

GRAND COUNTY
Planning Commission
Monday, May 23, 2022
4:30 P.M. Regular Meeting

****PLEASE NOTE: THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD IN PERSON & VIRTUALLY****

REGULAR PC MEETING:

County Commission Chambers 125 E. Center St. Moab, UT
Join via Zoom <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84930753400> **Meeting ID: 849 3075 3400**
 Or call in to meeting: **(669) 900-6833** and when prompted, enter meeting ID
Send written comment to planning@grandcountyutah.net **or call 435-259-1368.**

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Type of Meeting: | Regular PC Meeting | |
| Facilitator: | Chair Emily Campbell | |
| Attendees: | Planning Commissioners, interested citizens, and staff | |
| 4:30 PM | | |
| | Regular Meeting | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Call to Order ● Citizens to be Heard – public comment opportunity for any item not listed as a public hearing ● Ex Parte Communications and Disclosures | <i>Chair</i> |
| Action Item (Administrative) | 1) Approval of Meeting Minutes from May 9, 2022 | <i>Chair</i> |
| Discussion Items | 2) County Commission Update a) Commission meeting action items update | <i>County Commission Liaison</i> |
| | 3) PC vacancy – Applicant interview (tentative) | <i>Chair</i> |
| | 4) Review OAO policy statement | <i>Chair</i> |
| | 5) Unified Transportation Master plan https://www.grandcountymoabtmp.com/ | <i>Staff</i> |
| | 6) Recent Rezone requests and options for applicants to provide workforce housing or affordable fee in lieu | <i>Staff</i> |
| | 7) LUC code Updates status | <i>Staff</i> |
| | 8) Alternative Dwelling discussion / brainstorm | <i>Staff</i> |
| 5:30 PM | | |
| | Citizens to be Heard – public comment opportunity for any item not listed as a public hearing | |
| ADJOURN | | |

DEFINITIONS:

Public hearing = a hearing at which members of the public are provided a reasonable opportunity to comment on the subject of the hearing.

Public meeting= a meeting required to be open to the public pursuant to the requirements of Title 52, Chapter 4, Open and Public Meetings; the public may or may not be invited to participate.

Legislative act = action taken by the County Council or Planning Commission; amending ordinances, adopting general plan, Annexations, zoning and rezoning; a reasonable debatable action that could promote the general welfare of the community.

Administrative act = action taken by the Planning Commission, County Council or staff interpreting ordinances and regulations, conditional uses, approving subdivision, site plans, issuing building permits; an administrative decision must satisfy the requirements prescribed under state law or the County Land Use Code, whichever is stricter.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
Monday, May 9th, 2022 at 4:30pm

The Grand County Planning Commission held its regular meeting on the above date, with attendees participating in person and remotely via Zoom

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84930753400> Meeting ID: 849 3075 3400

YouTube recording of the meeting can be viewed at https://youtu.be/D_aqSMlln2w Recordings archived at www.grandcountyutah.net/AgendaCenter.

In attendance:

Commissioner Makeda Barkley, Commissioner Bob O'Brien, Commissioner Steve Evers, Commissioner Tony Mancuso, Commissioner Trisha Hedin, Planning Director John Guenther, Associate Planner, Elissa Martin Planner Jenna Gorney,

Absent

Commission Chair Emily Campbell, Commissioner Rick York,

Vice Commission Chairman O'Brien calls the meeting to order at 4:33 pm

Citizens to be Heard (outside of scheduled public hearings) - None

Ex Parte Communication and Conflicts of Interest - None

Action Items (Administrative):

1. Approval of meeting minutes from April 25th, 2022

Commissioner Evers moves to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Mancuso seconds

All in favor - all

Approved

Discussion items:

2. County Commission update - Commission Liaison Trisha Hedin

- None

3. Debrief on Public Open House workshops

- 27th (GWSSA) 25 people & 28th (Grand Center) about 12 people
- Planning Dept will bring an Implementation workshop to PC in June following formal adoption of the General Plan

4. General Plan public hearing date closes May 11th, 2022

- About 30 public comments have been collected
- Comments will be forwarded to County Commission

5. Status of Code Updates to allow long-term camparks & temporary seasonal camping permits for workforce

First solution: An immediate Code Update: Temporary Dwelling Permit

- Will establish Health and Safety standards where camping is occurring
- Compatibility with the surrounding area will be considered
- This will be considered within the current Temporary Use Land Use Code Updates: Article 3
- Not all properties that have current workforce camping will be able to qualify for this Temporary Dwelling Permit - all applications will need to meet drafted standards

Second solution: Overlay Zone for alternative dwellings

- Would be processed as a rezone request potentially
- Alternative Dwelling Overlay (ADO)
- Would allow a variety of dwelling types such as KOA style cabins, tiny homes, modular homes, campers, vans and trucks
- All sites will need water and sewer hookups or bath house

Possible Concerns or Challenges

1. Each development will be Deed restricted for workforce housing
2. Possible minimum occupancy period 90 days or shorter
3. Permit will be needed for compliance as to assure no overnight rentals and to track compliance
 - How do we enforce compliance: HASU has a lot on their plate with HDHO tracking already

Options

1. Incentivization for this type of development: possibly allow property owners to rent out vacant sites overnight during the off season. Enforcement or tracking of this would be difficult
2. A percentage of the site to be permitted to allow overnight rental as to offset costs of running the site
3. All site shall have water and sewer utilities unless a shared service buildings are provided (Bath house)

Considerations

Composting toilets may be permitted provided access to the service utilities is available

Buffering between the development and surrounding neighborhoods

Density options: 2 dwelling sites per .25 acres or 8 dwellings per acre?

Minimum lot size ¼ acre:

Max development 32 dwellings (minimum 4 acres)

Steve Evers: Like the trajectory, continue the momentum - Concerned about 4.6.6. B. "at any point, if the site is deemed necessary for HASU it must be made available for long term lease (more than 30 days) This could be challenging for a developer : This turns into a question mark

for the developer: viability of using an overnight rental that can be taken away at a moment's notice. Potentially add some conditions that would make that Measure needed to take that property/site

Makeda Barkley: - this isn't aimed for developers - maybe have a set notice requirement - be wary about centering around the developer

Steve Evers: keep in mind that "developer" is not necessarily someone out of town looking to make money. This can be any local property owner looking to help the housing issue or.

Elissa Martin: Potentially, simply allow a certain number of sites to simply be overnight rentals to offset the low long term rental rate

Tony Mancuso: Would like to hear from local employers who would like to take advantage of this code change

Action Item:

6. (Public Hearing) Red Rock Development PUD Rezone Request

Red Rock Development: Steelbender- Rezone request to apply a PUD to property now within RR, RG, and MFR zoning

Elissa Martin Presented - see staff report within the agenda or YouTube for full details

Commissioner Questions

Steve Evers - Is a Fee in-lieu required?

Elissa Martin - Not required - you can provide open space or affordable housing in a PUD in exchange for density. The applicant opted for Open Space set aside.

Applicant Commented - see staff report or YouTube for full applicant statement

Commissioner questions for Applicant

Trish Hedin - What is your projected cost per lot?:

Matt Robinson (Co-Applicant) - goal less than \$300,000 will be dependent on Infrastructure costs

Trish Hedin - Access: This trail access is actually a recorded easement so it is not an allowance it is a requirement to maintain this access.

Tony Mancuso: This rezoning only adds 9 units to the property. Applicants could move forward with development with existing land use rights.

Also noted in your narrative that the proposed land use is consistent with adjacent land uses. How do you justify that when the closest neighborhoods are such with large lots of 3-6 acres

Nicholas Kanaan (Applicant) - A 5 acres portion of Multifamily residential currently exists however it did not seem appropriate to build a 5 story condominium on that area and

have the rest Rural Residential and Range and Grazing. We proposed to keep with the residential character and cluster the permitted density

Elissa Martin: staff prospective - a PUD drawback is that you are creating potentially smaller lots but the benefit is that you preserve large swaths of land that is preserved in perpetuity. It doesn't necessarily fit with the Neighboring Navajo heights in terms of density but there is a benefit in the preserved open space

Tony Mancuso: How much of this land is actually developable? A huge tenant of this application is Open Space.

Jeff Pilus (SET Engineering). You could develop lots across the entirety of the parcels however it does not seem to be the optimal route. The public access is the benefit

Tony Mancuso: Applicant states that they have discovered 2 petroglyph panels that they intend to develop trails to. Have you contacted the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for Historical requirements?
How do we guarantee access to these trails - at what stage is that guaranteed?

Elissa Martin - the Master Plan identifies that access. It would be finalized at Final Plat stage those easements would solidify those as designated on the Final Plat.

John Guenther (Planning Director): These things are financially guaranteed in a service agreement

Steve Evers: Realtor.com regarding listed home prices in that area show upwards of \$820,000 - 1 million. What benefit do you see in terms of having 50: million dollar homes in the valley:
Community benefit

Nicholas Kanaan: We hope to develop a community of homes that is enriching and preserves the natural environment there This is why we want to create Community Amenities

Matt Robinson: We are not home builders - we want to put the lots in and offer them to anyone.

Makeda Barkley: This type of development will likely be targeted to second home owners and without affordable housing ...do you envision this for locals?... do you see a deed restriction for local workforce housing?

Nicholas Kanaan: We are agnostic to whomever may want to purchase property. We had no original intention of restriction. Regarding the affordable component - the utilities will cost about 8 million to bring to this area - this does not fit with "affordable housing". This particular property does not fit with affordability. A property that may already be connected to water and sewer may be a solid choice

Matt Robinson: Affordable housing looks at the end cost of a home - we are just looking to develop and sell the lots. We are not builders.

Trish Heidin: Average local income is at \$57,000 this is pinpointed for second homeowners- we are struggling to provide housing to our locals. We want to provide that for developers that are looking to supply housing for our community. Have you considered local UTV and ATV traffic in that area.

5:30pm: Citizens to be Heard (public comment opportunity for any item not listed as a public hearing) - Please reference YouTube recording for full comment details

Michael Grindstaff - Alternative dwelling styles are an integral part of our culture and the community. If we limit the ability for people to move here in that manner we are contributing to the gentrification of the area - we need to be supporting those who are vulnerable in our community. We need to consider what is feasible and best for our people.

PUD Rezone continued...

Public Hearing Opened at 5:46 pm
Comments heard:

Sarah Heffron- Not in Favor

Crystal Muzik - Not in Favor

Ann Martin - Not in Favor

Michael Grindstaff - Concerns of meeting format being only virtual

JL - I access my home from Westwater Drive. I am very concerned about the amount of traffic this will bring to a very narrow and steep road. Especially if they will be promoting recreation in the area.

Susan McDowell - I'm not sure why the planning commission is trying to compare affordable housing acreage with obviously prime real estate. Unless the county wants to buy the property to preserve it, they just need to limit Nic's development to the current guidelines.

Motion by Commissioner Evers to forward an unfavorable recommendation to the County Commission for the Red Rock Development PUD

Seconded by Commissioner Mancuso

Justification of Motion:

Commissioner Evers: The County would be making some harmful concessions that move toward gentrification and exasperation of current housing issues. I have concerns over the watershed. I don't favor putting our water source in jeopardy without affordable or workforce housing. Risky and lacking benefit for the county

Commissioner Mancuso: The Applicant is permitted 45 units under the current General plan. A request for additional density this close to the General Plan update without the addition of affordable or workforce housing does not feel justified.

Discussion by Commissioners

- Makeda Barkley: this is a big ask for this time and place
- Bob O'Brien: concerned with watershed: This is a minimum 50% reduction area. A study should be done - Hydrological - under constrained lands

6:15pm Public Hearing ended

Additional Discussion:

All in Favor - all

Opposed - none

Future Considerations

7. ADU code updates in legal review: hoping to bring to PC public hearing May 23rd, 2022

Adjournment 6:16pm pm

Motioned by Commissioner Barkley

Seconded by Commissioner Mancuso

All in favor - all

OAo Policy Statement (for use in the Land Use chapter of GP)

Goal: Balance overnight accommodation developments against economic diversity, residential housing availability, and community health

Historically, overnight accommodations were allowed in the Highway Commercial zone, primarily located along 191. In recent years Grand County experienced a rapid increase in large hotel and condominium developments in this zone district, crowding out other commercial uses and generating significant impact on abutting residential zones and on general community and economic health. These impacts were exacerbated by the number of Residential/Highway Commercial split-zoned parcels along 191, and during this period Grand County lost significant residential acreage as parcels were fully up-zoned to High Commercial to accommodate these uses.

To promote economic diversification, mitigate community impact, and maintain a healthy housing market for residential and workforce needs, overnight accommodations were removed as a permitted or conditional use by right in any underlying zones and now require overnight accommodation overlays (OAo) for designated uses. When considering whether to extend an OAo to a specific parcel, the County considers the nature and community impact of the proposed location and general indicators of community health.

Future OAos should be balanced against the economic conditions of the County at that time, as well as consider future housing and commercial needs to promote economic diversification and a well-rounded community with broad access to attainable housing.



STAFF REPORT

COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
GRAND COUNTY, UTAH

DATE: Wednesday, May 11, 2022

TO: Grand County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Planning and Zoning Unified Transportation Master Plan

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: John J.Guenther, Planning and Zoning Director

REPORT TYPE

Information and Discussion – Status update on the Unified Transportation Master Plan (UTMP)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

For discussion with Planning Commission members – primarily the consideration and adoption timetable, and the current draft report and project list.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The UTMP has reached another milestone after vetting through the project manager’s and clients. An updated engagement and adoption schedule is attached, along with the draft final report.

1. The Technical Advisory Committee latest meeting was on May 11, 2022 and their comments will be documented and responded to;
2. The proposed adoption schedule is:

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Public Comment Period | Mon 6/20/22 | Fri 7/8/22 |
| 2 | Community Meeting #3 | Thu 6/23/22 | Thu 6/23/22 |
| 3 | Public Outreach Summary Report | Mon 7/11/22 | Tue 7/19/22 |
| 4 | Task 9 - Final Transportation Master Plan | Mon 7/11/22 | Tue 8/2/22 |
| 5 | Final Transportation Master Plan | Mon 7/11/22 | Tue 7/19/22 |
| 6 | City Council Presentation | Tue 7/26/22 | Tue 7/26/22 |
| 7 | Grand County Commission Presentation Seeking Adoption | Tue 8/2/22 | Tue 8/2/22 |


The draft final report is attached and the following areas may be of particular attention:

1. Roads, Parking and Active transportation list of projects – pgs. 85 – 94;
2. Improvement Strategies – pgs. 75 – 83;
3. Strategies and Plans – pg. 95; and
4. Project prioritization – pgs. 97-99

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Review and adoption schedule; and
2. Draft final report.

Grand County and City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan
Updated: May 9, 2022





Draft Final Report

April 2022

Grand County & City of Moab

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Draft Final Report

APRIL 2022

Prepared for:



Grand County
125 East Center Street
Moab, UT 84532

and



City of Moab
217 East Center Street
Moab, UT 84532

Prepared by:



Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
111 East Broadway | Suite 600
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

In association with:

Alta Planning + Design, Inc.

This document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

© April 2022
Moab-Grand_UTMP_Draft.docx

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Executive Summary | 1 |
| 2. Introduction | 10 |
| 2.1 Project Background | 10 |
| 2.2 Goals and Objectives | 10 |
| 2.3 Study Area | 11 |
| 2.4 Planning Process | 11 |
| 3. Previous Plans and Studies | 15 |
| 4. Current Conditions | 20 |
| 4.1 Population, Employment, and Development | 20 |
| 4.2 Planned Projects | 25 |
| 4.3 Streets and Roadways | 26 |
| 4.4 Active Transportation | 31 |
| 4.5 Safety | 37 |
| 4.6 Travel Patterns and Traffic Operations | 42 |
| 4.7 Key Findings | 47 |
| 5. Future Conditions | 48 |
| 5.1 Future Population and Employment | 48 |
| 5.2 Travel Patterns and Traffic Operations | 51 |
| 5.3 Key Findings | 58 |
| 6. Needs & Deficiencies | 59 |
| 6.1 Stakeholder Group Interviews | 59 |
| 6.2 Safety Needs & Deficiencies | 59 |
| 6.3 Capacity Needs & Deficiencies | 63 |
| 6.4 Active Transportation Needs & Deficiencies | 66 |
| 7. Stakeholder & Community Outreach | 71 |
| 7.1 November 2021 Community Meeting | 71 |
| 7.2 December 2021 Community and TAC Meeting | 71 |
| 7.3 June 2022 Community Meeting | 72 |
| 7.4 Grand County Commission and Moab City Council | 72 |
| 8. Transportation Strategies | 73 |
| 8.1 Guiding Policies | 73 |
| 8.2 Transportation Improvement Strategies | 74 |
| 9. Recommended Improvements | 84 |
| 9.1 Planning-Level Cost Estimates | 84 |
| 9.2 Active Transportation Improvement Projects and Assessments | 84 |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

9.3 Roadway Improvement Projects and Assessments.....89

9.4 Parking and Transit Improvement Projects.....93

9.5 Network-Wide Strategies95

10. Prioritization & Implementation96

10.1 Prioritization Methodology96

10.2 Project Prioritizations97

10.3 Potential Funding Sources100

11. Next Steps105

Appendices106



List of Acronyms

| | |
|--------|--|
| ACS | American Community Survey |
| AADT | Annual Average Daily Traffic |
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| ADT | Average Daily Traffic |
| ARPA | American Rescue Plan Act |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FLAP | Federal Lands Access Program |
| HAWK | High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk |
| HCM | Highway Capacity Manual |
| HSIP | Highway Safety Improvement Program |
| ITS | Intelligent Transportation System |
| JHC | Joint Highway Committee |
| LOS | Level of Service |
| LPA | Local Public Agency |
| MPO | Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| MUTCD | Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices |
| OHV | Off-Highway Vehicle |
| PHB | Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon |
| ROW | Right-of-Way |
| RRFB | Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon |
| RUC | Road Usage Charge |
| SITLA | Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration |
| SR | Utah State Route |
| SRTS | Safe Routes to School |
| STIP | Statewide Transportation Improvement Program |
| STP | Surface Transportation Program |
| TAC | Technical Advisory Committee |
| TAP | Transportation Alternatives Program |
| TAZ | Traffic Analysis Zone |
| TDM | Travel Demand Model |
| UDOT | Utah Department of Transportation |
| US 191 | United States Highway 191 |
| USU | Utah State University |
| UTMP | Unified Transportation Master Plan |
| WFRC | Wasatch Front Regional Council |



List of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1. UTMP Outcome Goals | 11 |
| Figure 2. UTMP Planning Process | 12 |
| Figure 3. Study Area Location | 13 |
| Figure 4. Study Area Detail | 14 |
| Figure 5. Grand County and Moab Population by Age (2000-2020) | 20 |
| Figure 6. Current Population Density by TAZ (2020) | 22 |
| Figure 7. Current Employment Density by TAZ (2020) | 23 |
| Figure 8. Potential Growth Areas | 24 |
| Figure 9 . Functional Classification..... | 27 |
| Figure 10. Functional Classification..... | 29 |
| Figure 11. Intersection Types | 30 |
| Figure 12. Commute Mode to Work | 32 |
| Figure 13. Bicycle Infrastructure..... | 34 |
| Figure 14. Pedestrian Infrastructure | 35 |
| Figure 15. Active Transportation Destinations | 36 |
| Figure 16. Study Area Crash Summary (2017-2021)..... | 37 |
| Figure 17. Pedestrian/Bicycle Crash Severities Compared to Total Crashes..... | 38 |
| Figure 18. Crash Density | 39 |
| Figure 19. Crash Severity | 40 |
| Figure 20. Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes..... | 41 |
| Figure 21. Roadway Daily Traffic (2021) | 43 |
| Figure 22. Roadway Level of Service Capacity Analysis (2021)..... | 44 |
| Figure 23. Future Population Density (2050) | 49 |
| Figure 24. Future Employment Density (2050) | 50 |
| Figure 25. Future Daily Traffic (2040)..... | 52 |
| Figure 26. Future Daily Traffic (2050)..... | 53 |
| Figure 27. Future Roadway LOS Capacity Analysis (2040)..... | 54 |
| Figure 28. Future Roadway LOS Capacity Analysis (2050)..... | 55 |
| Figure 29. Safety Needs and Deficiencies Identified by Stakeholders | 62 |
| Figure 30. Capacity Needs and Deficiencies Identified by Stakeholders | 65 |
| Figure 31. Active Transportation Needs and Deficiencies Identified by Stakeholders | 69 |
| Figure 32. Crossing Distances | 70 |
| Figure 33. Active Transportation Improvement Projects | 88 |
| Figure 34. Roadway Improvement Projects..... | 92 |
| Figure 35. Roadway and Active Transportation Prioritization Elements..... | 96 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Previous Plans and Studies Recommended Improvements Summary | 16 |
| Table 2. Grand County Project List | 25 |
| Table 3. City of Moab Five-Year Plan Projects | 26 |
| Table 4. Federal Functional Classification Definitions | 27 |
| Table 5. Functional Classification Mileage | 28 |
| Table 6. Intersection Control by Location | 28 |
| Table 7. Crash Summary by Year | 37 |
| Table 8. Roadway LOS Capacity Thresholds | 42 |
| Table 9. Intersection Level of Service Thresholds | 45 |
| Table 10. Intersection Level of Service Capacity Analysis..... | 46 |
| Table 11. Forecasted Population and Employment Growth | 48 |
| Table 12. 2040 Intersection Level of Service Capacity Analysis | 56 |
| Table 13. 2050 Intersection Level of Service Capacity Analysis | 57 |
| Table 14. Recommended Transportation Policies | 73 |
| Table 15. Active Transportation Strategies..... | 75 |
| Table 16. Roadway Improvement Strategies..... | 80 |
| Table 17. Parking and Transit Strategies | 82 |
| Table 18. Active Transportation Improvement Projects and Assessments | 85 |
| Table 19. Roadway Improvement Projects and Assessments | 90 |
| Table 20. Parking and Transit Improvement Projects | 94 |
| Table 21. Recommended General Strategies..... | 95 |
| Table 22. Prioritized Active Transportation Projects | 97 |
| Table 23. Prioritized Roadway Projects..... | 98 |
| Table 24. Prioritized Parking and Transit Projects..... | 98 |
| Table 25. Prioritized Active Transportation Planning Assessments | 99 |
| Table 26. Prioritized Roadway Planning Assessments..... | 99 |



1. Executive Summary

Introduction

Grand County and City of Moab collaboratively prepared this Unified Transportation Master Plan (UTMP). The UTMP identifies actionable steps, strategies, and specific projects to achieve the community’s goals for a safe, reliable, connected, and efficient transportation system to improve mobility and connectivity for people, using all modes of transportation, as shown in **Figure ES-1**. The focus of the Grand County and City of Moab UTMP are roads, streets, trails, and connections that are under jurisdiction and responsibility of Grand County and City of Moab. References are made to projects and plans with mutual impact including other jurisdictional interests (e.g. Utah Department of Transportation [UDOT], federal lands, etc.).

The UTMP recommends projects to be considered for implementation in Grand County and Moab over near-, mid-, and long-term planning horizons. Prioritized projects include street connections, roadway improvements, and new pathways.




Figure ES-1. UTMP Outcome Goals

Previous Plans and Studies

Previously completed transportation plans provide a base set of recommended improvements to the regional transportation system. These transportation plans vary in focus and scale, and the UTMP does not replace or supersede these plans and studies.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) assisted the study team to identify previously-recommended projects, for which Grand County or City of Moab are responsible to implement, that were carried forward into the UTMP process.

Current Conditions

The study area roadway network is heavily reliant on United States Highway 191 (US 191). Incidents and closures on US 191 have a significant impact on regional mobility, reducing the reliability and resiliency of the transportation network.

While the pedestrian network is well-connected in central Moab, much of the study area consists of isolated and disconnected sidewalks. An extensive network of bike lanes and trails provide connectivity for bicyclists; however, there are key gaps in the system.

The number of crashes that occurred on study area roadways increased by 14 crashes in 2021 compared to the previous year. There were 824 crashes within the study area between 2017-2021, with 154 occurring in 2021. From the 824 crashes, there were 31 bicycle and pedestrian crashes between 2017-2021. Crashes involving pedestrians and bicycles are more likely to result in severe injuries or fatalities.

Roadways within the study area generally operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS) for typical daily traffic conditions. However, visitors to Moab during peak weekends and during the tourism season stretch the limits of the transportation system, including US 191 and corridors that access recreation areas such as Millcreek Drive.

