flood protection improvements for three sub-basin project areas was identified and evaluated in detail. The project consists of eight project areas across waterways within the three sub-basins. The three sub-basins are: 1. American Fork City (along the American Fork River), 2. Lehi City (along

Dry Creek and Waste Ditch) and 3. Lehi City and Saratoga Springs City (along lower Dry Creek). The project improvements were designed to convey flood waters offsite safely.

In all three sub-basins, each flood protection structure works in conjunction with each other, and omitting any item within the alternative would render the remaining options ineffective. As such, the project locations include all items as a single alternative for each sub-basin.

The project measures address flooding issues along the waterways. Project measures for channel improvements include two methods, an earthen channel or gabion baskets, to address flooding concerns and improve public safety along the waterways. It is less expensive to construct earthen channel improvements. However, each location was evaluated to select the most feasible solution that meets all the functionality and needs based on location and the space available for the necessary improvements to meet each city's design standards.

The design standards for each city were used to determine which storm event to design for and to assess the extent of project measures required. Project measures proposed for each of the three sub-basins are described below.

#### Location 1: Channel Improvements at 300 North in American Fork City

At this location, the upstream channel needs improvements to contain the flows and direct water to the existing box culvert under 300 North. The proposed measures at this location include improving the channel by raising the riverbanks by 1.5 feet for approximately 350 feet upstream of 300 North and constructing new upstream and downstream wingwalls. A new concrete apron would be placed on the downstream side at the outlet to protect against erosion. The embankments would be armored with gabions or riprap to protect against erosion. Other channel improvements could include modifications to the channel slope and channel width for up to 680 feet. Trees and vegetation would be removed within the flow area. The total area of disturbance would be up to 0.9 acres. These channel improvements would allow the 100-year flood to pass without any flooding upstream.

#### Location 2: Channel Improvements at 100 North and 200 East in American Fork City

The proposed measures at this location include improving the channel by raising the riverbanks by 2.5 feet for approximately 350 feet upstream of 100 North and creating a new transition into the existing box culvert. The embankments would be armored with gabions or riprap to protect against erosion. Other channel improvements could include modifications to the channel slope and channel width for up to 700

feet. Trees and vegetation would be removed within the flow area. The total area of disturbance would be up to 1.2 acres. These channel improvements would allow the 100-year flood to pass without any flooding upstream.

#### Location 3: Channel Improvements at 200 South in American Fork City

At this location, project measures would consist of removing energy dissipation baffle blocks that catch debris and cause backups in the channel. Riprap would be placed as erosion protection on the downstream banks instead of the baffle blocks. The existing culvert is anticipated to be replaced in the future under a separate action. Other channel improvements could include modifications to the channel slope and channel width for up to 150 feet. Trees and vegetation would be removed within the flow area. The total area of disturbance would be up to 0.3 acres. These improvements would allow the 100-year flood to pass without any flooding.

#### Location 4: Channel Improvements at 400 South in American Fork City

The proposed measures at this location include widening the upstream channel and raising the riverbanks from 5 feet to 8 feet for approximately 300 feet using gabion baskets. Other channel improvements could include modifications to the channel slope and channel width for up to 900 feet. Trees and vegetation would be removed within the flow area. The total area of disturbance would be up to 0.9 acres. These improvements would allow the passage of the 100-year flood and would prevent flooding the houses near the river.

#### Location 5: Channel Improvements along Upper Dry Creek in Lehi City

As Dry Creek passes Lehi Elementary School, the existing 510-foot-long culvert would be replaced with a 12-foot-wide by 5-foot-tall concrete box culvert. The box culvert would have a trash rack and intake structure to prevent plugging.

The channel downstream of the box culvert would be improved to handle the design flow and the next box culvert downstream at 600 North (12-foot-wide by 5-foot-tall concrete box culvert). Channel improvements are proposed to include a 15-foot-wide concrete-lined channel bottom with 5.5-foot-tall gabion basket channel banks for approximately 381 feet. Channel slopes would match the existing channel slope with a minimum of 0.3 percent. Trees and vegetation would be removed within the flow area. The total area of disturbance would be up to 2.6 acres. Proposed improvements provide near 100% flood reduction of the 50-year flood and would prevent flooding of houses, roadways, and other critical infrastructure.

