JUNE 17, 2020
ARCHES HOTSPOT REGION COORDINATING COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
2:00 P.M.

1. Call To Order
2. Approval Of Minutes

2.1. Minutes: May 27, 2020 Regular Meeting

Documents:
MIN-AHRCC-2020-05-27 DRAFT.PDF

2.2. Minutes: May 29, 2020 Special Meeting

Documents:
MIN-AHRCC-2020-05-29 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

   You must submit your comments by 1:30 p.m. on June 17, 2020. Please limit your comments to 400 words

4. Committee Member Reports
5. Framework Update

Documents:
PROPOSED HOTSPOT FUNDING PROCESS FRAMEWORK 06.12.2020.DOCX

6. Off-Main Street Parking Concept Presentation - Committee-Member Wes Shannon, President, Downtown Main Street Alliance

7. Discussion Of Off-Main Street Parking Project Work Plan & Scope Of Work

Documents:
HOTSPOT WORK PLAN 6-8-2020.PDF
8. Discussion Regarding Previous Dispersed Parking Projects/Main Street Improvements And Possible Action Item Regarding Emma Boulevard

Documents:

- REVISED DPS RESOLUTION.PDF
- EMMA BLVD DISPERSED PARKING EXHIBIT.PDF
- SCREEN SHOT 2020-06-11.PDF

9. Scheduling The Next Meeting

10. Adjournment
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=pkgVqqvwVfw.

**Regular Meeting—Call to Order and Attendance:** Committee Chair Wells called the Regular Meeting to order at 2:04 PM. Participating remotely were Committee Members Wes Shannon, Mike Duncan, Karen Guzman-Newton, Curtis Wells, Kalen Jones, Jaylyn Hawks, and Evan Clapper. City staff participating remotely were Assistant City Manager Carly Castle, Communications and Engagement Manager Lisa Church, 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, Region 4 Traffic Operations Engineer Robert Dowell, and Region 4 Deputy Director Monte Aldridge.

**Approval of Minutes: May 13, 2020**

**Motion:** Committee Member Guzman-Newton moved to approve the minutes from May 13, 2020. Committee Member Clapper seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Committee Member Duncan stated there were a couple items in the minutes that did not reflect what he said. Committee Chair Wells asked if Committee Member Duncan wanted to amend the minutes before the vote. Committee Member Duncan said the vote could proceed.

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

**Citizens to be Heard:**

Assistant City Manager Castle stated that UDOT was having difficulty joining the meeting. She said there were four public comments received since the last meeting. Committee Chair Wells inquired if the comments had been acknowledged. Assistant City Manager Castle indicated that they had. The following public comments were received:

Ruben Villalpando-Salas: “Ideas/concerns for the community that come to mind: Once off-main blocks are decided and planned for, brainstorming/sky-blue think about what areas can/should be used for in the future. Santa Fe, NM’s Canyon Road comes to mind as their "art" road. Discussion on the overall Moab Valley and what areas can be used for the future development of an urban center apart from downtown. I’ve got some cognitive dissonance for Moab’s Downtown- it’s congested now, and ultimately I believe that it should/will continue down South 191 (especially with the college coming), but how do we make progress South if a majority has already been taken up for private property? As well, how is economic development boosted when a majority of these areas are already taken up for residential property? As a citizen I am all for right turn only side roads, especially if they will mitigate future parking problems. Especially with the knowledge that this will only affect a limited amount of roads. (I like what’s been done in front of City Hall). Are there any plans to extend the bike path north of town from Lion’s Park? There is a lot of undeveloped area from where the path ends to the Rock Shop. It would also help if all feedback is posted on a public excel sheet so that the community can review other ideas and give input on those as well.”
Eve Tallman: “I hope this is not a misdirected (misguided?) email but some friends and I were discussing the question of how to use the Hotspot Funds and we floated the idea of building roundabouts at some key intersections on 191 that could keep traffic flowing more smoothly. 1) At the Colorado River bridge (River Road and Highway 191). If not a roundabout, perhaps a no-stop southbound merging lane such as installed at the entrance to Arches National Park. 2) At the new USU Aggie Blvd intersection with 191. Install a roundabout. 3) At 5th West. In Arizona, several successful large roundabouts on state highways accommodate semi trucks and tourist traffic, including at the turnoff to the South Rim of the Grand Canyon (Highways 89 & 64), in Cottonwood and the Verde Valley (highway 260), and in Payson (highway 87). I recommend you check these roundabouts in person! A road trip would be nice.”

Lara Derasary: “I am writing to express support for both downtown improvements and recreation parking. I like the idea of a shared use path in Spanish Valley, but it’s not as much of a priority for me in the short term as are reducing traffic congestion and creating a safer, more pedestrian friendly downtown. If there is a way to have trailer lots both north and south of town, in my mind that would be ideal. I respectfully disagree with Mike that these won’t be used by many without some sort of shuttle/transport system. Nearly all of the trailers I see are pulled by trucks or SUVs which get disconnected and provide the owners with ready transport without their trailer. In addition, many of these trailers are carrying recreational vehicles which often seem to be the chosen mode of transport around town. The exception to not needing transport from a dispersed lot might be RVs, but in my mind these aren’t generally our biggest congestion problem downtown. If created, we might have to encourage the use of dispersed lots (e.g. advertise their existence, disallow trailer parking downtown except in designated lots and clearly mark where trailers can park) and discourage/enforce trailers not parking where they’re not allowed such as in angled parking spots.”

