

**MOAB CITY COUNCIL, GRAND COUNTY COMMISSION, ARCHES  
HOTSPOT REGION COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 30, 2020**

The Moab City Council, Grand County Commission, and Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee held a Special Joint Meeting on the above date. Consistent with provisions of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, Utah Code Ann. § 54-2-207(4), the Moab City Council Chair has issued written determinations supporting the decision to convene electronic meetings of the Council without a physical anchor location. Due to the health and safety risks related to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and considering public health orders limiting in-person gatherings, the Moab City Council will continue to hold meetings by electronic means. 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=m4fBL8iVH\\_s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m4fBL8iVH_s).

[0:03](#)

***Special Meeting—Call to Order and Roll Call Attendance – Arches Region***

***Coordinating Committee:*** Committee Chair Curtis Wells called the Special Meeting to order at 12:33 PM. Participating remotely were Committee Members Curtis Wells, Kalen Jones, Jaylyn Hawks, Karen Guzman-Newton, Mike Duncan, Wes Shannon, and Evan Clapper.

[0:15](#)

***Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee Approval of Minutes – October 21, 2020—Approved***

***Motion:*** Committee Member Guzman-Newton moved to approve the minutes. Committee Member Jones seconded the motion.

***Vote:*** Motion passed unanimously with Committee Members Wells, Jones, Hawks, Guzman-Newton, Duncan, Shannon, and Clapper voting aye.

[0:57](#)

***Adjournment:*** Committee Chair Wells closed the Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee meeting at 12:34 PM.

[2:49](#)

***Call to Order and Roll Call Attendance – Grand County Commission:***

Commission Chair Mary McGann called the meeting to order at 12:36 PM. Participating remotely were Commissioners Mary McGann, Evan Clapper, Curtis Wells, Gabriel Woytek, and Jaylyn Hawks. Grand County staff participating remotely were Commission Administrator Chris Baird, County Attorney Christina Sloan, Assistant Commission Administrator Mallory Nassau, Clerk/Auditor Quinn Hall, and Planning & Zoning Director Mila Dunbar-Irwin.

[4:24](#)

***Call to Order and Roll Call Attendance – Moab City Council:***

Mayor Niehaus called the meeting to order at 12:37 PM. Participating remotely were Councilmembers Tawny Knuteson-Boyd, Kalen Jones, Karen Guzman-Newton, Rani Derasary, and Mike Duncan. City staff participating remotely were City Recorder Sommar Johnson, Assistant City Manager Carly Castle, City Engineer Chuck Williams, City Attorney Laurie Simonson, and Communications and Engagement Manager Lisa Church. UDOT staff participating remotely was Region 4 Deputy Director Monte Aldridge.

[5:49](#)

***Citizens to be Heard:***

***Comments received during the meeting:***

Reed Pendleton: “Yeah, I’ve just got a quick comment to make. My name is Reed Pendleton. I think the shuttle is a good concept, but I’m afraid of how much use it would get from the accommodation sector that it seems to want to target. I feel like, in my experience, most of my

guests drive into town anyway, just because they're on their way to or from the parks or the trail systems. I can see people who are purposely driving into town to shop or eat using it; but I think the parking would be a bigger necessity in my opinion. I have found myself personally trying to run errands to certain businesses and such downtown and not able to find parking. I also do worry about the construction of the parking and what effects that would have in the short-term. One other quick comment about the bypass: I do support the bypass 100%. I have seen comments where a bypass would potentially hurt downtown businesses, and I don't think that's the case here. I think a lot of the South valley residents, people staying in accommodations on the South end of town, and truckers are going to appreciate the bypass in order to avoid congestion downtown. This would encourage people to go downtown more and shop and eat and have a better user experience due to lessened noise and traffic. If we are going to continue to encourage economic diversification and growth, we need to create the infrastructure to better handle the people who are here now, as well as the ones who are coming. As the South end of the valley continues to grow, it will only create more of a demand for a bypass. Thank you."

Neal Clark: "I submitted comments, but I was actually hoping to speak on just a little bit broader view than what I submitted. I'm Neal Clark, I live in the Mountain View neighborhood. To start, I don't actually think anyone here lives in Mountain View so I want you all to think about how your opinion might differ if you were discussing a highway within 100/500/maybe even 1,000 feet of your home. Would you have even moved there in the first place? I want to speak to the frustration that myself and many members of the community have around this entire issue. And that frustration stems from the continual runaround that we've received from elected officials for years now. I can't even begin to tell you how many times I've heard/been told not to worry, that a bypass is not on the table, that we would never do anything to impact one of the neighborhoods. But that's really never been the case, and the bypass continues to bubble to the surface usually and honestly, conveniently, right around the time when everyone's frustrated with traffic. Which, to be clear, is due to the continual over-promotion of the area. So anyone who's looking at it subjectively can see that the only outcome of more analysis and process is the determination that the only feasible route is going to be through someone's neighborhood; and so far, that neighborhood is Mountain View. It's a mixed-income neighborhood of people who've worked extremely hard to be able to buy their homes, and who can't simply sell their place and find a new location in town. And so a resolution in support effectively throws your support behind a process that you ultimately cannot control, and that risks destroying someone's home. For those of us who live in the crosshairs of every proposal to date, there's no benefit. So please don't downplay or obfuscate this issue by saying that you're only exploring the idea further, or that you'll only support a tunnel; because a resolution in support of a bypass is supporting a process that leads to one outcome. So please be forthright, please stop placating. If you support a bypass through Mountain View, you owe it to everybody to be straightforward about that. And if you don't, then do not move forward with a resolution. Thank you for your time."

Kyle Bailey: "Here's my 'Citizen to be Heard' contribution to the UTV Noise and Traffic in our Neighborhood Communities Issue: I want to thank the Moab City Council and Grand County Council for addressing the effect that UTV Noise and Traffic is having on our city and county residential areas. The last joint County and City meeting took needed action for the community and now we have direction and momentum to address the concerns that have been articulated by so many of the citizens in Grand County. I'm sure I don't need to describe or repeat the outcries/comments/testimonies/information about UTV noise and traffic and the stressful effects it is having on people in their homes and businesses. I'm sure you have received that input. I don't think I need to discuss the negative and disruptive effect UTV traffic is having on our ability to keep our sense of neighborhoods and community. I'm sure you've gotten that input and had that conversation with constituents. Your actions at your last joint meeting make clear

that you want to strengthen and support the Grand County community, and that your neighbors and citizens come first. You were presented with a petition, 'Make Moab Quiet Again', signed by over 3000 people as of today, (mostly local citizens) that asked local elected leaders to take steps to do something about the UTVs' out-of-control presence on our streets. That was an impressive request for help from local citizens to you and the Utah State Legislature. That was an impressive request that unacceptable UTV traffic on our streets.....be addressed. Sincerely, Kyle Bailey”

Katherine Holyoak: “Hi Councilmembers, this is Katherine Holyoak in Moab. I had technical difficulties there for a minute. I submitted an email, which somewhat is defunct now because I really appreciate Curtis Wells calling this morning and clarifying some of the things that were going on with the bypass. But I was very concerned because the way it came across from your website was that we were making final decisions for bypasses and that type of thing, which that is not true, I have learned since. I would hope that when you do consider this, I wouldn't mind seeing a bypass happen, but the way one of them was drawn went right through my business. It would have ruined and wrecked our business because it came out through our property on South Main, just past Knowles Furniture Store. But, anyway, he explained to me that that is not what you're doing today, and I appreciate his clarification. But I just want you to know if there is a bypass, I would like to see it coming farther out of town than just staying right here in town, which would somewhat landlock the town still on the South end as compared to the North end. But, anyway I appreciated being called this morning by him and just wanted to clarify that, because the email that I sent is kind of not valid at this time. But I would like to see a bypass happen, but not in my yard. So thanks for your help.”

