



APRIL 29 2020

ARCHES HOTSPOT REGION COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING 1:00 P.M.

Per Executive Order 2020-5 issued by Governor Gary R. Herbert on March 18, 2020, this meeting will be conducted electronically and may be viewed on the [City's YouTube channel](#).

An anchor location will not be provided.

1. Call To Order
2. Approval Of Minutes
- 2.1. Minutes: April 23, 2020 Regular Meeting

Documents:

[MIN-AHRCC-2020-04-23 DRAFT.PDF](#)

3. Citizens To Be Heard

To have your comments considered for the Citizens to Be Heard portion of the electronic meeting, please fill out the form found here: [HTTPS://FORMS.GLE/32DJ26NN38IL5PCX8](https://forms.gle/32DJ26NN38IL5PCX8)

You must submit your comments by 1:00 p.m. on April 29, 2020. Please limit your comments to 400 words

4. Presentation Of Shared-Use Path Conceptual Design And Next Steps  
Presentation by Zacharia Levine
5. Discussion Of Transit And Shuttle Options
6. Project Identification: Discussion And Selection Of Projects To Be Evaluated For Hotspot Funding  
Discussion and possible action

Documents:

[PRELIMINARY PROJECT LIST ARHCC.PDF](#)  
[K JONES MAIN STREET IMPROVEMENT CONCEPTS.PDF](#)

7. Scheduling The Next Meeting
8. Adjournment

**ARCHES HOTSPOT REGION COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
APRIL 23, 2020**

The Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee held its Regular Meeting on the above date. Per Executive Order 2020-5 issued by Governor Gary R. Herbert on March 18, 2020, this meeting was conducted electronically. An anchor location was not provided. An audio recording of the meeting is archived at <http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>. A video recording is archived at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xn1728oX-PE>.

**Regular Meeting—Call to Order and Attendance:** City Manager Linares called the Regular Meeting to order at 2:02 PM. Participating remotely were Committee Members Wes Shannon, Karen Guzman-Newton, Mike Duncan, Curtis Wells, Jaylyn Hawks, Evan Clapper, and Kalen Jones. City staff participating remotely were City Manager Joel Linares, Assistant City Manager Carly Castle, City Attorney Laurie Simonson, and City Recorder Sommar Johnson. County staff participating remotely was Community and Economic Development Director Zacharia Levine. UDOT staff participating remotely were Region Planning Manager Jeff Sanders, District Engineer Jared Beard, and Region 4 Deputy Director Monte Aldridge.

**Citizens to be Heard:**

There were no Citizens to be Heard.

**Nomination and Selection of Committee Chair—Approved**

**Discussion:** Committee Member Duncan suggested that Committee Member Shannon be a candidate for Committee chair. Committee Member Clapper said it takes a certain affinity to run a meeting and keep the ball rolling. He said the Committee members that have attended a lot of public meetings are more in tune with the responsibilities of a Committee chair.

**Motion:** Committee Member Guzman-Newton moved to elect Curtis Wells as chair of this Committee. Committee Member Hawks seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Committee Member Clapper asked Committee Member Curtis if he is willing and able to be the Committee chair. Committee Member Curtis said he is happy to do it. Committee Member Jones asked if the choices could be ranked, since the Committee has not adopted bylaws yet. Committee Member Clapper asked what that would look like. City Manager Linares said there would be three people to choose from and a point tally system would be used. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said she nominated Committee Member Curtis because he is familiar with the process. She said that, the first time around, the projects landed with the City; she wants to show cooperation between the City and the County through her nomination. Committee Member Clapper appreciated Committee Member Guzman-Newton's position, since the City has four representatives and the County has three. Committee Member Duncan inquired if the chair could vote on matters before the Committee. City Manager Linares said the bylaws are not adopted yet, but the intent is for the chair to be able to vote.

**Vote:** The motion passed 7-0 with Committee Members Hawks, Duncan, Clapper, Jones, Shannon, Wells, and Guzman-Newton voting aye in a roll call vote.