Future Conditions

Population, employment, and tourism are anticipated to continue to increase in the region. Central Moab is anticipated to increase in both population and employment in the coming decades. By 2040, congestion is anticipated to continue to increase on US 191. US 191 averages nearly 20,000 vehicles per day in sections of Moab. Some portions of US 191 are expected to increase daily traffic by approximately 9,000 vehicles. Several intersections along Millcreek Drive and 400 East will require improvements. By 2050, congestion is anticipated to be at an unacceptable level for most of US 191 in the area.

Needs and Deficiencies

The previous plans and studies reviewed for development of the UTMP identified safety, capacity, and active transportation needs. In addition, needs were identified from the existing and future conditions analysis. Stakeholder discussions helped to confirm needs, and to identify potential solutions. Stakeholders also expressed their vision of the transportation system.

Safety needs were identified at multiple locations with a high concentration of crashes, and at locations of crossings on US 191 in and around downtown Moab.

Roadway needs include segments and intersections with high recreation/tourism/visitor traffic, off-highway vehicles, and truck traffic.

Active transportation needs include improving the ability for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross US 191. In addition, there are multiple gaps in the shared use path and sidewalk network. Completing projects in these gaps will improve multimodal connectivity.

Stakeholder and Community Outreach

The UTMP study team engaged the community early in the process to provide input on transportation needs, deficiencies, and potential solutions. Stakeholders represented City and County staff, elected officials, local businesses, contractors, transportation advocates, partner agencies, surrounding governments, and Utah State University (USU).

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Community meetings provided opportunity for public comment. An online stakeholder survey was conducted in Fall 2021 to obtain input on transportation needs in the community.

Recommendations

Policies, strategies, and improvement projects were identified to address the transportation needs.

Recommended Policies

Recommended policies to be considered by Grand County and the City of Moab are listed in **Table ES-1**.

Table ES-1. Recommended Transportation Policies

| Policy Name | Description |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Complete Streets Policy | Develop a Complete Streets Policy to guide future design of multimodal streets. The policy will emphasize County and City goals to accommodate all users and modes of the transportation system, particularly downtown (e.g., trucks, vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles). |
| Downtown Bicycle Parking Facilities | Develop a policy to require bicycle parking facilities with new or re-development throughout the downtown area. |
| Future Trail Acquisition | Formalize policy and code to require a review of potential trail easements in conjunction with new development or redevelopment reviews. |
| UDOT Frontage Road Study | Support implementation of UDOT Frontage Study in future development plans and consider streetscape improvements that enhance a multimodal environment and safety. |

Recommended Strategies

Network-wide strategies to be considered by the Grand County and the City of Moab are listed in **Table ES-2**.

Table ES-2. Recommended General Strategies

| Strategy Name | Project Description |
|--|---|
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Awareness Campaign | Prepare education materials relating to safe practices by motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists when using County or City streets. The materials can be distributed at hotels and visitor centers. |
| Downtown Wayfinding Signage Plan | Prepare a downtown signage wayfinding plan. The plan would identify the destinations, and locations for wayfinding signage. Destinations could include trails, trailheads, and on-street cycling route alternatives to US 191 in downtown Moab. |
| Wayfinding Signage (Parking) Plan | Prepare a wayfinding plan to City-owned parking lots and available spaces. |
| Transportation Technology Plan | Identify opportunities to implement technology-based infrastructure to improve traffic operations and safety. These could include vehicle detection, communication, and travel information signs. |
| Multimodal Nodes | Consider future opportunities for multimodal interaction at key public/private spaces and include shuttles, bicycles, pedestrians, and links to trail heads. Also consider a conflict management strategy that recognizes different users (vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, OHVs, etc.), common corridors, traffic patterns, loading/transfer areas, trailheads, and potential mode conflicts |
| Rail Service Feasibility Study | Conduct a feasibility study to evaluate short rail kickouts/spurs connecting the future parking at Moab Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action (UMTRA) project site to the airport that may include passenger rail service. |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Table ES-2. Recommended General Strategies (continued)

| Strategy Name | Project Description |
|--|---|
| East-West Spanish Valley Connectivity | Conduct a study to identify needed future east-west connections in Spanish Valley, particularly to/from US 191. |
| Freight Transfer Plan | Conduct a feasibility study to evaluate need for and location, outside of downtown Moab, for a freight, goods, and cargo transfer station. The facility would facilitate transfer of freight, goods, and cargo from large trucks to local delivery vehicles, easing congestion on US 191. |
| Pavement Maintenance and Preservation Program (Grand County) | Establish a comprehensive pavement maintenance program. |
| Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) | Consider ITS in all project development. ITS components include technologies that improve safety, efficiency, or sustainability of the transportation network (e.g., cameras, communication, fiber, message signs, etc.). |
| Shared Use Path Design Standards | Evaluate and update standards, guidelines, and criteria for shared use path construction to reflect best practices. The standards will reflect a range of users including bicycles, pedestrians, scooters, e-bikes and road separation. |

Recommended Improvements

Strategies are categorized as:

- Active transportation strategies refer to those that improve conditions for walking and bicycling.
- Roadway improvements focus on strategies that improve connectivity and safety for those driving in and around the Moab area.
- Parking and transit strategies further each of those aspects of the transportation network.

The UTMP recommends 38 transportation improvement projects and assessments including 19 active transportation, 14 roadway, 3 parking, and 2 transit. Planning-level cost estimates were prepared for each of the recommended projects.

The UTMP recommends 16 active transportation-related projects and 3 planning assessments. Recommended projects include pedestrian and bicycle facilities, shared-use paths, and planning assessments in the transportation network that help improve connectivity, safety, and mobility for all users in the area.

The UTMP recommends 10 roadway-related projects and 4 roadway planning assessments. Projects include roadway connections, intersection control, roadway improvements, and planning assessments in the transportation network that help improve connectivity, safety, and mobility for all users in the area.

The UTMP recommends 3 parking and 2 transit-related projects. Projects include improvements to parking and transit facilities in the transportation network that help improve wayfinding, access management, multimodal options, and mobility in the study area.

Prioritization and Implementation

A project prioritization methodology was developed for the UTMP to quantitatively score recommended active transportation and roadway projects. A summary of the prioritization structure for roadway and active transportation projects is provided in **Figure ES-2**.



Figure ES-2. Roadway and Active Transportation Prioritization Elements

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Active transportation projects are shown in **Table ES-3** in prioritized order.

Table ES-3. Prioritized Active Transportation Projects

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|---|---------------------|
| AT10 | Shared Use Path Construction and Connections; Pack Creek and Mill Creek | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a shared use path that connects the pedestrian hybrid beacon on US 191 at City Market crossing Pack Creek to Kane Creek Boulevard and north to 300 South, and to 100 West | 1 |
| AT2 | Dogwood Avenue and US 191 Area Crossing | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing on US 191 near Dogwood Avenue (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon [PHB]/High Intensity Activated Crosswalk [HAWK] crossing) | 2 |
| AT5 | US 191 at Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct tunnel at US 191 and Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard intersection to cross US 191 | 3 |
| AT1 | US 191 Sidewalk Improvements: Fourth East to Bittle Lane | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk to connect existing gap along US 191 from Fourth East to Bittle Lane | 4 |
| AT12 | Spanish Valley Drive Shared-Use Path | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a shared use path on Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to South County line | 5 |
| AT4 | Holyoak Sidewalk Connection | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk along Holyoak Lane from Mill Creek Drive to Wagner Avenue | 6 |
| AT8 | Kane Creek Boulevard Bicycle Lanes Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Stripe bicycle lanes and construct paved shoulders (if needed) on Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to 500 West | 7 |
| AT14 | Sand Flats Recreation Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Access | Shared-Use Paths | Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to connect Sand Flats Recreation to downtown. | 8 |
| AT3 | Millcreek Drive Sidewalk Improvements | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk where missing on Millcreek Drive, Spanish Valley Drive to bridge north of Lasal Road | 9 |
| AT6 | 100 East Bicycle Lanes | Bicycle Facilities | Install bicycle lane pavement markings on 100 East from 200 North to Millcreek Trail and on to City Market | 10 |
| AT11 | Colorado River Shared-Use Path Gap | Shared-Use Paths | Construct shared use path along Colorado River between Grandstaff Canyon and Goose Island (existing gap) | 11 |
| AT16 | San Miguel Connection | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a connection between San Miguel north to path over Pack Creek, eventually connecting to Millcreek Drive | 12 |
| AT9 | Murphy Lane Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Murphy Lane from Millcreek Drive to Spanish Trail Road | 13 |
| AT7 | Kane Creek Boulevard Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to Kane Creek Recreation Parking (end of pavement) | 14 |
| AT13 | Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead Connections | Shared-Use Paths | Construct trail connections to Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead (Powerhouse Lane) to Pack Creek and/or Millcreek pathways | 15 |
| AT15 | Sand Flats Road Shared-Use Path | Shared-Use Paths | Construct shared-use path from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | 16 |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Roadway projects are shown in **Table ES-4** in prioritized order.

Table ES-4. Prioritized Roadway Projects

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|--|----------------------|---|---------------------|
| R6 | 200 North and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at US 191 at 200 North intersection | 1 |
| R10 | Kane Creek Boulevard | Roadway Improvement | Reconstruct and widen Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to Kane Creek Recreation Parking; include intersection improvements to Kane Creek Boulevard and 500 West | 2 |
| R7 | West Moab Boat Dock Road and US 191 Improvements | Roadway Improvement | Identify and construct safety improvements to Moab Boat Dock Road intersection at US 191 | 3 |
| R4 | Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at Millcreek Drive and US 191 intersection | 4 |
| R8 | US 191 Gemini Bridges and Bar M Access Improvements | Roadway Improvement | Realignment of access roads on US 191 at Gemini Bridges and Bar M (AKA, Old Highway, Moab Canyon) | 5 |
| R2 | Walnut Lane Street Connection | Roadway Connection | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Walnut Lane to Orchard Park Lane (Hospital Road) | 6 |
| R5 | Meador Drive and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at US 191/Meador Drive | 7 |
| R3 | US 191 to Spanish Valley Drive Connection near Beeman Road | Roadway Connection | Construct new east-west street connection between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road | 8 |
| R1 | Park Drive Connection | Roadway Connection | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Park Drive, Opal Avenue to Park Road | 9 |
| R9 | Sand Flats Road Improvement | Roadway Improvement | Roadway improvement (paving) on Sand Flats Road from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | 10 |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Parking and transit improvement projects are shown in **Table ES-5** and were prioritized by the project team and TAC.

Table ES-5. Prioritized Parking and Transit Projects

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|--|------------------|--|---------------------|
| P1 | Oversized Lot Parking Improvements | Parking | Construct oversized parking lots north and south of downtown Moab | 1 |
| P3 | US 191 Parking | Parking | Evaluate no parking zones on US 191 to limit parking inhibiting sight distances; include freight parking | 2 |
| T1 | Multimodal Transfer Center | Transit | Construct a multimodal transfer center near Canyonlands Regional Airport, connecting Moab Canyon Pathway, SR 128 Trail, SR 313, and shuttle services | 3 |
| P2 | Arches National Park Overflow Parking Area | Parking | Construct parking at UMTRA site for Arches National Park/City Shuttles/etc. | 4 |
| T2 | Grand County Shuttle System | Transit | Implement shuttles (transit, medical, retail, etc.) to serve key destinations including Arches, Airport, Hospital, USU, Spanish Valley/Spanish Trail Road, Rocky Mountaineer Hub, etc. | 5 |

The roadway and active transportation planning assessments were not prioritized using the same methodology as the active transportation and roadway projects. The recommended planning assessments should be completed when funds are available. The County and City can coordinate efforts to complete planning assessments that traverse multiple jurisdictions.

The planning assessments were prioritized based on input from the project team and TAC. Active transportation planning assessments are prioritized in **Table ES-6** and roadway planning assessments are prioritized in **Table ES-7**.

Table ES-6. Prioritized Active Transportation Planning Assessments

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|---|---|--|---------------------|
| AT Plan 3 | Pack Creek Drainage Assessment | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Complete an assessment/feasibility study for improvements to the Pack Creek drainage including a bike trail, fire break, access, and floodway considerations | 1 |
| AT Plan 1 | 500 West Safe Routes to School Improvements | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Evaluate bike lane and parking needs on 500 West from 400 North to US 191 to provide a "Safe Route to School" | 2 |
| AT Plan 2 | 100 West Corridor Assessment | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Complete a corridor assessment for 100 West from Swanny City Park to 100 South including pedestrian and bicycle crossings, sidewalks, capacity improvements, and bike lane needs | 3 |

Table ES-7. Prioritized Roadway Planning Assessments

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|--|--------------------|--|---------------------|
| Roadway Plan 1 | Millcreek Drive Corridor Assessment and Preliminary Plan | Roadway Assessment | Prepare preliminary plans for the Millcreek Drive from Spanish Valley Drive to Fourth East, including the Fourth East/300 South intersection. Plans may identify improvements to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millcreek Drive / Spanish Valley Drive • Millcreek Drive / Murphy Lane • Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road • Millcreek Drive / Fourth East • Fourth East / 300 South | 1 |
| Roadway Plan 3 | Spanish Valley Drive | Roadway Assessment | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to County Line; Spanish Valley Drive to be an alternative route to US 191 during incidents | 2 |
| Roadway Plan 4 | Spanish Trail Road | Roadway Assessment | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Spanish Trail Road from US 191 to Murphy Lane | 3 |
| Roadway Plan 2 | Fourth East Improvements | Roadway Assessment | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements (intersection and segment) to Fourth E. Street between 100 North and US 191 | 4 |

Funding for transportation needs can come from a variety of federal, state, and local sources. Leveraging funds from a variety of available sources is an important component of a transportation master plan and various available sources of funding are explored in the UTMP.

Next Steps

Similar to any plan, this UTMP provides perspective from a specific point in time. The UTMP should be regularly updated to reflect work accomplished, identify new needs that arise, and update funding resources and cost estimates. Ultimately, implementation of UTMP recommendations requires identification of funding for the proposed prioritized projects.

2. Introduction

Grand County and City of Moab collaboratively prepared this Unified Transportation Master Plan (UTMP). The UTMP identifies actionable steps, strategies, and specific projects to achieve the community's goals for a safe, reliable, connected, and efficient transportation system to improve mobility and connectivity for people, using all modes of transportation.

The UTMP recommends projects to be considered for implementation in Grand County and Moab over the next 5, 10, and 20 years. Prioritized projects include street connections, roadway improvements, and new pathways.

Upon implementation, projects will improve mobility for residents and visitors in Grand County and the City of Moab. Planning-level cost estimates are provided. Recommendations are prioritized considering community, stakeholder, and technical advisory committee (TAC) input.

2.1 Project Background

Several regional transportation planning studies have been completed since 2008. These studies vary in their focus and scope, goals, and recommendations. Studies have focused on United States Highway 191 (US 191) under the jurisdiction of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Others have focused on downtown Moab. This updated unified transportation plan does not replace the studies that have been previously completed.

The focus of the Grand County and City of Moab UTMP is the roads, streets, trails, transportation infrastructure, and connections that are under the jurisdiction and responsibility of Grand County and the City of Moab. While the UTMP makes recommendations for intersections of County or City streets with US 191, the study does not analyze or make recommendations for corridor improvements to US 191 or to the adjacent public lands. Adjacent public lands include Bureau of Land Management, Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA), National Parks, United States Forest Service, State Parks, or the adjacent San Juan County. In addition, the study does not provide any additional analysis or recommendation of potential bypass routes around Moab – as those have been previously analyzed – or any evaluation or recommendation regarding the proposed Book Cliffs Highway.

2.2 Goals and Objectives

The UTMP identifies actionable steps and projects to achieve the community's goals for a safe, reliable, connected, and efficient multimodal transportation system, as shown in **Figure 1**. Plan objectives to achieve this goal include:

- Identify current and future transportation needs for Grand County and City of Moab study area.
- Identify multimodal improvements and strategies to meet the needs.
- Prioritize improvements considering community and stakeholder input.
- Prepare preliminary cost estimates and identify applicable funding strategies.
- Develop an implementation plan for near-, mid-, and long-term planning horizons.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 1. UTMP Outcome Goals

2.3 Study Area

The UTMP study area includes streets and roads under the jurisdiction of Grand County and the City of Moab. **Figure 3** shows the location of the study area within the State of Utah.

The study area encompasses 38.5 square miles and includes the entirety of the City of Moab and a portion of south-central Grand County, including the area known as Spanish Valley.

Figure 4 shows a detailed view of the study area, which generally follows the US 191 corridor in a northwest-southeast direction with extensions along Kane Creek Boulevard to the west and Sand Flats Road to the east. The study area also includes two locations that are discontinuous with the rest of the study area:

- Canyonlands Field Airport near the intersection of US 191 and Blue Hills Road.
- The area around the intersection of US 191 and Utah State Route (SR) 313.

2.4 Planning Process

The UTMP development followed a collaborative effort to establish a vision for the region's transportation system, based on direction from the TAC and considering input from the community and stakeholders.

The UTMP answers four key questions, as illustrated in **Figure 2**:

- 1. Where are we now?**
 - The UTMP summarizes existing transportation system conditions and needs.
- 2. Where do we want to go?**
 - The UTMP establishes transportation system goals and objectives.
- 3. What will it take to get us there?**
 - The UTMP provides recommendations for various modes of transportation.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

4. How do we allocate our resources?

- The UTMP guides how resources will be expended for transportation improvements.

The next step following this UTMP is for Grand County and the City of Moab to program the projects within their respective Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs), identify funding sources, and establish timetables for delivery.




Figure 2. UTMP Planning Process




Figure 3. Study Area Location

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 4. Study Area Detail

3. Previous Plans and Studies

Transportation-related plans and studies previously completed by agencies and jurisdictions within the study area were reviewed for relevant recommendations. The type of improvement recommended and implementation status, if known, were identified. The recommendations were reviewed with the UTMP project team and TAC to determine if a previous improvement recommendation should be further considered within the UTMP. **Table 1** lists the improvements summary by previous plan and study. *Italicized projects are not advanced in the UTMP.*

The following transportation-related plans, studies, and reports were reviewed. Included are the agencies involved and the year the study was completed.

- Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) – UDOT, Grand County, San Juan County, City of Moab, SITLA
- City of Moab 2021-2025 Capital Improvement Project List (2021) – City of Moab
- Moab City Roadway Evaluation and Facilities Plan (2020) – City of Moab
- Moab Downtown Plan (2019) – City of Moab
- Moab Parking Management Study (2019) – City of Moab
- US 191 Truck Parking Study (2019) – UDOT
- San Juan County Spanish Valley Area Plan (2018) – San Juan County
- Spanish Valley Plan – US Highway 191 Access Management Plan (2018)
- Main Street (US-191) Moab Bypass Planning Study (2018) – UDOT
- Grand County Spanish Valley Shared Use Path (2018) – Grand County
- US 191 Corridor Preservation Study, MP 112.0-123.4 (2015) – UDOT
- Book Cliffs Transportation Corridor Study (2015) – Grand County, Uintah County, Duchesne County, SITLA
- Grand County to Uintah County Connection Final Feasibility Study (2014) – UDOT
- Grand County Utah General Plan (2012) – Grand County
- Grand County Non-Motorized Trails Master Plan (2011) – Grand County
- Grand County Scenic Byways Corridor Management Plan (2008) – Grand County
- Spanish Valley Transportation Plan (2008) – Grand County
- Moab Transportation Plan (2004) – UDOT



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Table 1. Previous Plans and Studies Recommended Improvements Summary

| Previous Plan, Study, or Report | Recommendation | Improvement Category | Status | Feedback Received |
|--|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) | US 191 SB passing lane, MP 143.9 to 145.4 | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| | US 191 west multimodal path connection, 100 W to Kane Creek Boulevard | Active Transportation | Incomplete | |
| | Separated trail system along Spanish Valley Drive, from Millcreek Drive to Coronado Street | Active Transportation | Incomplete | This project has been funded and will be managed by Grand County |
| | Widen and update Kane Creek Road, including bike lanes, from US 191 to Campgrounds near Moab Rim Trailhead | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| | US 191 Frontage Road system from Millcreek to south Spanish Valley (Phases 1 and 2), intersection projects and frontage roads | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | UDOT has a current study underway for this project |
| | Intersection improvement, 200 North and Main | Intersection Improvements | Incomplete | |
| | Electronic message board system for congestion, parking, and special notices | Parking | Incomplete | |
| | Transit/shuttle study including intercity bus service to Wasatch Front and Grand Junction | Transit | Ongoing | Awarded to Moab by UDOT for a five-year pilot to begin service spring of 2022 |
| | Pilot shuttle project | Transit | Ongoing | |
| | Plan for Millcreek Parkway continuation | Active Transportation | Ongoing | |
| City of Moab 2021-2025 Capital Improvement Project List (2021) | Multimodal transfer center near Canyonlands Field Airport airport, connecting Moab Canyon Pathway, SR 128 Trail, and any shuttle service | Transit | Incomplete | |
| | 400 East construction | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete (3-5 years) | This project is not currently funded |
| | 400 East bridge widening (over Pack Creek) | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete (1-2 years) | This is a current programmed project |
| | Median parking | Parking | Incomplete (1-2 years) | This is a current programmed project |
| | 100 West construction | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete (3-5 years) | This project is not currently funded |
| | Minnie Lee paving improvements | Maintenance/Preservation | Incomplete (1-2 years) | This is a current programmed project |
| | Emma Boulevard dispersed parking | Parking | Incomplete (1-2 years) | This is a current programmed project |
| Moab City Roadway Evaluation and Facilities Plan (2020) | Shuttle/transit project | Transit | Incomplete (3-5 years) | Awarded to Moab by UDOT for a five-year pilot to begin service spring of 2022 |
| | Establish a comprehensive pavement maintenance program | Maintenance/Preservation | Incomplete | |
| | Budget funds for pavement preservation treatments | Maintenance/Preservation | Ongoing | |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Previous Plan, Study, or Report | Recommendation | Improvement Category | Status | Feedback Received |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|---|
| Moab Downtown Plan (2019) | Raised median, Main Street from 100 North to 100 South | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Support bypass (US-191) | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance; UDOT does not have plans to further consider a US 191 bypass |
| | Widen sidewalk on west side by two feet, Main Street from 400 North to 200 South | Active Transportation | Incomplete | |
| | Add curb bulb-outs, Main Street from 200 North to 100 South | Intersection Improvements | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Cycle track, 100 West from 400 North to 100 South | Active Transportation | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Bike Lanes, 100 South from 100 West to 100 East | Active Transportation | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Bike Lanes, 100 North from 100 West to 100 East | Active Transportation | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Bike Lanes, 100 East from 200 North to Millcreek Trail | Active Transportation | Incomplete | |
| | Downtown parking garage | Parking | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance; this project has been rescoped into dispersed parking |
| | Back-in parking, 100 South from 100 West to 100 East | Parking | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Back-in parking, 100 North from 100 West to 100 East | Parking | Incomplete | Back-in parking was installed, and after numerous complaints, was reverted back to front-in parking |
| | Back-in parking, 100 East from 100 North to 100 South | Parking | Incomplete | |
| Downtown Core: sidewalk, curb/gutter, vegetation, site amenities, lighting retrofits replacements | Maintenance/Preservation | Incomplete | Many of the Main Street Improvements recommended would require UDOT approval | |
| Moab Parking Management Study (2019) | Continue with FREE parking | Parking | Ongoing | |
| | Public parking sign with a two-hour time limit | Parking | Ongoing | City of Moab planning to implement |
| | Add parking signs to encourage parking in the City-owned lots and available spaces | Parking | Incomplete | |
| | Add red curb paint to restrict parking within 30 feet of an intersection | Parking | Ongoing | |
| | Back-in angle parking on roads with planned bike lanes | Parking | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Delineate specific parking stalls for the parallel parking downtown, especially on Main Street | Parking | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Continue forward with the plan to add a parking garage on the current city lot | Parking | Incomplete | Recommend that project not advance |
| | Continue forward with the plan to add oversized parking lots north and south of Moab | Parking | Incomplete | |
| | Add wayfinding signs to encourage walking to destinations one to two blocks away | Active Transportation | Incomplete | |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Previous Plan, Study, or Report | Recommendation | Improvement Category | Status | Feedback Received |
|---|---|---------------------------|-------------------|--|
| US 191 Truck Parking Study (2019) | <i>No applicable projects recommended in study</i> | | | |
| San Juan County Spanish Valley Area Plan (2018) | Develop a well-connected transportation system with safe access from US 191 that incorporates multiple modes of transit (shuttle/bus, bicycle, walking, etc.) | Active Transportation | Ongoing | |
| Spanish Valley Plan - US Highway 191 Access Management Plan (2018) | Establish US 191 as a Limited Access Highway with three to five interchanges | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| | Establish frontage roads alignments along US 191 | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | Current UDOT Study |
| | Establish six east-west connector roads, one every mile | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| | Establish neighborhood centers along Spanish Valley Drive | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| Main Street (US-191) Moab Bypass Planning Study (2018) | <i>Add the bypass as a project to state and local transportation plans</i> | <i>Roadway Capacity</i> | <i>Ongoing</i> | <i>Recommend that project not advance; UDOT does not have plans to further consider a US 191 bypass. Moab City Council and Grand County Commission both passed resolutions against the bypass in 2020.</i> |
| | <i>Advance the two alternatives studied by completing National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements, public outreach, and identifying funding</i> | <i>Roadway Capacity</i> | <i>Incomplete</i> | |
| Grand County Spanish Valley Shared Use Path (2018) | Shared use path parallel to Spanish Valley Drive | Active Transportation | Ongoing | |
| US 191 Corridor Preservation Study, MP 112.0-123.4 (2015) | Traffic signal at Old Spanish Trail Arena (MP 120.6) | Intersection Improvements | Incomplete | |
| | Traffic signal at Spanish Trail Road (MP 121.5) | Intersection Improvements | Incomplete | Intersection improvements (signal) are in design |
| | Traffic signal at Millcreek Drive (MP 123.2) | Intersection Improvements | Incomplete | Should be evaluated |
| Books Cliffs Transportation Corridor Study (2015) | <i>No applicable projects recommended in study</i> | | | |
| Grand County to Uintah County Connection Final Feasibility Study (2014) | <i>No previous recommendations within the study area</i> | | | |
| Grand County Utah General Plan (2012) | Facilitate planning and coordination of regional multimodal transportation | Active Transportation | Ongoing | |
| | Work with UDOT and City of Moab to improve US 191 and its intersections south of Moab | Intersection Improvements | Ongoing | |
| Grand County Non-Motorized Trails Master Plan (2011) | Address overcrowding, create more single-track trails | Active Transportation | Ongoing | |
| Grand County Scenic Byways Corridor Management Plan (2008) | <i>No previous recommendations within the study area</i> | | | |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Previous Plan, Study, or Report | Recommendation | Improvement Category | Status | Feedback Received |
|---|---|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Spanish Valley Transportation Plan (2008) | Improve Millcreek Drive to a three- to four-lane cross section | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| | Improve Spanish Valley Drive to a three- to four-lane cross section from Millcreek Drive to the County Line | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| | Extend five-lane section of US 191 from Sage Avenue to Spanish Trail Road and eventually to County Line | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| | Construct new east-west connectors between Murphy Lane and Spanish Valley Drive at Marshall Lane; and between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road | Roadway Capacity | Incomplete | |
| | Geometric improvements and/or signalization at the following intersections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US 191 / Spanish Valley Drive • Holyoak Lane / Millcreek Drive • Spanish Valley Drive / Millcreek Drive • Murphy Lane / Millcreek Drive • Sand Flats Road / Millcreek Drive • US 191 / Sage Avenue • US 191 / Spanish Trail Road • Spanish Trail Road / Spanish Valley Drive | Intersection Improvements | Incomplete | |
| Moab Transportation Plan (2004) | New signs and enforcement to reduce speeds on Main Street (US 191) | Enforcement | Ongoing | |
| | Add pedestrian crossing and bicycle lanes (downtown area) | Active Transportation | Ongoing | |
| | School crossings at US 191 at 400 North and Uranium | Active Transportation | Ongoing | |
| | Emergency vehicle preemption on Moab's traffic signals | Intersection Improvements | | |
| | Traffic calming medians (general area) | Roadway Capacity | Ongoing | |
| | <i>By-pass feasibility study</i> | <i>Roadway Capacity</i> | <i>Complete</i> | <i>Moab City Council and Grand County Commission both passed resolutions against the bypass in 2020</i> |
| | Moab shuttle service | Transit | Ongoing | Programmed project; awarded to Moab by UDOT for a five-year pilot to begin service spring of 2022 |
| | Enhancements to the North Corridor including adequate turning lanes and highway width and bicycle/pedestrian trails | Roadway Capacity | Ongoing | |