Melanie Snow: “Hi. After looking at your map and everything, I'm neighbors to the Holyoaks. So you're proposing to put the road that would go alongside our house as it cuts down to the main highway. To me, that's just not feasible; there's already a two-lane road that goes right by McDonald's. I don't know why you'd need to put another road in our backyard, and then come down along the side of our house. As we sit now, the highway noise from the semi-trucks that go down the main highway are already bad; so I couldn't imagine them coming down the hill to connect. And we hear them all night long, so I don't know how that's going to be feasible. And even the cost of it would be extraordinary. When you're planning a two-lane road when there's already a two-lane road there. I do agree there needs to be a bypass. I mean, right now, it takes over an hour to get into town from Arches, which is absolutely ridiculous. But I think in your study it says that the residents wouldn't be affected; there's several residents in the area that will be affected. So I don't know whose study that was, obviously someone that doesn't live in that area. But there are residents that will be affected. And, you know, we put a lot of time and money into building our place there and enjoying Moab; and to do a road like that right in our backyard and down alongside our home would be devastating. Thank you.”

Kim Kirks: “Hi, this is Kim Kirks. I just was wondering if the pollutions have been addressed and wildlife with that going through behind the neighborhood of Mountain View and McKay Place?”

***Written comments received before the meeting:***

Tracy Martinez: “I was just made aware of the plans of a bypass behind Doc Allen Dr. and I am writing in regards to how against this I am! I live on Doc Allen and if the City has so conveniently forgotten that a sink hole formed under a house in my neighborhood and that geological studies that were done on the hillside suggest the fragility of the soil in our area I can pretty much bet that this bypass would not be a good idea for our neighborhood. Along with this reason I can think of a hundred or more reasons NOT to do the bypass by our neighborhood, if

you would like a list of those, I would be happy to provide, but trying to make this short and sweet. This was brought up many years ago before they developed up here and it should have been done then but It's too late now. I dislike the traffic as much as anyone but please take in the consideration the people that live here all year long trying to raise a family and pay their taxes.”

Zach Raney: “I think the bypass would hurt the community more than help the traffic congestion in Moab, this town is more popular than ever and I do not wish for us to squeeze every penny out of it at locals expense. We should focus on advertising Moab less and look for more sensible alternatives that decrease the amount of visitors we see annually. I co-own a business in this town and the amount of demand we have seen has grown exponentially in the past 5 years and it is absolutely unsustainable. We need to work towards common sense alternatives that protect the Moab local -Zach”

Amy Walling: “I am writing you today in regards to the bypass being considered behind the Doc Allen subdivision. I have included below, excerpts from a State of Utah geological survey, why this is not a good idea. The area of Doc Allen Drive and the Allen subdivision is geologically mapped as predominately Quaternary younger alluvial fan deposits, with Triassic Chinle Formation and Pennsylvanian Paradox Formation mapped at the northern end of the subdivision. Subsequent geologic hazard mapping indicates portions of the Allen subdivision are within an area for potentially expansive soil and rock or potentially expansive and gypsiferous soil and rock. Up to four parallel traces of the Moab fault lie immediately west of the subdivisions, with most of the traces covered by Quaternary deposits. “Fresh water was pumped into a massive salt bed in the Moab Valley salt-cored anticline to produce brine from a second well. The injection well was originally drilled for oil in 1943 and was recompleted as a brine well in 1960. The boreholes, located in SWI/4SWI/4 section 1, T. 26 S., R. 21 E., reached the first salt bed at a depth of 900 feet, but produced from another bed at an approximate depth of 2,000 feet. The brine contained about 310,000 parts per million (ppm) sodium chloride and 1,200 ppm calcium sulfate (Mayhew and Heylman, 1965). Daily brine production in 1965 was between 400 and 3,000 barrels. Brine production forms large caverns in the salt beds. No one has any idea of how deep and how wide the caverns may be. By building a bypass in this area with CONSTANT motion during the construction and continually after, you are putting the entire neighborhood at risk of sink hole damage. Is the City of Moab willing to take on this responsibility? Is the City of Moab willing to ensure there will no issues to homes, roads and other infrastructures in the area? In addition, from the same document from the State of Utah: “Further building in the subdivision should be curtailed, until additional information is available that indicates if building is possible with mitigation, or should be prohibited. Additional development on the Paradox Formation (exposed at the ground surface) north of Huntridge Drive will likely not be possible”. Consider your tax paying, hardworking citizens of Moab and deal with the traffic IN ANOTHER WAY, NOT behind the Doc Allen subdivision. Sincerely, Amy N. Walling”

Josephine Kovash: “Hello, I'm writing a comment for Citizens to be Heard during the joint City/County meeting on Friday October 30th. As far as Hotspot funding goes, I look forward to seeing how the three chosen options evolve and I am optimistic at the direction the committee has taken. I want to reiterate the importance of green infrastructure with both downtown parking and a Spanish Valley trail systems. I encourage the City and County to go above and beyond in considering permaculture concepts and the expertise of local permaculture experts in executing green infrastructure. Additionally, I want to reiterate the importance of people and bike spaces, and encourage broader and more permanent parklets like the ones outside of 98 Center. On the topic of the bypass: I want a silver bullet to the problem of having an interstate trucking corridor as a Main Street more than anyone, but I am simply not convinced

that a bypass is it. From the numbers, it just seems that this is an extraordinary cost for such little impact. And the potential negative impact on the Kane Creek residential neighborhood feels like high stakes to gamble with as well--I do not understand the logic of routing traffic which currently runs through a commercial corridor to instead route through residential neighborhoods. I encourage the City and County to be more creative in their thinking. Perhaps re-envision downtown and Main St. to strengthen commercial access for pedestrians and bikers on car-less side streets and alleys and utilize vegetation on Main St. for sound dampening and screening. Mitigate the use of 500 W as a Main St. detour through lower speed limits and green infrastructure that might slow traffic down, deterring its use as a viable detour and making it more bikeable and pedestrian friendly for people in that neighborhood. Strengthen public transportation in the valley for visitors so that they don't feel the need to drive everywhere when they stay here. I feel like there are smaller more holistic solutions out there to be found. I don't think we can build our way out of this with the massive project of a bypass. If the numbers showed a different outcome, such as half or more of the traffic currently downtown being re-routed, then I could see re-visiting this idea. Thank you, Josie Kovash”

Elizabeth R. Bond: “We have just bought in Spanish Valley. I am returning to Moab and my husband is a life-long California dweller. I have family on Plateau Circle, Murphy Lane, and in the Holyoak subdivision. There is already semi-truck noise echoing around the larger Grand Valley. As there has been since 1980 when I moved here the first time. Occupants of Doc Allen Drive who have a NIMBY attitude are not looking at the community's needs. It is not a matter of a few restaurants on Main Street wanting outdoor seating (although that is not a trivial matter) - - we came into town late evening on Oct13th/2020 -- MIDWEEK. The backup was from before Potash Road. It took us at least 40 minutes to get to Sage/Holyoak turnoff. If NIMBY on Doc Allen wanted to retire to peace and quiet, they should have bought at Pack Creek Ranch or Wilson Arch. For those of us who want to live in a vibrant and dynamic community: PLEASE move forward on a bypass route that should have been enacted forty years ago. Thank you.”

Judy Powers: “I am very pleased with the Hot Spot recommendations for a shuttle, bike/walking path from Spanish Valley and dispersed parking in the downtown area. All of those are much needed. I am alarmed by the bypass plans. I am shocked by the predictions of the increased traffic by 2030 and agree something needs to be "done". However these plans are woefully inaccurate and ill-conceived. A highway could be a good solution but neither of these plans enables the traffic to move unimpeded. There are many serious considerations including the fact that neither of these plans create a flow. Both require stop lights, have left hand turns and in general do NOT seem to do what is intended. In addition plan 1 D doesn't account for crappy soil (there have been sink holes up there), serious noise bouncing off the walls all over town and tunnels(?) Besides the fact that it is very close to the Mountain View Neighborhood and ultimately dead ends right back on the hwy. There is no flow, meaning the ability to flow without traffic lights and left hand turns. I am concerned about para-touring assuming that is the people flying noisily over our valley. The sound starts way before they are overhead and continues well after they are gone. It's bad enough that we are bombarded with UTV"S but from the air as well? Egads. I may be too late for this but I'm not happy with the idea of buying new homes at Walnut Lane. While the construction is being delayed there are lots of options for the people living there to transfer to Cinema Court, MAPS, and other affordable housing. Buying new units that cannot be moved and financed, AND will continue our affordable housing being crappy trailers is frustrating. We need to be going in the opposite direction. Please reconsider and work on getting the people living there now into other affordable housing situations.”