**Adoption of Bylaws—Approved with Amendments**

**Discussion:** Committee Chair Wells said the bylaws were emailed to the Committee members. He asked if there was a motion to approve the bylaws or if there is a motion to approve the bylaws with amendments. Committee Chair Guzman-Newton said 4.2 of the bylaws regarding ex-parte seems heavy considering the amount of work needed in the short timeframe. City Attorney Simonson said the bylaws are based on the City's Water Board bylaws. City Manager Linares said the bylaws were created this way because it is a standard policy for any group that

has created itself the overarching body. He said the Planning Commission and the Water Board have that rule. He said the bylaws can be changed by the Committee if needed. Committee Member Duncan said he agrees with Committee Member Guzman-Newton because he does not want to cut off any communication between the Committee and the community. He said several of the potential projects involve public-private cooperation. He said communication with private parties will be necessary at some point. He suggested that 4.2 include language that allows ex-parte communication if it is acknowledged as part of the public record. Committee Member Guzman-Newton asked if the Committee members are not allowed to communicate with each other outside of the group setting. Committee Chair Wells said he understood the bylaw to say that, if communication occurs outside of the group setting, it should be disclosed on the record. Assistant City Manager Castle said the rule is not between Committee members, it is between Committee members and individuals who have an item pending before the Committee. City Attorney Simonson agreed with Assistant City Manager Castle's interpretation. She advised the Committee to be aware if there is a quorum when discussions occur outside of meetings. City Manager Linares said 4.2 could be removed due to the short timeframe, and the Committee would operate more like City Council does. City Attorney Simonson said there could be added language instead that says, "If people are having conversations with entities potentially with a matter before the Committee that they would need to disclose it at the public meeting." She offered another suggestion that states, "Pre-arranged private meetings between a Committee member and individuals and their agents or other interested parties with a matter pending before the Committee should be disclosed at the next public meeting of the Committee." She added "Partisan information or application received by a Committee member, whether by mail, telephone, or other communication, should be disclosed at the next public meeting of the Committee. If other similar communications do occur, it must be made part of the public record by the Committee member."

Committee Chair Wells asked if there are other concerns or questions pertaining to the bylaws before moving forward. Committee Member Hawks inquired who will create the minutes in section 3.1 B of the bylaws. City Manager Linares said City staff will provide the noticing and the minutes for the meetings. Levine asked the Committee Members representing the County if the County would add these meetings to their record system as well. Committee Member Clapper said the County does not have a quorum, so he does not anticipate it being needed. He said the County members could speak with their administrator to verify. Committee Member Hawks requested clarification on 7.3 F regarding closed sessions. City Manager Linares stated closed sessions that are not recorded are due to personnel matters. He said that language could be added to 7.3 F.

UDOT Deputy Director Aldridge requested clarification regarding why UDOT does not have representation on the Committee. Committee Chair Wells said he anticipates UDOT being part of the Committee's process to evaluate and recommend projects to the Transportation Commission. Aldridge said he wants to make sure UDOT is engaged and supportive of the process going forward. Assistant City Manager Castle said the City could amend its ordinance that created the Committee to include UDOT. She said another option is to amend the bylaws to add that the Committee will work closely with UDOT. Levine asked if the Committee could add one or two non-voting Committee members. Committee Chair Wells said he is comfortable with adding language to the bylaws that encourages the Committee to stay in lockstep with UDOT staff. City Attorney Simonson said she has been adding the suggestions to the bylaws document and suggested sharing her screen for the Committee to review them. Committee Chair Wells asked Aldridge if the added language to the bylaws would be acceptable. Aldridge agreed, with the understanding that UDOT and the Transportation Commission will ultimately elect to move a project forward.

Committee Member Jones expressed concern that the second sentence in 6.1 indicates that if there are four Committee members present, the vote must be unanimous to pass. City Manager Linares said the idea behind that bylaw is that the minimum requirement for a vote to pass is the number required for a quorum. City Attorney Simonson added that the purpose is to prevent a small number of people from deciding on behalf of the Committee. Committee Member Jones suggested changing the second sentence to say, "A vote of a majority of the total membership of the Committee is required for approval of final action." Committee Member Duncan seconded the idea.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton said 5.1 does not seem applicable to this Committee. City Manager Linares supported Committee Member Guzman-Newton remove it from the bylaws.