Brook Indries: “I would like to see the Shared Multi-Use Path coupled with the South Recreation Parking Area. This would provide parking for big cars and trailers south of town, and reduce noise and friction downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. The multi-use path would benefit residents, as well as tourist. Residents will have an alternative to driving or un-safe biking if they live in Spanish Valley and noise levels would be decreased, which would benefit quality of life for residents and quality of vacation for tourists. The multi-use path and south recreation parking would encourage biking and exercise in the tourist demographic that would otherwise drive (jeepers, razors, etc), and instigate carpooling with groups that would otherwise each drive their own cars to get dinner downtown after 4 wheeling. Really, the most important thing would be signage. Prompting travelers with clear signs on how to behave in Moab is the single most important thing to do. You want people to not bring their cars downtown? Encourage carpooling from trailheads or other parking lots that are already established. Thanks for considering my comment.”

**Committee Member Reports**

Committee Member Shannon stated the Downtown Business Alliance had a gathering that included Committee Member Guzman-Newton and Committee Chair Wells. He said they created a pamphlet for the workshop on Friday, May 29, 2020.

Committee Member Duncan said he was hoping to ask Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) Region 4 Deputy Director Aldridge about the potential future of the North and South recreation parking. He is interested in knowing if UDOT would fund operational expenses for a couple years. City Recorder Johnson said UDOT was about to join the meeting.
Committee Chair Wells stated he shared a report encompassing the work and discussions from the beginning to present. He said hopefully the report helps keep everyone on the same page moving forward.

**Discussion to Further Define and Evaluate Main Street Improvements & Downtown Improvements: Off-Main Street Parking and Urban Design Components**

**Discussion:** Committee Chair Wells stated he recirculated the initial feedback document from UDOT regarding the Main Street improvements. He reminded the Committee that Main Street improvements is considered a separate project from off-Main Street parking and urban design redevelopment. He said the Committee needs to propose a combination of components from the feedback document which UDOT will analyze for feasibility. He said a good goal for today’s meeting is to agree on multiple proposals for UDOT to analyze. He stated the four projects do not show a significant reduction in congestion. He said the parking on Main Street is a major contributor to congestion, so he would like one proposal to include removal of parking on Main Street. He said he would also like a proposal with Main Street parking included for comparison. He said that, if the Committee can find a way to adequately address the congestion reduction, it will provide more flexibility to move forward with other projects that are lacking in the congestion reduction requirement.

Committee Member Clapper said the removal of Main Street parking has been a contentious issue in the past. He expressed interest in seeing what might replace some of the parking. He said the parking currently creates a barrier between the sidewalk and the highway traffic. He said one opportunity is to replace the parking with drop off areas. He added that the areas could be utilized by a shuttle or transit system in the future. He said it is beneficial to show what could replace Main Street parking.

Committee Chair Wells agreed with Committee Member Clapper about including public transit design in the projects. He said the off-Main Street improvements can create additional parking for Main Street businesses, which is an added benefit. He added that the UDOT feedback document indicates that mid-block crossings for pedestrians is a non-starter, so it should not be added to the proposals. He inquired if anyone would like to suggest some components for the Main Street improvements proposal.

Committee Member Shannon stated that, as a business owner and representative of the Downtown Business Alliance, his goal is to keep the parking on Main Street. He said it is vital for safety and the health of the businesses. He requested clarification from UDOT regarding the parking on Main Street. Committee Chair Wells said the idea is to include the removal of Main Street parking for modeling purposes to gather data. He reiterated that the removal of parking on Main Street is not on the table right now.

Committee Member Duncan agreed with Committee Member Shannon that business owners are vehemently opposed to the removal of parking on Main Street. He said he is not in favor of continued study on that topic. He stated the focus should be on removing left turns on Main Street through the downtown area and adding bulb outs at intersections, pedestrian-friendly options, and off-Main Street parking. He added that he would like to ask UDOT about North and South recreation parking operational expenses before the meeting is over. He clarified that left turns do not need removed at every intersection in the downtown area. Committee Chair Wells clarified that off-Main Street parking is considered a separate project from Main Street improvements. He asked Committee Member Duncan to expand on the pedestrian amenities. Committee Member Duncan said a center median would be narrow if it does permit a left turn at
the intersection. Committee Chair Wells confirmed that the removal of left turns, bulb outs at intersections, and a center median are the proposed components.

Committee Member Kalen said the removal of left turns will create controversy, and the model should be used to figure out how many left turns need removed to eliminate friction in balance with the public outcry. He said if the removal of left turns were consistent over a couple of blocks, it would be possible to move the travel lanes closer to the middle to an elevated median. He said this could create additional space for sidewalks. He said the public outreach and modeling will be critical. He added that he is in favor of mid-block bulb outs because it will add valuable pedestrian and bike parking space. He said he understands UDOT’s concerns and suggested having the mid-block bulb outs offset. He suggested an elevated concrete planter on the outside edge to further discourage people from attempting to cross the highway mid-block. He added that, from the beginning, there have not been shovel-ready projects to apply the funding to. He said it has been a scramble to create projects that fit the mold. He suggested keeping higher level goals in mind like safety for Main Street. He said the on street parking is not necessarily safe for drivers and driver side passengers as they exit vehicles on a state highway. He said another goal is to enhance economic activity downtown. He requested input from the community and economic development staff regarding if the parking on Main Street is required to enhance economic activity downtown.

Committee Chair Wells reiterated that the primary use for the funds must be congestion mitigation. He verified with Committee Members Jones and Duncan that the following are components for the Main Street improvements proposal: removal of left turns, mid-block bulb outs, and center median/elevated median. Committee Member Jones suggested adding consistency in downtown design. He also clarified that corner bulb outs should be on the list. He said he would like to see the mid-block bulb outs, but it may be more challenging to weigh the pros and cons.