Brian Hays: “Hello, Please pave Rainbow Drive. This is a dirt road within city limits on the north side of town. There has been a large increase in traffic with the new Preserve development

going in over the last 5 years. The road is very dusty when it's dry and muddy with precipitation. The city passed increased taxes for road maintenance a few years ago. These funds should be used for projects like this. Thank you."

Lara Derasary: "I am completely opposed to Bypass Alternative 1A. I see no benefit to our community in bisecting a neighborhood with a highway. Nor do I see benefits to reducing congestion. Kane Creek is already more heavily trafficked than it was in the past, and I just see this as a way to move Main Street traffic a few blocks west and out of sight of Main Street businesses and into the front yards of residents. Moreover there will be a new traffic choke point at Kane Creek and 191. It's dangerous enough as it is at this intersection with a cross-walk and vehicle traffic coming in and out of McDonald's and the Brewery/Village Market parking lot. Putting a bypass on this road would be irresponsible and negatively impact the residents in these neighborhoods as well as community safety and quality of life in general. I am on the fence on Alternative D and would need to be persuaded that adjacent residents approve this option and by design. Again, I think this alternative will impact the adjacent neighborhood even with a sound wall. It is preferable to Alternative A in that it doesn't bisect a neighborhood, and it gets traffic further south. That said, I think for a bypass to be truly effective, it needs to get the truck traffic south of the south town Shell station. I also worry about increased/amplified noise from trucks closer to the rim, and I wonder about the geologic stability of Alternative D given the Paradox formation that created the Moab Valley and the known presence of sink holes on the west side of the Valley. Finally I have concerns for the cumulative impacts of both a new bridge and additional traffic at the Portal, on river morphology, riparian health and the health of wetland flora and fauna."

Marcia Ewell: "I live on 500 West and have a rental with an elderly couple on my property as well. We cannot go anywhere on a Sunday during the main fall or spring season and be able to get back to our homes due to the long line of traffic blocking the roadway. Last Sunday, I witnessed a fire truck traveling very fast northbound on 500 West in the southbound lane running full code, lights and sirens, speeding past all the stopped vehicles that were blocking the northbound traffic flow. I was a Law Enforcement Officer for 7 years and thought this was a very dangerous situation. I am very concerned that my tenants, myself or my neighbors may have difficulty in the future trying to get emergency services to our homes with the worsening traffic gridlock. It is also a very dangerous situation for anyone north of town, in the parks, roads, airport, camps, trails or river that might need emergency services with the current traffic gridlock. I know there have been past deaths on main street due to the excessive traffic of locals, tourists and truckers. I strongly support the construction of a bypass to connect S 191 via a bridge to Potash Rd. I believe this will be a huge benefit to the town residents and businesses and all vehicular traffic to have a bypass and will alleviate many of the traffic congestion and be a safer situation for everyone in Moab. I also understand some homes may suffer some impact to their quality of life from noise or fumes or other bypass related issues. I hope the Council will do everything possible to mitigate the negatives for the few that might be impacted, but will make the bypass happen for the sake of safety and quality of life of the overall community."

Clint Ball: "Regarding the proposed highway bypass. Moab government seems to be intent upon making this place unlivable for residents while giving it all away to visitors. I do not agree that having two noisy, crowded, ugly, high speed (relative to residential streets) routes through town is more desirable than just one. Too busy, too crowded, too loud, too much emphasis on persons passing through and no emphasis on quality of life for those who choose to live here. Channeling traffic through a commercial center makes good sense for both visitors and residents. Running traffic through residential neighborhoods and open space is purely punishing those residents for their choice of which small town they chose to live in."

Chelsea: "I have many concerns about a potential bypass and sent an email with more details. My main concern is that a bypass would be detrimental to my neighborhood and would only be beneficial to truckers. I do not believe it would solve our traffic issues, but regardless, I hope no action will be taken until the highway widening is complete and we can see the benefits of that project. The main thing I want to concentrate on with this comment is potential business loss if a bypass does happen. While I don't believe it would alleviate traffic issues or vehicle noise in the valley in a large enough way to outweigh the overall impact of a bypass, as a Main Street retail employee, I do notice people stopping and supporting local business who are otherwise passing through. I am sure part of that is having available parking, which is not always a thing, but it is something to note. It might be another way in which we lose with the construction of a bypass."

Christina Behling: "Hello Mayor and Council members, My name is Christina Behling and I am a resident, taxpayer, voter, and 12 year homeowner of a house I built and live in on Doc Allen drive. I am opposed to building the bypass in the Doc Allen neighborhood for multiple reasons. This inherit problem is NOT through traffic, if it was Monticello would have the same problem. It is people coming solely for Moab and then turning around and going back to S.L.C. and never using this bypass. I believe that solutions for this are First, let's stop advertising Moab, the cat is out of the bag, people know about us so let's stop adding fuel to the fire. Second, let's wait and see if this huge and EXPENSIVE project North of town helps. We haven't even enjoyed the fruits of its labor yet. Third, if need be take the parking off of Mainstreet and add another lane and build parking garages. Having the highway above Doc Allen would amplify the sound that would reverberate off the rock walls. Also, the light would bounce off the rim wall. Aren't we supposed to be a Night Sky Community? This would not only effect the neighborhood nearby but make everyone in Moab miserable. The Moab esthetics would be ruined especially for people who have views of the rim. It would disturb the soil causing the area to become more prone to mudslides and flooding. It would entomb our large, local, neighborhood in traffic with no reprieve. Locals like myself, who have worked so hard in the community to buy a house would see their home values significantly decrease. I will share my opinions with neighbors and friends to grow opposition to this project. I would like to thank any council member that opposes this idea, you will have my vote. Sincerely, Christina Behling"

Kaki Hunter: "Concerning development of a bypass around Moab: 1. Rather than investing in a a bypass that will adversely affect neighborhoods I encourage the City and County to work with the State in developing a rail transport system. Trucking is one of the least efficient ways to transport goods. Getting trucks off the road and products onto rails is the next step toward greening the US economy and lowering emissions. 2. Build more bike and pedestrian paths throughout Grand County with public shuttles that take people to the trails. My observation is that most traffic is from folks coming TO Moab not THROUGH Moab. I was stuck in traffic returning to Moab from the north on 191 for 40 minutes late Sunday afternoon. There was not a single semi-truck in the line backed up from the Potash turnoff to the bridge. Traffic was backed up due to the stop light from the River Road. After vehicles got past the light all traffic moved along fine even with the road still under construction. 3. Reduce congestion by limiting the number of people allowed into the Sand Flats Recreation area. The Sand Flats area is getting overused and abused. Require a permit for only as many users the landscape can support. Require a reservation to to camp, and lastly it will come to the point as it has for all permitted River Trips; a Lottery to get a permit. 4. Direct the Travel Council to promote Moab as a pedestrian oriented community with an emphasis on exploring nature on foot or bicycle rather than in an OHV. Do we need to spend TRT advertisement-allocated funds every year? Could money be set aside for remediating the damage done from OHV abuse to trails? Instead of

advertising adventure sports and OHV use could advertising focus on low impact/leave no trace education? Thank you for reading my comments!"

Mark Olson: "Hello and thank you for taking my comment. I want to let you know that I am adamantly against the two options the 2018 study proposed. Both would have significant negative impacts to the mtn. view community which has over 100 hours. This would also be a hug waste of money for no reason. We have traffic maybe 10 weekends a year, it is truly no big deal. If it is a big deal let's do something. Let's get rid of parking on main from Grand Tire Pro's/Sweet Cravings all the way to High Point. Let's get rid of left turns in the same spot. It doesn't have to be all year either just March-June and Sept-Nov. Let's do the transportation hub north of town with transit. Let's try a myriad of other cheaper, more environmentally friendly, more in line with preserving a neighborhood for the people who live here. I live here, and I could care less about sitting in traffic a little, as long as I can return to my house after and find peace. Please stop this short-sighted plan."