City Attorney Simonson shared her screen with the amended portions of the bylaws. She said the first amendment is 3.1 B that now states, "minutes recorded by the City of Moab Recorder." She said the next amendment is 4.2 which now states, "Ex-parte Communication: Pre-arranged private meetings between a Committee member and an individual(s) and their agents, or other interested parties with a matter pending before the Committee shall be disclosed by the Committee member at the next public meeting of the Committee. Partisan information on any application received by a Committee member, whether by mail, telephone, or other communication, should be disclosed by the Committee member at the next public meeting of the Committee. If other such communication does occur, it must be disclosed by the Committee member and made part of the public record by the Committee member at the next public meeting of the Committee." She said section 5.1 is removed, and the rest of article 5 is renumbered. She said the second sentence in section 6.1 is changed to say, "A vote of the majority of the total membership of the Committee is required for a motion to pass." She said 7.3 F includes the following language, "Closed sessions regarding personnel matters shall not be recorded." She added the following language from Committee Chair Wells and Committee Member Hawks regarding the proposal section: "It is the Committee's intent to maintain alignment with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) staff regarding project review and selection and to ensure that the Committee has a viable proposal to submit to the Utah Transportation Commission."

**Motion:** Committee Member Hawks moved to approve the bylaws of the Arches Transportation Hotspot Funding Committee as amended per the discussion. Committee Member Guzman-Newton seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The motion passed 7-0 with Committee Members Guzman-Newton, Shannon, Clapper, Hawks, Duncan, Jones, and Wells voting aye in a roll call vote. City Attorney Simonson said she will send a clean copy of the bylaws to Committee Chair Wells to sign and the Committee will have it at their next meeting. City Attorney Simonson left the meeting at 2:54 PM.

### ***Overview of Committee Process Framework and Schedule--Discussion***

**Discussion:** Committee Chair Wells requested comments or questions about the document. Assistant City Manager Castle said it is a living document and the schedule depends on the projects being evaluated. She said UDOT has requested a project list by the end of April and the Committee has a September 1 deadline. She said Grand County Council and Moab City Council will approve and recommend the projects identified by the Committee. She said the Committee will determine the different criteria to evaluate projects which will be determinative to project selection. Committee Member Clapper said he does not see any need for edits on this document.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton asked Aldridge if the list must be completed by next week regarding any potential projects. Aldridge agreed. Committee Member Guzman-Newton

expressed concern regarding the public input part of the process with such a close deadline. Committee Chair Wells requested a brief overview of what is being done regarding public input. Assistant City Manager Castle said the City has developed a website for information and a potential survey for the public. She said City Communication and Engagement Director Church is developing a public engagement plan. She inquired if UDOT could be flexible with the April deadline, so there could be more public input. Committee Chair Wells said his understanding is that UDOT wants the Committee to be timely in narrowing the scope of projects. He said the public engagement piece will provide feedback on the Committee's list, rather than adding new projects. He said agenda item 7 will look at the previous project list and add any projects the Committee members suggest. He said Committee members are already conduits of the public, and he does not feel that the public input process is needed for the first step. Committee Member Duncan agreed with Committee Chair Wells. Aldridge agreed and said there are projects on the list that UDOT has confidence could be delivered. He suggested the Committee use their discretion to add projects to the list and ensure that the new additions meet the criteria and have public support. Committee Member Shannon said the Downtown Alliance is trying to receive public input on the potential projects. He said that, due to Coronavirus, the public has been slow to respond. He said he hopes to have more information next week.

Levine said public comments are not always equal; neither are the forms of public comment. He asked the Committee what feedback is going to assist in making decisions relatively quickly. He said the way the polling is framed dictates what kind of feedback is received. Assistant City Manager Castle said the draft of the public engagement plan can be presented to the Committee. Committee Chair Wells expressed support of Levine's comments. He asked if the Committee would be okay with not adopting this document formally. The Committee indicated support of Committee Chair Wells' suggestion.

Committee Chair Wells reviewed the ground rules for collaborations and group meetings.