Committee Member Clapper suggested implementing a frontage road. He said a citizen comment also suggested the idea of roundabouts. He added that the farthest North stoplight at the bridge could add a large roundabout at the river road/Highway 191 intersection. He said 500 West and Highway 191 could also add a roundabout. Aldridge stated the downtown area’s biggest challenge is space. He said the current lanes are eleven feet wide; typically, lanes should be twelve feet wide with a fourteen foot center turn lane. He said there is not enough room for a frontage road, parking, and median. He said the roundabout on the North end is intriguing, but he does not know if the congestion problem will still exist once the Highway Widening Project is completed. UDOT Region 4 Traffic Operations Engineer Dowell said roundabouts function well to calm traffic but the current congestion issue primarily calms traffic already. He added that roundabouts could be considered on the South end. He said the roundabouts would need two lanes.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton requested adding safer crosswalks in the downtown area. Committee Chair Wells requested clarification on that suggestion. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said it has been brought up in City Council meetings to have a lighted crosswalk to increase visibility at night for pedestrian traffic. Committee Member Duncan proposed adding audible signals for people that are visually impaired.

Committee Member Hawks indicated support for having the removal of Main Street parking in the initial analysis. She said that, if enough off-Main Street parking can be created, it could replace the parking on Main Street. She said there are examples of other cities that do not offer parking in the downtown area, and people are willing to walk to where they need to go. She said
it could also provide an economic opportunity for someone to have a shuttle service. She suggested a bike lane to replace the parking on Main Street, because it would increase safety.

Committee Chair Wells agreed that project decisions need to be data-driven. He stated that UDOT is lending analytic resources, and he would like to take the opportunity to acquire data. He said he wants to see the comparison between the proposals with and without Main Street parking.

Committee Member Duncan suggested removing left turn lanes for southbound traffic at 100 North and 300 South. He said northbound traffic could remove left turn lanes at 100 South and 400 North. He requested the Committee consider where left turns can be removed.

Committee Member Clapper said projects one and two are inseparably linked. He said a flow study will be needed to analyze removal of parking and left turns. He said project two is not strong enough to stand alone. Committee Member Duncan agreed with combining both projects. Grand County Community and Economic Development Director Levine offered support for viewing both projects as a downtown improvements package. He said it is important to think of trade-offs with respect to the goals of the funding. He said he supports some analysis of eliminating Main Street parking through the lens of trade-offs. He requested Committee Member Shannon communicate the underlying interests of the downtown businesses. He said the position is to maintain parking on Main Street, but the underlying interest is accessibility for customers. He said there may be trade-offs with an end goal of mutual gain for all the different interests. He added that Main Street business owners are not the only stakeholders for the downtown area. He said it is important to consider the economic opportunity of off-Main Street parking as well.

Committee Chair Wells requested input from UDOT. Aldridge said he agrees with Grand County Community and Economic Development Director Levine regarding trade-offs and multiple stakeholders. He said UDOT, if left to its own devices, would probably do something like what Committee Member Hawks proposed to improve capacity. He said the question is to define what is acceptable to this Committee and UDOT will move forward to model that to determine if it reveals a project that meets the criteria.

Committee Chair Wells inquired if anything else needs added to the proposal. Committee Member Clapper asked if the widening of the sidewalk on the West side is included. Committee Chair Wells said it could be included but it increases congestion and reduces pavement width. Committee Member Clapper said that, if a pedestrian finds it difficult to walk two blocks, they will circle around three times to find a place to park. He said people avoid downtown at certain times of the day because it is impossible to walk shoulder-to-shoulder down the sidewalk.

Committee Chair Wells requested a straw poll for who is in favor of including the removal of Main Street parking in the analysis of proposals. Committee Chair Wells, Committee Members Clapper, Jones, Hawks all voted yes. Committee Member Shannon indicated that he is opposed to the removal of Main Street parking in the analysis of proposals. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said she is not opposed if it is a give-and-take. Committee Chair Wells said there is a majority in favor of including the removal of Main Street parking in the analysis. He inquired if anyone wanted to add anything else.

Committee Member Duncan requested to pose a question to UDOT. He said the North and South recreation parking for oversized vehicles is not as beneficial to the City and County without a shuttle system to bring people to the downtown area. He inquired if UDOT would consider funding the operational expenses of a very small prototype shuttle system from either
the North or the South. He clarified that the shuttle system could be two small vans to provide service as often as possible. He said Committee Members Clapper and Guzman-Newton have pointed out the school district bus barn as a potential place to rent. He said that, after two years, the operational expenses would become the responsibility of the City and/or the County.

Committee Chair Wells clarified that the purpose of the discussion is the scope of Main Street improvements. He said it is established that public transit can be accounted for in the project designs. He invited Aldridge to respond to Committee Member Duncan’s question, but said there will be a more in-depth conversation at another meeting. Aldridge said the short answer is that UDOT does not fund operation and maintenance costs. He said that decision applies throughout the state.

Committee Member Clapper said the story map from the first Hot Spot funding committee includes shared use paths with connections to Ken Canyon pathways and Mill Creek pathways. He said if downtown is being considered as a whole, those shared use paths could be included. He added that safe routes for kids to get to school will eliminate a lot of vehicle traffic on Highway 191.