#### Location 6: Channel Improvements along Upper Waste Ditch in Lehi City

As the Waste Ditch passes the school, it enters a 42-inch-diameter corrugated metal pipe, is conveyed under a portion of lawn for approximately 348 feet, and discharges back into the open channel. To provide more capacity, the existing pipe would be replaced with a 20-foot-wide by 4-foot-tall concrete box culvert. The box culvert would also have a trash rack and intake structure to prevent plugging.

The downstream channel would be improved to handle the design flow. Channel improvements would include a 15-foot-wide concrete-lined channel bottom with 5.5-foot-tall gabion basket channel banks for approximately 550 feet. Channel slopes would match the existing channel slope, with a minimum of minimum of 0.3 percent. Trees and vegetation would be removed within the flow area. The total area of disturbance would be up to 3.2 acres. Proposed improvements provide near 100% flood reduction of the 50-year flood and would prevent flooding of houses, roadways, and other critical infrastructure.

#### Location 7: Channel Improvements along Waste Ditch at Willow Park in Lehi City

Approximately 1,279 feet of unimproved sections of the Waste Ditch channel would be excavated and expanded to match the upstream capacity. An undersized box culvert at 300 North in Willow Park would be replaced. The new box culvert would be a 20-foot-wide by 4-foot-tall concrete box culvert. The channel improvements would be the same as those at the elementary school, including a 15-foot-wide concrete-lined channel bottom with 5.5-foot-tall gabion basket channel banks. Channel slopes would match the existing channel slope with a minimum of 0.3 percent.

Floodplain diversions would also be constructed along the lower portion of the channel. Fill material would be imported and compacted into berms to contain flows adjacent to the channel. The total area of disturbance would be up to 8.1 acres. Proposed improvements provide near 100% flood reduction of the 50-year flood and would prevent flooding of houses, roadways, and other critical infrastructure.

#### Location 8: Channel Improvements along Lower Dry Creek in Lehi City and Saratoga Springs City

Approximately 4,150 feet of the Dry Creek channel between 1100 West and Utah Lake would be improved with a combination of channel clearing (dredging channel and restoring natural channel capacity) and gabion-lined channel sections. The minimum slope of this channel would be 0.3 percent. Several large

trees would be removed from the channel to restore hydraulic capacity. Channel dredging would extend up to 2 feet below the existing channel flow line. Culverts would be upsized at 1700 West (12-foot-wide by 5-foot-tall) and 1900 South (14-foot-wide by 5-foot-tall). The total area of disturbance would be up to 19.4 acres. Proposed improvements provide near 100% flood reduction of the 50-year flood and would prevent flooding of houses, roadways, and other critical infrastructure.

The preferred alternative will allow the Sponsors to protect property and infrastructure while maximizing public benefits. This alternative's average annual monetary benefits are estimated to be \$2,670,190, while its estimated average annual cost is \$656,800, resulting in an annual net benefit of \$2,013,390.

# 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL BENEFITS

Environmental and social benefits were not monetized, but they are explained in detail for each alternative studied in the Environmental Consequences Section of the Plan/EA.

Environmentally adverse impacts will be minimized during construction. In the long term, there would only be negligible adverse impacts anticipated from any of the evaluated alternatives. The region is developed urban land with intermittently dry waterways.

Socially, the threat of loss of life or property will be minimized with reduced flood depths at buildings and roads. The annual average daily traffic on county major collector and rural roads near the project area near American Fork was about 2,500 to 8,000 vehicles per day, and near Lehi, 1,000 to 200,000 vehicles per day (Utah Department of Transportation, 2023). However, road and bridge damages were deemed insignificant in the project area and were not evaluated. Incidental recreation and wildlife use after construction will continue and will not be affected by the project improvements. No waterbodies will be developed from the project improvements.