### ***Review of Prior Hotspot Process and Discussion of Conceptual Transportation Projects Evaluated In 2017–Discussion***

**Discussion:** Aldridge provided a brief review of the Hotspot process that took place in 2017-2018. He said the end of the process requires a selected project that meets the criteria from the legislation and that can be delivered. He said a list of project goals and priorities was created to provide an objective way for decision making. He said the bypass project can not be delivered with the amount of funding available, so it is off the list. He said the Main Street improvements would affect the parking, which the public does not want at this time. He said the situation regarding the parking structure is well understood. He said the dispersed parking has a lot of challenges. He said the US-191 South widening project will benefit the congestion in the area. He said the bike paths fit the criteria as well. He said the Kane Creek Road improvements does not meet the criteria. He said UDOT staff is willing to help facilitate the use of Decision Lens software to help in the decision process. He said the September 1 deadline requires concept(s) and concept estimate(s) to propose to Transportation Commission. He said Sanders has done background work on transit shuttles and can provide fact sheets to provide more information.

Committee Chair Wells suggested looking at the list of 11 conceptual projects and narrowing it down. He said the Committee has already established that the bypass is off the list. He asked Aldridge where the bike path project is located. Aldridge said it is in Spanish Valley and connects to bike paths in the Moab area. He said it meets some of the criteria but would require further discussion. Levine said there is a complete story map that has been developed to support the planning of the Spanish Valley Drive multi-use pathway. He said he has been spearheading this project and can share a link to the story map to Committee members. He added the project

cost is higher than what is shown on the prior Hotspot story map; it is closer to \$4.2 million instead of \$2.75 million. He said the path is along Spanish Valley Drive from Mill Creek Drive to the County line.

Committee Chair Wells suggested starting with recommendations to narrow the list down and seeing if Committee members and UDOT agree. Committee Member Duncan said the North and South recreational vehicle parking are his top priorities; he would like to tie them into a shuttle system. He said the bike share could help shuttle people from parking lots North and South of town. He said the shared-use paths is another option to consider.

Committee Member Clapper said choosing projects with smaller costs would allow more than one project to be selected. He said he does not have strong feelings about the proposed projects, since he is newer to the process.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton said the bypass and Kane Creek Road improvements should be removed from the list. She said the US-191 South Moab Expansion would be an easier project for UDOT, but she would prefer to look at a small-scale transit system. She inquired if a paid parking system on Main Street would be acceptable to UDOT. She further inquired if better crosswalks and expansion of side streets could fall under the Main Street improvements project. Aldridge said those items could be vetted. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said dispersed parking has been difficult so far, but it might be feasible by restructuring side roads.

Committee Member Jones said Main Street improvements should remain on the list with a reduced scope and budget. He said the shared-use paths should remain on the list; if it did not go to the County line, there would be more money for other projects. He said dispersed parking should be re-scoped with what is now known. He said Kane Creek Boulevard improvements need to be on the list, because that is the alternate route when Main Street is backed up. He said 100 West should be considered for the project list because it could reduce congestion in the core of downtown. He said the current US-191 North widening project requires \$1 million funding from the City; if Hotspot funds could be used for that, it would help the City due to impacts from COVID-19. He suggested adding active traffic management to the list. Aldridge said improvements on Main Street for pedestrians and aesthetics could create congestion. He said that could be challenging to vet. He said the 100 West improvements would require more discussion with UDOT.

Committee Member Hawks said she likes many of the projects on the list. She said it would be great to have dispersed parking like what has been done on Center Street. She said the South and North recreational vehicle parking is needed. She said her version of Main Street improvements would include adding parking on the side streets. She said she supports the bike path idea, but she would like to see it go farther South. She said the cost of the US-191 South widening project is not attractive at all. She said Kane Creek Road improvements should be funded with a federal lands access grant. She inquired if the Main Street improvements could include medians with left turn lanes only at the intersections.

Committee Member Shannon said he is focused on the Main Street improvements project with some revisions. He said the Main Street businesses do not want parking taking away from Main Street. He said the North and South recreational vehicle parking would be helpful. He said dispersed parking would be helpful as well.

Committee Chair Wells expressed interest in the bike paths project. He said that, if only a portion of the bike paths was considered for completion, he would be deterred from supporting

that project. He said he is still interested in dispersed parking. He said he liked the Main Street improvements ideas suggested by Committee members. He said the opinion received from constituents is to add parking to the side streets. He said he liked the suggestion from Committee members to not go all-in on public transit, but to select projects that could lend themselves to a future public transit system. He said there appears to be a lot of public support for a public transit system.