Scheduling the Next Meeting
Committee Chair Wells suggested a follow up call/Zoom meeting with UDOT, City staff, and County Staff to compare notes. He said he appreciates everyone’s engagement and contributions. He confirmed that the next meeting will be on May 29 at 8 AM. He said it will be a walking field trip beginning at City Hall. Committee Member Clapper inquired if a member of the Downtown Business Alliance could attend this meeting. He asked if UDOT would attend as well. Aldridge said he was not aware of the field trip, and he would have to check his availability.

Committee Member Jones said he is unclear what the scope of downtown improvements is. Committee Chair Wells said his understanding is that Emma Boulevard and the parking behind Wells Fargo are not included in the analysis of the Committee. Assistant City Manager Castle said it is the Committee’s decision regarding what to include. Committee Member Jones recommended that the parking near the post office and Wells Fargo could benefit from government funding. Committee Member Clapper said that area could be included in the field trip on Friday. Committee Chair Wells said there could be another field trip to focus on those additional opportunities. Assistant City Manager Castle said those areas could be reconsidered, but they are extremely complicated projects. She said there have been negotiation issues with property owners. She said the Emma Boulevard project is an endeavor, but it can be discussed at a future meeting. Committee Member Jones said Emma Boulevard could be discussed with UDOT in relation to the traffic flow studies and congestion reduction. Committee Chair Wells stated that he is trying to honor UDOT’s request to identify four projects by the end of April and stick with them. He said the Committee will discuss expanding upon those projects and if there should be some flexibility.

Committee Chair Wells verified with Assistant City Manager Castle that the following meeting will be June 10 at 2 PM.

Adjournment: Committee Chair Wells adjourned the meeting at 3:29 PM.
ARCHES HOTSPOT REGION COORDINATING COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
MAY 29, 2020

The Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee held a Special 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.

Special Meeting—Call to Order and Attendance: Committee Chair Wells called the Special Meeting to order at 8:08 AM. Participating were Committee Members Wes Shannon, Mike Duncan, Karen Guzman-Newton, Curtis Wells, Jaylyn Hawks, and Evan Clapper. Committee Member Kalen Jones was absent. City staff participating were Assistant City Manager Carly Castle, City Engineer Chuck Williams, Assistant Engineer Mark Jolissaint, City Recorder Sommar Johnson, and Deputy Recorder Kerri Kirk. County staff participating was Community and Economic Development Director Zacharia Levine. Downtown Business Alliance representative participating was Matt Hancock.

Off-Main Street Parking/Improvements Field Trip Discussion: Committee Chair Wells invited City Engineer Williams to provide a brief overview of the City Hall parking design. City Engineer Williams reminded the Committee about the template that was used at the May 13 meeting for potential side street parking. He said the template has angled parking on one side, angled parking in the middle with a six foot median, and parallel parking on the other side. He said there are sidewalks on both sides. He said this design requires 87 feet from curb to curb. He stated the other side streets have roughly 77-71 feet from curb to curb. He said parking can be added to other streets, but it will not be exactly like the parking outside of City Hall. He added that the parking spaces at City Hall meet City Code standards, which is 18 ½ feet by 9 feet. He said angled parking from the curb to the back of the parking spot is about 20 feet long. He said angled parking can achieve 60% more spaces than parallel parking. He said that, when the Engineering department begins a design, they start from the existing curb. He said one of the key constraints is crosswalks for safety.

Committee Member Clapper inquired if the parking spaces met City or State Code. City Engineer Williams said the spaces are compliant with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), which is the federal standard. Committee Member Clapper inquired about compact parking spaces. City Engineer Williams said he did not believe the City had any compact spaces. Hancock said one space in front of City Hall is compact due to the bulb out. City Engineer Williams said that space is not defined as compact space, but it might not meet standard. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said the spaces in front of Zax Restaurant have signs that say “compact” on them. City Engineer Williams said he had not seen those signs. Committee Member Clapper asked if it was required that the angled parking spaces be 20 feet deep. City Engineer Williams said it would need to be considered if the spaces should be compact or accommodate regular-sized vehicles.

Hancock inquired about the lane widths by City Hall. City Engineer Williams responded that the lanes are 12 feet. Hancock asked about the total from curb to curb with the breakdown for parking and lane widths. City Engineer Williams offered to send the template document to Hancock.

Committee Chair Wells said it was understood that the template does not fit all streets. He asked City Engineer Williams what the Committee should be considering. City Engineer Williams said
that, if the Committee decides to proceed with reconstruction, utilities that run underneath sidewalks will need relocated. He said moving a power pole costs about $35,000. He said moving a fire hydrant costs about $10,000.

City Engineer Williams said some of the parking is maximized without adding a median. He said that, if a median is added, driveways need to be accommodated. He said it becomes a policy decision of whether left turns are permitted to exit the driveways.

Committee Member Clapper suggested that straight-in parking would fit more spaces than angled parking. Grand County Community and Economic Development Director Levine said that type of parking is rare. City Engineer Williams said there would need to be consideration for movement, because backing out of a parking space at a 90 degree angled is different than a 45 degree angled. Committee Member Clapper said straight-in parking is accessible by both lanes of travel. City Engineer Williams added that a vehicle backing out of a straight-in space cannot cross the center line.

Committee Member Hawks asked if parallel parking could be located at the median. City Engineer Williams said it is possible.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton inquired who maintains the planter strips on the sidewalks. City Engineer Williams said the City maintains the trees and the mowing. He said the sidewalks and the park strips are the property owner’s responsibility. Committee Member Duncan inquired if the easement ends at the curb. City Engineer Williams said that, typically, the right-of-way goes to the back of the sidewalk. He added that some locations have buildings that are in the right-of-way. Committee Member Duncan said he wants to be informed if the trees and sidewalks are impacted as additional parking is considered. City Engineer Williams said those would become policy decisions.