This project was initiated in 2019, prior to the 2020 census. While the project area may be considered urban, the sponsor cities met the rural definition by having populations under 50,000 people in the 2010 census, which was used for the applications. Since then, Lehi City's population has grown to over 50,000 people in the 2020 census. NRCS-Utah has moved the project forward due to meeting the 20% agricultural benefits/population less than 50,000 for the whole project, as defined in Section 2 (16 U.S.C. Section 1002, "Definitions". (See Appendix B for email correspondence from Sonya Keith, National Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations Program Coordinator, NRCS – Lexington, KY.)

13

## 4.0 PERIOD OF ANALYSIS

The Period of Analysis used was 52 years (including 2 years for design and construction). Floods from the 2, 5, 10, 25, 50, 100, 200, and 500-year storm events were analyzed to estimate average annual flood-related damages.

A net present value analysis was conducted to compare the costs of project alternatives. Average annual values were also estimated. All costs of installation, operation and maintenance were based on 2024 prices. The costs associated with designing and implementing all structural measures were assumed to be implemented over a one-year period immediately preceding operation. The alternative with a 51-year period of analysis yielded the highest net benefits using the mandated 2.75% discount rate for all federal water resource projects for FY24 to discount and amortize the anticipated streams of costs and benefits.

#### 5.0 ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND DOCUMENTATION

A customized Excel worksheet using Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) depth-damage curves and locally obtained data was used to evaluate the benefits and costs of alternatives. Each project alternative, storm event, and flood damage category was included in the worksheet to estimate average annual damages. Alternative cost estimates provided by the project engineers were also included in the worksheet. Economic data and results were linked in the worksheet to create the required P&G tables for the final project report.

#### 6.0 RURAL COMMUNITY AND AGRICULTURAL DAMAGES

~

The stream of monetary benefits was described in average annual equivalent terms. The average annual expected benefits were the difference between the No Action Alternative and each project Alternative. The expected average annual damages for each alternative, storm event (8-events), and damage category below were estimated with the following equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{8} (\underline{PFED_{i-1} + FED_i})/2 * (PPFE_{i-1} - PFE_i)$$

PFED<sub>i-1</sub> - Previous Flood Event Damages FED<sub>i</sub> - Flood Event Damages PPFE<sub>i-1</sub> - Probability of Previous Flood Event PFE<sub>i</sub> - Probability of Flood Event

#### 6.1 STRUCTURE, CONTENT & VEHICLE DAMAGES

Structure, building content, and vehicle damages for each storm event and project alternative were estimated based on structures identified from aerial imagery and property data provided by the Utah County, Utah tax assessor. Local tax appraisal district records were utilized in order to obtain the structural values of residences, commercial and public properties, and outbuildings that would be affected by project activities. The structure damages were estimated using the methodology described in the Structural Damages Calculations Template (Tim Goody, NWMC). The value of the structures was calculated by subtracting the depreciated replacement value (DRV) from the Tax Accessor's structure value. The structures in the project area that are affected by flooding are located in a small rural town. The year structures were built varied significantly, as did the DRV:

<u>Structure Built</u>	<u>Approx. Age</u>	DRV
2000 – 2024	25 Years	.20
1980 -1997	40 Years	.18
1960 – 1979	65 Years	.28
1936 – 1958	82 Years	.10
1911 – 1935	100 Years	.25
1895 – 1910	120 Years	.30

Based on the Life Cycle Chart (Swiftestimator.com, building cost reports online 2/2007) the Depreciated Multiplier ranged from 18% to 30%. The structure value used in the flood damage analysis was estimated as: The County Tax Accessed Value \* (1- Depreciated Replacement Value Factor) (see: DelaneyFloodDamagesBenefitsData.xls for calculations). For vehicles, local project managers estimated the typical vehicle replacement dollar value.

This estimated Depreciated Replacement Value is also consistent with the USACE National Structure Inventory documentation: "Structure Valuation - These replacement values for structures are then depreciated in order to obtain depreciated replacement value; each structure is depreciated by 1% per year for the first 20 years, after which it is assumed that routine maintenance would keep structure values at 80% of their replacement values".

(https://www.hec.usace.army.mil/confluence/nsi/technicalreferences/latest/technical-documentation).