Committee Chair Wells requested clarification of the projects that are still on the list moving forward. Assistant City Manager Castle requested Committee members to send their lists to her. She said she will combine those project lists and have the document available for discussion next week. Levine suggested separating the previously established projects from the new ideas.

***Preliminary Identification of Transportation Projects to Be Evaluated Moving Forward***

Not discussed at this meeting due to time constraints.

***Scheduling the Next Meeting***

Committee Chair Wells proposed meeting on April 29 from 2:00 PM-4:00 PM. Committee Member Jones requested the meeting take place a little earlier due to another meeting at 4 PM. Committee Chair Wells modified the time to 1:00 PM-3:00 PM.

***Adjournment:*** Committee Chair Wells adjourned the meeting at 4:05 PM.

**Preliminary Arches Region Hotspot Project List 2020**

Project	Original Scope	Original Budget	Proposed New Scope Ideas	New Budget	Votes
<b>Dispersed Parking</b>	Convert empty lot space behind storefront businesses along Main Street into additional parking lots. Requires City to work with business owners to combine separated parking lots to increase efficiency and provide business access to the rear of the building.	\$1,728,000	Concepts discussed during first ARHCC meeting: Off-Main Street dispersed parking (parking developed on side streets); like original, but reduced per current progress, Emma Blvd and east of Main.	TBD	5
<b>Main Street Improvements</b>	Replace on-street parking along Main Street in downtown area with bike lanes. Put a median down the center lane that pockets for left-hand turns at intersections only. Install parking meters on side streets east and west of Main Street from 100 South to 200 North (replacing or increasing parking that was lost with other projects).	\$1,544,000	Concepts discussed during first ARHCC meeting: Off-Main Street improvements, urban design improvements; pedestrian mall concept; metered parking; keeping Main Street parking; side-street parking; pedestrian Bulbouts at intersections (ED - more attractive and pedestrian friendly environment; crossing distance, comfort/crowding during queue including social distancing, traffic calming); locate pushbutton activators so bikers can reach from curb; midblock planting and bike parking bulbouts (ED); parking time limit signage (ED, supports parking availability for customers; study indicated that meters not warranted at this time).	TBD	5

<b>North Recreation Parking</b>	Provide parking for trucks and trailers that is lighted and has security cameras. The lot would be around two acres, and fit around 100 regular trailers and 50 large and be located off of SR-191 toward the north end of town.	\$1,430,000	Consider transit/shuttle connection to serve the lots		4
<b>South Recreation Parking</b>	Provide parking for trucks and trailers that is lighted and has security cameras. The lot would be around two acres, and fit around 100 regular trailers and 50 large and be located off of SR-191 toward the south end of town.	\$1,430,000	Consider transit/shuttle connection to serve the lots		4
<b>Shared-use Path</b>	Connect the Canyon Pathway to future Main Street bike lanes which will connect to Millcreek Parkway. Extend Millcreek Parkway to Spanish Valley through Spanish Valley Dr.	\$298,000 (North) \$2,705,000 (South)	Concept to be provided by Zacharia Levine at 04/29/2020 meeting	≤\$4.25M (\$150/linear foot)	4
<b>Shuttle/Transit</b>	N/A	N/A	TBD	TBD	4
<b>Active Traffic Management</b>	N/A	N/A	Examples: Eliminate center lane as turn lane, and allocate to either north/south via Dynamic Lane Reversal (may conflict with ED and friction reduction goals of center median?). Dynamically optimize traffic signals for progression of most congested direction. Dynamically adjust speed limits north and south of town when slower speeds can get vehicles to destination just as fast, and slower travel on congested undivided highway will improve safety.	TBD	1

