

## UNEV Petroleum Pipeline Project Update

May 15, 2012

- **Overall:** The UNEV pipeline and terminals are in operation and everything is going well. Product is being shipped and marketed from both terminals.
- **Millard County:** Some sand fencing is being installed to stabilize a sand dune that has blown and exposed a small section of the pipeline to the West of Lynndyl (access from MCO3 at mile marker 125.5). This fencing was recommended by the BLM and is being monitored by them. Doing some work on a pipeline camel back by the Sevier River where a valve was going to be installed but wasn't because of the water level. Installing a fence around it and spreading gravel in the fenced in area. This work is being monitored by the BLM. The BLM is completing final inspections of the right-of-way and is expecting that this inspection in Millard County will take place in the next couple of weeks. There will be UNEV trucks out on the right-of-way about twice a year to inspect the right-of-way and to replace signage. Some signage has already had to be replaced in some areas due to the cattle.
- **Road Conditions Report:** UNEV submitted a Final Roads Conditions Report that was produced by GEM Engineering, a third-party engineering firm that produced the initial Roads Conditions Report, to Thayne Henrie, Millard County Road Department Superintendent. Based on this report Thayne has responded to UNEV and provided a letter to the Commissioners stating that it is his opinion that there has been no damage done to the designated County roads by UNEV and that UNEV has carried out its obligations under the Road Maintenance Agreement. The BLM did think that two loads of gravel needed to be spread out on MCO9. Thayne will coordinate having crews do this work and charge UNEV for this. UNEV is asking the County Commissioners to accept Thayne's findings and the BLM's findings that once this gravel is put down that UNEV has carried out its obligations.
- **Road Maintenance Agreement:** Bruce Parker has suggested that the Road Maintenance Agreement not be terminated and should continue indefinitely. It is UNEV's perspective that this agreement was put together with the County in regards to construction of the pipeline. UNEV was careful to have a third-party entity inspect the roads that were used before and after so that UNEV could be responsible for only what impact it might have on them. To have the Agreement just open it would be hard to know if the small amount of UNEV trucks now traveling on the County roads for operation and maintenance cause an impact. UNEV would also like to point out that the County receives taxes from the pipeline that should help cover regular road maintenance and repair.
- **Let Us Know:** If you hear something about our project that we need to be aware of or address, please let me know.

If you or anyone else in the County have questions or need to talk to someone about the UNEV project call Cindy Gubler at 801.364.0088 x107 or 801.971.5639.

Larry A. Peterson ~ PO Box 744 ~ Fillmore, UT 84631

May 12, 2012

Mr. Bart Whatcott, Millard County Commissioner  
50 South Main  
Fillmore, UT 84631

Dear Commissioner Whatcott:

**Thank you** for taking a few minutes of your time last week at the Fillmore City Council meeting to briefly discuss the proposed Millard – Juab County line adjustment. I indicated my regrets that I would not be able to attend the scheduled public hearing.

As I also indicated I do not personally have any property that would be effected and thus I do not have a strong for or against feeling about the proposal. In my years of being involved in planning and various land management issues I have found it difficult to see all future effects of proposed actions.

I recognize the problems caused by irregular land parcels. One of the properties I purchased in Ohio had a description like “*Beginning at the old mill race on the Grand River* “ (The old mill was taken out in a flood 100 years ago and the river had changed course over ¼ mile)” “*and continues northwesterly up the slope to the old apple tree* “ ( it was old then, but gone by 1970 ) ... etc. I sure wished for the public land survey system we have in the west.

**I suggested to you hat the Commissioners may want to discuss if there is an alternative way of solving the problem of recording by something like a Inter-governmental agreement instead of a County boundry change.** Such a simple agreement saying that for recording purposes that on this side of the line, Millard County will record and tax, while the other side of that line will be Juab's responsibility.

My thoughts are about unintended consequences. We complain of State and Federal legislation that was passed without full understanding of the impact to counties , other agencies or individuals. Some effects may be immediate, some may be years ahead. What may seem minor today could become a problem later. Some may have expenses that have not yet been considered.

As I have thought about our conversation, a few considerations came to mind.

- Every map-maker, such as Rand McNally to National Geographic would have to go in and revise their maps.
- GPS manufactures may need to do re-programing for their units
- Similar requirements would extend to other governments which have mapping responsibilities from Mr. Nord having to change the State highway map to the need to change the official Federal GLO land plats.
- There are businesses which draw their sales districts based on County lines.
- There are lists that are dependent and have been prepared based on established County line, the first that comes to mind is the Payments in-lieu of taxes.

While I am sure that is not an exhaustive list, the examples may suffice for the purpose of the discussion of whether to consider a boundary change or just a simple inter-agency agreement. I know that many other counties in Utah have irregular boundary lines, many established before surveying was completed. It was an easy way for people on the ground to know what County they were in, In the case of a ridge line a person was able to look down and see which way the water flows. When they established those lines, they probably had no idea of some of the future impacts would be of certain county lines. In some areas the location of a County line was debated quite a bit.

If the last line of your legislation read that the Millard & Juab Counties would reimburse anyone that incurred costs because of this change. Would that influence you decision to consider an alternative such as as Inter-governmental Agreement.

As a closing remark, which might get a few laughs, maybe we should promote a Statewide bill for needed boundary adjustments throughout the State taken care of at once.

Please feel free to share these thoughts with your fellow Commissioners during the discussion.

Sincerely,



LARRY A. PETERSON