Areas flooded and flood depths with and without project were estimated for the 2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, 50-, 100-, 200-, and 500-year storm events. The water depths for the 10- through 500-year storm events were obtained from the hydraulic simulation performed by Jones & DeMille Engineering, Inc., Richfield, Utah. The 2- and 5-year storm events were included in the economic analysis but were not modeled. Instead, a conservative assumption was made that the flood depths were zero during the 2- and 5-year storm events. Building types, contents, and the typical number of vehicles and vehicle values associated with impacted buildings were estimated using interpolation of flood depth-damage curves developed by FEMA. The percent damage factor was multiplied by each building structure and vehicle dollar value to estimate flood damages. The total value of structures on impacted properties is shown below. This value does not include land values, only structure values.

	Total Structures	Residences & Apartments	Commercial Properties	Public Properties
Number	1,336	1,209	125	2
Value	\$241,673,943	\$179,568,556	\$61,917,707	\$187 <i>,</i> 680

Watershed Planning Area 500 yr Flooded Structures (W/O Project)

Structure and content values were estimated as a percentage (about 75% structure and 60% content damages at 10-feet flood depth in a 1-story, no basement home) of assessed property values. Estimated floodwater depths (where damage occurs) for various storms (including the 500-year storm) for each structure were based on the results of the hydrology and hydraulics (H&H) simulation modeling. Floodwater data was then used with water depth to damage functions to estimate structural and content damages based on the ground elevation of each structure. A similar analysis was conducted for vehicles located at the property within the floodplain area. Damages to vehicles were estimated to begin at 0.5 feet of flood depth. Each affected property was estimated to have a minimum of two vehicles. The vehicle value was estimated to be \$7,500/vehicle.

#### 6.2 ROAD DAMAGES

Road damages caused by storms up to and including the 500-year storm event would be insignificant, so they were not evaluated.

## 6.3 BRIDGE & CULVERT DAMAGES

For the economic analysis, no identified culverts and bridges (stream crossings) were affected by storms up to and including the 500-year event.

#### 6.4 OTHER DAMAGES

Local county officials provided or estimated no additional "Other Damages" (emergency aid, clean-up, sewer, debris removal, etc.).

## 6.5 AGRICULTURAL OR CROP DAMAGES

No pasture, range, livestock, or confined animal feeding operation damages were identified within the project area affected by storms up to and including the 500-year event.

#### 6.6 **RECREATION**

Based on evidence found at the site and information from local residents, the waterways are not used for recreational purposes. The flood protection measures are not intended to store water for recreation. Incidental recreational activities such as walking are expected to be minimal. Since there is no official or unofficial usage count, estimated annual visitor days are unavailable. Therefore, incidental recreation impacts were not evaluated.

## 6.7 SCOUR & SEDIMENT DAMAGES

Erosion and sedimentation were not identified as a project resource concern. Flood erosion, scour, and sediment deposition damages are assumed to be minimal and not evaluated with and without the project.

The table below shows that the current average annual floodwater damages without project (present condition) are \$7,396,773. Floodwater damages with project (Alternative 1) were estimated at \$4,726,583.

Table 0-1. Summary of Annual Expected Damages					
Plan Annual Expected Damages					
Category	Present Condition	Alt 1			
Structure, Contents & Vehicles					

Table 6-1: Summar	y of Annual	Expected	Damages
-------------------	-------------	----------	---------

American Fork	\$781,766	\$246,810
Lehi Upstream	\$5,419,884	\$4,445,151
Lehi Downstream	\$1,195,123	\$34,622
Total:	\$7,396,773	\$4,726,583

1 Price base: 2024. Calculated using FY 20242 Water Resources Discount Rate (2.75%), annualized over 50 years, and 52-year period of analysis.