Lori Adams: "I am writing this letter to express my concerns over both of the bypass options presented in the 2018 bypass study. My husband and I purchased a home on Doc Allen Drive in 2014. Although we are not full-time residents of Moab, we are recently retired and are spending more and more time here. My concerns over the bypass are not just for myself and my neighbors, but for all of Moab. My biggest concern is the noise that would be produced having a bypass up against the rim. We all know that vehicle noise has been a big issue in Moab, and semi-trucks traveling against the rim will add to the problem. Also, I believe that the visual effect of the bypass would ruin part of the natural beauty that Moab offers both its residents and visitors. In the introduction explaining the need for a bypass it states that a "bypass solution must prioritize neighborhood integrity and character". I don't think that a bypass above Doc Allen Drive, or on Kane Creek could have anything but negative effects on the neighborhoods. Currently our neighborhood is very quiet and peaceful. That would not be the case with a bypass above us. A solution that could be explored more is to move parking off of main street, and have more lanes of traffic. Possibly some pedestrian bridges for crossing streets? Maybe we need to wait and see how traffic flows after the construction is finished north of town. I know that traffic is an issue, but I feel that there is a better and more creative solution that putting a bypass through or near a residential neighborhood. Thank you for your time, Lori Adams"

Sheila Strahan: "In regulars to the proposed bypass road: I notice that the 2 options attached to this agenda both include a bridge over the river to connect Kane Creek to Potash road and agree that if a bypass road is the best solution to the traffic problems (I'm not convinced of this yet), then an extra bridge is key to making it work. Between the two options, utilizing Kane Creek Road as the bypass route is the better option - the infrastructure is already in place and if widened and improved with traffic lights, it would serve the purpose proposed without having to create a whole new road. I hope that the people studying this issue are considering some of the alternatives that have been proposed (I don't know what has been officially proposed, only what I have heard from fellow citizens). For example, one suggestion I've heard: since the primary traffic issues appear to happen at the same times each week and only during the 'on season' (Friday and Saturday evenings southbound into town and Sunday mornings/afternoons northbound out of town), what about re-programming traffic lights during those times? I have many friends who live on or near 5th west, and know that their lives are miserable during those times right now - turning off the Light at 191 and 5th west on Sunday mornings would keep the out of town travelers out of those neighborhoods and would allow those residents to move around town in alternate ways instead of being stuck in their houses. There have been other suggestions as well. I think it's important to acknowledge that there are many issues cropping up right now all related to the same thing: too many visitors. So, if our town decides they want to

solve the traffic issues with a bypass, we need to make sure we know that it only makes sense to spend that ton of money if we put in a second bridge; AND we need to realize that this will not solve the other issues from too many visitors and may, in fact, make some of them worse . . .”

Valencia Miller: “As a resident of Doc Allen neighborhood, I respectfully ask that these two points are considered: 1. Table the Matter until 2025. In my humble opinion it would be best to table the discussion of the US 191 By-Pass until the completion of the current US 191 Expansion Project. In your document, Introduction to A Bypass Discussion, you mention that the 2018 analysis and proposal is currently being considered because “the traffic congestion Moab experienced this fall is a compelling reason to look hard at this alternative concept today”. This statement is very vague and in need of more explanation and exploration. Is it the construction or volume of vehicles that is the cause of the congestion? What are the areas of congestion that you are referring to? What day of the week and time of day are you referring to? It would just be nice to know the answer to these questions before considering a project that you previously deemed to be “excessive”. 2. Consider Restructuring Vehicular Traffic. I would like to suggest an alternative to the possible \$125 million dollar By-pass project. Since the US 191 is a very important route for commerce and happens to be our current Main Street, I would like to suggest that parking on Main Street is prohibited and those parking spaces be re-assigned as lanes which would allow 3 lanes in each direction. If this was an agreeable implement then parking would be limited to parking structures and side roads. Furthermore the semi-trucks could have a designated lane to pass through town. In short, a by-pass bridge and tunnel through residential areas is something that we should consider AFTER exploring and implementing other methods of traffic control that we have available to us with far less expense especially since it appears that we are considering to spend millions of dollars to save 2 to 5 minutes of our life at best. Thank you for the opportunity to share these thoughts, Valencia”

Jason Ramsdell: “I oppose any and all traffic bypass routes around the city of Moab; whether tunneling through the cliffs, under Main Street, or “behind” Mountain View neighborhood. Please keep all traffic (Including trucks) on 191. Neighborhoods in Moab, like Mountain View, need a quite respite from unrelenting noise from traffic echoing off the cliffs to neighborhoods below. The UTV noise and traffic problems in Moab are bad enough, and we don’t need more traffic and noise with an expensive bypass. In addition, the BLM land behind Doc Allen Drive is used by many locals for needed quite recreation such as hiking, dog walking, and mountain biking. Yes there is noise and congestion on 191, but please keep it there and not in and around our neighborhood sanctuaries. Thank you, Jason Ramsdell Huntridge Drive”

Liz Ballenger: “I was shocked and disappointed to see discussion of a Moab bypass on the agenda yet again and am writing to express opposition to the ill-conceived options presented in the 2018 study attached to this agenda item. I am extremely opposed to any bypass that would negatively impact Moab valley neighborhoods, and I know many of you are as well. I truly want to believe that you put the quality of life for we who elected you as your highest priority. But I have to admit I question WHY, with all that is going on at this time and the Hell that is 2020, would you choose to resurrect this highly contentious issue, seemingly out of the blue, now? And WHY, if you do oppose bypass options that impact our neighborhoods, would you include the 2018 study as the only supporting documentation for this agenda item when it so obviously impacts our neighborhoods?? The 2018 Study is highly questionable as it lacks any supporting data and explanation for the conclusions presented. In any case, I’m very concerned that by signing onto any resolution supporting a bypass scenario now, you will set us on the path towards a very impactful future bypass. Let’s face it, while we all support the concept of a magical bypass that gets semis off Main Street and reduces traffic, (another questionable assumption, since we all know areas south of here have no traffic issues!) bypass options that

won't impact neighborhoods (i.e. tunnels) will ultimately be cost-prohibitive. A resolution supporting a bypass now may set us on a path of more studies and planning that ultimately conclude that surface options (such as those along Kane Creek Dr. or a trench behind Doc Allen Dr.) are much, much cheaper. By this time, untold millions of dollars will have been spent in decades-long study, planning, and momentum for this project. Do we really think UDOT and the State will fork over billions of dollars for tunnel construction in little 'ol Moab when they've subjected residents on the Wasatch front to highway construction in their backyards?? This is naïve thinking, and if you are truly opposed to a bypass that impacts our neighborhoods, then stop this process now and focus your efforts on addressing the root causes of our traffic problems that stem from unbridled industrial tourism. Thanks for all you do in supporting your constituents and our community. Liz Ballenger”

Deborah Holyoak Martinez: “Deciding on the best “route” for a bypass without informing the parties possibly effected is devious and wrong. Using COVID to move forward agendas without the right to a face-to-face public meeting to hear and see all parties’ feelings/ideas is unconstitutional. My family helped settle the Moab valley and all the city and state has done is take that away. My grandfather had to take what was offered at pennies on the dollar for the road through his property or loose it to the state/city years ago and now you are trying again. You’re fine to support anyone that doesn’t stand in your way but mow over anyone who doesn’t support your agendas. My family has paid taxes (HIGH taxes) for years so you could develop and frivolously spend money in Moab and now you want to take the very hand that has fed you from their hard work and ingenuity. You leave cities that are too congested and busy for a quieter, beautiful area only to step on the toes of those who have made it what it is. If Bypass 1D is chosen you will encounter Indian artifacts along that area that should be properly cared for and maintained. Where do you think the rock in the Swanny City Park with the petroglyphs came from? The full woven pot that sits in the museum and found in a cave 20 years ago? Many arrow heads and grinding stones? My parent’s backyard, the very area you are looking to put a Bypass through to accommodate the traffic that city officials pushed and pulled to bring here on their own agendas. What about the wild life that continues to find its way to and from the river along this route? Push it aside as well? You’re not okay with the swamps having a road but do you realize the other wildlife that lives on and through the cliffs? When does the beauty, wildlife and people that made Moab great from the beginning get put first before the tourists and visitors in and through the town? How much is the city council and state willing to sacrifice to the extent that Moab then loses its appeal and falls like the mining crash? As long as you place the noise outside your “City Limits” it’s okay and you’ve done your job? Wake up and serve the people you were elected to serve!”