City Engineer Williams stated median strips are most effective when they are continuous. He said 100 East has less utilities located on it than Center Street. He added that drainage needs to be considered as well. Committee Chair Wells said this block has potential for additional parking.

Committee Chair Wells said the current scope for additional parking is 100 North, Center Street, and 100 South. He said the Committee can choose to expand that scope. Committee Member Clapper said 100 North could become more visually appealing and have additional parking. Committee Member Duncan said there will be push back because this area is partially residential. Committee Member Clapper said flow studies will be beneficial to decide which side streets will have additional traffic if some left turns are removed from Main Street. Committee Member Shannon said the Downtown Business Alliance supports additional parking on side streets.

Committee Member Duncan said, for the traffic heading South on Main Street, the left turn could remain at 100 North and 300 South. He said for the northbound traffic on Main Street, 100 South and 400 North would have left turn lanes. City Engineer Williams said that, during the first round of Hotspot funding, the consultants considered removing left turns on every other block. Committee Member Duncan said the medians will add friction, and he wants to find a way to decrease congestion.

City Engineer Williams said the left turn bays from the side streets onto Main Street are necessary. He said the driveway exits could be one-way exits only, but he is unsure about the
post office exit being one-way. He said it could add safety to that parking area if it became one-way in and one-way out.

Committee Member Clapper inquired about the parking area behind Wells Fargo and the post office. City Engineer Williams said that area is comprised of multiple private parking lots. He said the consultants inquired if the private parking lots could be consolidated into one public parking lot. He said the responses of the business owners were mixed. Committee Chair Wells said this area could be discussed again to see if there is potential for consolidation.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton said the park strip and sidewalk seems to be wider than normal on 100 North. City Engineer Williams said the road classification determines the width of the sidewalks and park strips. He said the park strip can be changed to add parking, but it would affect all the trees in the park strip. Committee Member Guzman-Newton inquired if the trees could remain while adding parking spaces in between them. Committee Member Clapper asked if the trees would become bulb outs. City Engineer Williams said he was not sure if there were utilities that would need relocated, but the parking could work.

Committee Member Shannon said the hotel parking exit, the Moonflower, and the La Sal House Restaurant parking is a huge blind spot. Levine requested confirmation that the area could benefit from visual cues that indicate what drivers should do. Committee Member Shannon agreed. He added that delivery trucks do not need accommodated in the parking designs. He said the delivery truck drivers will park wherever they can to deliver their product.

City Engineer Williams said mid-block crosswalks need to be minimized per the MUTCD. Levine said some businesses do not have a parking lot; instead, they use the parking on the street for their businesses. Committee Chair Wells confirmed that 100 North could potentially have angled parking on both sides of the street, but there is no room for median parking as well.

City Engineer Williams said 100 North to 100 West is 71 feet from curb to curb. He said, in order to have parking like City Hall at this location, the sidewalks and park strips would need moved to create more roadway. He said this would affect the utilities, drainage, and driveways. Committee Member Clapper inquired if the center median could have parallel parking. City Engineer Williams said it would require the same amount of space to have angled parking on both sides and parallel parking at the median.

Hancock said the pedestrian experience on the side streets is important. He said the area in front of Moonflower is a great example, because it has shade and seating in the large sidewalk area. He said another great example would be in front of Rim Cyclery. He suggested having three-tiered parking that is parallel on both sides and angled at the median. He said other street templates could work. City Engineer Williams said two parallel parking sections and one angled parking section equals fewer parking spaces. Hancock disagreed and said the curb cuts would affect angled parking and reduce the number of possible spaces. Committee Member Clapper said he would like to see the template for two parallel sections and angled parking at the median included in the proposals that UDOT will review. Committee Chair Wells clarified that UDOT will not review the side street designs, it will only review the Main Street improvements. Hancock said there should be consideration for other templates that will balance the needs of businesses, pedestrians, and vehicular traffic. Levine agreed that one template will not work for all side streets. Levine said consideration should be taken for sidewalk, bike lane, and parking areas. City Engineer Williams said that each bike lane is 5 feet wide, which will impact the size of the roadway.
Hancock inquired about shared street concepts. City Engineer Williams said it is possible to incorporate urban design concepts. He said the focus has been on maximizing parking and increasing traffic flow, so he has not looked at urban design yet. Assistant City Manager Castle requested direction from the Committee regarding conservative parking designs versus more extreme parking designs. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said she would like to use what is already present, such as shade and angled parking. She said traffic calming is another resident concern. Assistant City Manager Castle said City staff can maximize on what is available currently. Committee Member Duncan expressed support for not ripping out a lot of trees to provide more parking.

Assistant City Manager Castle said changing the back-angled parking created a lot of push back. She expressed concern regarding public push back for redesign of the side streets. Committee Chair Wells said the parking designs might need to be on a block-by-block basis. He said the goal is to build a spreadsheet of each block with pros and cons. He agreed that the blocks are in the municipality and the designs will need to be reviewed by City Council. Committee Member Duncan said the consultant for the first Hotspot concepts provided different design options from the conservative to the more aggressive approach. He said he does not want all the funding spent on downtown, because he would still like to see North and South recreation parking lots. Committee Chair Wells reiterated that the projects do not have funding yet. He said taking away from one project’s ability to rank better on the criteria in order to budget for an additional project will decrease the probability of approval from UDOT. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said the trailers need somewhere to park besides Main Street and rural areas.