The number of structures that could be flooded and their total structural value are displayed below for each of the three sub-basins:

American	Fork 500 yr	<b>Flooded St</b>	tructures (W	/O Project)
----------	-------------	-------------------	--------------	-------------

		Residences			
	Total	&	Commercial	Public	
	Structures	Apartments	Properties	Properties	
Number	328	254	72	2	
Value	\$73,574,967	\$22,064,487	\$51,322,800	\$187,680	

# American Fork 500 yr Flooded Structures (Alt 1)

	Total Structures	Residences & Apartments	Commercial Properties	Public Properties
Number	210	163	45	2
Value	\$30,957,510	\$13,059,120	\$17,710,710	\$187,680

## Lehi Upstream 500 yr Flooded Structures (W/O Project)

	Total Structures	Residences & Apartments	Commercial Properties	Public Properties
Number	858	809	49	0
Value	\$141,607,320	\$131,471,373	\$10,135,947	\$0

## Lehi Upstream 500 yr Flooded Structures (Alt 1)

	Total Structures	Residences & Apartments	Commercial Properties	Public Properties
Number	793	750	43	0
Value	\$136,686,467	\$126,658,187	\$10,028,280	\$0

# Lehi Downstream 500 yr Flooded Structures (W/O Project))

	Residences		
Total	&	Commercial	Public
Structures	Apartments	Properties	Properties

Number	150	146	4	0
Value	\$26,491,656	\$26,032,696	\$458,960	\$0

#### Lehi Downstream 500 yr Flooded Structures (Alt 1)

		Residences		
	Total	&	Commercial	Public
	Structures	Apartments	Properties	Properties
Number	80	76	4	0
Value	\$15,987,075	\$15,528,115	\$458,960	\$0

#### Structures Flooded in the Dry Fork Watershed Project Area Without Project

		Home		Commercial			Public		
Event	< 1 ft	1 to 3 ft	> 3 ft	< 1 ft	1 to 3 ft	> 3 ft	< 1 ft	1 to 3 ft	> 3 ft
2-yr	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
5-yr	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
10-yr	258	57	4	11	3	2	2	0	2
25-yr	556	159	12	44	9	2	1	1	2
50-yr	649	208	18	54	16	6	1	1	4
100-yr	732	246	16	56	27	8	1	1	2
200-yr	809	275	18	68	33	10	1	1	2
500-yr	884	305	21	79	35	13	1	1	2

# 7.0 WATERSHED PROJECT COSTS

Project costs for flood control measures and channel work were estimated by Franson Civil Engineers, Jones & DeMille Engineering, and Horrocks Engineers. Installation and operation & maintenance costs for each activity are described in detail in the cost tabs in the economic analysis Excel worksheet.

All costs were allocated to the flood prevention purpose according to the procedure in the National Resource Economics Handbook, Part 611 Water Resources Handbook for Economics, Chapter 6 Costs and Cost Allocation (NRCS 2014b). Work Plan-EA tables were constructed based on the calculated cost allocated to flood prevention. Within this purpose, the costs were shared between NRCS and the local and state entities as specified in the NWPM; in this case, the cost share for flood prevention is 100 percent federal and 0 percent local. Within these guidelines, engineering is 100 percent federal, and operation,

maintenance, and replacement are 100 percent local. See Work Plan Table 2 in the Plan-EA for the cost allocation/cost-sharing process results.

All costs were amortized at the Fiscal Year 2024 Federal Water Resource Discount of 2.75 percent for 52 years. Average Annual Costs are computed as the sum of the amortized construction and annual operation and maintenance costs. Engineers estimate that each structure would last 50 years, the project's life.

Project engineers estimated all project costs and converted them to Present Values by discounting each cost at the beginning of the period of analysis using the applicable project discount rate. Installation expenditures before the project was installed were brought forward to the end of the installation period by charging compound interest at the project discount rate from the date the costs were incurred. Finally, the project discount rate converted the present values to average annual equivalent terms. All estimated values and damages were assessed within a customized Excel template.

#### Watershed Project Annual Cost Summary

	Amortization of Installation Cost	Operation, Maintenance, and Replacement Cost2	Total
American Fork	\$104,000	\$8,600	\$112,600
Lehi Upstream	\$251,400	\$14,200	\$265,600
Lehi Downstream	\$263,900	\$14,700	\$278,600
Total	\$619,300	\$37,500	\$656,800

1/ Discount rate 2.75% with a 52 year period of analysis. Price base 2024

# 8.0 WATERSHED PROJECT BENEFITS AND COSTS

The table below shows that the current average annual benefits are \$2,670,190, and the average annual costs are \$656,800. The net annual benefits between with and without project that the project would provide to downstream properties are \$2,013,390.