Katherine Holyoak: “My name is Katherine F. Holyoak and I am addressing number 9, the bypass in Moab. As a background, I live next to Knowles Furniture store and across from Maverick and the big field. I live about 200 feet back from Highway 191. I have lived here about 50 years. 2 nights ago I found out the bypass would literally be within 50 feet of the steps of our A & E Electric business!!! I don't need to tell you it has been an absolutely complete shock and blow to the head to find out where this could be located. It would literally decimate our business because we would no longer have access in any way, to use our business as we know it, eliminating access for supply trucks and parking and access to the business! You have known about these bypasses plans since May of 2018, the date on the plans. It would have been the courteous thing to do to have at least contacted us to make us aware of this. These plans, in FULL, have NOT been available to the public! I am absolutely shocked and surprised you did not even consider going clear along the base of the cliffs and clear OUT of town with an exit by the college and several other exists much further south. If you are truly forward thinking, for the next 20 to 30 years, you will reconsider and not bring the route back into town at my place, it

only bottle necks the traffic on the south end of town instead of the north! Consider the diesels coming off my HILL and trying to STOP at a light OR if going around a curve onto 191 having to STOP anyway at the light at 4th East just moments away. There would also be a bottle neck for trucks coming into town trying to turn LEFT to get onto the bypass road. There would HAVE to be a traffic light with a left turn arrow so they could get onto the bypass. Trucks and traffic would be backed up, light to light, waiting to turn left onto the bypass. An arrow kind of signal takes a long time to go through it's cycle, further stopping traffic on 191 IN TOWN going both directions. Again I cannot conceive why you did not consider the route to truly go OUT of town, merely get it off the 8 or 9 blocks of Main Street. I KNOW it would take more time and money for another by pass study but I will tell you this, IF the bypass does go through my place, I know in the not so distant future, someone else will have to go through what you are going through now, to change even this route, to get the traffic truly OUT OF TOWN!"

Andrew Kubik: "Hello, I am a local business owner and resident of Doc Allen neighborhood and I oppose the bypass as has been proposed. I believe this proposal is short sighted and nearly ineffective by the time it would be finished in 5 plus years or so. I believe an effective bypass would have to pass all of Moab AND Spanish Valley because Spanish Valley is rapidly developing. I am also very concerned about the noise and light pollution this would cause not just to the nearby neighborhoods but to all of the valley. This bypass being so close to the rock walls would amplify all motor vehicle sounds and lights. Thank you for your time, Andrew Kubik"

Dave Sakrison: "Let me begin by saying I totally agree in principal with the letter written Will Holoman Moab Sun News Oct 29 which should be in and of itself grounds to regulate the use of these vehicles. I would encourage you to read his article. We live on 300 South and in recent years we have seen the increase use of these vehicles on our street. The noise that they create has become intolerable, I would invite anyone of you to come and sit on my porch any weekday during the height of tourist season and see for yourself. Besides the noise there is a total disregard for the speed limit as they race up and down the street. Enough of the complaining, how about some possible solutions. 1) Obviously enforcement of existing laws/ speed, licensing, noise. 2) Education, owners of rental ATV's should have an obligation to inform and ask the people they rent to, to obey the laws of the community and to show some respect for the residents of Moab and Grand County. 3) Regulate through legislation the use of aftermarket mufflers. 4) Traffic calming initiatives (bulb-outs, narrowing street width, roundabouts, better signage. 5) Dedicated enforcement with severe penalties not just warnings. 6) Allowing residents to construct noise abating barriers that exceed four feet on their property. 7) Obviously the obstacle to addressing this issue is legislation on a state level, getting back local control of our community. I have other suggestions that I would be willing to discuss. In closing you have a tiger by the tail, you also have a petition with 2000 signatures and a bunch of silent citizens who have had enough, I don't envy your position but now is the time to get control if you don't I am afraid it will have detrimental effects not only to the residents but people that travel here to experience this beautiful place, this place we call home. Respectfully, Dave Sakrison"

Ryan Taylor: "As a lifelong resident of Moab, the bypass seems like an expensive short-term bandaid that will do very little to solve any of the problems long-term. The direction of growth for Moab is to the south. Both Bypass plans will merge traffic right into what is becoming the center of town. The environmental concerns, which will be significant, don't seem to have been addressed, not to mention the detrimental effects to Moab's established long-term neighborhoods."

Kelly Vagts: “Good Morning, I am writing in regard to the agenda item, on whether to draft a resolution in support of a bypass. I would appreciate, if this was tabled until we have exhausted other options. I, like others I speak to, am exhausted by the sheer volume of visitors and traffic we have endured this fall. This is the first time, in my 16 years residing in Moab, that I've felt this tension around tourism. We are a small valley and, in my opinion, have reached capacity. I would like to see our elected officials support an end to advertising and overnight accommodation growth. Where our numbers are currently at, our businesses are making money, our residents are paying their bills, and now it is time to say this is the cap - no more growth in the tourism industry. Last weekend I was able to escape the Moab madness and float down the San Juan river, because of the graciousness of a friend who had a permit. He tried to extend the permit and add people to it, but the numbers on the river were at their maximum so the trip stayed as it was originally planned. I realized that even though the permits were all taken, we only saw 3 other groups, and enjoyed an incredible wilderness experience. Why can't this be the goal for our elected officials and our community? Why can't we say, no more tourism growth? If the current hotels are full and campsites reserved, you will have to visit another time. The area you are proposing is a sanctuary for my family and others in our neighborhood. Kids have forts built and go sledding, our dogs get their runs in, and we neighbors pass each other on our morning walks and make small chat - reminding ourselves why we choose to live in a small rural community. We can no longer do this at Mill Creek. Please don't make this another area we have to say good-bye to because of unregulated tourism growth. Please, find another way, and put the bypass idea to rest once and for all.”

Mr. Marc Thomas: “Case studies show that bypasses often fail to resolve the congestion they're designed to avoid and the environment and neighborhoods lose big in the long run. Fortunately, just like setting up this Hotspot Committee to propose alternatives to a downtown parking garage, there are better solutions to our traffic problems. Please set aside the time to determine the true cause of our congestion, such as poorly timed lights, local traffic with no alternatives and tourism growth. With that understanding in place, a suitcase full of improvements can be developed to provide long-term traffic relief, including, among others: Improving local road networks near or parallel to Main Street; Adding turn lanes; Improving transit options; Limiting parking on Main Street; Optimizing traffic signal timing. Let's not spend hundreds of millions or billions of dollars on degrading neighborhoods or bulldozing the landscapes that make Grand County special. By moving beyond a bypass as a knee-jerk reaction to congestion, our councils, with the help of experts, can develop more effective responses to the traffic problems we're encountering while at the same protecting our neighborhoods and our environment.”

Nichole Taylor: “These bypass plans are going to create more problems than they solve. First, there's the sound problem. Every time fireworks go off or a thunderstorm rolls in, the sound echoes off of the cliff face and bounces back down into the Moab neighborhoods. Putting more traffic up there is only going to make Moab's sound problems worse. Second, Huntridge, Doc Allen, And Mountain View are residential areas. We already have a problem with traffic being diverted into those areas. They used to be amazing neighborhoods, but now I can't let my kids play in front of my house because of the traffic and people who are filtering in. Diverting more traffic into an entire area of residential is going to ruin what we love about our neighborhoods. Third, this is only going to create an even bigger traffic jam in front of Maverick as traffic will have to merge with what will soon be the middle of town. This won't solve the traffic problem. The people aren't coming to Moab just to bypass Moab for another town. They are coming here to be in Moab. The diesels have to stop here to make their deliveries. The traffic will still stop here for the university. The tourists will stop here for the hotels and restaurants. Diverting the traffic into residential neighborhoods won't change that. It'll just make things harder for those of us who live here.”