4. Current Conditions


An understanding of the current state and potential deficiencies of the transportation system informs identification and prioritization of potential projects.

Current conditions also serve as the baseline for identification of future transportation deficiencies that will be addressed by UTMP recommendations.

4.1 Population, Employment, and Development

The total population of Grand County is estimated at approximately 9,698 residents, as shown in **Figure 5**. Since 2000, the population has grown by roughly 1,200 residents, an average annual rate of 0.67%. The fastest growing age group is those 65 and older, which grew by over 70% over the past 20 years. In contrast, the population age 15 and younger has declined by almost 9%.

Moab has seen slightly slower growth than Grand County, growing by over 500 permanent residents over the last 20 years, at an average annual growth rate of 0.52%. Similar to Grand County, the population 65 and older has grown by 69% and the population age 15 and younger has declined by 21%.



Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2000 Decennial Censuses, American Community Survey 2010 and 2020 5-Year Estimates)

Figure 5. Grand County and Moab Population by Age (2000-2020)

Study area population is unevenly distributed throughout the region. **Figure 6** shows population density by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) from the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) Statewide Travel Demand Model (TDM). Population densities are highest to the north and west of downtown Moab, along the 400 North corridor. The area southeast of downtown Moab, along 300 South and Locust Lane also has relatively high population density. The remainder of the study area has relatively low population density, particularly away from central Moab and the residential areas in Spanish Valley.

4.1.1 Employment

Employment data was obtained from the WFRC Statewide TDM at the TAZ level. It is estimated that there are 8,311 jobs within the study area. Similar to population, employment is also unevenly distributed throughout the region. **Figure 7** shows the distribution of employment density. Employment is highly concentrated in downtown Moab. The area along US 191 between Bowling Alley Lane and 400 North has the highest density of employees in the study area. The remainder of the study area has sparse employment.

4.1.2 Potential Growth Areas

Vacant properties within the study area represent potential growth opportunities for Grand County and the City of Moab. **Figure 8** shows vacant properties by acreage in the study area. Larger properties provide an opportunity for regional-scale developments and planned communities, while smaller properties provide an opportunity for small-scale, infill development to increase density within the existing built environment.

Larger parcels are most prevalent on the edges of the study area, where topography may limit the development potential of some parcels. There are several large vacant properties on US 191 north of downtown Moab as well as properties on Sand Flats Road east of Millcreek Drive. There are several moderately sized vacant parcels on either side of 500 West, west of downtown Moab, though several of these parcels are impacted by Millcreek, which may limit development. Smaller parcels are scattered throughout the City.

4.1.3 Tourism

Grand County and Moab continue to be tourism destinations for the region. In 2021, Arches National Park recorded over 1.8 million visitors and nearby Canyonlands National Park recorded over 900,000 visitors¹. Along with national parks, Grand County and Moab provide access to multiple other tourism and recreation destinations such as Dead Horse Point State Park, Utahraptor State Park, Green River State Park, Sand Flats Recreation Area, the Colorado River, and renowned hiking, biking, and off-road vehicle recreation.


What is a Traffic Analysis Zone?

The development of the UTMP relies in part on the analysis of the WFRC TDM, which forecasts future traffic patterns and trends based on calibrating a base-year model from observed traffic conditions and future projections of population and employment demographics.

The TDM uses unique, custom zones based on Census Tracts and Blocks as well as natural and manmade barriers to travel, such as rivers and railroads. Demographic information, such as population and employment characteristics, is assigned to each TAZ based on U.S. Census Bureau data paired with data from other local and state sources. In the UTMP study area, there are a total of 57 model TAZs within or partially within the study area.

¹ <https://irma.nps.gov/STATS/>, accessed April 2022

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead


Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

Legend

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>People/Sq. Mi.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 150 150 to 500 500 to 1,000 1,000 to 2,500 Greater than 2,500 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other Road Water Park City of Moab Railroads Study Area |
|---|---|

Figure 6. Current Population Density by TAZ (2020)

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Arches National Park

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett

Legend

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Employees/Sq. Mi.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 250 250 to 1,000 1,000 to 2,500 2,500 to 5,000 Greater than 5,000 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other Road Water Park City of Moab Railroads Study Area |
|--|---|

Major Road

0 0.25 0.5 Miles

0 0.25 0.5 Miles



0 0.5 1 Miles



Figure 7. Current Employment Density by TAZ (2020)

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 8. Potential Growth Areas

0 0.5 1 Miles

4.2 Planned Projects

Grand County and the City of Moab each have planned or programmed projects. The programmed transportation improvements will be considered when evaluating the 2040 and 2050 horizon years.

4.2.1 Grand County Projects

Several Grand County projects recommended in the 2008 Spanish Valley Transportation Plan are actively in the planning process. These projects are shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Grand County Project List

| Project | Improvement Category |
|---|---------------------------|
| Improve Millcreek Drive to a three- to four-lane cross-section | Roadway Capacity |
| Improve Spanish Valley Drive to a three- to four-lane cross-section from Millcreek Drive to the County Line | Roadway Capacity |
| Extend the five-lane section of US 191 from Sage Avenue to Spanish Trail Road (and eventually to the County Line) | Roadway Capacity |
| Construct new east-west connectors between Murphy Lane and Marshall Lane | Roadway Capacity |
| Construct new east-west connectors between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road | Roadway Capacity |
| Geometric improvements and/or signalization at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US 191 and Spanish Valley Drive • Holyoak Lane and Millcreek Drive • Spanish Valley Drive and Millcreek Drive • Murphy Lane and Millcreek Drive • Sand Flats Road and Millcreek Drive • US 191 and Sage Avenue • US 191 and Spanish Trail Road • Spanish Trail Road and Spanish Valley Drive | Intersection Improvements |

4.2.2 City of Moab Projects

The City of Moab has programmed transportation projects in its 2021-2025 Capital Improvement Plan. **Table 3** shows the programmed transportation projects anticipated to be completed over the next five years.

Table 3. City of Moab Five-Year Plan Projects

| Project | Improvement Category | Estimated Cost | Priority |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| 400 East Construction | Roadway Capacity | \$1,693,119 | 3-5 Years |
| 400 East Bridge Widening (over Pack Creek) | Roadway Capacity | \$740,000 | 1-2 Years |
| Median Parking | Parking | \$6,765,406 | 1-2 Years |
| 100 West Construction | Roadway Capacity | \$1,247,936 | 3-5 Years |
| Emma Boulevard Dispersed Parking/Minnie Lee Paving Improvements | Maintenance/Preservation/Parking | \$487,791 | 1-2 Years |
| Shuttle/Transit Project | Transit | \$1,500,000 | 3-5 Years |

Source: City of Moab 2021-2025 Capital Improvement Project List

4.3 Streets and Roadways

Roads serve as the foundation of the regional transportation network, accommodating motor vehicles, freight, transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Roads are the main component of the transportation network throughout the study area, and the primary public space in which residents travel daily.

In all, there are 221 miles of roads of various conditions and types. The efficiency, safety, and condition of the area's road and bridge network is essential to the functionality of the other transportation modes and to the economic prosperity and quality of life of the region.

4.3.1 Functional Classification

Transportation planners and engineers categorize roadways based on the type of traffic they are intended to serve, referred to as functional classification.

Three main functional classes are defined by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): arterial, collector, and local based on speed, vehicular capacity, and relationships with adjacent land uses as described in **Table 4**.

Functional classifications have an inverse relationship between land access and mobility as shown in **Figure 9**, based on the types of trips they are intended to serve. The functional classification map for the study area is shown in **Figure 10**.

Arterials move people for long distances at higher speeds within a city or between cities.

Collector streets are lower speed and shorter distances than arterials and connect travelers to the arterials.

Local streets are very low speed, extend for short distances, and provide direct access to residential and commercial properties.

Table 4. Federal Functional Classification Definitions

| Functional Classification | Services Provided | Types |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Arterial | Provides the highest Level of Service (LOS) at the greatest speed for the longest uninterrupted distance, with some degree of access control. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal Arterial. Serves major activity centers; links urban areas; provides high connectivity. • Minor Arterial. Connects principal arterials; provides accessibility. |
| Collector | Provides a less highly developed LOS at a lower speed for shorter distances by collecting traffic from local roads and connecting them with arterials. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Collector. Generally, major collector routes are longer; have lower connecting driveway densities; have higher speed limits; are spaced at greater intervals; have higher annual average traffic volumes; and may have more travel lanes than minor collectors. • Minor Collector. These roadways collect traffic from the local roadway network and distribute them to the major collector or arterial system. |
| Local | All roads not defined as arterials or collectors; primarily provides access to land with little or no through traffic. | |

Why is Federal Functional Classification Important?

A road must be federally functionally classified as an arterial or collector road to be eligible for federal funding for improvements.

There are 221 miles of roadways within the study area. **Table 5** shows the breakdown of functional classification by mileage: 9.2% of the roadway mileage in the study area is arterial roadways, 15.9% are collectors, and 74.9% are local. There are no freeways or interstates within the study area.

US 191 is the highest classified roadway in the region as the only principal arterial. Other major regional roadways are classified as minor arterials, including 4th East Street, 100 North, and Millcreek Drive. Kane Creek Boulevard, Sand Flats Road, and SR 313 are classified as major collectors.

Proportion of Service




Figure 9 . Functional Classification

Table 5. Functional Classification Mileage

| Functional Classification | Approximate Mileage | % of Total Mileage |
|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Arterial | 20.4 | 9.2% |
| Principal Arterial | 16.8 | 7.6% |
| Minor Arterial | 3.6 | 1.6% |
| Collector | 35.3 | 15.9% |
| Major Collector | 24.0 | 10.8% |
| Minor Collector | 11.3 | 5.1% |
| Local | 165.5 | 74.9% |

4.3.2 Intersection Types

Most intersections in the study area are stop-controlled (either a four-way stop or side street stops). There are some intersections in the City of Moab that have different intersection control, including traffic signals, HAWK/PHB signals, and a roundabout. These locations are also shown geographically in **Figure 11**.

Table 6. Intersection Control by Location

| Intersection Control Type | North-South Roadway | East-West Roadway |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Traffic Signal | US 191 | SR 128 |
| | 500 West | US 191 |
| | US 191 | 100 North |
| | US 191 | Center Street |
| | US 191 | 100 South |
| | US 191 | 200 South |
| | US 191 | 300 South |
| | US 191 | Kane Creek Boulevard |
| | 4 th East | US 191 |
| HAWK Signal | US 191 | Uranium Avenue |
| | US 191 | Rosalie Court |
| Roundabout | Murphy Lane | Spanish Trail Road |

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 10. Functional Classification



Grand County & City of Moab UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 11. Intersection Types

4.4 Active Transportation

Residents and visitors to Grand County and the City of Moab benefit from a climate and landscape conducive to choosing active transportation. With few rainy days, gentle topography along the valley floors, and beautiful vistas, walking and biking in Moab are enjoyable ways to travel.

This section provides an overview of active transportation in Grand County and the City of Moab including current trends, existing walking and biking infrastructure, local destinations, and gaps and needs in the network.

4.4.1 Existing Travel Trends

Eight percent of people in Moab live with a disability, 21% of the population is less than 18 years old, and 17.5% are 65 years or over, underscoring the importance of developing a transportation system that can provide for those who are unable to drive a vehicle.

Journey to Work

Based on the 2015-2019 ACS five-year estimates, most residents in Grand County commute to work by driving alone (74.5%), followed by bicycling at 5.9%.

Figure 12 compares Grand County's mode share compared to other small urban areas located near national parks, and to the State of Utah. It is important to note there is no public transit system in Grand County or the City of Moab.

While current bicycle/pedestrian mode share is relatively low, there is potential for progress. The ACS data show that the mean travel time to work for City of Moab residents is 9.4 minutes, compared to 26.9 minutes for the United States. Residents within the study area predominantly live within five miles of the center of Moab. These short times and distances create the opportunity to transform driving trips into walking or bicycling trips.




Image Credit: Kimley-Horn

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 12. Commute Mode to Work

4.4.2 Trails, Paths, and Biking Infrastructure

Shared-Use Paths and Side Paths

These facilities are paved off-street paths/trails adjacent to roadways, along riparian or rail corridors, or through parks and open space. They are typically 10-12 feet wide (8 feet minimum) and are designed to accommodate two-way travel by people walking, biking, rolling, or using other non-motorized modes. There are approximately 11.3 miles of shared-use paths of varying character within the study area. The primary shared-use paths in and around Moab are:

- **Mill Creek Parkway.** This shared-use path runs along Mill Creek from 500 West to Lasal Road for roughly 1.6 miles. West of 100 West, the path is loose sand/dirt. East of 100 West, the path is paved.
- **Colorado River Pathway.** The paved Colorado River Pathway alternates between being a buffered and separated path between the Colorado River and SR 128. It would connect Lions Park to Grandstaff Campground and the Porcupine Rim Trail, except there is a 0.5-mile gap near Icebox Canyon.
- **500 West Side Path.** This attached, paved side path runs on the West side of 500 West between 400 North and Kane Creek Boulevard where it transitions into a sidewalk. Just after the intersection with Mountain View Drive, the sidewalk ends. The side path on 500 West provides a connection to an underpass that allows users to access either Williams Way or Mill Creek Parkway.
- **100 West Sidepath/Emma Boulevard.** This route runs from a HAWK signal on US 191 to the Mill Creek Parkway via a paved side path along 100 West, and a new trail parallel to Emma Boulevard. The facilities allow bicyclists to bypass busy Main Street (US 191).
- **Moab Canyon Pathway.** This paved, shared-use path connects Arches National Park and numerous destinations north of Moab. The trail is separated from traffic by a variety



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

of methods, including bollards, concrete barriers, and a dirt strip. The trail parallels US 191 north past the entrance to Arches National Park until it terminates at the intersection of US 191 and SR 313. The trail was recently extended further south into Moab to Emma Boulevard.



Image Credit: Kimley-Horn

Bike Lanes

Bike lanes are provided by designating four to seven feet of roadway width for exclusive bicycle use with six-inch striped lanes. There are approximately 4.9 miles of bike lanes in the study area. Bike lanes exist on several streets within Moab including 400 North, 500 West, and 4th East.

Figure 13 shows the bicycle network in the study area.

4.4.3 Pedestrian Infrastructure

Pedestrian infrastructure consists of trails, paths, and sidewalks. Sidewalks through downtown Moab, along Main Street/US 191, are attached and typically 8-12 feet wide to accommodate high pedestrian volumes on weekends and during peak tourism season.

There are 46.5 miles of existing sidewalks in Moab. While the sidewalk network within the city is generally complete, sidewalks are generally lacking throughout other parts of the study area and in Spanish Valley, except for small pockets within newer developments.

Figure 14 shows pedestrian facilities in Grand County and the City of Moab.


4.4.4 Active Transportation Destinations

Figure 15 shows major active transportation destinations within the study area, which can benefit by improved active transportation access.



Image Credit: Kimley-Horn


Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

See Inset




Legend

| | | | |
|--|------------|--|-------------------------|
| | Major Road | | Study Area |
| | Other Road | | Paved Shared Use Trails |
| | Water | | Bike Lanes |
| | Park | | Connecting Bike Routes |
| | Railroads | | |



Figure 13. Bicycle Infrastructure


Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

See Inset



Legend


- Major Road
- Other Road
- Water
- Park
- Railroads
- Study Area
- Sidewalk
- Hiking and Biking Trail
- Hiking-Only
- Trail Paved
- Shared Use Trails
- Dirt Trails



CITY OF
MOAB
 UTAH


Figure 14. Pedestrian Infrastructure

Grand County & City of Moab UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

See Inset



CITY OF
MOAB
UTAH

Figure 15. Active Transportation Destinations

4.5 Safety

Crash data was obtained from UDOT. During the five-year period (2017-2021) there were 824 crashes within the study area. Of these, 638 (77%) were non-injury crashes, 91 (11%) were possible injury crashes, 64 (8%) were suspected minor injury crashes, 23 (3%) were suspected serious injury crashes, and 8 (1%) were fatal crashes. A summary of crashes by severity type and year is shown in **Table 7** and **Figure 16**.

Table 7. Crash Summary by Year

| Year | Fatal | Suspected Serious Injury | Suspected Minor Injury | Possible Injury | Non-Injury | Total |
|--------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| 2017 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 140 | 171 |
| 2018 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 152 | 189 |
| 2019 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 26 | 124 | 170 |
| 2020 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 110 | 140 |
| 2021 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 13 | 112 | 154 |
| Total | 8 | 23 | 64 | 91 | 638 | 824 |




Figure 16. Study Area Crash Summary (2017-2021)

Crash densities are shown in **Figure 18** and crash severity by location is shown in **Figure 19**. The highest density of crashes is located along US 191 in central Moab, extending from 4th East Street to Mivida Drive. A majority of fatal and suspected serious injury crashes occurred on US 191, including four fatal crashes occurred on US 191 in Spanish Valley. Other fatal crashes occurred on US 191 in the vicinity of Arches Scenic Drive and in central Moab. One fatal crash occurred on Kane Creek Boulevard west of Moab.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

There were 31 bicycle and pedestrian crashes in the analysis period, representing 3.8% of total crashes. Of the 31 bicycle and pedestrian crashes, two were fatal crashes (6%) and four were suspected serious injury crashes (13%).

Crash severity percentages for pedestrian/bicycle crashes compared with total crashes are shown in **Figure 17**. The comparison shows that a higher proportion of bicycle and pedestrian crashes result in fatalities, as compared to all crashes. **Figure 20** shows the location and severity of bicycle and pedestrian crashes in the study area.





Figure 17. Pedestrian/Bicycle Crash Severities Compared to Total Crashes

Grand County & City of Moab UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

0 0.25 0.5 Miles

0 0.25 0.5 Miles

0 0.5 1 Miles

Legend

- Major Road
- Other Road
- Railroads
- City of Moab
- Park
- Water
- Study Area
- Crash Density
 - Sparse
 - Dense

Figure 18. Crash Density



Grand County & City of Moab UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 19. Crash Severity



Grand County & City of Moab UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 20. Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes

4.6 Travel Patterns and Traffic Operations

4.6.1 Traffic Count Data

Daily traffic volumes from 2016-2021 were obtained from the City of Moab on study area functionally classified roadways. All daily traffic volume data was normalized to 2021 using a 2% annual growth rate. Available 2021 daily traffic data is shown in **Figure 21**.

Existing AM and PM peak hour turning movement traffic count data was collected on Tuesday, September 21, 2021 at six intersections throughout the study area. Those intersections include:

1. Spanish Valley Drive and Millcreek Drive
2. Millcreek Drive and Sand Flats Road
3. 4th East Street and Millcreek Drive
4. Millcreek Drive and Murphy Lane
5. 4th East Street and 300 South
6. Spanish Valley Drive and Spanish Trail Road

All six study intersections are either two-way or all-way stop-controlled and represent the intersections understood to have high demand within the street network off US 191. A summary of the count data is provided in **Appendix A**.

4.6.2 Existing Capacity Analysis

A traffic operations LOS analysis was performed for functionally classified roadway segments and the six selected intersections. For roadway segments, the LOS analysis is based on daily traffic volumes and functional classification of the roadway segment. **Table 8** summarizes the LOS thresholds (C or better, D-F) for each functional classification in terms of available capacity. Most agencies consider LOS D or better as acceptable conditions.

Table 8. Roadway LOS Capacity Thresholds

| Functional Classification | LOS Thresholds (maximum vehicles per day) | | |
|---|---|--------|--------|
| | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E |
| Principal Arterial (more than 2 lanes) | 27,280 | 30,690 | 34,100 |
| Principal Arterial (2 lanes) | 12,000 | 13,500 | 15,000 |
| Minor Arterial | 10,240 | 11,520 | 12,800 |
| Major Collector | 8,160 | 9,180 | 10,200 |
| Minor Collector | 7,360 | 8,280 | 9,200 |

Source: Adapted from Maricopa County Department of Transportation Roadway Design Guide

Figure 22 shows the capacity analysis for the existing traffic volumes. All roadway segments operate at acceptable LOS for average daily traffic conditions. Traffic data are collected in different months of the year and represent average conditions, rather than traffic conditions on peak weekends or holidays. Traffic conditions are commonly exasperated beyond the average during peak tourist times including holidays and weekends.