As reflected below, all three project areas had a B/C ratio greater than 1.0. Under Alternative 1, all three geographic areas produce a B/C ratio of 4.07.

#### Watershed Project Benefit-Cost Summary

	Average Annual	Average	Benefit Cost	
Alternative 1	Benefits <sup>2/</sup>	Annual Costs <sup>3/</sup>	Ratio	Net Benefits
American Fork	\$534,956	\$112,600	4.75	\$422,356

Lehi Upstream	\$974,733	\$265,600	3.67	\$709,133
Lehi Downstream	\$1,160,501	\$278,600	4.17	\$881,901
Grand Total	\$2,670,190	\$656,800	4.07	\$2,013,390

1/ Discount rate 2.75% with a 52 year period of analysis. Price base 2024

Economic Analysis Report

# 9.0 FINAL TABLES

Below are all tables for all project increments and alternatives.

Table 6-1   Estimated Installation Cost Amorican Fork-Dry Crook Watershed, Utab [2024 Dollars] <sup>1</sup>												
Estimated installation Cost American Fork-Dry Creek W     Number   E								Estimated Cost (2024 Dollars) <sup>1</sup>				
Works of					Pul	olic Law 83-56	6 Funds		Other Fund	ls	Total	
Improvement Unit	Improvement	Unit	Federal Land	Non- Federal Land	Total	Federal Land	Non- Federal Land	Total	Federal Land	Non- Federal Land	Total	
Structural Measures	•		•	•	•	•		2	•			
Flood Protection												
American Fork	Acres	0	1,305	1,305	\$0	\$2,728,000	\$2,728,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,728,000	
Lehi Upstream	Acres	0	2,323	2,323	\$0	\$5,718,000	\$5,718,000	\$0	\$865,000	\$865,000	\$6,583,000	
Lehi Downstream	Acres	0	284	284	\$0	\$4,817,000	\$4,817,000	\$0	\$2,079,000	\$2,079,000	\$6,896,000	
Total Project					\$0	\$13,263,000	\$13,263,000	\$0	\$2,944,000	\$2,944,000	\$16,207,000	
<sup>1</sup> Price base: 2024												

Table 6-2														
Estimated Cost Distribution—Water Resource Project Measures American Fork—Dry Creek Watershed, Utah [2024 Dollars] <sup>1</sup>														
	Installation Cost—Public Law 83-566				Installation Cost—Other Funds					Total				
Works of Improvement	Construction <sup>3</sup>	Engineering <sup>6</sup>	Real Property Rights <sup>4,5</sup>	Relocation Payments	Project Admin.	Total Public Law 566	Construction <sup>3</sup>	Engineering <sup>6</sup>	Real Property Rights <sup>4,5</sup>	Water Rights	Relocation Payments	Project Admin. <sup>2</sup>	Total Other	Installation Costs
American Fork	\$2,387,000	\$341,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,728,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,728,000
Lehi Upstream	\$4,968,000	\$750,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,718,000	\$0	\$0	\$865,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$865,000	\$6,583,000
Lehi Downstream	\$4,187,000	\$630,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,817,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,079,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,079,000	\$6,896,000
Total	\$11,542,000	\$1,721,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,263,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,944,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,944,000	\$16,207,000

1 Price base: 2024

2 Includes \$0 for relocation assistance advisory service.

3 Includes \$\_\_\_\_ of Public Law 83-566 funds and \$\_\_\_\_ of other funds for cultural resource protection and mitigation measures.