Karen Tremaine: “Comments item 9: Potential Bypass I am not in favor of constructing a bypass as a possible solution to traffic congestion for the following reasons: 1. Reviewing the 2018 Study results it appears to be a very expensive solution with significant detriment to neighborhoods and surrounding landscape yet does not address what I see to be the actual problem. The bypass, as indicated in the study, is really about predominately moving commercial trucks around Main Street accounting for 36% of total traffic. Trucks move efficiently through town. The problem is the remaining 64% of traffic, mostly attributed to growing tourism. The times I have been in traffic north of town, mostly due to the current road work, the vehicles are comprised of out of state cars, RV’s, ATV trailers, fifth wheels all heading to campgrounds and downtown hotels and shops for the most part. Comparatively few trucks. 2. Peak tourism, basically the cause of the downtown congestion, is 5 months of the year- March through May and September through October. Investing 125M (plus another 125M for a tunnel) to divert a few trucks, really only necessary in the Fall and Spring, is saving a visitor 3 minutes to get to Arches with a significant decrease in quality of life for residents of Moab. 3. Moab officials have continually put the growth of tourism before the quality of life of the locals and this is another example. A bypass will not only not solve the problem but destroy open space locals enjoy and the pipe dream trail (Alt 1D), increase total traffic noise significantly as now you will have two highways through town and neighborhoods with noise echoing off the rim, create an ugly eyesore with a bridge at the river confluence; a view most people enjoy from various rims, and create a highway on Potash where camping, climbing, road cycling is enjoyed. In conclusion, I ask you to consider who is actually benefiting from this visitors or locals and at what expense to our quality of life. Also, to consider are you really solving the problem by building a bypass. The congestion is not the trucks but vehicles, large RV’s, etc.. trying to park and shop. Could money and energy be better spent by addressing Main Street flow and parking or a pedestrian retail area to pull traffic off of Main as is being considered in Steamboat Springs where I moved her from. Thank you.”

Michael McCue: “Dear Council and Commission members, I support the Moab Bypass Concept 1D. I live in the City of Moab as a full time resident and homeowner. I looked at a map of Moab before we purchased our home, and since that time it has seemed obvious where a bypass will inevitably be located. Moab is a bottleneck on one of very few arterial roadways in the region. Resistance is futile. Traffic density will continue to increase and negatively impact the quality of life in Moab. It seems irresponsible to procrastinate any longer. Moab citizens are reliant on leadership to provide for the future needs of the populace. Please move forward with the bypass project.”

Michael Wolfe: “Councilmembers and Commissioners, I'm writing to urge you to vote against any resolution in support of a highway bypass. This is a ridiculous idea in 2020. I live at 228 Aspen Ave so I am well aware of how a potential by-pass could affect my family and my self's quality of life. A little bit of history is needed here. UDOT, who has the expertise and knowledge of how to predict future needs and manage traffic congestion, offered the City of Moab an option of exploring the possibility of building a bypass of downtown for Highway 191 back over 25 years ago? Because they saw the writing on the wall that in the future traffic congestion would be a big problem. The route they were proposing was where the present Doc Allen neighborhood is located. The city fathers and local businesses at that time said no way, we want all traffic to come down main street. At that time a major obstacle in design of such a by-pass was the challenge of relocating three underground pipelines and several high voltage power lines. Since then the city permitted the construction of houses on Doc Allen drive, in a geologically unstable area. The Moab fault underlies this area, large rocks and debris constantly fall and wash down from the escarpment above. When this subdivision was permitted the city also waived the existing

requirements for road access to be spread out over multiple entries, and thus directed all the traffic down Aspen Ave to Kane Creek Dr. instead of having the developer construct access roads over the top of the buried pipelines at each existing side road. I have to live with that additional traffic coming down my street. That was a bad decision but made to facilitate a land developer and build more houses, despite the zoning rules that were in place at the time. Michael Wolfe, 228 Aspen Ave, Moab, UT 84532”

Gia McCue: “Greetings, I support the Moab Bypass Concept 1D. I am a homeowner in the city of Moab and live here full time. I have heard claims that a bypass is intended to benefit downtown business owners to the detriment of residents. As a homeowner and resident with no business interest downtown I would like to explain that I welcome the bypass, and the relief it will provide. I think the bypass will be a benefit to all the people that want to enjoy our downtown as well as anyone that would prefer to pass it by. I think the bypass is inevitable and long overdue. Please resolve to support the bypass proposal. Thank you.”

Cynthia Barnes: “I am writing to express my strong opposition to the bypass alternatives that are proposed that will directly affect the Mountain View neighborhood. As a Moab resident I worked multiple jobs so I could fulfill the dream of having my first home. Over the years since I purchased my first house on Mountain View, I've poured so much time and love into it to turn it into my dream and escape from the (more often than not) hustle and bustle of Moab. Although family obligations have recently taken me away temporarily, I am disheartened to learn that the proposition has come up yet again, and I am adamant that either alternative proposed would drastically affect the quality of life established for any residents in our neighborhood. My concerns are that it would be an enormous cost and would not result in what supporters of the bypass believe would happen. Traffic congestion has become a contentious point for Moab locals but yet not for those towns south of Moab. So, this begs the question what good will a bypass do if the traffic in question is Moab targeted anyways? I do agree that a portion of the traffic does probably continue south but realistically the majority is headed to Moab. If a bypass were approved and completed, after millions of dollars are spent, Moab residents and families are angered and disheartened, and homes are no longer cherished, is the 5-7 minutes less really worth it? Another concern is the study itself and the accuracy of the findings. At what time of year was the study performed? What day? And was each vehicle that was counted asked where they were going? Was there any construction? Obviously, any construction greatly impacts traffic flow anywhere, so the validity of the findings then and even now would not reflect normal traffic flow. In conclusion, I urge the city council and county officials to look into mindful ways to improve the traffic situation, find and deal with the source. I understand that Moab is a tourist town and relies heavily on the tourism industry, which I have worked in in the past. However, if continued development of large-scale accommodations and national marketing campaigns continue, I believe the traffic situation will increase and continue to be an issue. When your sink is flooding you don't just divert the water, you try to turn the faucet down. Thank you for your time and I am hopeful you will agree this bypass option is not in the best interest of Moab residents that you serve.”

Emily Stock: “Last week, with all the stressful issues going on right now, I thought to myself, “Well, at least we're not still talking about a bypass.” Here we are, bringing up this contentious issue when time and time again there has been widespread public opposition. The timing honestly feels manipulative; everyone is stressed about traffic because of the construction and noise from UTV's, not to mention COVID and national politics. People want real solutions, which means we need to look to the root of our congestion problems. The idea of a bypass is a misguided direction for solutions. We cannot build ourselves out of congestion. Studies show this. We can't build more highways in the hopes of a quieter downtown. We will simply hear the

roar of high-speed truck traffic over the river (even if we were able to pull off this billion-dollar tunnel) in addition to 191 highway noise and UTV noise. Also, who would we be doing this for? The major benefactor would be the trucking industry. Downtown will continue to be busy, because we are beyond our tourism capacity and that is what causes 90% of the traffic. If we want to think solutions, we need to focus on our noise ordinance and be thinking about how we can effectively manage the continual onslaught of too many tourists. A bypass won't help us improve the character of our town; it will make it feel busier. The bottom line for me is that we will end up doing the most feasible route in the end if we support this resolution now, which means that it will end up going through a neighborhood. Once studies have started and the momentum of looking into the bypass starts, there will be enormous pressure to move forward with something, and that something will end up being Kane Creek. Let's not waste time, money, and energy on this pipedream. Let's do the work to find real and lasting solutions to our problems of diminishing quality of life for our residents. Thanks for your consideration."

Nate Rydman: "Good day, My comments are regarding the bypass discussion. The concerns that come to my mind are; UDOT's mission on this is primarily to get trucks and traffic around/through town, preferably at highway speeds with minimal disruption to their travel, and not our community's well-being. This means regardless of where the bypass is routed, we will have greatly increased the noise level due to trucks/traffic at high power settings trying to maintain speed going up the hill to the south and engine breaks being used to control speed coming the other direction. We know town is noisy now... Wait until then. Routing this bypass, as I know you are aware is a horrible issue. Nobody wants it through their neighborhood and our valley being small, and full, leaves no options. Discussions of using Kane creek or 500W (or anywhere else for that matter) for unobstructed higher speed flow through traffic greatly reduces the quality of life in those neighborhoods. New through roads through towns creates divisions in a community- it creates a place called "the other side of the tracks" or the like. We don't need that kind of division in our community. Right now, Main Street is a huge hassle. But we should not sacrifice what quality of life we have by increasing noise, disrupting neighborhoods, for the travelers who aren't going to stay anyway."