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN





Figure 21. Roadway Daily Traffic (2021)

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

Legend

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| 2021 Level of Service | Other Road |
| C or Better | Railroads |
| D | Water |
| E | Park |
| F | City of Moab |
| Major Road | Study Area |

Figure 22. Roadway Level of Service Capacity Analysis (2021)



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

The intersection analysis reports average total delay at intersections consistent with the *Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition* (HCM 6). LOS describes the operating performance of an intersection or roadway and is measured quantitatively and reported on a scale from A to F, with A representing the best performance and F the worst.

LOS for a four-way stop-controlled intersection is defined for all the intersection movements, while LOS for a two-way stop-controlled intersection is defined for only the minor street stop-controlled movements.

Table 9 shows the vehicle delay (in seconds per vehicle) at an unsignalized intersection for each LOS category.

Table 9. Intersection Level of Service Thresholds

| Level of Service | Unsignalized Intersection Average Total Delay (sec/veh) |
|------------------|---|
| A | ≤10 |
| B | >10 and ≤15 |
| C | >15 and ≤25 |
| D | >25 and ≤35 |
| E | >35 and ≤50 |
| F | >50 |

Source: *Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition*

Synchro Analysis and Optimization Software was used to analyze the intersection delay at the six locations. Synchro is an interactive computer program that enables planners and engineers to estimate traffic operations for various intersections in a network. Synchro utilizes HCM 6 methodology to analyze intersection delay and LOS.

Results indicate that the intersections operate at acceptable LOS (D or better) in both the AM and PM peak hours evaluated. The 2021 intersection analysis results are summarized in **Table 10**. Detailed Synchro analysis reports are in **Appendix B**.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Table 10. Intersection Level of Service Capacity Analysis

| Intersection | Level of Service [Total Delay (sec/veh)] | |
|---|--|--------------|
| | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| Spanish Valley Drive / Millcreek Drive | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [7] | A [8] |
| Eastbound Left/Right | A [9] | B [10] |
| Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road | | |
| All-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Total Intersection | A [8] | A [9] |
| 4th East Street / Millcreek Drive | | |
| Two-way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [7] | A [7] |
| Eastbound Left/Through/Right | C [16] | C [16] |
| Westbound Left | C [17] | D [26] |
| Westbound Through/Right | B [11] | B [11] |
| Southbound Left | A [8] | A [8] |
| Millcreek Drive / Murphy Lane | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Westbound Left/Right | A [10] | B [11] |
| Southbound Left | A [8] | A [8] |
| 4th East Street / 300 South | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [8] | A [8] |
| Eastbound Left | B [14] | B [14] |
| Eastbound Right | B [10] | B [11] |
| Spanish Valley Drive / Spanish Trail Road | | |
| All-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Total Intersection | A [8] | A [9] |



4.7 Key Findings

- The population of older adults has grown faster than the population as a whole, and the proportion of the population 15 years old and younger has decreased over the last 20 years. Age-friendly planning and mobility improvements are increasingly important.
- The roadway network in the study area is heavily reliant on US 191 and incidents and closures on US 191 have a major impact on regional mobility, which reduces overall reliability and resiliency of the transportation network.
- The pedestrian network is well-connected in central Moab, but the remainder of the study area has isolated, disconnected sidewalks, making walking in many areas a challenge.
- There is an extensive network of bike lanes and trails that provide connectivity for bicyclists; however, there are key gaps in the system that if filled could provide better access to recreational areas and jobs.
- Total crashes in the study area limits increased in 2021 compared to the previous year (140 in 2020 and 154 in 2021).
- Crashes involving pedestrian and bicycle crashes are more likely to result in severe injuries or fatalities, indicating the benefits of additional active transportation facilities and to reduce crashes with motor vehicles.
- The roadway capacities evaluated currently operate at acceptable LOS for daily traffic conditions. Note that peak tourist season, including peak weekends, places additional demand on the transportation system.
- All six intersections analyzed for congestion issues are currently operating at acceptable LOS.

5. Future Conditions

Forecasted growth of the study area for two future horizon years, 2040 and 2050, was analyzed to identify potential deficiencies in the transportation network.

5.1 Future Population and Employment

Based on data from the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) Statewide TDM, the study area population and employment are anticipated to increase over the coming decades as shown in **Table 11**. The population is expected to increase at a rate higher than over the past 20 years (which has been 0.67% annually for Grand County and 0.52% annually for the City of Moab).

The study area is also anticipated to experience employment growth, drawing employees from surrounding areas. The projected population and employment growth rates are higher between 2020 and 2040 than between 2040 and 2050, though still higher than historic trends.

Table 11. Forecasted Population and Employment Growth

| Year | 2020 | 2040 | 2020-2040 Growth | 2020-2040 Growth Rate | 2050 | 2040-2050 Growth | 2040-2050 Growth Rate |
|------------|-------|--------|------------------|-----------------------|--------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Population | 9,845 | 11,897 | 2,052 | 0.95% | 12,787 | 890 | 0.72% |
| Employment | 8,311 | 10,657 | 2,346 | 1.25% | 11,670 | 1,013 | 0.91% |

Source: WFRC Statewide TDM


Figure 23 and **Figure 24** show forecasted 2050 population and employment densities of the study area, respectively. General growth trends include:

- Population densities are anticipated to increase in the central area of Moab and along the US 191 corridor in both Spanish Valley and north of Moab to the Colorado River.
- Employment densities are anticipated to increase in downtown Moab and the surrounding central area of the City. Additional employment is also anticipated to occur along the east side of US 191 in the Spanish Valley area on both sides of Spanish Trail Road.

It is also recognized that northern San Juan County is expected to continue growing in the Spanish Valley area. San Juan County growth will contribute to traffic in southern Grand County, particular via US 191 as a connector to the Wasatch Front.

Additionally, recreation visitors and tourism is expected to continue to increase in the area.

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Arches National Park

Utah Hwy. 128 - River Rd.

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead

Sand Flats Rd

500 West St

400 East St

Sand Flats Rd.

191

Mill Creek Dr

Murphy Ln

Spanish Trail Rd

Spanish Valley Dr

191

0 0.25 0.5 Miles

0 0.25 0.5 Miles

Legend

- 2050 Population Density
 - Less than 150
 - 150 to 500
 - 500 to 1,000
 - 1,000 to 2,500
 - Greater than 2,500
- Other Road
- Water
- Park
- City of Moab
- Railroads
- Study Area
- Major Road



0 0.5 1 Miles



CITY OF **MOAB** UTAH

Figure 23. Future Population Density (2050)

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Figure 24. Future Employment Density (2050)

5.2 Travel Patterns and Traffic Operations

To estimate future traffic volumes on the roadway network, the 2021 daily traffic volumes and turning movement counts were grown at a 2% annual growth rate to future years 2040 and 2050. These future volume projections were used to analyze future capacity needs on study area roadways. The 2040 future daily traffic projections are shown on **Figure 25** and 2050 future daily traffic projections are shown on **Figure 26**.


The 2040 and 2050 daily traffic projections were used to evaluate roadway segment LOS, based on maximum daily volumes for each LOS previously shown in **Table 8**.

Figure 27 and **Figure 28** summarize the 2040 and 2050 segment capacity analysis, respectively. All roadway segments operate at an acceptable LOS (D or better) with the exception of:

- US 191 between the Arches National Park entrance road and SR 313 (2050 only)
- US 191 near the Canyonlands Field Airport (2050 only)
- US 191 between 4th East Street and 100 South (2050 only)
- 100 West between 100 South and 100 North (2050 only)
- 4th East between 300 South and Millcreek Drive (2050 only)
- US 191 south of Spanish Trail Road (2050 only)

The 2040 and 2050 roadway segment and intersection capacity analysis represent average daily traffic volumes. Roadways and intersections may experience unacceptable LOS in peak tourist times or event weekends.

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead


Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

Legend

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| 2040 Average Daily Traffic | Major Road |
| Less than 2,500 | Other Road |
| 2,500 to 5,000 | Railroads |
| 5,000 to 10,000 | Water |
| 10,000 to 15,000 | Park |
| Greater than 15,000 | City of Moab |
| | Study Area |

Figure 25. Future Daily Traffic (2040)

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead


Legend

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| 2050 Average Daily Traffic | Major Road |
| Less than 2,500 | Other Road |
| 2,500 to 5,000 | Railroads |
| 5,000 to 10,000 | Water |
| 10,000 to 15,000 | Park |
| Greater than 15,000 | City of Moab |
| | Study Area |

Figure 26. Future Daily Traffic (2050)



Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead



0 0.25 0.5 Miles



0 0.25 0.5 Miles

Legend

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| 2040 Level of Service | Other Road |
| C or Better | Railroads |
| D | Water |
| E | Park |
| F | City of Moab |
| Major Road | Study Area |





0 0.5 1 Miles



CITY OF **MOAB** UTAH

Figure 27. Future Roadway LOS Capacity Analysis (2040)

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Legend

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| 2050 Level of Service | Other Road |
| C or Better | Railroads |
| D | Water |
| E | Park |
| F | City of Moab |
| Major Road | Study Area |

0 0.5 1 Miles

Figure 28. Future Roadway LOS Capacity Analysis (2050)

2040 Intersection Capacity Analysis

The 2040 intersection capacity analysis was performed using the methodology and thresholds as described for the 2021 intersection analyses. Results indicate the six study intersections operate at an acceptable LOS in 2040 in both the AM and PM peak hours, with exception of the westbound left stop-controlled movement at 4th East and Millcreek Drive in the PM peak hour. The 2040 conditions analysis results are summarized in **Table 12** and Synchro analysis reports are in **Appendix B**.

Table 12. 2040 Intersection Level of Service Capacity Analysis

| Intersection | Level of Service [Total Delay (sec/veh)] | |
|---|--|--------------|
| | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| Spanish Valley Drive / Millcreek Drive | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [7] | A [8] |
| Eastbound Left/Right | B [10] | B [12] |
| Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road | | |
| All-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Total Intersection | A [9] | B [11] |
| 4th East Street / Millcreek Drive | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [8] | A [8] |
| Eastbound Left/Through/Right | D [28] | D [26] |
| Westbound Left | D [30] | F [92] |
| Westbound Through/Right | B [13] | B [13] |
| Southbound Left | A [8] | A [9] |
| Millcreek Drive / Murphy Lane | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Westbound Left/Right | B [11] | B [13] |
| Southbound Left | A [8] | A [8] |
| 4th East Street / 300 South | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [8] | A [9] |
| Eastbound Left | C [18] | C [19] |
| Eastbound Right | B [12] | B [15] |
| Spanish Valley Drive / Spanish Trail Road | | |
| All-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Total Intersection | A [9] | A [10] |

2050 Intersection Capacity Analysis

The 2050 analysis indicates the intersections operate at acceptable LOS in both the AM and PM peak hours with exception of the eastbound stop-controlled approach and westbound left stop-controlled movement at 4th East and Millcreek Drive in both the AM and PM peak hour. The 2050 conditions analysis results are summarized in **Table 13** and Synchro analysis reports are in **Appendix B**.

Table 13. 2050 Intersection Level of Service Capacity Analysis

| Intersection | Level of Service [Total Delay (sec/veh)] | |
|---|--|--------------|
| | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| Spanish Valley Drive / Millcreek Drive | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [8] | A [8] |
| Eastbound Left/Right | B [11] | B [14] |
| Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road | | |
| All-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Total Intersection | B [11] | B [14] |
| 4th East Street / Millcreek Drive | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [8] | A [8] |
| Eastbound Left/Through/Right | F [56] | E [45] |
| Westbound Left | F [58] | F [435] |
| Westbound Through/Right | C [16] | C [16] |
| Southbound Left | A [9] | B [10] |
| Millcreek Drive / Murphy Lane | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Westbound Left/Right | B [12] | C [15] |
| Southbound Left | A [8] | A [8] |
| 4th East Street / 300 South | | |
| Two-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Northbound Left | A [9] | A [10] |
| Eastbound Left | C [23] | C [23] |
| Eastbound Right | B [13] | C [20] |
| Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road | | |
| All-Way Stop-Controlled | | |
| Total Intersection | A [10] | B [11] |

5.3 Key Findings

- Population and employment are anticipated to grow at a rate faster than historically experienced in the study area. Population is expected to grow at a 0.95% annual growth rate while the historic annual growth (from 2000 to 2020) has been 0.67% and 0.52% annually for the County and City, respectively. Central Moab is anticipated to see a substantial increase in both population and employment in the coming decades.
- By 2040, congestion is anticipated to continue to increase on US 191. The intersection of 4th East and Millcreek Drive is projected to be congested during peak hours.
- By 2050, most of US 191 south of 100 South, as well as some surrounding roadway network in downtown Moab, are projected to be heavily congested.
- US 191 south of Spanish Trail Road and north of the Arches National Park entrance is anticipated to be congested.

6. Needs & Deficiencies

Transportation needs were identified from the review of previous plans and studies, stakeholder interviews, and the existing and future conditions technical analyses. They are categorized as safety, capacity, or active transportation needs and deficiencies.

6.1 Stakeholder Group Interviews

Stakeholder groups were identified with input from the project management team. Interviews were conducted to discuss their transportation-related concerns, specific needs, potential solutions, and their vision for transportation in the area. The following stakeholder groups were interviewed:

- Downtown business owners
- River/bicycle/shuttle business owners
- Universities/public schools
- Trails
- Emergency services
- Development (contractor/construction)
- Partner governments
- Citizens at large

Stakeholder interview participants were asked to provide feedback on the following questions regarding transportation in the area:

1. What do you view as the main mobility and transportation issues within Grand County and the City of Moab?
2. Are there specific intersections or roadways of most concern?
3. What is your vision for the future of transportation in Grand County and the City of Moab?
4. What solutions or projects are needed to realize the vision?

Stakeholder responses informed the needs and deficiencies presented in the following sections.

A detailed summary of the stakeholder group interviews is provided in **Appendix C**.

6.2 Safety Needs & Deficiencies

6.2.1 Crash Hot Spots

US 191 in Spanish Valley

The US 191 corridor in Spanish Valley had the highest number of fatal and serious injury crashes during the five-year analysis period, particularly between Spanish Trail Road and Millcreek Drive.

Downtown Moab

US 191 between Kane Creek Boulevard and 400 North is a crash hot spot for crashes of all types. This segment experienced several fatal and serious injury bicycle and pedestrian crashes, indicating a need for improved accommodation for active transportation users to reduce the frequency and severity of crashes involving non-motorists.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Arches National Park Entrance

There were three fatal crashes near the intersection of US 191 and the Arches National Park entrance. This area has a high number of tourists who are unfamiliar with the area, which may factor in these crashes.

6.2.2 Safety Needs Identified by Stakeholders

Stakeholders identified both general and location-specific safety needs. These are summarized in this section and shown in **Figure 29**.

Pedestrian Safety Throughout Downtown Moab

The downtown area is busy with pedestrians crossing US 191 to access destinations and businesses on both sides of the highway. Many are tourists who may be unfamiliar with the area. Stakeholder groups expressed the following concerns:

- Limited separation of users: trucks, vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians
- Speed of motorists entering downtown north and south of downtown Moab, as there is no real “transition zone” for motorists to slow down
- Parking congestion and parking inhibiting sight distances in downtown

Pedestrian Crossings on US 191

Stakeholders identified a need to improve pedestrian crossing locations along US 191 (see **Figure 29**), including crossings utilized to access schools and parks.

Access Control on US 191

Stakeholders commented that driveway access locations along US 191 need to be managed, or specific movements prohibited. There are locations along US 191 where driveways create conflicts for motorists and other users.

Other Specific Location Concerns

Other concerns identified by stakeholders include:

- Left turns at signalized intersections downtown need to be protected movements.
- Provide designated routes for school children to walk or bike, including Spanish Valley Drive, 500 West, and 100 West.
- Evaluate/improve intersection control (traffic signals or roundabouts) at the following intersections:
 - Intersections on 500 West, from US 191 to Kane Creek Boulevard
 - 100 West and 400 North
 - Sand Flats Road and Millcreek Drive
 - 300 South and 4th East
 - 4th East and Millcreek Drive
 - 200 North and US 191
 - 400 North and US 191
- Kane Creek Boulevard, west of the Kane Creek Boulevard and 500 West intersection, is a high pedestrian use area with no pedestrian infrastructure.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

- Additional crash hot spot locations:
 - US 191 and Spanish Trail Road intersection
 - US 191 and Dogwood Avenue area
- Deceleration turning and/or acceleration lanes to facilitate turning off and onto US 191 south of Moab in Spanish Valley.



6.3 Capacity Needs & Deficiencies

6.3.1 Capacity Analysis Needs

Existing (2021) Capacity Needs

Technical analysis results indicate that the roadway and specified intersections within the study area operate at acceptable LOS in average daily traffic conditions. Note that intersections operate under more congested conditions during peak tourism season.

Future (2040) Capacity Needs

All roadway segments operate at LOS C or better, with exception of the following segments which operate at LOS D, based on 2040 daily traffic volumes.

- US 191 between the Arches National Park entrance road and SR 313
- US 191 near the Canyonlands Field Airport
- US 191 between 4th East Street and 100 South
- 100 West between 100 South and 100 North
- 4th East between 300 South and Millcreek Drive

Technical analysis results indicate the six study intersections operate at acceptable LOS in 2040 in both the AM and PM peak hours with exception of the westbound left stop-controlled movement at 4th East and Millcreek Drive in the PM peak hour.

Future (2050) Capacity Needs

All roadway segments operate at LOS D or better, with exception of the following segments which operate at either LOS E or LOS F, based on 2050 daily traffic volumes.

- US 191 between the Arches National Park entrance road and SR 313
- US 191 near the Canyonlands Field Airport
- US 191 between 4th East and 100 South
- 100 West between 100 South and 100 North
- 4th East between 300 South and Millcreek Drive
- US 191 south of Spanish Trail Road

Technical analysis results indicate the six study intersections operate at acceptable LOS in both the AM and PM peak hours with exception of the eastbound stop-controlled approach and westbound left stop-controlled movement at 4th East and Millcreek Drive in both the AM and PM peak hours.

6.3.2 Capacity Needs Identified by Stakeholders

Both general and location-specific capacity needs were identified by stakeholders and are summarized in this section and shown in **Figure 30**.

US 191 Capacity

Stakeholders suggested a need to widen US 191 to five lanes (two lanes in each direction and a center two-way left-turn lane) south of the City of Moab from approximately Sage Drive to Spanish Trail Road.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Stakeholders expressed concern about shifting congestion to side streets off US 191 in the downtown area. For instance, 100 East, 100 West, or 500 West may not be able to accommodate large amounts of detoured traffic from US 191.

Recreation Destinations

Recreation destinations such as Arches National Park, Sand Flats Recreation Area, Colorado River, regional destinations such as Canyonlands National Park, Dead Horse Point State Park, soon to be opened Utahaptor State Park, and world-class mountain biking, hiking, and utility terrain vehicle trails create heavy visitor traffic in the study area during peak periods. Stakeholders expressed concern with congestion during peak tourism and visitor times.

Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs)


Street-legal OHVs are allowed on Moab streets to access trailheads and recreation areas. Access to popular OHV destinations is primarily on residential streets. Typically, OHVs are transported via trailers and trailer parking becomes a concern at trailheads, in public spaces, and in residential areas. Noise from OHVs is a significant concern to study area residents.

Truck Traffic

Stakeholders expressed concern regarding the truck traffic utilizing US 191 through downtown Moab, including impacts from congestion and noise.


Corridor Design and Integration

Corridor design limitations include the need for managed access improvements and integrated multimodal uses, particularly with the addition of frontage roads along US 191. Multimodal integration with corridors such as Spanish Valley Drive and Kane Creek Boulevard require design solutions to avoid conflicts. Safe alternative routes to US 191 need attention especially should the roadway become blocked.




Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead



0 0.25 0.5
 Miles



0 0.25 0.5
 Miles

Legend

- Spot Capacity Need (Blue dot)
- Corridor Capacity Need (Blue wavy line)
- Major Road (Thick grey line)
- Other Road (Thin grey line)
- Railroads (Black dashed line)
- Water (Blue area)
- Park (Green area)
- City of Moab (Orange area)
- Study Area (Red outline)



0 0.5 1
 Miles



CITY OF
MOAB
 UTAH

Figure 30. Capacity Needs and Deficiencies Identified by Stakeholders

6.4 Active Transportation Needs & Deficiencies

Active transportation needs were identified by stakeholders and are summarized in this section and shown in **Figure 31**.

Residents and tourists are interested in connecting to recreational facilities and trailheads, with destinations distributed throughout the region.

While farms, floodways, and dead-end streets create challenges to a well-connected street grid, there are multiple opportunities to connect routes for active transportation. In addition, several streets that connect residential and commercial areas have sufficient width to accommodate facilities for bicycles and pedestrians.

6.4.1 Challenges

US 191

US 191 is an obstacle for pedestrians and bicyclists in Grand County and the City of Moab. With traffic volumes and freight traffic, it is a difficult roadway to cross and travel along. In many areas, long distances exist between crossings (signalized or grade-separated), as shown in **Figure 32**. The Spanish Valley area lacks any signalized crossings for over four miles to the boundary of the study area and beyond. As development increases in this part of Grand County and destinations develop on both sides of US 191, the need for protected pedestrian crossings will increase. Even downtown, where there are more frequent signalized crossings, residents report difficulty crossing US 191.

Limited Street Connectivity

The study area is separated into two clusters of development, north and south, by a swath of development that contains many dead-end roads, large parcels, and few through streets. This area is bounded by 300 South and Millcreek Drive on its north edge, and US 191 and Holyoak Lane on its south edge. This lack of street grid or alternatives, forces many to use US 191 to reach their destination.

6.4.2 Bikeway Needs

North-South Bikeways

High traffic volumes, heavy freight traffic, and lack of dedicated bicycle facilities along US 191 through downtown make for a stressful bicycling experience. With the Moab Canyon Pathway paralleling US 191 from the north and major destinations such as the Utah State University (USU) in the south of town, there is a need to better accommodate north-south bicycle traffic through Moab. While improvements to US 191 are an option, it would require impacts to on-street parking and vehicle throughput in downtown. Parallel corridors such as 500 West, 100 West, and 100 East can potentially accommodate north-south connectivity but may require detours to overcome inconsistent street connectivity.

East-West Bikeways

Mill Creek Parkway, and its underpass, are the only locations along the bikeway network where bike facilities and a safe crossing of US 191 align to permit east-west travel. 300 South has a traffic signal, but the street grid ends on the west side of US 191. 200 North lacks a signal to cross US 191, and there is a gap in the bike lane network between US 191 and 100 West.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Kane Creek Boulevard between 500 West and US 191

High traffic volumes and speeds, as well as the lack of sidewalks or bicycle facilities, on Kane Creek Boulevard deter pedestrians and bicyclists from using this road. For bicyclists using 500 West to bypass downtown and avoid US 191, the stretch on Kane Creek Boulevard presents an obstacle to connecting to destinations on the south side of town.

6.4.3 Pedestrian Needs

Pedestrian Crossings of US 191

Destinations and residences on both sides of US 191 at 400 North and 200 North require additional crossings.

USU is constructing a 40-acre campus on the west side of US 191. Aggie Boulevard connects at the intersection of US 191 and Millcreek Drive. Considering the number of people that will travel to and from the campus, a signalized crossing would allow students to more comfortably reach Millcreek Drive to access downtown.

Many people cross between the signalized crossings at Kane Creek Boulevard and 4th East Street (a 0.5-mile distance) to reach commercial destinations. Higher speed traffic and the curve in the road lead to discomfort.

6.4.4 Trail and Pathway Needs

Colorado River Pathway Gap

The Colorado River Pathway is an important shared-use path connection between destinations along SR 128 and Moab, including campgrounds, river put-in sites, and the Porcupine Rim Trail. While the pathway was mostly completed in 2015, a gap forces pathway user onto the SR 128 shoulder between Grandstaff Canyon and the Goose Island campground.

Pathway Connectivity between the USU Campus and Downtown Moab

With the USU campus under construction, pedestrians and bicyclists will need facilities connecting the campus and the commercial destinations along US 191 south of downtown (City Market or the Moab Brewery, for example).

Sand Flats Road Connectivity

The Sand Flats Recreation Area has seen increases in traffic due to the recreational opportunities for hikers, mountain bikers, and OHVs. This growth has created conflicts between users on Sand Flats Road that are likely to increase once the proposed Lions Back Resort development is constructed. To mitigate these conflicts, accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists should be considered to connect to the trailheads and recreational destinations at the top of the hill.