4 Includes \$0 of real property cost for mitigation.

5 Includes \$\_\_\_\_ or surveys, legal fees, other costs.

6 Engineering services contract cost to be borne: \$3,066,477 by Public Law 83-566 funds and \$0 by other funds.

Economic Analysis Report

Table 6-3									
Cost Allocation and Cost Sharing Summary for Multi-Purpose Watershed Project Plans American Fork—Dry Creek Watershed, Utah [2024 Dollars] <sup>1</sup>									
	PL-566	PL-566 Funds Other Funds Total Funds							
	Flood Protection	Total	Flood Protection	Total	Flood Protection	Total			
Structural Measures									
Construction	\$11,542,000	\$11,542,000	\$0	\$0	\$11,542,000	\$11,542,000			
Engineering	\$1,721,000	\$1,721,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,721,000	\$1,721,000			
Real property rights	\$0	\$0	\$2,944,000	\$2,944,000	\$2,944,000	\$2,944,000			
Relocation Payments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Project admin.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Total		\$13,263,000		\$2,944,000		\$16,207,000			
<sup>1</sup> Price base: 2024									
<sup>2</sup> Method of cost allocation:									

# Table 5c: Estimated Average Annual Flood Damage Reduction Benefits

Alternative 1 – Shiviwits								
Table 6-4								
Estimated Average Preferred Alternative Annual Costs, American Fork—Dry Creek Watershed, Utah (2024 Dollars) <sup>1</sup>								
Works of ImprovementAmortization of Installation CostOperation, Maintenance and 								
American Fork	\$104,000 \$8,600 \$0 \$112,600							
Lehi Upstream	\$251,400 \$14,200 \$0 \$265,600							
Lehi Downstream	ehi Downstream \$263,900 \$14,700 \$0 \$278,600							
Total \$619,300 \$37,500 \$0 \$656,800								
1 Price base: 2024, amortized over 52-years at a discount rate of 2.75 percent.								
2 Includes \$0 for operation, maintenance, and replacement for recreational development.								
3 Costs for technical assistance to install measures in this evaluation unit are included.								

# Santa Clara Watershed Economic Analysis Report

Table 6-5								
Estimated Average Annual Flood Damage Reduction Benefits American Fork—Dry Creek Watershed, Utah [2024 Dollars]								
	Esti	mated Averag	Damage Reduction					
	Without	Project	With F	roject	Benefit <sup>3,4</sup>			
Item	Agriculture -related <sup>2</sup>	Non- agriculture -related	Agriculture -related <sup>2</sup>	Non- agriculture -related	Agriculture -related <sup>2</sup>	Non- agriculture -related		
Flood Protection Improvements								
Structure, Contents & Vehicles								
America n Fork	\$781,766		\$246,810		\$534,956			
Lehi Upstream	\$5,419,884		\$4,445,151		\$974,733			
Lehi Downstream	\$1,195,123		\$34,622		\$1,160,501			
Grand Total	\$7,396,773		\$4,726,583		\$2,670,190			
<sup>1</sup> Price base: 2024								
<sup>2</sup> Agriculture-related damage includes damage to rural communities.								
3 Includes offsets of land treatment measures								

<sup>3</sup> Includes effects of land-treatment measures.

<sup>4</sup> Costs and benefits for on-farmland treatment have been netted out.

i abië 0-0								
Estimated Average Annual Watershed Protection Damage Reduction Benefits American Fork—Dry Creek Watershed, Utah [2024 Dollars] <sup>1</sup>								
ltom	Damage Reduction Benefit, Average Annual							
item	Agriculture-related	Non-agriculture-related						
Onsite								
Structure, Contents & Vehicles	\$2,670,190							
Total	\$2,670,190	\$0						
<sup>1</sup> Price base: 2024								

Santa Clara Watershed Economic Analysis Report

Table 6-7									
Comparison of Preferred Alternative Benefits and Costs American Fork—Dry Creek Watershed, Utah [2024 Dollars] <sup>1</sup>									
	Agricultural	Non	Average Annual	Average Annual	Benefit Cost				
Works of Improvement	Damage Reduction	Agricultural							
	Flood Reduction	Other	Benefits	Costs <sup>2</sup>	Ratio				
Land Treatment—acres									
American Fork	\$534,956	\$0	\$534,956	\$112,600	4.75				
Lehi Upstream	\$974,733	\$0	\$974,733	\$265,600	3.67				
Lehi Downstream	\$1,160,501	\$0	\$1,160,501	\$278,600	4.17				
Total	\$2,670,190	\$0	\$2,670,190	\$656,800	4.07				
<sup>1</sup> Price base: 2024									
<sup>2</sup> From Table 2									