Levine inquired about a target number of parking spaces that need to be created. Committee Chair Wells said there needs to be a cost per parking space, so it can be compared with the parking structure. Committee Member Clapper said the previous parking study indicated that there is unused parking. He said he does not want to turn blocks into parking lots because it will not help the downtown experience. He said the design should appeal to people looking for a place to park.

Assistant City Manager Castle said it sounds like the Committee wants to see options so they can understand the trade-offs involved. She said there will be an option with no action involved, and an option with the parallel parking. She said it sounds like the parking needs to be balanced with economic development, community character, and community identity.

Committee Chair Wells said there is an assumption that off-Main Street parking will increase the total number of parking spaces. He said it needs to provide enough parking to be beneficial, or the project will not meet the Hotspot criteria effectively. Levine inquired how much more parking is needed. City Engineer Williams said City staff counted the parking spaces on Main Street between 400 North and 300 South, and it is about 100 spaces.

City Engineer Williams reviewed the design of 100 West with the newly added bike lanes. He said the bike lane design sacrificed some parking spaces. He added that the left turn lane onto Williams Way was necessary because 2/3 of the traffic on 100 West turn left to head towards the hospital.

Hancock inquired about data for the congestion choke points. City Engineer Williams said the City has traffic counts throughout its area, and UDOT has traffic counts throughout Main Street. Hancock wondered if the data would account for the seasonal nature of the traffic, and if the data could be drilled down into. City Engineer Williams said it is possible, but it depends on time and money. Committee Chair Wells said the bike lanes are an asset and a priority due to
the Mill Creek Parkway that feeds into this area. Committee Member Clapper said it might be possible to give up one of the bike lanes to add parallel parking.

City Engineer Williams said the park strip and trees on Center Street towards 100 West could be removed to change the parking from parallel to angled. Committee Member Duncan suggested leaving the trees and adding angled parking around them. Hancock inquired if there was a deed restriction on this right-of-way; City Engineer Williams said no. He said this block has been considered for closure during street festivals. Committee Member Clapper appreciated the mid-block crosswalk on this street. City Engineer Williams confirmed that it is a traffic-calming device. Committee Member Clapper said the shade is a benefit for people looking for a parking space. Hancock said this street has a great balance between pedestrians and vehicular traffic. Committee Chair Wells confirmed that this area has potential to increase parking. City Engineer Williams said utilities would be a factor for this street. Committee Member Duncan said irrigation lines would also be a factor.

Committee Member Hawks said there is an empty half block on 100 East near the parkway. City Engineer Williams said the City has design plans for reconstruction of 100 South from Main Street to 200 East. He said there would be a cul-de-sac and angled parking at 100 South and 100 East. He indicated that a property owner may not be on board with the design plans. Assistant City Manager Castle clarified that it is not a City right-of-way, and the property owner may not be interested. City Engineer Williams said that the project has traffic-calming devices, angled parking, and parallel parking. He said it is shovel ready but needs funding.

City Engineer Williams said the block between Main Street and 100 East on Center Street did not work with the City Hall template due to the driveway and parking lot cuts. He said the turn lane tapers approaching Main Street prevent a median from being placed there. Committee Chair Wells confirmed that a policy decision would need to be made regarding one way exiting from driveways. Committee Member Clapper said the flow studies will help determine if this block would become more active if some left turns are removed on Main Street. Committee Member Duncan said pylons could be added to the block and raised in the evening to create more pedestrian friendly areas. Committee Member Clapper said traffic-calming devices would be beneficial on this block. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said it could create more outside seating for the businesses on this block as well.

Committee Chair Wells inquired if the off-Main Street parking designs should come before the Main Street improvements or vice versa. City Engineer Williams inquired what the scope of work and goal is for the Committee. He said some of the downtown improvements may not be able to be funded by UDOT. Committee Chair Wells said it is unknown when the congestion will be adequately addressed in UDOT’s mind. City Engineer Williams said the first way to reduce congestion in UDOT’s mind would be to eliminate parking on Main Street. Committee Chair Wells said that option will be included in the modeling provided by UDOT.

City Engineer Williams said he needs to know the boundaries of the off-Main Street improvements. He said that, if the study area is 100 North to 100 South and 100 East to 100 West, the next step is to count parking spaces and existing conditions. He said City staff will start with the low hanging fruit to try to increase parking. He said the number of parking spaces created will be proposed to UDOT to see if it reduces congestion enough. He said redesign or expansion of the study area would be the next step.

City Engineer Williams said the parking structure was initially approved because it added parking which is a congestion relief tool. Committee Chair Wells inquired how much additional
parking would be considered sufficient. City Engineer Williams said the parking structure would have added 217 spaces minus the 70 currently existing spaces in that location. Committee Chair Wells said that, eventually, the parking on Main Street may be removed due to safety concerns. He said it could be years down the road, but it would be better to be proactive. Hancock inquired if the Main Street parking must be an “all or nothing” proposal. He said other cities restrict parking on one side of the street during congestion periods. Committee Guzman-Newton said it will need considered that Moab does not have traffic all the time due to its seasonal nature. Committee Chair Wells said it should be included in the modeling. Committee Member Shannon said it would be beneficial to have confirmation from UDOT regarding the removal of Main Street parking.

Committee Chair Wells thanked City Engineer Williams for his assistance today.