<b>Bike Share</b>	Concentrating parking along Main Street will create an opportunity for a future bike sharing, e-bike, or other active transportation program.	\$500,000			1
<b>Bypass Corridor</b>	Refer to the Bypass study found here: <a href="https://uplan.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=03b200018428482388a1c0a46955dc2a">https://uplan.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=03b200018428482388a1c0a46955dc2a</a> :	Outside of scope for Hotspot funding			1
<b>Kane Creek Boulevard</b>	Includes widening, rehabilitation, and paving of Kane Creek Boulevard beginning at 500 West and continuing west and south to the existing end of pavement, approximately 3.9 miles.	\$6,304,000	Reconceptualize as part of "Main Street alternates." Scope changes to beginning at 500 West and thence east to US-191.	\$2,200,000	1
<b>Main Street Alternates</b>	N/A	N/A	Reduce Congestion. Minnie Lee paving (\$300k), 100 West roundabout (\$1.1M), 100 West construction (\$1.2M). Develop bypass candidates rejected in previous study, but which in fact can reduce main st traffic. And which are/will be used as such and are bearing that impact, since phone mapping apps already guide people from arterials to local and feeders during times of congestion.	\$2,600,00	1
<b>New Project Development</b>	N/A	N/A	Development of 2020 Hotspot Projects	\$100,000	1
<b>Stewart Canyon Drainage</b>	N/A	N/A	City match on UDOT's signature project for congestion reduction in Moab between 2010-2030.	1,000,000	1

<b>West Parking Structure Design Costs</b>	<p>Suggested location based on a central location and Moab is willing to partner in the project by contributing the majority of the needed land. This structure will contain around 320 stalls with four levels. The existing parking lot contains around 70 stalls which would be removed.</p>	<p>\$7,283,000</p>	<p>Payment for design services already performed</p>	<p>\$300,000</p>	<p>1</p>
<b>East Parking Structure</b>	<p><del>Suggested location is based on a central location and Grand County is willing to partner in the project by contributing the needed land. It is next to the Moab Information Center which will have an increase in traffic and they can educate the tourists and promote other projects such as bike share or trailer parking which could result in reduced trips. This structure will contain around 250 stalls with four levels. The existing parking lot contains around 50 stalls which would be removed.</del></p>	<p>\$6,096,000</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>0</p>
<b>US-191 Expansion</b>	<p><del>Widen US 191 to five lanes from MP-121.335 to MP 123.850 to reduce congestion south of Moab.</del></p>	<p>\$4,937,000 \$7,200,000 (with frontage roads)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>0</p>

# Main Street Improvement Concepts

Prepared by Kalen Jones

---

The yet-to-be-approved downtown plan has a recommendation for Main Street streetscape improvements in the core which is a hybrid of what I hear business wants, and UDOT wants.

<https://nebula.wsimg.com/45471a5ea6c11d601756d7cb1c872b4d?AccessKeyId=6188E9477819064D0873&disposition=0&alloworigin=1> pages 24-31. Draft cost numbers on pg 31.

In summary:

- Eliminate center lane and left turns
- Add median strip of less than full lane width
- Use that gained 2' to add 2' sidewalk on the west side
- Add substantial bulbouts at all intersections. These correspond roughly with the areas which are already no parking.
- UDOT version of Main Streets improvements used the additional width to add bike lanes. Seems like it could be a topic of discussion or study what the best usage of the limited width is. As it is now I, as a sample bicyclist, don't mind walking my bike, at most half a block, from the nearest side street to a mid-block destination. What can be more annoying is the lack of bike racks, and space there for.
- Mid-block bulbouts. The proposed plan view just shows them adjacent to the one driveway in the sample street. Perhaps locate them more mid-block, and on both sides, for better distribution of amenities throughout the block.

Questions for UDOT:

- Can the proposed projects be considered as a whole package, and scored as such? In other words, if most of the money isn't going to the DPS, but instead to a number of smaller projects, do they all have to meet the same scoring standard? Or can some of them address congestion better, some economic development?
- If so, could the scoring be cost weighted?
- Would it be a worthwhile exercise to score the package against the DPS?
- Would added friction (UDOT's concern) slow traffic *below the speed limit* measurably, or just reduce speeds to the limit and reduce running reds as the lights change?
- The downtown plan suggested: *The current speed limit on Main Street is 30 mph. Residents have expressed concerns about that speed limit and suggested potentially lowering it to 25 mph, congruent with a more relaxed downtown feel. It would still require coordination with UDOT to explore the change and to ensure that the appropriate levels of service are maintained. Before changing a speed limit, UDOT conducts a speed study to measure the 85th percentile speed and typically changes the speed limit accordingly. To meet this community goal, it is recommended that the City of Moab work with the UDOT Region 4 representatives to complete the required analysis for speed limit reduction.* As far as I know, speed limit is still 30, but I could have missed the change. This might be something to pursue concurrently if it hasn't already.