Mill Creek Parkway Improvements and Extension

West of 100 West, the shared-use path along Mill Creek turns from paved to sand. Despite bridges across the creek, the path surface is too soft to allow use by bicyclists, who must dismount and walk through heavy sand. Additional development in this area presents an opportunity to extend this pathway network to the west and south.

Millcreek Drive and Spanish Valley Drive

While sidewalks are present throughout Moab, they are absent in Spanish Valley. Two critical streets provide connections for residents of Spanish Valley to the destinations in Moab – Millcreek

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Drive and Spanish Valley Drive. Together, these roads could provide a low-stress, parallel route to US 191. While a previous National Park Service study evaluated this corridor and recommended a side path along Spanish Valley Drive, a solution will require a long-term commitment to acquire the necessary right-of-way (ROW).

6.4.5 Supporting Infrastructure Needs

Comprehensive Bicycle Parking


Increasing tourism numbers and bike theft issues necessitate installation of bike parking throughout the downtown area. Parking solutions must consider fat bikes and e-bikes. Racks styles should accommodate a variety of frames, styles, and tire sizes. Given the cost of e-bikes and mountain bikes visitors bring to Moab, secure bike parking is vital to encourage recreational rides to seamlessly transition to post-ride dining and shopping.

Wayfinding Signage

Due to the area's tourism draw, many pedestrians and bicyclists in Moab are unfamiliar with the active transportation network. Wayfinding signage is needed to promote the available trails, connections to nearby trailheads, and designated bicycling routes including alternatives to US 191.

Speed Management along US 191 (Main Street)

Stakeholders expressed a desire for speed management elements on US 191 at the entrances to downtown. These elements would communicate to motorists that they are transitioning from a high-speed highway to a small-town Main Street. These improvements could take the form of landscaped medians, signage, speed-feedback signs, or curb extensions but would need to be carefully designed to accommodate the traffic volumes and freight functions of the corridor.



Study Area extends southwest on Kane Creek Boulevard to Pritchett Canyon Trailhead

Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

Legend

CHALLENGES
 (B1) US 191
 (B2) Limited Street Connectivity

BIKEWAY NEEDS
 (BN1) North-South Bikeways
 (BN2) East-West Bikeways
 (BN3) Kane Creek Blvd between 500 W and US 191

PEDESTRIAN NEEDS
 (P1) Safe Pedestrian Crossings of US 191 / Main Street


TRAIL AND PATHWAY NEEDS
 (T1) Colorado River Pathway Gap
 (T2) Pathway Connectivity between the New USU Campus and Moab
 (T3) Sand Flats Road Connectivity
 (T4) Mill Creek Parkway Improvements and Extension
 (T5) Mill Creek Dr and Spanish Valley Dr.

SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS
 (IN3) Traffic Calming Elements Along Main Street



Figure 31. Active Transportation Needs and Deficiencies Identified by Stakeholders

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



LEGEND

- Traffic Signal
- HAWK
- Roundabout
- CROSSING NEEDED



Figure 32. Crossing Distances

7. Stakeholder & Community Outreach

Community involvement is an important part of successful transportation planning. Community outreach is critical to identify community goals and context, and gain insight on desired and appropriate transportation solutions.

The UTMP effort engaged the community early in the process. Early engagement best enables input provided by stakeholders to influence decisions. Stakeholders represented government and elected officials, businesses, contractors, transportation advocates, conservation, surrounding governments, agencies, and USU.

Outreach for this project was accomplished through:

- **UTMP TAC:** Representatives of the UTMP TAC met regularly to discuss progress and issues, as well as to provide guidance for the plan.
- **Board of Supervisors/City Council Briefings:** Presentations on the UTMP were made to City of Moab and Grand County in July and August 2021 and the final plan will be presented in July 2022.
- **Stakeholder Interviews:** Information was gathered through discussions with various contacts representing different interests in Grand County and City of Moab related to transportation issues.
- **Stakeholder Survey:** An online stakeholder survey was conducted in late 2021 to obtain input on transportation needs in the community.
- **Community Meetings:** Community meetings were held to present findings of analysis, review potential projects and prioritization methodology, and review the UTMP report.

7.1 November 2021 Community Meeting

A community meeting to present findings and potential strategies and improvements was held November 10, 2021. Key findings from Working Paper #1, including needs and deficiencies and potential strategies were presented, followed by an open discussion with community members.

In addition, an online survey and comment form was distributed to stakeholders and the community. Responses provided valuable input that was considered by the project team in developing strategies and solutions moving.

Note that while the study team reviewed all comments submitted, several were not directly addressed as they pertain to issues outside of the scope, goals, or objectives of the UTMP.

Community and stakeholder feedback was recorded and is provided in **Appendix D**.

7.2 December 2021 Community and TAC Meeting

A TAC and community meeting were held December 16, 2021 to review proposed draft strategies and projects. The projects were based on the current and future conditions analysis, input from the November 2021 community meeting and survey, and project team and TAC input.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

The community meeting served to solicit public and stakeholder perspectives on potential project solutions and strategies. The information gathered from the community meeting, stakeholders, and the project TAC and study team helped refine the UTMP project list.

Community and stakeholder feedback was recorded and is provided in **Appendix D**.

7.3 June 2022 Community Meeting

A community meeting will be held in June 2022 to solicit community and feedback on the draft UTMP final report including project prioritization results. The information and comments received from the community meeting will assist the study team in refining the draft UTMP final report and in preparing a final UTMP report for presentation to the community and local jurisdictions.

7.4 Grand County Commission and Moab City Council

The final UTMP report will be presented for adoption to the Grand County Commission and City of Moab City Council in summer 2022.

8. Transportation Strategies

This section presents an overview of proposed transportation policies, strategies, and improvements to make it more convenient, comfortable, and safe to walk, bicycle, and drive within and throughout Grand County and the City of Moab.

Implementing changes requires a combination of guiding policies, network-wide strategies, and specific improvement projects.

8.1 Guiding Policies

Recommended policies to be considered by Grand County and the City of Moab are listed in **Table 14**.

Table 14. Recommended Transportation Policies

| Policy Name | Description |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Complete Streets Policy | Develop a Complete Streets Policy to guide future design of multimodal streets. The policy will emphasize County and City goals to accommodate all users and modes of the transportation system, particularly downtown (e.g., trucks, vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles). |
| Downtown Bicycle Parking Facilities | Develop a policy to require bicycle parking facilities with new or re-development throughout the downtown area. |
| Future Trail Acquisition | Formalize policy and code to require a review of potential trail easements in conjunction with new development or redevelopment reviews. |
| UDOT Frontage Road Study | Support implementation of UDOT Frontage Study in future development plans and consider streetscape improvements that enhance a multimodal environment and safety. |

8.1.1 Complete Streets Policy Information

Complete Streets is an approach to planning, designing, building, operating and maintaining streets that enable safety for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists of all ages and ability. A goal of a complete street is to reduce speeds on roadways to improve safety.

Complete Streets are a process and approach to street design or redesign – there is no singular design for Complete Streets. A complete street may look different in different community settings or areas. A complete street may include sidewalks, bike lanes (or wide shoulders), frequent and safe crosswalks, median islands, curb extensions, narrower travel lanes, roundabout, and more. Other streets should be designed to focus on freight and mobility needs. Not all streets can accommodate all users. Successful communities provide a network of streets that serve different users.

The Smart Growth America National Complete Streets Coalition provides resources for communities in drafting a complete streets policy. The National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) identified 10 elements of a comprehensive Complete Streets policy that serve as a model in developing Complete Streets, including the following:

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

1. **Vision and intent:** Includes an equitable vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets. Specifies need to create complete, connected network and specifies at least four modes, two of which must be biking or walking.
2. **Diverse users:** Benefits all users equitably, particularly vulnerable users and the most underinvested and underserved communities.
3. **Commitment in all projects and phases:** Applies to new, retrofit/reconstruction, maintenance, and ongoing projects.
4. **Clear, accountable exceptions:** Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval and public notice prior to exceptions being granted.
5. **Jurisdiction:** Requires interagency coordination between government departments and partner agencies on Complete Streets.
6. **Design:** Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines and sets a time frame for their implementation.
7. **Land use and context sensitivity:** Considers the surrounding community's current and expected land use and transportation needs.
8. **Performance measures:** Establishes performance standards that are specific, equitable, and available to the public.
9. **Project selection criteria:** Provides specific criteria to encourage funding prioritization for Complete Streets implementation.
10. **Implementation steps:** Includes specific next steps for implementation of the policy.

Source: <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/elements-complete-streets-policy/>




8.2 Transportation Improvement Strategies

Transportation improvement strategies are separated into three categories:





1. Active transportation improvement strategies refer to those that improve conditions for walking and bicycling. Examples of active transportation strategies and their benefits and considerations are summarized in **Table 15**.
2. Roadway improvement strategies focus on those that improve connectivity and safety for those driving in and around the Moab area. Examples of roadway-focused improvements and their benefits and considerations are reported in **Table 16**.
3. Parking and transit improvement strategies, and their benefits and considerations are reported in **Table 17**.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN





Table 15. Active Transportation Strategies

| Active Transportation Strategy | | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|--|--|---|---|
| Pedestrian Facilities | | | |
| Sidewalks |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide dedicated space for people to walk, run, skate, bike, etc. to help improve pedestrian safety • Improve transportation network connectivity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize locations near transit stops, schools, parks, public buildings, and other areas with high concentration of pedestrians • Street furniture should not restrict pedestrian flow |
| PHB / HAWK Signal |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve pedestrian safety crossing at mid-block or uncontrolled intersections • Improve transportation network connectivity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-lane or greater roadways with speed limits above 40 mph and annual average daily traffic (AADT) greater than 9,000 • Install with high-visibility crosswalks, advance yield/stop signage and pavement markings • The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) provides guidance on pedestrian volume warrants, design features, and restrictions associated with a PHB |
| Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For use at uncontrolled pedestrian and school crosswalk locations to improve pedestrian safety and increase motorist awareness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-lane or greater roadways with speeds greater than 30 mph and daily traffic less than 15,000 or speeds less than 40 mph for daily traffic greater than 15,000 • Three-lane roadways with speeds less than 40 mph • Four-lane or greater roadways with speeds less than 40 mph and daily traffic less than 15,000 or speeds less than 30 mph for daily traffic greater than 15,000 |




UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Active Transportation Strategy | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|---|--|---|
| <p>In-Street Pedestrian Crossing Sign</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remind roadway users of laws regarding ROW | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended for multi-lane roadways where AADT is greater than 10,000 or on two- to three-lane roads where speed limits are 30 mph or less Cannot be implemented at signalized locations Other crossing improvements are required to prevent an increase in pedestrian crashes |
| <p>Yield/Stop Here to Pedestrian Sign</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide advance warning to drivers of a marked crosswalk | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement along with Advance Yield/Stop pavement markings |
| <p>Pedestrian Refuge Island</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breaks up walking distance and allows pedestrians to focus on one direction at a time | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended for roadways with raised median, especially for roadways with more than two lanes in each direction |
| <p>Advance Yield/Stop Pavement Markings</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves pedestrian visibility by providing advance warning to drivers of marked crosswalk | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended at uncontrolled crossings for three-lane roadways with speeds less than 30 mph, and daily traffic less than 9,000 Implement with Advance Yield/Stop signage, RRFB, and PHB Restrict parking between yield line and crosswalk to allow for better visibility Effectiveness depends on motorist compliance with marked yield lines |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Active Transportation Strategy | | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|---|---|---|--|
| High-Visibility Crosswalks |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves pedestrian visibility by providing advance warning to drivers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended for two- to three-lane roadways, with speeds less than 30 mph, and AADT less than 9,000 Can be considered for two- to four-lane roadways with speed less than 40 mph, and AADT less than 15,000 with combination with other improvements such as advance yield/stop signage and pavement markings, pedestrian refuge islands, RRFB, and PHB |
| Raised Pedestrian Crossings |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves safety for pedestrians by increasing visibility for drivers and reduces speed of vehicles | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended as an uncontrolled crossing for two- to three-lane roadways with speeds less than 30 mph and AADT less than 9,000 Attention should be paid to impacts on drainage May be inappropriate on curves or steep roadway grades |
| Curb Extension |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves safety for pedestrians at an intersection Shortens required crossing distances Increases visibility and reduces speed of turning vehicles | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate where there is an on-street parking lane and transit and bicyclist would travel outside curb edge Curb extension should not extend more than six feet from curb Consider turning needs for larger vehicles such as school buses or emergency vehicles Consider impacts to drainage |
| Pedestrian Overpasses/ Underpasses (Tunnel) |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides physically separated crossings from vehicular traffic Provide safe crossing over/under connectivity barriers such as freeways, railways, and natural barriers Improves transportation network connectivity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use sparingly and as a measure of last resort Pedestrian will not use if there is a more direct route Lighting, drainage, graffiti removal, and security are major concern with underpasses Long ramps may be necessary to accommodate wheelchairs |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




| Active Transportation Strategy | | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Separated Shared-Use Path |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides separated space for multimodal users Creates additional transportation network connections | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paths should be designed to ensure safety among all path users caused by high use and differences speeds. Typical widths of 10-14 feet are desirable |
| Bicycle Facilities | | | |
| Bicycle Signage and Pavement Markings |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase motorist awareness Create designated space for bicyclists Provide warning and/or regulatory information to all road users | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signage may include bicycle lane, share the road, bicycle guide information, etc. Intersection markings may include dashed lines, color (green) pavement or bicycle box Avoid overuse of signs, which may contribute to non-compliance or visual clutter |
| Bicycle Lanes |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides dedicated portion of the roadway for preferential use by bicyclist May visually narrow the roadway to encourage reduced vehicle speeds | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide adequate bicycle lane width: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five feet from face of curb Six to seven feet for locations with higher bicycle traffic, higher vehicles speed, volume, or percentage large vehicles Provide additional space between bicycle lane and on-street parking Minimize paving joints in bicycle lanes Marked crosswalk should extend across bicycle lanes |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN





| Active Transportation Strategy | | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Separated Bicycle Lanes (Cycle Tracks or Protected Bicycle Lanes) |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases safety by physically separating bicyclists from vehicle traffic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum width of separated bicycle lane is five feet, with a minimum three-foot buffer At intersections, make sure to have signage and pavement markings to improve awareness and provide guidance through the intersection Consider separation such as jersey barriers or knock-down posts |
| Paved Shoulders |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates separated space for bicyclists | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum width of shoulder is five feet Provide rideable space if rumble strips are present Create accommodations for bicycles through intersections |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Table 16. Roadway Improvement Strategies




| Roadway Improvement Strategy | | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Traffic Signals |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides gaps in traffic flow for pedestrians to cross roadways | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A pedestrian phase should be automatically active for locations where pedestrian traffic is regular and frequent |
| System/Network Connectivity |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase multimodal usability for a transportation network system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider connections for all users (roadway, sidewalks, transit, etc.) |
| Install Red Curb Markings |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Install red curb to increase corner sight distance at intersections. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Red curb should be installed 10-25 feet from corner; additional length may be needed to accommodate corner sight distance |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN




| Roadway Improvement Strategy | | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Roundabouts |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help reduce vehicle speeds • Improve safety by eliminating left-turns and angled collisions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider bicycle/pedestrian volumes, design vehicle, available ROW • Best where traffic flows are balanced on all approaches or at intersections with more than four approaches • Not suitable for high-speed roadways or for intersection of two multi-lane roads • Consider mini-traffic circles or smaller-scale roundabouts on low-speed and volume roadways |
| Sight Distance Improvements |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve visibility and awareness of all users by removing sight distance obstructions (e.g., overgrown vegetation, on-street parking) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is on-street parking, should determine whether on-street parking is necessary or what is the most appropriate kind of parking • Determine if skewed intersection should be realigned |
| Access Management |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase safety by reducing the number of potential conflict points between pedestrians/bicyclists and motorists | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May assist to determine closing/consolidating or restricting movements at driveways |
| Road Diet/Lane Reductions |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfigure roadway cross-section to optimize street space to benefit all users | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four to three-lane conversion should be considered for roadways with documented safety concerns or prioritizes bicycling and walking routes • Community outreach is helpful to educate and gather input • Consider how roadway diet/lane reduction may affect alternative and neighboring routes |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Table 17. Parking and Transit Strategies

| Parking/Transit Strategy | | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Parking Restriction |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking restriction may remove parked vehicles that can obstruct sightlines • Can increase visibility of pedestrian crossing the road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate with community stakeholders about removing parking spaces • Important to enforce parking restriction with signage, paint, and pavement markings |
| On-Street Parking Enhancements |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May serve as traffic calming (lane narrowing) to reduce vehicle speeds • Provides a buffer between sidewalk edge and motorist traffic, creating a safer environment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May take up roadway space desired for other uses such as bicycle lanes • Can be combined with curb extensions (or bulb-outs) to increase safety |
| Transit Stop Improvements |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase usability of the transportation system • Provides safe and convenient access for people to wait | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide comfort items such as shelter, places to sit, trash bins, and schedule information • Ensure a clear and visible path for pedestrians |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Parking/Transit Strategy | | Purpose/Benefit | Considerations |
|---|--|---|---|
| Access to Transit |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide safe and convenient access for all transportation network users | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure stops are connected to sidewalks • Locate stops on the far side of the intersection where possible • Review Americans with Disabilities Access |
| Wayfinding |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct pedestrians and bicyclists to the best routes connecting destinations or circumventing obstacles | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate use of both regulatory and warning signs • Avoid overuse of signs, which may contribute to non-compliance or visual clutter |
| Freight Shuttles/ Loading and Unloading Areas |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce truck traffic in congested and heavy pedestrian areas (downtown) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location with access for large trucks and ability to store/warehouse items before final destination |

9. Recommended Improvements

Dozens of potential transportation improvements were evaluated considering existing and future conditions needs analysis, TAC, community and stakeholder input, and transportation strategies. The evaluation yielded 38 transportation improvement projects categorized as follows:

- 19 active transportation
- 14 roadway
- 3 parking
- 2 transit

A project information summary sheet was prepared for each improvement that provides the following information:

- Project Name
- Project Category
- Project Description
- Project Length
- Jurisdiction
- Planning Horizon: Near (1-6 years), Mid (7-12 years), and Long (13+ years)
- Cost Estimate (planning level)
- Priority (TAC and/or community input)
- Other Notes and Considerations

Transportation project information summary sheets are provided in **Appendix E** for active transportation improvement projects and **Appendix F** for roadway improvement projects.

9.1 Planning-Level Cost Estimates

Planning-level cost estimates for each project were prepared utilizing the following sources:

- UDOT's project cost estimator tool
- Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (Completed 2021)
- Moab City Roadway Evaluation and Facilities Plan (Completed 2020)
- Recently completed construction projects in the State of Utah
- Input from the project team

Cost estimates account for inflation, preliminary engineering, ROW (when applicable), a contingency, and represent a future estimated cost for the designated horizon year.

9.2 Active Transportation Improvement Projects and Assessments

A total of 16 active transportation projects and 3 planning assessments were identified. Projects include pedestrian and bicycle facilities, shared-use paths, and planning assessments to improve connectivity, safety, and mobility for all users.

The active transportation improvement projects and assessments are shown in **Table 18**. The project number corresponds to the active transportation projects shown in **Figure 33**.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Table 18. Active Transportation Improvement Projects and Assessments

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Project Length | Jurisdiction(s) | Planning Horizon | Cost Estimate | Priority | Other Notes (Issues, Concerns, ROW Considerations, etc.) |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|--|
| AT1 | US 191 Sidewalk Improvements: Fourth East to Bittle Lane | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk to connect existing gap along US 191 from Fourth East to Bittle Lane | 425 ft. | City; UDOT | Near (1-6 years) | \$70,000 | Low | Will require coordination with UDOT |
| AT2 | Dogwood Avenue and US 191 Area Crossing | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing on US 191 near Dogwood Avenue (PHB/HAWK crossing) | N/A | City; UDOT | Near (1-6 years) | \$300,000 | High | Will require coordination with UDOT |
| AT3 | Millcreek Drive Sidewalk Improvements | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk where missing on Millcreek Drive, Spanish Valley Drive to bridge north of Lasal Road | 0.93 mi | City; County | Mid (7-12 years) | \$800,000 | High | |
| AT4 | Holyoak Sidewalk Connection | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk along Holyoak Lane from Mill Creek Drive to Wagner Avenue | 0.47 mi | City | Mid (7-12 years) | \$400,000 | Low | |
| AT5 | US 191 at Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard Crossing | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct tunnel at US 191 and Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard intersection to cross US 191 | N/A | City | Long (13+ years) | \$1,600,000 | Medium | Will require coordination with UDOT |
| AT6 | 100 East Bicycle Lanes | Bicycle Facilities | Install bicycle lane pavement markings on 100 East from 200 North to Millcreek Trail and on to City Market | 0.68 mi | City | Near (1-6 years) | \$60,000 | High | Recommended in Moab Downtown Plan (2019) |
| AT7 | Kane Creek Boulevard Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to Kane Creek Recreation Parking (end of pavement) | 3.87 mi | City; County | Long (13+ years) | \$2,860,000 | High | Similar recommendation in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |
| AT8 | Kane Creek Boulevard Bicycle Lanes Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Stripe bicycle lanes and construct paved shoulders (if needed) on Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to 500 West | 0.77 mi | City | Mid (7-12 years) | \$590,000 | Medium | Similar recommendation in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |
| AT9 | Murphy Lane Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Murphy Lane from Millcreek Drive to Spanish Trail Road | 2.51 mi | County | Mid (7-12 years) | \$1,860,000 | Low | |


UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Project Length | Jurisdiction(s) | Planning Horizon | Cost Estimate | Priority | Other Notes (Issues, Concerns, ROW Considerations, etc.) |
|----------------|---|---|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|---|
| AT10 | Shared-Use Path Construction and Connections; Pack Creek and Mill Creek | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a shared-use path that connects the pedestrian hybrid beacon on US 191 at City Market crossing Pack Creek to Kane Creek Boulevard and north to 300 South; also connect to 100 West | 0.40 mi | City | Mid (7-12 years) | \$630,000 | High | |
| AT11 | Colorado River Shared-Use Path Gap | Shared-Use Paths | Construct shared-use path along Colorado River between Grandstaff Canyon and Goose Island (existing gap) | 0.66 mi | County | Off the shelf | \$4,530,000 | High | Will require coordination with UDOT |
| AT12 | Spanish Valley Drive Shared-Use Path | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a shared-use path on Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to South County line | 5.10 mi | County | Off the shelf | \$8,500,000 | High | Partially funded; to be implemented as development continues; recommended in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |
| AT13 | Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead Connections | Shared-Use Paths | Construct trail connections to Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead (Powerhouse Lane) to Pack Creek and/or Millcreek pathways | 1.11 mi | City; County | Long (13+ years) | \$1,025,000 | Low | |
| AT14 | Sand Flats Recreation Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Access | Shared-Use Paths | Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to connect Sand Flats Recreation to downtown. | 2.18 mi | City; County | Near (1-6 years) | \$2,000,000 | Low | May be completed concurrently with developments in the area |
| AT15 | Sand Flats Road Shared-Use Path | Shared-Use Paths | Construct shared-use path from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | 7.0 mi | County | Long (13+ years) | \$6,500,000 | Low | |
| AT16 | San Miguel Connection | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a connection between San Miguel north to path over Pack Creek, eventually connecting to Millcreek Drive | 350 ft. | City | Mid (7-12 years) | \$475,000 | Medium | |
| AT Plan 1 | 500 West Safe Routes to School Improvements | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Evaluate bike lane and parking needs on 500 West from 400 North to US 191 to provide a "Safe Route to School" | N/A | City | Off the shelf | \$75,000 | Medium | |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Project Length | Jurisdiction(s) | Planning Horizon | Cost Estimate | Priority | Other Notes (Issues, Concerns, ROW Considerations, etc.) |
|----------------|--------------------------------|---|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|--|
| AT Plan 2 | 100 West Corridor Assessment | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Complete a corridor assessment for 100 West from Swanny City Park to 100 South including pedestrian and bicycle crossings, sidewalks, capacity improvements, and bike lane needs | N/A | City | Off the shelf | \$75,000 | Medium | |
| AT Plan 3 | Pack Creek Drainage Assessment | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Complete an assessment/feasibility study for improvements to the Pack Creek drainage including a bike trail, fire break, access, and floodway considerations | N/A | City; County | Off the shelf | \$300,000 | High | |

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead

See Inset Map Below

Inset Map

Legend

- Railroads
- Water
- Park
- City of Moab
- Study Area
- Proposed Projects
- Proposed Projects

Figure 33. Active Transportation Improvement Projects



9.3 Roadway Improvement Projects and Assessments

A total of 10 roadway projects and 4 roadway planning assessments were identified. Roadway projects include roadway connections, intersection control, roadway improvements, and planning assessments to improve connectivity, safety, and mobility for all users.