\textit{Adjournment:} Committee Chair Wells adjourned the meeting at 9:51 AM.
Process Framework
Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee

General Roles & Resource Identification

City of Moab:
- Process development and implementation
- General administration and staff support
- Meeting facilitation in coordination with Grand County
- Coordinate with Grand County to produce meeting documents and materials
- Public engagement
- OPMA compliance
- Engineering and planning technical support

Grand County:
- Assist with process implementation
- General administration and staff support
- Meeting facilitation in coordination with City of Moab
- Coordinate with City of Moab to produce meeting documents and materials
- Assist with public engagement efforts
- Engineering and planning technical support

UDOT:
- Technical expertise
- Meeting support (materials, information from initial Hotspot engagement, information about existing project proposals)

Future Process Schedule

May 2020

Meeting Date: May 13
Subject: Program Criteria Development, Transportation Project Development, Project Evaluation

Desired Outcome: Discussion and development of refined program criteria; refinement of transportation projects; preliminary evaluation of projects

Agenda
- Overview of Program Criteria
- Discussion of potential sub-criteria for refined project evaluation
- Discuss, evaluate, refine final list of projects
  - Shared-use Path (County)
  - Downtown Improvements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-Main Street Parking and Urban Design Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Recreation Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of public engagement efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Date: May 27**

**Subject:** Developing Main Street Improvement Projects

**Desired Outcome:** Further developing scope of Main Street Improvements projects

**Agenda**
- Finalize Main Street Improvements project scope
- Evaluate/rate proposed Main Street Improvements
- Update on public engagement efforts and feedback

**Public Engagement:** Update on feedback sought by committee on projects and program criteria

---

**June 2020**

**Meeting Date: June 17**

**Subject:** Update on Progress and Next Steps

**Desired Outcome:** Project List Re-Assessment, Clarity on Dispersed Parking/Main Street Improvement Funding/Projects

**Agenda**
- DMSA Presentation RE: Off-Main Street Parking Concept(s)
- Discuss Emma Boulevard dispersed parking
- Discuss next steps for Main Street Improvements and Off-Main Street Parking

**Public Engagement:**

---

**July 2020**

**Meeting Date: July 8**

**Subject:** Workshopping/Reviewing Off-Main Street Parking Designs

**Desired Outcome:** Preliminary information about Level 1 Off-Main Street concepts

**Agenda**
- Presentation and discussion of Off-Main Street parking drawings
- Presentation on other dispersed parking possibilities?

**Public Engagement:** Surveys/social media engagement around Off-Main Street Parking Designs, mailers to adjacent businesses, town halls/listening sessions on developed concepts
**Meeting Date: July 22**  
**Subject: Off-Main Street Parking**

**Desired Outcome:** Additional discussion and approval of final Off-Main Street Parking concept

**Agenda**
- Selection of Off-Main Street Parking scenario
- Presentation on Shared-Use Path’s congestion mitigation potential

*Public Engagement:* Surveys/social media engagement around Off-Main Street Parking Designs, mailers to adjacent businesses, town halls/listening sessions on developed concepts

---

**August 2020**

**Meeting Date: August 5**  
**Subject: Main Street Improvements—Modeling**

**Desired Outcome:** Preliminary results from UDOT’s Main Street Improvement modeling

**Agenda**
- 

*Public Engagement:*

---

**Meeting Date: Mid-August**  
**Subject: Main Street Improvements Model Results**

**Desired Outcome:** Finalization of Main Street Improvement plan,

**Agenda:**

*Public Engagement:*

---

**Meeting Date: Late August**  
**Subject: Final Project Selection**

**Desired Outcome:** Final project ranking, Selection of Projects to be Recommended to UDOT

**Agenda:**

*Public Engagement:*
Proposed Hotspot Funding Conceptual Alternatives

Work Plan (6/8/2020)

Preliminary Project Area

Conceptual planning and design will consider parking improvements around four city blocks in the downtown Moab area, extending from 100 West to 100 East, and 100 North to 100 South. Both sides of all streets will be considered, including the streets running the perimeter of the project area.

Conceptual Design Alternatives

An inventory of existing parking spaces will be conducted using aerial photographic methods as the basis of counting. Face-of-curb to face-of-curb will be measured using available aerial drone imagery. The inventory and curb measurements will be used as the basis for the conceptual design alternatives below. An ALTA or field survey conducted by a professional surveyor will not be performed at this time.

Three conceptual design alternative levels will be considered to increase parking capacity in the project area, with each level increasing in complexity and scope. Elements of lower level alternatives will likely be available in the design of higher level alternatives.

Level 1 conceptual design will consider alterations to striping and signing only. This could include increases to longitudinal density of parking by way of restriping parallel spaces to angle spaces, where the available street width allows.

Level 2 will consider alterations with limited effects to existing curb alignments. This could include any alteration made within the existing curb-to-curb width, or realignment of the curb to accommodate short segments of recessed parking where wide park strips and absence of trees or other significant landscaping allows.

Level 3 will consider all alterations that may be made within the existing City right-of-way. Median parking or relocation or removal of extraneous driveways could be utilized. Complete realignment of existing curbs along at least one side of each street will likely be necessary.

Design Criteria

Though each location within the project area will require special consideration, the project will comply with all available and applicable standards, guidelines, and best practices. Generally, travel lane widths, turning radii, and parking spaces should be designed to accommodate the largest reasonable design vehicle. Bicycle users should be considered in the design of all travelled ways. In most cases, pedestrian facilities should be at least five feet wide, though it is desirable that they be much wider.