Constance Brichford: "Councilmembers and Commissioners, I'm writing to urge you to vote against any resolution in support of a highway bypass. I am aware of our traffic issues and how they have been pushed to a crisis point this fall, and am as frustrated by them as anyone else who had the pleasure of sitting in that backup north of town. But a bypass is not the answer. First, a bypass, will not actually solve the root cause of our traffic woes, which is overuse. Second, regardless of whatever caveats you might attach to this resolution, once approval for a bypass is secured, any bypass that is actually constructed will inevitably run through the Mountain View neighborhood, my neighborhood, either above Doc Allen or via Kane Creek, (1A and 1D as described in the 2018 study attached to today's agenda.) The proposed tunnel is completely unworkable. Permission and funding for this project will need to involve city, county, state and federal agencies, and it is naive at best to think that once these multiple stakeholders are involved, they will gladly hand over control of this multi-billion-dollar project to the Moab City Council, the only entity who is directly accountable to Moab constituents. UDOT and the FHWA will reasonably look at the bottom line and conclude that a tunnel is far too costly. There's no reason to believe they would heed local objections once the project is underway. (In fact, we need look no further than the Wasatch Front to find precedent for UDOT pushing forward despite public outcry and building highways adjacent to neighborhoods.) Any resolution in favor of a bypass, regardless of what caveats you may add to it, is a resolution that will open the door to a bypass through residential neighborhoods, whether it is my neighborhood, or my friends' neighborhood across town. Again, to believe otherwise is at best naive, and at worst, the type of cold, calculated maneuvering that shatters faith in local governments. If you are truly

committed to preventing "a negative impact on any residential neighborhoods" please vote against this resolution. There are better, less destructive ways out there to find a solution to the very real traffic problems we face, and I'm confident that if we turn our energy and resources there, we can find them. Thank you very much for your time, consideration, and the work you do for this community. Thanks again, Constance Brichford 777 Mountain View Drive"

Ryan Steenson: "I'm a little confused as to why this is coming up as an option again but I would like to voice my opposition to either bypass options outlined in the draft plan. I am a permanent resident of Mountain View Drive and mainly would be concern about the noise either option would create. Information from a UDOT study says moving traffic from downtown to the bypass would remove the noise of between 70,000 and 112,000 cars DAILY! If this is in fact an accurate representation of noise volumes, I would hate to see our neighborhood heavily impacted for the benefit of downtown commerce and ambiance. That being said I know a fellow neighbor commented in a council meeting in 2018 that there is the same number of trucks going through Monticello as Moab and they don't have a traffic problem. People, and more accurately tourist, are most likely the main cause of traffic congestion. It is mentioned a couple times in a Times Independent article from a couple years ago that "universal local support is key" to the development of this plan and I know I'm not alone in opposition to this. Furthermore, if local support is so important, I would like to see creation of a formal public opinion poll on whether the community fully supports the specific plan of a bypass near the Mountain View neighborhood. I'm all for alleviating traffic congestion to make Moab safer and more efficient but the plans and ideas I've seen surrounding the bypass don't seem to accomplish this goal. I appreciate your time and consideration of my thoughts on this matter"

Randall W. Fox: "Please consider changing all bike paths within the city and county from eBike (electrically assisted bicycles) exclusion to a posted 15 mph speed limit. This is how many municipalities across the nation control eBike usage, and most of the current illegal eBike/path users are visitors who probably have only speed restrictions back home. Also, a 15-mph speed limit on bike paths corresponds with the new 15 mph speed limit for UTVs on city streets. Thank you."

Bruce Hucko: "Grand County Commission, Moab City Council: Thursday October 29 re: Friday's dual meeting and the "bypass" discussion. You have to know that when you state or write "bypass" around Moab it gets people riled up. It's an emotional issue that speaks to the core of the Moab community and it's in that vein that I write. I have written to the city and county on this subject every time it's come up. I have listed personal reasons why a bypass should never be. I have offered arguments to alternatives in various proposals and have stated common sense and technical reasons why a bypass is not the answer to our problems. The subject has been around for over 30 years and every time it's been presented it's been dismissed, voted down, turned away and denied. Every time. Seeing that it's on the agenda AGAIN came as a surprise and has created quite a concern. That Mayor Neihaus and Commissioner Wells are presenting this together creates a host of questions (few of them good) and makes a bunch of us nervous and suspicious. We find this action at this hour, in these very trying COVID times, and on the cusp of probably the most important national election in our nation's history (as well as important local elections) to be extremely disingenuous. Folks are preparing for Halloween with their families. Others are out hunting. Some are probably replacing Monday's frozen pipes. We're all quite anxious about the presidential election and what will happen across this country no matter which way it goes. There are lots of pressing issues to distract us all right now. This move, whatever it's motivation, does not create much trust in them as individuals nor in the governing bodies they represent, and I'm sorry, but this includes you. What are they concocting and why? Why do they seem to be pushing the bypass and bypassing the public? Do I

sound paranoid? You bet I probably do. I have good reason. I live here. I purchased my home at from Ralph Miller in 1989. I have made Moab my home and have dedicated the last 13 years to working at HMK as the "Art Coach!" I am not passing through, or here to reap profits from the tourist economy, especially in a way that may sacrifice the quality of life that I and many residents enjoy here. The construction and use of any bypass in this area would destroy the very character of the place. As it is, I already hear every football game with the play by play bouncing off the cliffs and into my backyard. And I'm not a football fan. The noise would be terrible, not only for those of us in Mountain View, but for the whole of town. The cliffs act like speakers. I'm pretty sure that a bypass in this area would devalue my property and that of my neighbors and that is why we've already discussed organizing a class action lawsuit on the city and county should that happen. In an email response to Mark Olson (Oct 28, 2020. 9:22 AM) Mayor Neihaus wrote "I do not support any bypass option that increases noise or traffic in any of our residential neighborhoods. I will always place our residential quality of life over a reduction in truck travel time." By their very nature bypasses increase noise and traffic. The two forwarded alternatives in the 2018 Bypass Study involve at least one residential area. That being the case, and if the mayor's words are true, why are we entertaining discussing a bypass? As before, the thought of a bypass, stirs my gut perhaps more than most other development schemes hatched by private individuals or local government. I am opposed to any sort of bypass in the valley and especially in the Mountain View area. I am most certainly opposed to the city and county signing any sort of resolution or agreement that would give promoters of this most seriously flawed idea any legal standing in the future. My first suggestion to you, the two governing bodies meeting together, is to 1) kindly ask Mayor Neihaus and Commission Wells to remove the agenda item and should they not 2) take a vote as a double-body to remove the item from the agenda and should you not 3) entertain their proposal, but do not agree to or sign a single thing! Your constituents need in on this. From the start and at every turn. There should be public hearings . . . again. Information meetings . . . again. There should be time to re-access and process what is really being considered. The accompanying packet is greatly flawed. Given adequate time I'd be happy to list them. Very little in the packet really addresses the congestion issue. It's about moving trucks out of downtown Moab. Monticello sees pretty much the same truck going through their town and they don't have a downtown traffic problem. Our downtown traffic problem comes from the many tourists we attract to Moab (I'm all for really downsizing the Travel Council ad budget, people know where Moab is!) and the fact that they spend a good deal of time driving short distances up and down main street and then back and forth across main street. THAT's where the congestion is! Besides, the 2018 Moab Bypass Study Findings suggests that there are only two alternatives to the congestion problem. There are more. No bypass. Place the bypass on the EAST SIDE of town. As a local rancher told me, "It's just plain stupid to build on the high side of a ditch!". And that's what the area behind Mountain View is. Reduce congestion in downtown Moab by reducing tourism to levels that we can maintain without sacrificing the integrity and quality of life in our community. We're at that point right now. Another rub to that document is that there's a section for Benefits but not one for Issues and Problems (or whatever you want to call it). The final rub. Late last night there was word that changes had been made to the cover letter being presented to you by the Mayor Neihaus and Commissioner Wells. First, they get on the agenda and then they decide to write a cover letter explaining their actions and now last-minute changes. This does not appear transparent at all. If you really think that a bypass is an important topic, then open it up to the community. Let's review all of the studies that have been done including those before this flimsy 2018 job. Yes, it means rehashing lots of things, but if it's really important and not something that's being pushed forward for the sake of tourism, then let's put all the cards on the table, again, and see what happens. To do anything else is just plain . . . well, you know. Thanks for listening. Yes, I'm riled up. Bruce Hucko"

[23:18](#)

***Presentation of Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee Public Engagement Efforts – Lisa Church***

Communications and Engagement Manager Church reviewed the public engagement efforts for the Hotspot Committee. There was a discussion regarding the results of the second survey. Mayor Niehaus thanked the Committee for their work.