The roadway improvement projects and assessments are shown in **Table 19**. The project number corresponds to the projects shown in **Figure 34**.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN


Table 19. Roadway Improvement Projects and Assessments

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Project Length | Jurisdiction(s) | Planning Horizon | Cost Estimate | Priority | Other Notes (Issues, Concerns, ROW Considerations, etc.) |
|----------------|--|----------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|--|
| R1 | Park Drive Connection | Roadway Connection | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Park Drive, Opal Avenue to Park Road | 300 ft. | City | Mid (7-12 years) | \$180,000 | Low | |
| R2 | Walnut Lane Street Connection | Roadway Connection | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Walnut Lane to Orchard Park Lane (Hospital Road) | 100 ft. | City | Mid (7-12 years) | \$60,000 | Medium | |
| R3 | US 191 to Spanish Valley Drive Connection near Beeman Road | Roadway Connection | Construct new east-west street connection between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road | 0.5 mi | County | Mid (7-12 years) | \$2,560,000 | Medium | Similar recommendation in Spanish Valley Transportation Plan (2008); requires coordination with UDOT |
| R4 | Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at Millcreek Drive and US 191 intersection | N/A | City; UDOT | Near (1-6 years) | \$650,000 | Medium | Requires coordination with UDOT |
| R5 | Meador Drive and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at US 191/Meador Drive | N/A | County | Mid (7-12 years) | \$775,000 | Medium | Similar recommendation in US 191 Corridor Preservation Study (2015); requires coordination with UDOT |
| R6 | 200 North and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at US 191 at 200 North intersection | N/A | City; UDOT | Near (1-6 years) | \$650,000 | High | Recommended in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021); requires coordination with UDOT |
| R7 | West Moab Boat Dock Road and US 191 Improvements | Roadway Improvement | Identify and construct safety improvements to Moab Boat Dock Road intersection at US 191 | N/A | County; UDOT | Near (1-6 years) | \$50,000-\$200,000 | High | Requires coordination with UDOT |


UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Project Length | Jurisdiction(s) | Planning Horizon | Cost Estimate | Priority | Other Notes (Issues, Concerns, ROW Considerations, etc.) |
|----------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|--|
| R8 | US 191 Gemini Bridges and Bar M Access Improvements | Roadway Improvement | Realignment of access roads on US 191 at Gemini Bridges and Bar M (AKA Old Highway, Moab Canyon) | 500 ft. | County; UDOT | Mid (7-12 years) | \$325,000 | Medium | Requires coordination with UDOT |
| R9 | Sand Flats Road Improvement | Roadway Improvement | Roadway improvement (paving) on Sand Flats Road from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | 7.0 mi | County | Long (13+ years) | \$30,000,000 | Low | See Section 10.3, RAISE and FLAP grant opportunities |
| R10 | Kane Creek Boulevard | Roadway Improvement | Reconstruct and widen Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to Kane Creek Recreation Parking; include intersection improvements to Kane Creek Boulevard and 500 West | 4.64 mi | City; County | Long (13+ years) | \$20,000,000 | High | Similar recommendation in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |
| Roadway Plan 1 | Millcreek Drive Corridor Assessment and Preliminary Plan | Roadway Planning Assessment | Prepare preliminary plans for the Millcreek Drive from Spanish Valley Drive to Fourth East, including the Fourth East/300 South intersection. Plans may identify improvements to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millcreek Drive / Spanish Valley Drive • Millcreek Drive / Murphy Lane • Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road • Millcreek Drive / Fourth East • Fourth East / 300 South | 1.65 mi | City; County | Off the shelf | \$250,000 | High | |
| Roadway Plan 2 | Fourth East Improvements | Roadway Planning Assessment | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements (intersection and segment) to Fourth E. Street between 100 North and US 191 | 1.18 mi | City | Off the shelf | \$100,000 | Medium | |
| Roadway Plan 3 | Spanish Valley Drive | Roadway Planning Assessment | Conduct multimodal assessment to Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to County Line; Spanish Valley Drive is alternative route to US 191 during incidents | 5.10 mi | County | Off the shelf | \$100,000 | High | Similar recommendation in Spanish Valley Transportation Plan (2008) |
| Roadway Plan 4 | Spanish Trail Road | Roadway Planning Assessment | Conduct multimodal assessment to Spanish Trail Road from US 191 to Murphy Lane | 0.95 mi | County | Off the shelf | \$100,000 | Medium | |

Grand County & City of Moab
UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN



Study Area extends east on Sand Flats Road to the East Porcupine Rim Trailhead



Legend

- Railroads
- Water
- Park
- City of Moab
- Study Area
- Proposed Projects
- Proposed Projects



Figure 34. Roadway Improvement Projects

9.4 Parking and Transit Improvement Projects

A total of 3 parking and 2 transit-related projects were identified. Projects include improvements to parking and transit facilities that improve parking, access management, multimodal options, and overall mobility.

The parking and transit improvement projects are shown in **Table 20**.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Table 20. Parking and Transit Improvement Projects

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Project Length | Jurisdiction(s) | Planning Horizon | Cost Estimate | Priority | Other Notes (Issues, Concerns, ROW Considerations, etc.) |
|----------------|--|------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------|---|
| P1 | Oversized Lot Parking Improvements | Parking | Construct oversized parking lots north and south of downtown Moab | N/A | City; County | Mid (7-12 years) | \$660,000 | Medium | Requires ROW acquisition; recommended in Moab Parking Management Study (2019) |
| P2 | Arches National Park Overflow Parking Area | Parking | Parking at UMTRA site for Arches National Park/City Shuttles/etc. | N/A | County | Long (13+ years) | \$3,300,000 | Low | Environmental clearance and coordination with National Parks Service |
| P3 | US 191 Parking | Parking | Evaluate no parking zones on US 191 to limit parking inhibiting sight distances; include freight parking | N/A | City; UDOT | Off the shelf | \$50,000 | Medium | Evaluation for future potential improvements; will require coordination with UDOT |
| T1 | Multimodal Transfer Center | Transit | Construct a multimodal transfer center near Canyonlands Regional Airport, connecting Moab Canyon Pathway, SR 128 Trail, SR 313, and shuttle services | N/A | County | Long (13+ years) | \$8,000,000 | Low | Recommended in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |
| T2 | Grand County Shuttle System | Transit | Implement shuttles (transit, medical, retail, etc.) to serve key destinations including Arches, Airport, Hospital, USU, Spanish Valley/Spanish Trail Road, Rocky Mountaineer Hub, etc. | N/A | City; County | Mid (7-12 years) | \$230,000 (annually) | Medium | |

9.5 Network-Wide Strategies

The UTMP identifies network-wide projects that requiring further scoping. General network-wide strategies to be considered by Grand County and the City of Moab are listed in **Table 21**.

Table 21. Recommended General Strategies

| Strategy Name | Project Description |
|--|--|
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Awareness Campaign | Prepare education materials relating to safe practices by motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists when using County or City streets. The materials can be distributed at hotels and visitor centers. |
| Downtown Wayfinding Signage Plan | Prepare a downtown signage wayfinding plan. The plan would identify the destinations, and locations for wayfinding signage. Destinations could include trails, trailheads, and on-street cycling routes alternatives to US 191 in downtown Moab. |
| Wayfinding Signage (Parking) Plan | Prepare a wayfinding plan to city-owned parking lots and available spaces. |
| Transportation Technology Plan | Identify opportunities to implement technology-based infrastructure to improve traffic operations and safety. These could include vehicle detection, communication, and travel information signs. |
| Multimodal Nodes | Consider future opportunities for multimodal interaction at key public/private spaces and include shuttles, bicycles, pedestrians, and links to trail heads. Also consider a conflict management strategy that recognizes different users (vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, OHVs, etc.), common corridors, traffic patterns, loading/transfer areas, trailheads, and potential mode conflicts. |
| Rail Service Feasibility Study | Conduct a feasibility study to evaluate short rail kickouts/spurs connecting the future parking at UMTRA project site to the airport that may include passenger rail service. |
| East-West Spanish Valley Connectivity | Conduct a study to identify needed future east-west connections in Spanish Valley, particularly to/from US 191. |
| Freight Transfer Plan | Conduct a feasibility study to evaluate need for and location outside of downtown Moab for a freight, goods, and cargo transfer station. The facility would facilitate transfer of freight, goods, and cargo from large trucks to local delivery vehicles, easing congestion on US 191. |
| Pavement Maintenance and Preservation Program (Grand County) | Establish a comprehensive pavement maintenance program. |
| Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) | Consider ITS in all project development. ITS components include technologies that improve safety, efficiency, or sustainability of the transportation network (cameras, communication, fiber, message signs, etc.). |
| Shared Use Path Design Standards | Evaluate and update standards, guidelines, and criteria for shared use path construction to reflect best practices. The standards will reflect a range of users including bicycles, pedestrians, scooters, e-bikes and road separation. |

10. Prioritization & Implementation

10.1 Prioritization Methodology

A project prioritization methodology was developed for the UTMP to quantitatively score and rank recommended active transportation and roadway projects. The process considers the impacts of improvements on the transportation network for six categories: safety, livability and economic growth, traffic congestion and operations, implementation, preservation and resiliency, and community and stakeholder input.

A summary of the prioritization structure for roadway and active transportation projects is provided in **Figure 35**. Detailed information on each element’s scoring and weighting used in the prioritization process is provided in **Appendix F**.



Figure 35. Roadway and Active Transportation Prioritization Elements

10.2 Project Prioritizations

10.2.1 Active Transportation Project Prioritization

Active transportation projects are shown in **Table 22** in prioritized order. The detailed project inputs to the project prioritization categories used in the project prioritization process for active transportation projects is provided in **Appendix F**.

Table 22. Prioritized Active Transportation Projects

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|--|---------------------|
| AT10 | Shared Use Path Construction and Connections; Pack Creek and Mill Creek | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a shared use path that connects the pedestrian hybrid beacon on US 191 at City Market crossing Pack Creek to Kane Creek Boulevard and north to 300 South; also connect to 100 West | 1 |
| AT2 | Dogwood Avenue and US 191 Area Crossing | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing on US 191 near Dogwood Avenue (PHB/HAWK crossing) | 2 |
| AT5 | US 191 at Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct tunnel at US 191 and Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard intersection to cross US 191 | 3 |
| AT1 | US 191 Sidewalk Improvements: Fourth East to Bittle Lane | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk to connect existing gap along US 191 from Fourth East to Bittle Lane | 4 |
| AT12 | Spanish Valley Drive Shared-Use Path | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a shared use path on Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to South County line | 5 |
| AT4 | Holyoak Sidewalk Connection | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk along Holyoak Lane from Mill Creek Drive to Wagner Avenue | 6 |
| AT8 | Kane Creek Boulevard Bicycle Lanes Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Stripe bicycle lanes and construct paved shoulders (if needed) on Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to 500 West | 7 |
| AT14 | Sand Flats Recreation Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Access | Shared-Use Paths | Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to connect Sand Flats Recreation to downtown. | 8 |
| AT3 | Millcreek Drive Sidewalk Improvements | Pedestrian Facilities | Construct sidewalk where missing on Millcreek Drive, Spanish Valley Drive to bridge north of Lasal Road | 9 |
| AT6 | 100 East Bicycle Lanes | Bicycle Facilities | Install bicycle lane pavement markings on 100 East from 200 North to Millcreek Trail and on to City Market | 10 |
| AT11 | Colorado River Shared-Use Path Gap | Shared-Use Paths | Construct shared use path along Colorado River between Grandstaff Canyon and Goose Island (existing gap) | 11 |
| AT16 | San Miguel Connection | Shared-Use Paths | Construct a connection between San Miguel north to path over Pack Creek, eventually connecting to Millcreek Drive | 12 |
| AT9 | Murphy Lane Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Murphy Lane from Millcreek Drive to Spanish Trail Road | 13 |
| AT7 | Kane Creek Boulevard Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements | Bicycle Facilities | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to Kane Creek Recreation Parking (end of pavement) | 14 |
| AT13 | Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead Connections | Shared-Use Paths | Construct trail connections to Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead (Powerhouse Lane) to Pack Creek and/or Millcreek pathways | 15 |
| AT15 | Sand Flats Road Shared-Use Path | Shared-Use Paths | Construct shared-use path from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | 16 |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

10.2.2 Roadway Project Prioritization

Roadway projects are shown in **Table 23** in prioritized order. The detailed project inputs to the project prioritization categories used in the project prioritization process for roadway projects is provided in **Appendix F**.

Table 23. Prioritized Roadway Projects

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|--|----------------------|---|---------------------|
| R6 | 200 North and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at US 191 at 200 North intersection | 1 |
| R10 | Kane Creek Boulevard | Roadway Improvement | Reconstruct and widen Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to Kane Creek Recreation Parking; include intersection improvements to Kane Creek Boulevard and 500 West | 2 |
| R7 | West Moab Boat Dock Road and US 191 Improvements | Roadway Improvement | Identify and construct safety improvements to Moab Boat Dock Road intersection at US 191 | 3 |
| R4 | Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at Millcreek Drive and US 191 intersection | 4 |
| R8 | US 191 Gemini Bridges and Bar M Access Improvements | Roadway Improvement | Realignment of access roads on US 191 at Gemini Bridges and Bar M (AKA Old Highway, Moab Canyon) | 5 |
| R2 | Walnut Lane Street Connection | Roadway Connection | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Walnut Lane to Orchard Park Lane (Hospital Road) | 6 |
| R5 | Meador Drive and US 191 Traffic Signal | Intersection Control | Construct traffic signal at US 191/Meador Drive | 7 |
| R3 | US 191 to Spanish Valley Drive Connection near Beeman Road | Roadway Connection | Construct new east-west street connection between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road | 8 |
| R1 | Park Drive Connection | Roadway Connection | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Park Drive, Opal Avenue to Park Road | 9 |
| R9 | Sand Flats Road Improvement | Roadway Improvement | Roadway improvement (paving) on Sand Flats Road from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | 10 |

10.2.3 Parking and Transit Project Prioritization

Parking and transit project improvements are shown in **Table 24** and were prioritized by the project team and TAC.

Table 24. Prioritized Parking and Transit Projects

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|--|------------------|--|---------------------|
| P1 | Oversized Lot Parking Improvements | Parking | Construct oversized parking lots north and south of downtown Moab | 1 |
| P3 | US 191 Parking | Parking | Evaluate no parking zones on US 191 to limit parking inhibiting sight distances; include freight parking | 2 |
| T1 | Multimodal Transfer Center | Transit | Construct a multimodal transfer center near Canyonlands Regional Airport, connecting Moab Canyon Pathway, SR 128 Trail, SR 313, and shuttle services | 3 |
| P2 | Arches National Park Overflow Parking Area | Parking | Construct parking at UMTRA project site for Arches National Park/City Shuttles/etc. | 4 |
| T2 | Grand County Shuttle System | Transit | Implement shuttles (transit, medical, retail, etc.) to serve key destinations including Arches, Airport, Hospital, USU, Spanish Valley/Spanish Trail Road, Rocky Mountaineer Hub, etc. | 5 |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

10.2.4 Planning Assessments Prioritization

Roadway and active transportation planning assessments were prioritized based on input from the project team and TAC. The planning assessments should be completed as funds are available. These projects will inform future project scoping and development. The County and City can coordinate efforts to complete planning assessments that span multiple jurisdictions.

The planning assessments were prioritized by the project team and TAC. Active transportation assessments are prioritized in **Table 25** and roadway assessments are prioritized in **Table 26**.

Table 25. Prioritized Active Transportation Planning Assessments

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|---|---|--|---------------------|
| AT Plan 3 | Pack Creek Drainage Assessment | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Complete an assessment/feasibility study for improvements to the Pack Creek drainage including a bike trail, fire break, access, and floodway considerations | 1 |
| AT Plan 1 | 500 West Safe Routes to School Improvements | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Evaluate bike lane and parking needs on 500 West from 400 North to US 191 to provide a "Safe Route to School" | 2 |
| AT Plan 2 | 100 West Corridor Assessment | Active Transportation Planning Assessment | Complete a corridor assessment for 100 West from Swanny City Park to 100 South including pedestrian and bicycle crossings, sidewalks, capacity improvements, and bike lane needs | 3 |

Table 26. Prioritized Roadway Planning Assessments

| Project Number | Project Name | Project Category | Project Description | Prioritized Ranking |
|----------------|--|--------------------|--|---------------------|
| Roadway Plan 1 | Millcreek Drive Corridor Assessment and Preliminary Plan | Roadway Assessment | Prepare preliminary plans for the Millcreek Drive corridor from Spanish Valley Drive to Fourth East, including the Fourth East/300 South intersection. Plans may identify intersection improvements to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millcreek Drive / Spanish Valley Drive • Millcreek Drive / Murphy Lane • Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road • Millcreek Drive / Fourth East • Fourth East / 300 South | 1 |
| Roadway Plan 3 | Spanish Valley Drive | Roadway Assessment | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to County Line; Spanish Valley Drive to be an alternative route to US 191 during incidents | 2 |
| Roadway Plan 4 | Spanish Trail Road | Roadway Assessment | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Spanish Trail Road from US 191 to Murphy Lane | 3 |
| Roadway Plan 2 | Fourth East Improvements | Roadway Assessment | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements (intersection and segment) to Fourth E. Street between 100 North and US 191 | 4 |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

10.3 Potential Funding Sources

Funding for transportation needs can come from a variety of federal, state, and local sources. The following sections explore different funding sources that may be leveraged during planning and implementation efforts.

Information in this section is summarized from the UDOT Local Public Agency (LPA) Guide².

10.3.1 Federal Funding Sources

Highway Safety Improvement Program Funds

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) implements the FHWA Highway Safety Improvement Program. HSIP is a core Federal-Aid program with the purpose to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, including non-state-owned roads. The HSIP requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads with a focus on performance. UDOT accomplishes these objectives by identifying high crash locations and developing a program of roadway safety improvement projects for those locations. The UDOT Traffic and Safety Division maintains a three-year program of statewide HSIP projects. A local match of 6.77% is required.

American Rescue Plan Act – Travel, Tourism, and Outdoor Recreation Funds

As part of the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA), passed in March of 2021, funding was authorized to help communities and regions devise and implement sustainable economic recovery strategies through a variety of non-construction and construction projects to respond to damage to the travel, tourism, and outdoor recreation sectors from the COVID-19 pandemic and to promote the economic resilience of regions dependent on those industries.

Funds are allocated in two buckets:

1. State Tourism Grants: \$510 million in non-competitive awards to help states quickly invest in marketing, infrastructure, workforce, and other projects to rejuvenate safe leisure, business, and international travel.
2. Competitive Grants: \$240 million to help communities that have been hardest hit by challenges facing the travel, tourism, and outdoor recreation sectors to invest in infrastructure, workforce, or other projects to support the recovery of the industry and economic resilience of the community in the future.

Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity Grant Program

The Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grant program provides opportunities for investment in road, rail, transit, and port projects. The RAISE grant program replaced the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant program. Raise can provide capital funding directly to any public entity, including municipalities and counties.

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program

The Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program is a federal-aid highway flexible funding program that funds a broad range of surface transportation capital improvements including roads,

² <https://www.udot.utah.gov/connect/business/public-entities/local-government-program-assistance/>

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

transit, airport access, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Planning, research, and development activities are also eligible for the use of STBG funds, within specifically defined types of projects.

Federal Lands Access Program

The Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) awards funding to improve transportation facilities that provide access to, are adjacent to, or are located within federal lands. The Access Program is funded by contract authority from the Highway Trust Fund.

Federal Transit Administration Funds – Section 5311 Formula Grants for Rural Areas

This program provides capital, planning, and operating assistance to states to support public transportation in rural areas with populations less than 50,000. Eligible activities include planning, capital, operating, job access, and reverse commute projects (low income) and the acquisition of public transportation services. Federal/local share for capital projects is 80/20 percent and 50/50 percent for operating assistance.

Federal Transit Administration Funds – Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities

This program is intended to enhance mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities by providing funds for programs to serve the special needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary para-transit services. Program funds are to be used on capital projects that are public transportation projects or alternatives to public transportation that assist seniors and individuals with disabilities. Federal/local share for capital projects is 80/20 percent and 50/50 percent for operating assistance.

10.3.2 State Funding Sources

UDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

UDOT administers federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for projects listed on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The STIP is a six-year plan of state and local highway and transit projects for the State of Utah. The STIP list is updated and published annually and includes transportation projects on state, city, and county highway systems as well as projects in national parks, national forests, and on Indian reservations. These projects use various federal and state funding programs.

Class B and C Road Funds

Class B and C roads are public highways, roads, or streets maintained by and under the jurisdiction of an incorporated municipality. Class B roads are county roads and Class C roads are city or town roads. These funds differ from ordinary local revenues in that they are subject to administrative direction by the state – UDOT is the administrative authority for the State of Utah.

UDOT Transportation Alternatives Program

Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) provides funding for transportation alternatives including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, enhanced mobility, community improvements, environmental mitigations, recreational trails, safe routes to schools, etc.

UDOT grants each UDOT Region TAP funds for use on the state highway system.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

UDOT Technical Planning Assistance Program

UDOT offers funding for technical planning assistance to local governments in Utah, especially to those that are experiencing rapid growth and/or lack sufficient resources to carry out planning projects on their own. These funds are awarded on a competitive basis and calls for projects are issued at least once per year.

UDOT Solutions Development Program

The UDOT Solutions Development is a planning process developed to capture the unique context of an area or corridor and develop a set of solutions to meet its transportation needs. Solution sets could include elements such as roadway improvements, transit and/or active transportation; travel demand management; ITS improvements; land use changes, etc.

The Solutions Development process integrates with the work of other UDOT divisions, such as Environmental, Operations, and Performance Management to help ensure holistic solutions that match the area's unique context and needs.

UDOT Safe Routes Grants Program

The main goal of the Safe Routes Grants program is to encourage and assist students living within 1.5-2 miles to safely walk or bike to school. Available grant funding can be used for projects that include non-infrastructure (such as education and encouragement) and infrastructure physical improvements (sidewalks, pavement markings, signage, bicycle parking, etc.). State funds are used for Safe Routes Grants (also known as Safe Routes to School [SRTS]) projects. Local matching funds are not required. UDOT requires infrastructure grant applicants to be submitted by the agency that owns the ROW where the project will be constructed.

UDOT Safe Sidewalk Program

State policy declares that "pedestrian safety" considerations shall be included in all state highway engineering and planning for all projects where pedestrian traffic would be a significant factor. The Safe Sidewalks Program provides a legislative funding source for construction of new sidewalks adjacent to state routes where sidewalks do not currently exist and where major construction or reconstruction of the route, at that location, is not planned for 10 or more years.

For a proposed sidewalk location to be considered for the Safe Sidewalks Program, it must first meet the following criteria:

- Located adjacent to a state highway
- Located within an urban area or an area where the immediate environment of the project is of an urban nature
- Significant pedestrian traffic
- 25% local government match (cash or ROW)

UDOT Road Usage Charge Local Overlay

UDOT has been awarded a federal grant through the Surface Transportation System Funding Alternatives (STSFA) program to further explore Road Usage Charge (RUC). A portion of the grant is to further explore the RUC Local Overlay to test the feasibility of local government agencies (cities and counties) to use Utah's RUC platform as a means to generate user-based revenue to pay for their transportation needs. Technologies, processes, and customer communication will be tested. This a program the County or City may be able to explore in the future.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

10.3.3 Local and Other Funding Source

City and County General Funds

Projects may be funded through City and County general funds or capital improvement budgets.

Joint Highway Committee Non-Urban Funds

Utah's Joint Highway Committee (JHC) recommends projects to the Utah Transportation Commission (UTC) with a primary focus on areas of the State of Utah outside of the currently designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) planning areas.

The JHC Non-Urban Program (NURB) provides federal funding for roadway safety and condition improvements in small cities. Eligible roads must be classified as a Major Collector or above and located outside MPO urban boundaries. The required local match is 6.77% and the maximum amount of federal aid per project is \$2,000,000.