Existing Conditions
City staff has estimated that there are 340 on-street parking spaces currently available in the project area (including on Main Street; see Table 1 below). Another 70 spaces are provided in the City-owned lot that can be accessed from Center Street, and 42 spaces at the Moab Information Center (MIC) lot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W 100 North</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 100 North</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 100 West</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Main</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 100 East</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Center</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Center</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 100 West</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Main</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 100 East</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 100 South</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 100 South</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total On Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>340</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>452</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
RESOLUTION NO. XX-2020

A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE RENEGOTIATION OF THE UDOT AGREEMENT AND TERMINATING THE DESIGN CONTRACT FOR THE DOWNTOWN PARKING STRUCTURE PROJECT & DIRECTING COORDINATION WITH UDOT & GRAND COUNTY TO PURSUE ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS FOR HOTSPOT FUNDING

WHEREAS, significant investments have been made in delivering a Downtown Parking Structure (DPS); and

WHEREAS, the primary need for the DPS as identified in the 2017 UDOT Region 4 Arches Hotspot Study was to replace on-street parking lost as part of Main Street Improvements, but that those Improvements were rejected by residents and Council who objected to loss of on-street parking; and

WHEREAS, building private vehicle capacity, including parking, does not always lead to congestion reduction, and capital projects other than the DPS may result in better long-term satisfaction of Hotspot program goals and community priorities; and

WHEREAS, the DPS, according to the Downtown Parking Study, primarily benefits businesses within 600 feet of the structure, that is a limited number of businesses, and thus is a poorer use of public funds than dispersed parking or a regional shuttle which benefits a broader number of businesses; and

WHEREAS, DPS design has changed significantly from its original less-intrusive, partially buried bottom floor, and two additional stories, to an imposing and view-shed blocking four story structure of 42 feet including its roof parapets; and

WHEREAS, the DPS, still early in its design phase, has already incurred significant cost overruns forcing the adoption of structural construction techniques that trade lower construction cost for increased maintenance cost during its life; and

WHEREAS, the DPS will incur significantly higher maintenance cost than the existing surface lot, with poor prospects for offsetting revenue whether it charges for parking or not, since according to the Downtown Parking Study the lot is often under-utilized; and

WHEREAS, the DPS cannot accommodate over-sized vehicles, a critical parking need; and

WHEREAS, UDOT is receptive to the redirection of Hotspot Funding if an alternative project achieves the goals of reducing congestion, increasing economic development, and increasing tourism opportunities; and

WHEREAS, alternate uses of DPS funds have been identified that may satisfy the above criteria;
WHEREAS, Moab City is currently partnering with Grand County and UDOT on a series of comprehensive transportation planning efforts, and is committed to improving transportation throughout Spanish Valley including Moab City, but as currently sequenced the transit component will not be complete until well after the Hotspot funding opportunity is passed; and

WHEREAS, meetings of UDOT staff and local advisory bodies convened by UDOT are not subject to the conditions of Utah Open and Public Meetings Act; and

WHEREAS, Moab City officials and residents value government transparency, and Moab City is committed to and capable of providing meeting noticing and record keeping facilitation, as well as other public engagement tools; and

WHEREAS, given a UDOT project may fall either entirely within or without Moab City limits, or include both Moab City and Grand County; and

WHEREAS, Moab City is interested in cooperating with Grand County to deliver services to their shared constituents more efficiently, Moab elected officials are accountable first and foremost to the citizens within their jurisdictional boundary, and Moab officials desire to cooperate with the County on projects which include both their areas, and retain the authority over projects entirely within City limits; and

WHEREAS, the Moab City Council believes that, despite the previous investments of time, money, goodwill, public process, and commitments made, on balance the interests of Moab and the satisfaction of the Hotspot criteria may be better served by project(s) other than the DPS.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MOAB, UTAH that:

1) The City Council directs the City Manager to issue a “stop work” order to Kimley-Horn to cease work on design for the DPS;

2) The City Council directs City staff to seek clarity from UDOT regarding the measures by which alternative projects will be evaluated to meet Hotspot Funding criteria, and any UDOT submittal requirements in order to develop projects that meet the criteria of the Hotspot Funding Program and which the City anticipates would garner community and local leadership support. City Staff shall engage with relevant parties at Grand County and UDOT to determine the feasibility, cost, and staffing needs to quickly develop alternative Hotspot-funded projects. This information shall be brought to City Council, and County Council should their leadership so choose, for consideration;

3) The City Council directs the City Manager to renegotiate the Cooperative Agreement with UDOT, dated July 22, 2019, in a way that minimizes legal and financial risk to the City and the goals outlined in item #2 above;
4) The City Council directs the City Manager, following the renegotiation discussions with UDOT, to produce to the City Council a proposed framework and process to accomplish the goals outlined in item #2 above;

5) If UDOT and the City Council agree to terminate the July 22, 2019 Cooperative Agreement, the City Council directs the City Manager to terminate the City’s consulting services agreement with Kimley-Horn, dated October 24, 2019; and

6) City Council and City staff will coordinate with Grand County Council to form the “Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee,” which shall consist of seven (7) members. The City Council shall establish the Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee by resolution or ordinance, with clarity as to appointing authority, membership, organization, purpose, authority, and expiration date. The Arches Hotspot Regional Coordinating Committee shall provide noticing and record keeping in compliance with the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act. City staff shall consult with the Council on other public engagement tools and efforts for this process. Transparency and public involvement shall be prioritized in the definition of alternative projects.

PASSED AND ADOPTED in open Council by a majority vote of the Governing Body of the City of Moab this xxth day of March, 2020.

SIGNED:

__________________________________
Emily S. Niehaus, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________
Sommar Johnson, City Recorder