***32:42***

***Presentation of Concept Package and Transportation Project Prioritization List – Commissioner Curtis Wells and Carly Castle***

Commissioner Wells thanked City staff for the public engagement efforts. He provided a brief overview of the potential projects. Commission Chair McGann read the following letter of gratitude: “Dear UDOT staff and members of the Utah Transportation Commission, The Grand County Commission, City of Moab Mayor and City Council, and Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee would like to express our sincerest gratitude and appreciation to the state transportation commission and to UDOT for the tremendous opportunity to participate in the regional hotspot program established by senate bill 277 in 2017. The community is especially grateful for Utah’s generous and professionalism while the Arches Hotspot Regional Coordinating Committee has spent the past 8 months and 12 public meetings developing this concept package for your consideration. While the discussion has been lively at times, the regional hotspot program has provided a unique platform for our residents and businesses to contribute invaluable input and creative thoughts towards transportation issues and ideas in the Moab area. The projects now before you are a unique combination of basic, essential, and direct solutions, as well as innovative forward-thinking concepts that have the potential for growth and evolution over time. Together, this suite of projects accomplished the legislative mandate outlined in Senate Bill 277: reducing congestion, supporting economic development, and increasing recreational and tourism opportunities. The Moab community appreciates not only the opportunity presented by the regional hotspot program, but also the history of transportation infrastructure investment made by UDOT, the transportation commission, and the Utah Legislature into Southeastern Utah. Projects, such as the current North US-191 Main Street widening, the lane and shoulder additions to the highway spanning from Crescent Junction to the Colorado River, the improvements to Main Street and Moab downtown corridor, the Mill Creek Parkway reconstructions, and the approval for a roundabout off of 100 West. Your partnership in the Pack Creek bridge widening and your investment in this area’s regional transportation plan have been invaluable to improving the quality of life for residents and enriching the experience for those visiting the Moab region. Grand County and the City of Moab are extremely grateful for the opportunity to present this concept package to UDOT and the Transportation Commission. And this community appreciates your considerations for our proposal. We look forward to continuing our partnership as these projects move forward. Sincerely, Emily Niehaus, Mayor of Moab, Mary McGann, Grand County Commission Chair, Curtis Wells, Arches Hotspot Regional Coordinating Committee Chair and member of Grand County Commission”

Mayor Niehaus thanked UDOT for everything they have done. Commissioner Wells thanked the Committee members for all of their efforts. Councilmember Duncan thanked Matt Hancock for sharing the idea of double median parking.

There was a discussion about Fehr & Peers’ assistance with the transit pilot program. Councilmember Knuteson-Boyd requested more clarity in the Fehr & Peers proposal. Assistant City Manager Castle said the intent is to have a turnkey-ready RFP by the end of this process. Commissioner Clapper inquired if the proposal from Fehr & Peers will have a hotel hopper or a valley-wide shuttle system. UDOT Region 4 Deputy Director Aldridge explained the difference between transit and shuttle systems.

There was discussion about green infrastructure and ADA parking spots regarding the dispersed parking project. Commissioner Woytek said the idea of retrofitting would be important for the multi-use path and dispersed parking projects. Councilmember Guzman-Newton said the focus is on a complete streets approach that emphasizes multi-modality. Councilmember Derasary said the shade issue is a safety issue. Councilmember Jones said shade is also an economic development focus. Commissioner Clapper said there could be potential for people to adopt a median to take on those landscaping efforts in the future.

Councilmember Knuteson-Boyd inquired about the responsibility for the maintenance of the shared-use path. Commissioner Clapper said it is worth designing a low maintenance/low cost sort of path. He added that the project has been identified and prioritized through the Grand County Active Transportation and Trails Department.

Assistant City Manager Castle reviewed the Hotspot criteria and the project ranking results. There was discussion about the interpretation of the results, the focus on congestion relief, and transportation planning.

Councilmember Derasary inquired about who determines if the transit shuttle system is healthy and viable at the conclusion of the first three years. There was a discussion regarding grant funding for years four and five. There was a discussion about other ways to fund the transit shuttle system as well.

[1:42:36](#)

***Action to Approve the Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee's Recommended Transportation Project Concept Package and Prioritization List – Commissioner Curtis Wells***

***City Motion:*** Councilmember Duncan moved to approve the Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee's recommended transportation project concept package and prioritization list. Councilmember Guzman-Newton seconded the motion.

***City Vote:*** Motion passed 4-1 with Councilmembers Duncan, Guzman-Newton, Derasary, and Jones voting aye. Councilmember Knuteson-Boyd voted no.

***County Motion:*** Commissioner Wells moved to approve the Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee's recommended transportation project concept package and prioritization list. Commissioner Clapper seconded the motion.

***County Discussion:*** Commissioner Clapper thanked Commissioner Wells for doing a great job as the Committee Chair.

***County Vote:*** Motion passed 5-0 with Commissioners Wells, Woytek, Clapper, McGann, and Hawks voting aye.

[1:48:54](#)

***Discussion Regarding Resolutions Committing to Funding Years Four and Five of the Transit Shuttle Pilot Project – Commissioner Curtis Wells***

Assistant City Manager Castle reviewed the potential timeline to commit to funding years four and five of the transit shuttle pilot project. Mayor Niehaus said that, by approving the concept package, it is implicit that City and County staff should move forward with preparing a resolution if this project is selected.

[1:51:39](#)

***Discussion of Potential Resolution in Support of a Bypass – Mayor Emily Niehaus and Commissioner Curtis Wells***

Mayor Niehaus said the point of this agenda item is because the two bodies are discussing congestion relief. She reviewed the next steps for support of a bypass. Commissioner Wells provided background on the bypass discussions from 2017. He said both entities need to be in

support of a bypass in order to move forward with discussion and public engagement. He said the increasing traffic on Highway 191 will continue to grow, and there needs to be a direct solution.

Councilmember Knuteson-Boyd said the concepts are not bypasses because they do not bypass the town. Mayor Niehaus confirmed that Councilmember Knuteson-Boyd does not want to move forward with a public hearing process.

Councilmembers Derasary and Guzman-Newton said they were upset to see the bypass agenda item on this meeting, because this meeting should have focused on the Committee's work and the findings of their research. Councilmember Guzman-Newton said congestion and the environmental impacts are critical; however, she does not support a bypass going through a neighborhood. Councilmember Duncan said he felt sideswiped by this agenda item. He said the two proposals presented by UDOT were not acceptable to the neighborhood or the town. He said a bypass tunnel underneath the West edge of the rim would not be feasible for many reasons. He said he would vote no to a public hearing.

Commissioner Clapper said the regional transportation planning process has discussed a bypass among other options. He said he does not support moving forward with any public hearings. Commission Chair McGann said there are other ways to address pedestrian safety besides a bypass. Councilmember Jones said he is not in favor of pursuing this proposal or a public hearing. Commissioner Hawks said she is in favor of keeping options on the table, and that a full conversation with the community could provide different feedback.

Commissioner Wells clarified that neither the City Council nor the County Commission ever voted on this issue. He said this discussion was important to tie up a loose end.

Councilmember Derasary said that, until the majority of our residents say they want a bypass, particularly those most impacted by its location, she will not support it. She said the City has had a communication reputation problem, and this agenda item did not help that issue. She said she cannot consciously defend spending so much money to prioritize automobiles over other human needs. She described residents' concerns from the comments she received.

Committee Member Shannon said this topic is very polarizing for people, and it will take a lot of time and energy to sort through it. Commissioner Woytek said he does not support the concept. He added that entertaining the concept sends a message that we are prioritizing this unsustainable growth trend over the quality of life of our residents. He said the regional transportation plan has a survey online right now so residents can provide input on the valley's long-term transportation plan. County Attorney Sloan said UDOT does not have funds for this project, and the community has made it clear that this is not where they want to focus our efforts with the legislature for funding.

Commissioner Hawks said there has not been a true conversation with the constituents regarding a bypass. She said she does not support the bypasses as presented, but she would like to keep the options open for the distant future. Councilmember Guzman-Newton agreed that the options presented are not acceptable, but many residents are in support of a bypass.

**2:26:21**

**Adjournment:** Councilmember Jones moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Derasary seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Councilmembers Derasary, Guzman-Newton, Jones, Duncan, and Knuteson-Boyd voting aye. Mayor Niehaus adjourned the meeting at 2:59 PM.