Joint Highway Committee Small Urban Funds

The JHC Small Urban Program (SMURB) provides federal funding for roadway safety and condition improvements in small cities. Eligible roads must be designated as a Collector or above and located outside the current MPO boundaries and within a designated small urban city with a population between 5,000 and 50,000. The required local match is 6.77% and the maximum amount of federal aid per project is \$1,500,000.

Joint Highway Committee State Park Access Funds

The JHC State Park Access Funds (SPA) are available to make necessary improvements and repairs to roads leading to State Parks. Utah Code sections 72-3-201 to 72-3-206 list the roads that are eligible for this program. The required local match is 50% and the maximum amount of state aid per project is \$500,000. A flexible match may be allowed.

Private Funding or Development

Sources of private funding may include private organizations that offer innovative ways to provide transportation infrastructure or services or public-private partnerships that leverage private funding for public infrastructure. The County and City may explore these options when the opportunities arise.

Development or Transportation Impact Fees

There is a direct correlation between development activity and vehicle trips added to the roadway network. Transportation or traffic impact fees are one way to obtain funds for transportation infrastructure projects resulting from and needed to serve new growth. State statutes govern how these types of impact fees may be used; impact fees can only be used to fund growth related system improvements. Adopting impact fees can leverage needed improvements serving growth areas.

Regional Sales Tax

An increase in the local sales tax to fund transportation improvements could drastically increase the amount of transportation improvements that can be funded in the future. Sales taxes also provide a revenue source that allow visitors and seasonal residents to contribute towards the region's transportation system that provides their travel needs to visit recreational sites, international destinations, or other locations.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Property Tax Increase

An option is available to raise property taxes and dedicate some, or all, to increase roadway and mobility improvements, which could help fill the gap in transportation funding.

10.3.4 Other Considerations

The County and City are responsible for the maintenance and operations of the existing and planned transportation infrastructure in the area, even if the construction funds were provided by state or federal grant funds. UDOT maintains and operates US 191 in the area and all state highways. Expanded or new transportation facilities will need to be factored into local jurisdictions' standard maintenance programs to ensure they are properly maintained over time. Typical maintenance and operating activities include, but are not limited to:

- Adverse weather response – closing flooded roads, de-icing bridges, removing wind-blown debris, removing rockfalls
- Clearing sight distance encroachments
- Signing, striping, and pavement markings
- Pavement management – everything from filling potholes to full pavement overlays

With limited transportation dollars, proactive maintenance of existing infrastructure is a cost-effective strategy to extend the functional life of transportation facilities. Preventative maintenance activities performed while pavement is still in good condition is a relatively inexpensive way to extend the life of pavement and reduce the frequency of needed major rehabilitation or reconstruction, which is significantly more expensive.

11. Next Steps

The UTMP identifies and prioritizes transportation improvement strategies, projects, and policies through a process that considered input from the community, stakeholders, and TAC members, along with a review of previous studies, current and future conditions analysis, and identification of needs and deficiencies.

Given the current challenges of increasing costs and limited potential for new funding sources to be implemented quickly, most new or improved roadways, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities will likely rely on outside funding and will have to proactively seek grant or private funding sources.

Similar to any plan, this UTMP provides perspective from a specific point in time. The UTMP should be regularly updated to reflect work accomplished, identify new needs or deficiencies that arise, and update funding resources and cost estimates.

As vehicle technology matures, future updates should consider how to integrate automated vehicles, alternative fuel vehicles requiring different sources of recharging, electronic bicycles, transit options, and other new modes of mobility.

As population, employment, and tourism continue to increase in the region, the County and City must collaborate to improve the transportation system to accommodate all users.

Ultimately, implementation of the UTMP recommendations requires identification of funding for the proposed prioritized projects.

Appendices

Appendix A. Traffic Count Data

Appendix B. Capacity Analysis Results

Appendix C. Summary Memorandum of Stakeholder Group Interviews

Appendix D. Stakeholder and Community Outreach Summary

Appendix E. Active Transportation Improvement Project Summaries

Appendix F. Roadway Improvement Project Summaries

Appendix A. Traffic Count Data





ALL TRAFFIC DATA SERVICES

(303) 216-2439

www.alltrafficdata.net


Location: 1 SPANISH VALLEY DR & S MILL CREEK DR AM

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021

Peak Hour: 07:30 AM - 08:30 AM


Peak 15-Minutes: 07:45 AM - 08:00 AM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | S MILL CREEK DR Eastbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Westbound | | | | SPANISH VALLEY DR Northbound | | | | SPANISH VALLEY DR Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|---|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | | | West | East | South | North | |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 27 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 33 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 39 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 54 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 35 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 41 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 38 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 47 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 43 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 37 | 314 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 21 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 18 | 169 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


Location: 2 S MILL CREEK DR & SAND FLATS RD AM

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021


Peak Hour: 08:00 AM - 09:00 AM

Peak 15-Minutes: 08:45 AM - 09:00 AM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles



Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | SAND FLATS RD Eastbound | | | | SAND FLATS RD Westbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Northbound | | | S MILL CREEK DR Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------|------|-------|----------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------------------------------|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|------|-------|-------|---|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | | | Right | West | East | South | North | |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 5 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 326 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 9 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 93 | 328 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 79 | 331 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 88 | 142 | 0 | 13 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 2 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 599 | | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 60 | 81 | 0 | 9 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 331 | | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | |

Location: 3 FOURTH E ST & S MILL CREEK DR AM



Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021

Peak Hour: 07:30 AM - 08:30 AM

Peak 15-Minutes: 07:30 AM - 07:45 AM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles

Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | S MILL CREEK DR Eastbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Westbound | | | | FOURTH E ST Northbound | | | | FOURTH E ST Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | | | West | East | South | North |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 57 | 520 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 29 | 0 | 93 | 602 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 12 | 0 | 17 | 60 | 1 | 195 | 633 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 37 | 0 | 175 | 560 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 34 | 0 | 139 | 529 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 31 | 27 | 2 | 124 | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 28 | 22 | 0 | 122 | | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 10 | 0 | 24 | 29 | 0 | 144 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 69 | 1 | 266 | 1 | 4 | 220 | 61 | 0 | 156 | 252 | 3 | 1,049 | | 20 | 10 | 0 | 3 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 1 | 155 | 1 | 2 | 148 | 29 | 0 | 88 | 158 | 3 | 633 | | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3 |


Location: 4 S MILL CREEK DR & S MURPHY LN AM

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021

Peak Hour: 07:15 AM - 08:15 AM


Peak 15-Minutes: 07:45 AM - 08:00 AM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.


Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk




Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | S MURPHY LN Eastbound | | | | S MURPHY LN Westbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Northbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------|------|-------|--------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | | | West | East | South | North |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 34 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 61 | 266 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 66 | 264 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 82 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 57 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 59 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 60 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 0 | 73 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 31 | 0 | 46 | 104 | 0 | 492 | | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 19 | 0 | 22 | 52 | 0 | 266 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour - All Vehicles



Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | E 300TH S Eastbound | | | | E 300TH S Westbound | | | | FOURTH E ST Northbound | | | FOURTH E ST Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------|------|-------|------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------|------|------|---------------------------|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | | | Right | West | East | South | North |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 51 | 503 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 4 | 89 | 615 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 3 | 181 | 659 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 2 | 182 | 587 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 6 | 163 | 555 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 6 | 133 | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 3 | 109 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 3 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 4 | 150 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 1 | 26 | 0 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 159 | 405 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 | 31 | 1,058 | | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 16 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 97 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 17 | 659 | | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

Location: 6 SPANISH VALLEY DR & SPANISH TRAIL RD AM



Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021

Peak Hour: 07:15 AM - 08:15 AM

Peak 15-Minutes: 07:15 AM - 07:30 AM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles

Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | SPANISH TRAIL RD Eastbound | | | | SPANISH TRAIL RD Westbound | | | | SPANISH VALLEY DR Northbound | | | SPANISH VALLEY DR Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------------|------|------|---------------------------------|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | | | Right | West | East | South | North |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 60 | 297 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 31 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 86 | 318 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 69 | 306 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 82 | 313 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 81 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 74 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 76 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 77 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 18 | 65 | 70 | 0 | 18 | 114 | 10 | 0 | 173 | 39 | 22 | 0 | 8 | 43 | 25 | 605 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 12 | 28 | 32 | 0 | 9 | 69 | 5 | 0 | 106 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 12 | 318 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



ALL TRAFFIC DATA SERVICES

(303) 216-2439

www.alltrafficdata.net

Location: 1 SPANISH VALLEY DR & S MILL CREEK DR PM



Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021

Peak Hour: 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM

Peak 15-Minutes: 04:00 PM - 04:15 PM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles

Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | S MILL CREEK DR Eastbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Westbound | | | | SPANISH VALLEY DR Northbound | | | SPANISH VALLEY DR Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------------|------|------|---------------------------------|--------|------|------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|------|-------|-------|---|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | | | Right | West | East | South | North | |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 67 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 16 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 61 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 6 | 65 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 9 | 67 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 64 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 8 | 56 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 50 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 7 | 51 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 77 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 51 | 481 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 43 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 30 | 260 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


Location: 2 S MILL CREEK DR & SAND FLATS RD PM

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021


Peak Hour: 04:30 PM - 05:30 PM

Peak 15-Minutes: 04:45 PM - 05:00 PM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles



Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | SAND FLATS RD Eastbound | | | | SAND FLATS RD Westbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Northbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------|------|-------|----------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | | | West | East | South | North |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 7 | 40 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 100 | 448 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 87 | 468 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 15 | 41 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 479 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 20 | 61 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 456 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 12 | 55 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 10 | 41 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 17 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 88 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 11 | 30 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 104 | 335 | 0 | 20 | 78 | 2 | 1 | 261 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 833 | | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 57 | 198 | 0 | 16 | 41 | 1 | 1 | 148 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 479 | | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |


Location: 3 FOURTH E ST & S MILL CREEK DR PM

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021


Peak Hour: 04:30 PM - 05:30 PM

Peak 15-Minutes: 04:45 PM - 05:00 PM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles



Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | S MILL CREEK DR Eastbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Westbound | | | | FOURTH E ST Northbound | | | | FOURTH E ST Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | | | West | East | South | North |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 10 | 0 | 40 | 48 | 1 | 182 | 749 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 39 | 40 | 1 | 160 | 779 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 0 | 54 | 37 | 0 | 182 | 801 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 2 | 48 | 13 | 0 | 67 | 37 | 0 | 225 | 796 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 2 | 48 | 14 | 0 | 52 | 51 | 6 | 212 | 737 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 0 | 47 | 38 | 1 | 182 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 18 | 0 | 44 | 49 | 0 | 177 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 12 | 0 | 39 | 34 | 2 | 166 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 64 | 2 | 296 | 0 | 6 | 284 | 98 | 0 | 382 | 334 | 11 | 1,486 | | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 4 | 160 | 52 | 0 | 220 | 163 | 7 | 801 | | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Location: 4 S MILL CREEK DR & S MURPHY LN PM



Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021

Peak Hour: 04:30 PM - 05:30 PM

Peak 15-Minutes: 04:45 PM - 05:00 PM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles

Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk




Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.


Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | S MURPHY LN Eastbound | | | | S MURPHY LN Westbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Northbound | | | | S MILL CREEK DR Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------|------|-------|--------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | | | West | East | South | North |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 28 | 0 | 80 | 352 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 83 | 370 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 18 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 0 | 90 | 373 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 35 | 0 | 99 | 343 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 11 | 0 | 15 | 25 | 0 | 98 | 317 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 23 | 0 | 86 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 0 | 60 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 73 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 65 | 0 | 73 | 202 | 0 | 669 | | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 41 | 0 | 46 | 113 | 0 | 373 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Peak Hour - All Vehicles



Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | E 300TH S Eastbound | | | | E 300TH S Westbound | | | | FOURTH E ST Northbound | | | | FOURTH E ST Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------|------|-------|------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | | | West | East | South | North |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 176 | 747 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 3 | 178 | 782 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 8 | 167 | 786 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 3 | 226 | 790 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 6 | 211 | 731 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 4 | 182 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 1 | 171 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 2 | 167 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 25 | 0 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 187 | 450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 493 | 27 | 1,478 | | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 12 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 242 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 14 | 790 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Location: 6 SPANISH VALLEY DR & SPANISH TRAIL RD PM



Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021

Peak Hour: 04:30 PM - 05:30 PM

Peak 15-Minutes: 05:00 PM - 05:15 PM

Peak Hour - All Vehicles

Peak Hour - Pedestrians/Bicycles on Crosswalk



Note: Total study counts contained in parentheses.

Traffic Counts

| Interval Start Time | SPANISH TRAIL RD Eastbound | | | | SPANISH TRAIL RD Westbound | | | | SPANISH VALLEY DR Northbound | | | | SPANISH VALLEY DR Southbound | | | | Total | Rolling Hour | Pedestrian Crossings | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------------|------|------|-------|---------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | | | West | East | South | North |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 9 | 16 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 104 | 397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 6 | 94 | 407 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 5 | 13 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 93 | 414 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 7 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 106 | 396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 5 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 114 | 397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 5 | 13 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 101 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 75 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 25 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 107 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 38 | 133 | 139 | 0 | 25 | 100 | 4 | 0 | 133 | 65 | 21 | 0 | 17 | 85 | 34 | 794 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 22 | 65 | 81 | 0 | 14 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 61 | 28 | 11 | 0 | 14 | 48 | 16 | 414 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Appendix B. Capacity Analysis Results



HCM 6th TWSC
 1: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | T | | T | | T | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 21 | 16 | 19 | 56 | 39 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 21 | 16 | 19 | 56 | 39 | 18 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 58 | 58 | 89 | 89 | 75 | 75 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 36 | 28 | 21 | 63 | 52 | 24 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 169 | 64 | 76 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 64 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 105 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 821 | 1000 | 1523 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 959 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 919 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 810 | 1000 | 1523 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 810 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 946 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 919 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|-----|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.4 | 1.9 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | A | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1523 | - | 883 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.014 | - | 0.072 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.4 | 0 | 9.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | 0.2 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
 2: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr/Sand Flats Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.4 |
| Intersection LOS | A |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | ↕ | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 60 | 81 | 9 | 32 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 60 | 81 | 9 | 32 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 67 | 90 | 11 | 41 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.9 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 7.1 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | A | A |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 88% | 0% | 0% | 22% | 0% |
| Vol Thru, % | 0% | 100% | 0% | 78% | 0% |
| Vol Right, % | 12% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 148 | 60 | 81 | 41 | 1 |
| LT Vol | 130 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 60 | 0 | 32 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 18 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 1 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 185 | 67 | 90 | 52 | 4 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.232 | 0.093 | 0.108 | 0.068 | 0.004 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.52 | 5.031 | 4.327 | 4.702 | 4.025 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 797 | 714 | 830 | 763 | 890 |
| Service Time | 2.534 | 2.747 | 2.044 | 2.721 | 2.047 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.232 | 0.094 | 0.108 | 0.068 | 0.004 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.9 | 8.3 | 7.6 | 8.1 | 7.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0 |

| Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 2 | 4 | 37 | 1 | 155 | 3 | 148 | 29 | 88 | 158 | 3 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 2 | 4 | 37 | 1 | 155 | 3 | 148 | 29 | 88 | 158 | 3 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 55 | - | - | - | - | - | 65 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 55 | 55 | 55 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 4 | 7 | 45 | 1 | 189 | 4 | 195 | 38 | 110 | 198 | 4 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | | Minor1 | | Major1 | | Major2 | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|---|---|-------|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 737 | 661 | 200 | 648 | 644 | 214 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 420 | 420 | - | 222 | 222 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 317 | 241 | - | 426 | 422 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 334 | 383 | 841 | 383 | 391 | 826 | 1370 | - | - | 1335 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 611 | 589 | - | 780 | 720 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 694 | 706 | - | 606 | 588 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 240 | 350 | 841 | 352 | 358 | 826 | 1370 | - | - | 1335 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 240 | 350 | - | 352 | 358 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 609 | 541 | - | 778 | 718 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 533 | 704 | - | 548 | 540 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------|------|--|------|--|-----|--|-----|--|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 15.9 | | 11.9 | | 0.1 | | 2.8 | |
| HCM LOS | C | | B | | | | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1370 | - | - | 351 | 352 | 819 | 1335 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | 0.057 | 0.128 | 0.232 | 0.082 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.6 | 0 | - | 15.9 | 16.7 | 10.7 | 7.9 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | C | C | B | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.3 | - | - |

HCM 6th TWSC
4: Spanish Valley Dr & Murphy Ln

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.3 | | | | | |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | | | | | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 32 | 71 | 70 | 19 | 22 | 52 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 32 | 71 | 70 | 19 | 22 | 52 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 86 | 86 | 74 | 74 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 39 | 86 | 81 | 22 | 30 | 70 |

| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|-------|
| Conflicting Flow All | 222 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Stage 1 | 92 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 130 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 766 | 965 | - | - | 1489 |
| Stage 1 | 932 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 896 | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 750 | 965 | - | - | 1489 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 750 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 932 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 877 | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|-----|----|-----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.7 | 0 | 2.2 |
| HCM LOS | A | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------|-----|----------|------|------|
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 886 | 1489 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | 0.14 | 0.02 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 9.7 | 7.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | A | A |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.5 | 0.1 |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.5 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | | | | | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 111 | 98 | 257 | 160 | 17 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 111 | 98 | 257 | 160 | 17 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 45 | 50 | - | - | 50 |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 75 | 75 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 23 | 161 | 131 | 343 | 178 | 19 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 783 | 178 | 197 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 178 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 605 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 362 | 865 | 1376 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 853 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 545 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 328 | 865 | 1376 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 432 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 772 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 545 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.6 | 2.2 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1376 | - | 432 | 865 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.095 | - | 0.054 | 0.186 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.9 | - | 13.8 | 10.1 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | B | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.3 | - | 0.2 | 0.7 | - | - |

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.1 |
| Intersection LOS | A |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 28 | 32 | 9 | 69 | 5 | 106 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 17 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 28 | 32 | 9 | 69 | 5 | 106 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 17 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 31 | 36 | 11 | 86 | 6 | 118 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 24 | 17 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.7 | 8.1 | 8.5 | 7.6 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | A | A |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 82% | 17% | 11% | 15% |
| Vol Thru, % | 11% | 39% | 83% | 50% |
| Vol Right, % | 7% | 44% | 6% | 35% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 129 | 72 | 83 | 34 |
| LT Vol | 106 | 12 | 9 | 5 |
| Through Vol | 14 | 28 | 69 | 17 |
| RT Vol | 9 | 32 | 5 | 12 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 143 | 80 | 104 | 48 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.18 | 0.095 | 0.128 | 0.058 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.523 | 4.264 | 4.453 | 4.329 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 795 | 842 | 807 | 828 |
| Service Time | 2.54 | 2.28 | 2.469 | 2.349 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.095 | 0.129 | 0.058 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.5 | 7.7 | 8.1 | 7.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 |

HCM 6th TWSC
 1: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | | | | | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 43 | 17 | 21 | 74 | 75 | 30 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 43 | 17 | 21 | 74 | 75 | 30 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 75 | 75 | 72 | 72 | 75 | 75 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 57 | 23 | 29 | 103 | 100 | 40 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 281 | 120 | 140 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 120 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 161 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 709 | 931 | 1443 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 905 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 868 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 694 | 931 | 1443 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 694 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 886 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 868 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.4 | 1.7 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1443 | - | 748 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.02 | - | 0.107 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.5 | 0 | 10.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 0.4 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
 2: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr/Sand Flats Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 9.2 |
| Intersection LOS | A |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | ↕ | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 2 | 57 | 198 | 16 | 41 | 1 | 149 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 2 | 57 | 198 | 16 | 41 | 1 | 149 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 3 | 72 | 251 | 25 | 65 | 2 | 167 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|----|-----|-----|----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9 | 8.6 | 9.7 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | A | - |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 91% | 3% | 0% | 28% | 0% |
| Vol Thru, % | 0% | 97% | 0% | 71% | 100% |
| Vol Right, % | 9% | 0% | 100% | 2% | 0% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 164 | 59 | 198 | 58 | 0 |
| LT Vol | 149 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 57 | 0 | 41 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 15 | 0 | 198 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 184 | 75 | 251 | 92 | 0 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.254 | 0.106 | 0.306 | 0.125 | 0 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.968 | 5.116 | 4.395 | 4.899 | 5.108 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 722 | 701 | 817 | 730 | 0 |
| Service Time | 3.005 | 2.845 | 2.124 | 2.939 | 3.162 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.255 | 0.107 | 0.307 | 0.126 | 0 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.7 | 8.5 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 8.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | A | N |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0 |

HCM 6th TWSC
3: Fourth E St & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.7 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1 | 1 | 35 | 0 | 158 | 4 | 160 | 52 | 220 | 163 | 7 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1 | 1 | 35 | 0 | 158 | 4 | 160 | 52 | 220 | 163 | 7 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 55 | - | - | - | - | - | 65 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 25 | 25 | 25 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 4 | 4 | 42 | 0 | 190 | 5 | 190 | 62 | 247 | 183 | 8 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | | Minor1 | | Major1 | | Major2 | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|---|---|-------|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1007 | 943 | 187 | 916 | 916 | 221 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 681 | 681 | - | 231 | 231 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 326 | 262 | - | 685 | 685 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 219 | 263 | 855 | 253 | 272 | 819 | 1383 | - | - | 1313 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 440 | 450 | - | 772 | 713 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 687 | 691 | - | 438 | 448 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 143 | 213 | 855 | 212 | 220 | 819 | 1383 | - | - | 1313 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 143 | 213 | - | 212 | 220 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 438 | 365 | - | 769 | 710 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 525 | 688 | - | 350 | 364 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------|------|--|------|--|-----|--|-----|--|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 15.8 | | 13.5 | | 0.1 | | 4.7 | |
| HCM LOS | C | | B | | | | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1383 | - | - | 341 | 212 | 819 | 1313 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | 0.023 | 0.199 | 0.232 | 0.188 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.6 | 0 | - | 15.8 | 26.1 | 10.7 | 8.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | C | D | B | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | - | - |

HCM 6th TWSC
4: Spanish Valley Dr & Murphy Ln

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 | | | | | |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | | | | | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 34 | 39 | 100 | 41 | 46 | 113 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 34 | 39 | 100 | 41 | 46 | 113 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 87 | 87 | 82 | 82 | 81 | 81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 39 | 45 | 122 | 50 | 57 | 140 |

| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|-------|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 401 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 147 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 254 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 605 | 900 | - | - | 1405 | - |
| Stage 1 | 880 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 788 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | - | - | | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 578 | 900 | - | - | 1405 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 578 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 880 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 753 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|----|-----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.7 | 0 | 2.2 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------|-----|----------|-------|------|
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 715 | 1405 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | 0.117 | 0.04 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 10.7 | 7.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B | A |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.4 | 0.1 |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.2 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ↖ | ↗ | ↖ | ↗ | ↗ | ↖ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 149 | 92 | 242 | 281 | 14 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 149 | 92 | 242 | 281 | 14 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 45 | 50 | - | - | 50 |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 76 | 76 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 159 | 121 | 318 | 323 | 16 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 883 | 323 | 339 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 323 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 560 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 316 | 718 | 1220 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 734 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 572 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 285 | 718 | 1220 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 409 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 661 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 572 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.6 | 2.3 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1220 | - | 409 | 718 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.099 | - | 0.031 | 0.221 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.3 | - | 14.1 | 11.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | B | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.3 | - | 0.1 | 0.8 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
6: Spanish Valley Dr & Spanish Trail Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.5 |
| Intersection LOS | A |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 22 | 65 | 81 | 14 | 53 | 1 | 61 | 28 | 11 | 14 | 48 | 16 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 22 | 65 | 81 | 14 | 53 | 1 | 61 | 28 | 11 | 14 | 48 | 16 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 24 | 71 | 89 | 21 | 78 | 1 | 69 | 31 | 12 | 16 | 54 | 18 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.3 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | A | A |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 61% | 13% | 21% | 18% |
| Vol Thru, % | 28% | 39% | 78% | 62% |
| Vol Right, % | 11% | 48% | 1% | 21% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 100 | 168 | 68 | 78 |
| LT Vol | 61 | 22 | 14 | 14 |
| Through Vol | 28 | 65 | 53 | 48 |
| RT Vol | 11 | 81 | 1 | 16 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 112 | 185 | 100 | 88 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.148 | 0.219 | 0.129 | 0.113 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.736 | 4.268 | 4.647 | 4.626 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 756 | 842 | 771 | 774 |
| Service Time | 2.768 | 2.294 | 2.678 | 2.659 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.148 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.114 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.6 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 |

