

From: fran lehman [mailto:franlehman@outlook.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2015 4:07 PM
To: mertman
Subject: RE: FW: 2015_FiddlerCreekQuestion

I would think it would come under "new business ". You are the only CC'S that responded.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy Note® 4, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: mertman@westongov.com
Date: 04/15/2015 2:14 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: fran lehman <franlehman@outlook.com>, BLambert <blambert@westongov.com>, rossman <rossman@westongov.com>, thunt <thunt@westongov.com>, tbarton <tbarton@westongov.com>
Cc: William Curley <wc.wecao@gmail.com>, WCClerk_Cheryl Kregel <wcclerk@rtconnect.net>
Subject: re: FW: 2015_FiddlerCreekQuestion

I assume this issue will be an item listed under 'new' business

From: "fran lehman" <franlehman@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 1:32 PM
To: "BLambert" <blambert@westongov.com>, "mertman" <mertman@westongov.com>, "rossman" <rossman@westongov.com>, "thunt" <thunt@westongov.com>, "tbarton" <tbarton@westongov.com>
Cc: "William Curley" <wc.wecao@gmail.com>, "WCClerk_Cheryl Kregel" <wcclerk@rtconnect.net>
Subject: FW: 2015_FiddlerCreekQuestion

2015_Fiddler Creek ROW,

Below is correspondence between Weston County WYDOT Engineer, Joni Kachelhoffer and Fran Lehman pertaining to the Fiddler Creek ROW which is 100' and 150'. The original question, asking the possibility of returning excessive ROW to the landowners.

The best information I have to date is below.

Please let me know if there any further questions.

Thank You,

franlehman@outlook.com

From: Joni Kachelhoffer [<mailto:joni.kachelhoffer@wyo.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2015 12:50 PM

To: fran lehman

Subject: Re: 2015_FiddlerCreekQuestion

Hi Fran,

I believe that is correct. I assume the landowners were happy to deal with the Highway Department for a chance to get their road improved. There is probably no reason the county can't give land back to the landowners if Weston County wants to pay to have it re-surveyed, platted, and handle the deeds/title/etc.

On Mon, Apr 6, 2015 at 8:39 AM, fran lehman <franlehman@outlook.com> wrote:

Thank you Joni.

I believe that it's ROW was obtained at that time due to anticipation of growth.

With having obtained all of the easements at that time at these ROW widths, 100/150', even the landowners must have agreed to the above.

franlehman@outlook.com

From: Joni Kachelhoffer [mailto:joni.kachelhoffer@wyo.gov]

Sent: Friday, April 3, 2015 11:07 AM

To: fran lehman

Subject: Re: 2015_FiddlerCreekQuestion

Hello Fran,

I don't know the answer to this question for this particular road and will check with our R/W people in Cheyenne. Highway right of way widths vary and many factors figure into it. Are there high, deep fills that will require significant room to construct flat, safe slopes? Are/will there be a lot of drainage pipes? We always try to keep pipe ends in our R/W so we can clean and maintain them. Are traffic volumes expected to increase? Will we possibly need to construct additional lanes in the future? Would a utility corridor be necessary or beneficial? Can utilities be avoided? Are there existing easements? Will wetlands be impacted? Are businesses impacted? What kind? What is the value and use of the land to be purchased? Will condemnation be required to acquire r/w? We consider a lot of things when it comes to r/w takings and try to keep the r/w footprint as small as possible. However, historically that was not necessarily the case. Projects constructed prior to the 1980s usually have wider r/w and I'm not sure why

Was this road the main highway at one time? I'm wondering if, before the current alignment for US 16 was constructed, this was the main traveled route and for WYDOT to do improvements they secured r/w at widths that were standard in the 60s. Let me do some checking and don't hesitate to contact me if I don't get back to you in a couple weeks.

Have a happy Easter.

On Tue, Mar 31, 2015 at 10:50 AM, fran lehman <franlehman@outlook.com> wrote:

Hello Joni,

Chairman Bill Lambert had this question on the ROW for Fiddler Creek Road #22.

Section 23, 22, 21, 20, 19,T 46-R 64

Section 24, 23,T 46-R 65

ROW width, Exciting #451 going W – Section 23, 22, 21, 20, ½ 19, ROW 150'

Approach to Upton~Fairview road - ½ Section 19, 100' ROW

Mr. Lamberts concerns are;

ROW width for landowners in the Townships and Ranges listed above.

The reasoning for having this wide a ROW width on the landowners and if this ROW width is not needed returning a portion back to the landowners.

Fiddler Creek road facts;

1962 -All easements for this road were obtained with 100' or 150" ROW. (Item 930)

1966 – A resolution with WYDOT for improvement for the entire length of this road which included 6.41 miles of County.

2014 – Road re-surveyed due to not having the proper documentation / survey / description for the entire road. 2014 survey followed the prior year's ROW of 100' and 150'.

My question for you; is there a statute stipulating a ROW width when egressing a State Highway and / or approaching a County road and in this case Upton~Fairview.

My objective is to be able to give Mr. Lambert a reasoning behind this ROW width for the entire road.

Thank You,

franlehman@outlook.com

[307-746-5140](tel:307-746-5140)

--

Joni B. Kachelhoffer. P.E.

Resident Engineer

Wyoming Dept. of Transportation

600 S. Seneca

Newcastle, WY 82701

[307-746-3551](tel:307-746-3551)

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records Act and may be disclosed to third parties.

--

Joni B. Kachelhoffer. P.E.

Resident Engineer

Wyoming Dept. of Transportation

600 S. Seneca

Newcastle, WY 82701

307-746-3551

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records Act and may be disclosed to third parties.