HCM 6th TWSC
 1: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.6 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | T | | | T | | T |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 31 | 23 | 28 | 82 | 57 | 26 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 31 | 23 | 28 | 82 | 57 | 26 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 58 | 58 | 89 | 89 | 75 | 75 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 53 | 40 | 31 | 92 | 76 | 35 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | | Major2 | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 248 | 94 | 111 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 94 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 154 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 740 | 963 | 1479 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 930 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 874 | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 724 | 963 | 1479 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 724 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 910 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 874 | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|----|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10 | 1.9 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1479 | - | 810 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.021 | - | 0.115 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.5 | 0 | 10 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 0.4 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
 2: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr/Sand Flats Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 9.4 |
| Intersection LOS | A |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | ↕ | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 87 | 118 | 13 | 47 | 0 | 189 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 87 | 118 | 13 | 47 | 0 | 189 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 97 | 131 | 16 | 59 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.5 | 8.7 | 10.4 | 7.5 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | B | A |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 88% | 0% | 0% | 22% | 0% |
| Vol Thru, % | 0% | 100% | 0% | 78% | 0% |
| Vol Right, % | 12% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 215 | 87 | 118 | 60 | 1 |
| LT Vol | 189 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 87 | 0 | 47 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 26 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 1 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 269 | 97 | 131 | 76 | 4 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.354 | 0.142 | 0.167 | 0.106 | 0.005 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.748 | 5.29 | 4.585 | 5.024 | 4.383 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 758 | 678 | 781 | 712 | 812 |
| Service Time | 2.781 | 3.025 | 2.32 | 3.067 | 2.434 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.355 | 0.143 | 0.168 | 0.107 | 0.005 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.4 | 8.9 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 7.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0 |

HCM 6th TWSC
3: Fourth E St & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.7 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 3 | 6 | 54 | 1 | 226 | 4 | 216 | 42 | 128 | 230 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 3 | 6 | 54 | 1 | 226 | 4 | 216 | 42 | 128 | 230 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 55 | - | - | - | - | - | 65 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 55 | 55 | 55 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 5 | 11 | 66 | 1 | 276 | 5 | 284 | 55 | 160 | 288 | 5 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | | Minor1 | | Major1 | | Major2 | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|---|---|-------|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1071 | 960 | 291 | 941 | 935 | 312 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 339 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 611 | 611 | - | 322 | 322 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 460 | 349 | - | 619 | 613 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 198 | 257 | 748 | 243 | 265 | 728 | 1269 | - | - | 1220 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 481 | 484 | - | 690 | 651 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 581 | 633 | - | 476 | 483 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 110 | 222 | 748 | 211 | 229 | 728 | 1269 | - | - | 1220 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 110 | 222 | - | 211 | 229 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 479 | 421 | - | 687 | 648 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 359 | 630 | - | 402 | 420 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------|------|--|------|--|-----|--|----|--|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 27.6 | | 16.3 | | 0.1 | | 3 | |
| HCM LOS | D | | C | | | | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1269 | - | - | 188 | 211 | 721 | 1220 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.004 | - | - | 0.155 | 0.312 | 0.384 | 0.131 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | 0 | - | 27.6 | 29.6 | 13.1 | 8.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | D | D | B | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 0.5 | - | - |

HCM 6th TWSC
 4: Spanish Valley Dr & Murphy Ln

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.7 | | | | | |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | W | W | T | T | T | T |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 47 | 103 | 102 | 28 | 32 | 76 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 47 | 103 | 102 | 28 | 32 | 76 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 86 | 86 | 74 | 74 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 57 | 124 | 119 | 33 | 43 | 103 |

| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|-------|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 325 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 136 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 189 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 669 | 913 | - | - | 1429 | - |
| Stage 1 | 890 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 843 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | - | - | | |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 648 | 913 | - | - | 1429 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 648 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 890 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 816 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|----|-----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.7 | 0 | 2.3 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------|-----|----------|-------|------|
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 809 | 1429 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | 0.223 | 0.03 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 10.7 | 7.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B | A |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.9 | 0.1 |

HCM 6th TWSC
5: Fourth E St & 300 S

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.9 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ↖ | ↗ | ↖ | ↗ | ↗ | ↗ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 23 | 162 | 143 | 374 | 233 | 25 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 23 | 162 | 143 | 374 | 233 | 25 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 45 | 50 | - | - | 50 |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 75 | 75 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 33 | 235 | 191 | 499 | 259 | 28 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1140 | 259 | 287 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 259 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 881 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 222 | 780 | 1275 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 784 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 405 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 189 | 780 | 1275 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 308 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 666 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 405 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 12.4 | 2.3 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1275 | - | 308 | 780 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.15 | - | 0.108 | 0.301 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.3 | - | 18.1 | 11.6 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | C | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.5 | - | 0.4 | 1.3 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
6: Spanish Valley Dr & Spanish Trail Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 9 |
| Intersection LOS | A |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 41 | 47 | 13 | 101 | 7 | 154 | 20 | 13 | 7 | 25 | 17 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 41 | 47 | 13 | 101 | 7 | 154 | 20 | 13 | 7 | 25 | 17 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 19 | 46 | 52 | 16 | 126 | 9 | 171 | 22 | 14 | 10 | 35 | 24 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.4 | 8.9 | 9.6 | 8.1 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | A | A |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 82% | 16% | 11% | 14% |
| Vol Thru, % | 11% | 39% | 83% | 51% |
| Vol Right, % | 7% | 45% | 6% | 35% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 187 | 105 | 121 | 49 |
| LT Vol | 154 | 17 | 13 | 7 |
| Through Vol | 20 | 41 | 101 | 25 |
| RT Vol | 13 | 47 | 7 | 17 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 208 | 117 | 151 | 69 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.275 | 0.148 | 0.199 | 0.089 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.767 | 4.553 | 4.727 | 4.642 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 752 | 785 | 758 | 768 |
| Service Time | 2.808 | 2.595 | 2.768 | 2.691 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.277 | 0.149 | 0.199 | 0.09 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.6 | 8.4 | 8.9 | 8.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 |

HCM 6th TWSC
 1: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | T | | | T | | T |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 63 | 25 | 31 | 108 | 109 | 44 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 63 | 25 | 31 | 108 | 109 | 44 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 75 | 75 | 72 | 72 | 75 | 75 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 84 | 33 | 43 | 150 | 145 | 59 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | | Major2 | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 411 | 175 | 204 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 175 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 236 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 597 | 868 | 1368 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 855 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 803 | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 577 | 868 | 1368 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 577 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 826 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 803 | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.9 | 1.7 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1368 | - | 638 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.031 | - | 0.184 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.7 | 0 | 11.9 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 0.7 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
 2: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr/Sand Flats Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 11.3 |
| Intersection LOS | B |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | ↕ | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 83 | 288 | 23 | 60 | 1 | 217 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 83 | 288 | 23 | 60 | 1 | 217 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 105 | 365 | 37 | 95 | 2 | 244 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|------|-----|------|----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.2 | 9.8 | 12.1 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | A | B | - |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 91% | 3% | 0% | 27% | 0% |
| Vol Thru, % | 0% | 97% | 0% | 71% | 100% |
| Vol Right, % | 9% | 0% | 100% | 1% | 0% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 239 | 86 | 288 | 84 | 0 |
| LT Vol | 217 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 83 | 0 | 60 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 22 | 0 | 288 | 1 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 269 | 109 | 365 | 133 | 0 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.401 | 0.165 | 0.478 | 0.198 | 0 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.374 | 5.441 | 4.717 | 5.35 | 5.853 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 663 | 654 | 758 | 663 | 0 |
| Service Time | 3.461 | 3.212 | 2.487 | 3.444 | 3.853 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.406 | 0.167 | 0.482 | 0.201 | 0 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.1 | 9.3 | 11.8 | 9.8 | 8.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | B | A | N |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.9 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 0 |

| Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 9.5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1 | 1 | 51 | 0 | 230 | 6 | 233 | 76 | 320 | 237 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1 | 1 | 51 | 0 | 230 | 6 | 233 | 76 | 320 | 237 | 10 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 55 | - | - | - | - | - | 65 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 25 | 25 | 25 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 4 | 4 | 61 | 0 | 277 | 7 | 277 | 90 | 360 | 266 | 11 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | | Minor1 | | Major1 | | | Major2 | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|---|-------|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1467 | 1373 | 272 | 1332 | 1333 | 322 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 367 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 992 | 992 | - | 336 | 336 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 475 | 381 | - | 996 | 997 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 106 | 146 | 767 | 131 | 154 | 719 | 1286 | - | - | 1192 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 296 | 324 | - | 678 | 642 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 570 | 613 | - | 294 | 322 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 50 | 101 | 767 | 97 | 107 | 719 | 1286 | - | - | 1192 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 50 | 101 | - | 97 | 107 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 294 | 226 | - | 673 | 638 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 348 | 609 | - | 201 | 225 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | | WB | | NB | | | SB | | |
|----------------------|------|--|------|--|-----|--|--|-----|--|--|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 26.2 | | 27.3 | | 0.1 | | | 5.3 | | |
| HCM LOS | D | | D | | | | | | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1286 | - | - | 178 | 97 | 719 | 1192 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.006 | - | - | 0.045 | 0.633 | 0.385 | 0.302 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | 0 | - | 26.2 | 91.5 | 13.1 | 9.3 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | D | F | B | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 0.1 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 1.3 | - | - |

HCM 6th TWSC
4: Spanish Valley Dr & Murphy Ln

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 | | | | | |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | | | | | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 50 | 57 | 146 | 60 | 67 | 165 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 50 | 57 | 146 | 60 | 67 | 165 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 87 | 87 | 82 | 82 | 81 | 81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 57 | 66 | 178 | 73 | 83 | 204 |

| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|-------|
| Conflicting Flow All | 585 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 251 |
| Stage 1 | 215 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 370 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 473 | 825 | - | - | 1314 |
| Stage 1 | 821 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 699 | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 439 | 825 | - | - | 1314 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 439 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 821 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 649 | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|----|-----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 12.8 | 0 | 2.3 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------|-----|----------|------|-------|
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 585 | 1314 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | 0.21 | 0.063 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 12.8 | 7.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B | A |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.8 | 0.2 |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.9 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ↖ | ↗ | ↖ | ↗ | ↗ | ↖ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 217 | 134 | 353 | 409 | 20 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 217 | 134 | 353 | 409 | 20 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 45 | 50 | - | - | 50 |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 76 | 76 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 231 | 176 | 464 | 470 | 23 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1286 | 470 | 493 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 470 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 816 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 181 | 594 | 1071 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 629 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 435 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 151 | 594 | 1071 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 285 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 526 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 435 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 15.2 | 2.5 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | C | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1071 | - | 285 | 594 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.165 | - | 0.063 | 0.389 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9 | - | 18.5 | 14.9 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | C | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.6 | - | 0.2 | 1.8 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
6: Spanish Valley Dr & Spanish Trail Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 9.7 |
| Intersection LOS | A |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 32 | 95 | 118 | 20 | 77 | 1 | 89 | 41 | 16 | 20 | 70 | 23 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 32 | 95 | 118 | 20 | 77 | 1 | 89 | 41 | 16 | 20 | 70 | 23 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 35 | 104 | 130 | 29 | 113 | 1 | 100 | 46 | 18 | 22 | 79 | 26 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.1 | 9.4 | 9.8 | 9.2 |
| HCM LOS | B | A | A | A |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 61% | 13% | 20% | 18% |
| Vol Thru, % | 28% | 39% | 79% | 62% |
| Vol Right, % | 11% | 48% | 1% | 20% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 146 | 245 | 98 | 113 |
| LT Vol | 89 | 32 | 20 | 20 |
| Through Vol | 41 | 95 | 77 | 70 |
| RT Vol | 16 | 118 | 1 | 23 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 164 | 269 | 144 | 127 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.234 | 0.343 | 0.201 | 0.178 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.132 | 4.593 | 5.031 | 5.046 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 694 | 778 | 706 | 703 |
| Service Time | 3.212 | 2.659 | 3.109 | 3.131 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.236 | 0.346 | 0.204 | 0.181 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.8 | 10.1 | 9.4 | 9.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.9 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 |

HCM 6th TWSC
1: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.7 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | | | | | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 37 | 28 | 34 | 99 | 69 | 32 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 37 | 28 | 34 | 99 | 69 | 32 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 58 | 58 | 89 | 89 | 75 | 75 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 64 | 48 | 38 | 111 | 92 | 43 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | | Major2 | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 301 | 114 | 135 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 114 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 187 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 691 | 939 | 1449 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 911 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 845 | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 672 | 939 | 1449 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 672 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 885 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 845 | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.5 | 1.9 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1449 | - | 766 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.026 | - | 0.146 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.6 | 0 | 10.5 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 0.5 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
 2: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr/Sand Flats Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10.5 |
| Intersection LOS | B |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | ↕ | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 107 | 144 | 16 | 57 | 0 | 231 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 107 | 144 | 16 | 57 | 0 | 231 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 119 | 160 | 20 | 72 | 0 | 289 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|----|-----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.2 | 9.2 | 12 | 7.8 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | B | A |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 88% | 0% | 0% | 22% | 0% |
| Vol Thru, % | 0% | 100% | 0% | 78% | 0% |
| Vol Right, % | 12% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 263 | 107 | 144 | 73 | 2 |
| LT Vol | 231 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 107 | 0 | 57 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 32 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 2 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 329 | 119 | 160 | 92 | 8 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.449 | 0.181 | 0.213 | 0.135 | 0.01 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.914 | 5.493 | 4.787 | 5.274 | 4.654 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 730 | 650 | 746 | 675 | 760 |
| Service Time | 2.967 | 3.254 | 2.547 | 3.349 | 2.74 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.451 | 0.183 | 0.214 | 0.136 | 0.011 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12 | 9.5 | 8.9 | 9.2 | 7.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0 |

HCM 6th TWSC
3: Fourth E St & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 9.8 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 4 | 7 | 66 | 2 | 275 | 5 | 263 | 51 | 156 | 281 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 4 | 7 | 66 | 2 | 275 | 5 | 263 | 51 | 156 | 281 | 5 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 55 | - | - | - | - | - | 65 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 55 | 55 | 55 | 82 | 82 | 82 | 76 | 76 | 76 | 80 | 80 | 80 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 16 | 7 | 13 | 80 | 2 | 335 | 7 | 346 | 67 | 195 | 351 | 6 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | | Minor1 | | Major1 | | Major2 | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|---|---|-------|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1306 | 1171 | 354 | 1148 | 1141 | 380 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 413 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 744 | 744 | - | 394 | 394 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 562 | 427 | - | 754 | 747 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 137 | 193 | 690 | 176 | 201 | 667 | 1202 | - | - | 1146 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 407 | 421 | - | 631 | 605 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 512 | 585 | - | 401 | 420 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 58 | 159 | 690 | 144 | 165 | 667 | 1202 | - | - | 1146 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 58 | 159 | - | 144 | 165 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 404 | 349 | - | 626 | 600 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 252 | 580 | - | 320 | 349 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------|------|--|------|--|-----|--|-----|--|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 56.4 | | 24.3 | | 0.1 | | 3.1 | |
| HCM LOS | F | | C | | | | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1202 | - | - | 105 | 144 | 653 | 1146 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.005 | - | - | 0.346 | 0.559 | 0.517 | 0.17 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8 | 0 | - | 56.4 | 57.8 | 16.3 | 8.8 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | F | F | C | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 1.4 | 2.8 | 3 | 0.6 | - | - |

HCM 6th TWSC
4: Spanish Valley Dr & Murphy Ln

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.1 | | | | | |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | | | | | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 57 | 126 | 124 | 34 | 39 | 92 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 57 | 126 | 124 | 34 | 39 | 92 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 86 | 86 | 74 | 74 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 69 | 152 | 144 | 40 | 53 | 124 |

| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|-------|
| Conflicting Flow All | 394 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 184 |
| Stage 1 | 164 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 230 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 611 | 881 | - | - | 1391 |
| Stage 1 | 865 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 808 | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 586 | 881 | - | - | 1391 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 586 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 865 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 775 | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|----|-----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.6 | 0 | 2.3 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------|-----|----------|-------|-------|
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 762 | 1391 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | 0.289 | 0.038 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 11.6 | 7.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B | A |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | - | - | 1.2 | 0.1 |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.4 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ↖ | ↗ | ↖ | ↗ | ↗ | ↖ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 28 | 197 | 174 | 456 | 284 | 30 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 28 | 197 | 174 | 456 | 284 | 30 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 45 | 50 | - | - | 50 |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 75 | 75 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 41 | 286 | 232 | 608 | 316 | 33 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1388 | 316 | 349 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 316 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 1072 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 157 | 724 | 1210 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 739 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 329 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 127 | 724 | 1210 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 245 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 597 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 329 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 14.4 | 2.4 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1210 | - | 245 | 724 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.192 | - | 0.166 | 0.394 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | - | 22.6 | 13.2 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | C | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.7 | - | 0.6 | 1.9 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
6: Spanish Valley Dr & Spanish Trail Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 9.8 |
| Intersection LOS | A |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 21 | 50 | 57 | 16 | 123 | 9 | 188 | 25 | 16 | 9 | 30 | 21 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 21 | 50 | 57 | 16 | 123 | 9 | 188 | 25 | 16 | 9 | 30 | 21 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 23 | 56 | 63 | 20 | 154 | 11 | 209 | 28 | 18 | 13 | 42 | 30 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|----|-----|------|-----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9 | 9.7 | 10.7 | 8.6 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | B | A |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 82% | 16% | 11% | 15% |
| Vol Thru, % | 11% | 39% | 83% | 50% |
| Vol Right, % | 7% | 45% | 6% | 35% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 229 | 128 | 148 | 60 |
| LT Vol | 188 | 21 | 16 | 9 |
| Through Vol | 25 | 50 | 123 | 30 |
| RT Vol | 16 | 57 | 9 | 21 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 254 | 142 | 185 | 85 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.35 | 0.189 | 0.254 | 0.115 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.948 | 4.78 | 4.937 | 4.88 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 723 | 744 | 722 | 727 |
| Service Time | 3.016 | 2.854 | 3.006 | 2.963 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.351 | 0.191 | 0.256 | 0.117 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.7 | 9 | 9.7 | 8.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.6 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.4 |

HCM 6th TWSC
 1: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.7 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | T | | T | | T | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 76 | 30 | 37 | 131 | 133 | 53 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 76 | 30 | 37 | 131 | 133 | 53 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 75 | 75 | 72 | 72 | 75 | 75 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 101 | 40 | 51 | 182 | 177 | 71 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | | Major2 | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 497 | 213 | 248 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 213 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 284 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 532 | 827 | 1318 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 823 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 764 | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 509 | 827 | 1318 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 509 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 788 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 764 | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.4 | 1.7 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1318 | - | 571 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.039 | - | 0.248 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | 0 | 13.4 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 1 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
 2: Spanish Valley Dr & Mill Creek Dr/Sand Flats Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 14.3 |
| Intersection LOS | B |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↖ | ↗ | | ↔ | | | ↔ | | | ↔ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 101 | 352 | 28 | 73 | 2 | 265 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 101 | 352 | 28 | 73 | 2 | 265 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 5 | 128 | 446 | 44 | 116 | 3 | 298 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|------|----|------|----|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.7 | 11 | 15.1 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | B | B | C | - |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 91% | 4% | 0% | 27% | 0% |
| Vol Thru, % | 0% | 96% | 0% | 71% | 100% |
| Vol Right, % | 9% | 0% | 100% | 2% | 0% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 292 | 105 | 352 | 103 | 0 |
| LT Vol | 265 | 4 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 0 | 101 | 0 | 73 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 27 | 0 | 352 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 328 | 133 | 446 | 163 | 0 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.527 | 0.215 | 0.629 | 0.265 | 0 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.788 | 5.813 | 5.085 | 5.835 | 6.406 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 623 | 618 | 708 | 615 | 0 |
| Service Time | 3.821 | 3.543 | 2.815 | 3.874 | 4.464 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.526 | 0.215 | 0.63 | 0.265 | 0 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.1 | 10.1 | 16.1 | 11 | 9.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | C | B | N |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 3.1 | 0.8 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 0 |

HCM 6th TWSC
3: Fourth E St & Mill Creek Dr

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 26 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | | | ↕ | | ↕ | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 2 | 2 | 62 | 0 | 281 | 7 | 284 | 92 | 391 | 289 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 2 | 2 | 62 | 0 | 281 | 7 | 284 | 92 | 391 | 289 | 12 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 55 | - | - | - | - | - | 65 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 25 | 25 | 25 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 8 | 8 | 75 | 0 | 339 | 8 | 338 | 110 | 439 | 325 | 13 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | | Minor1 | | Major1 | | Major2 | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|---|---|-------|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1789 | 1674 | 332 | 1627 | 1625 | 393 | 338 | 0 | 0 | 448 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 1210 | 1210 | - | 409 | 409 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 579 | 464 | - | 1218 | 1216 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 7.12 | 6.52 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | 4.12 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | 6.12 | 5.52 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 3.518 | 4.018 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | 2.218 | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 63 | 95 | 710 | 82 | 102 | 656 | 1221 | - | - | 1112 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 223 | 255 | - | 619 | 596 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 501 | 564 | - | 221 | 254 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 21 | 57 | 710 | ~ 50 | 61 | 656 | 1221 | - | - | 1112 | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 21 | 57 | - | ~ 50 | 61 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 221 | 154 | - | 613 | 591 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 240 | 559 | - | 125 | 154 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------|------|--|------|--|-----|--|-----|--|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 44.9 | | 91.8 | | 0.1 | | 5.8 | |
| HCM LOS | E | | F | | | | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1221 | - | - | 106 | 50 | 656 | 1112 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.007 | - | - | 0.151 | 1.494 | 0.516 | 0.395 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8 | 0 | - | 44.9 | 434.6 | 16.2 | 10.3 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | E | F | C | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | 0.5 | 7.1 | 3 | 1.9 | - | - |

Notes
 ~: Volume exceeds capacity \$: Delay exceeds 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon

HCM 6th TWSC
 4: Spanish Valley Dr & Murphy Ln

10/13/2021

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.8 | | | | | |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | TT | | TT | | | TT |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 60 | 69 | 178 | 73 | 82 | 201 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 60 | 69 | 178 | 73 | 82 | 201 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 87 | 87 | 82 | 82 | 81 | 81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 69 | 79 | 217 | 89 | 101 | 248 |

| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|-------|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 712 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 306 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 262 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 450 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 399 | 777 | - | - | 1255 | - |
| Stage 1 | 782 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 642 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | - | - | | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 362 | 777 | - | - | 1255 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 362 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 782 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 582 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|----|----|-----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 15 | 0 | 2.4 |
| HCM LOS | C | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------|-----|----------|-------|-------|
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 507 | 1255 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | 0.292 | 0.081 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 15 | 8.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | C | A |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | - | - | 1.2 | 0.3 |

| Intersection | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.9 | | | | | |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ↖ | ↗ | ↖ | ↗ | ↗ | ↖ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 21 | 265 | 163 | 430 | 499 | 25 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 21 | 265 | 163 | 430 | 499 | 25 |
| Conflicting Peds, #/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 45 | 50 | - | - | 50 |
| Veh in Median Storage, # | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, % | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 94 | 94 | 76 | 76 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 282 | 214 | 566 | 574 | 29 |

| Major/Minor | Minor2 | Major1 | Major2 | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| Conflicting Flow All | 1568 | 574 | 603 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 574 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 994 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | 4.12 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | 2.218 | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 122 | 518 | 975 | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 563 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 358 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, % | | | | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 95 | 518 | 975 | - | - | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 223 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 440 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 358 | - | - | - | - | - |

| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
|----------------------|------|-----|----|
| HCM Control Delay, s | 20.1 | 2.7 | 0 |
| HCM LOS | C | | |

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |
|-----------------------|------|-----|-------|-------|-----|-----|
| Capacity (veh/h) | 975 | - | 223 | 518 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.22 | - | 0.1 | 0.544 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.7 | - | 22.9 | 19.9 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | C | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) | 0.8 | - | 0.3 | 3.2 | - | - |

HCM 6th AWSC
6: Spanish Valley Dr & Spanish Trail Rd

10/13/2021

| Intersection | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 11.2 |
| Intersection LOS | B |

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Lane Configurations | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | | | ↕ | |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 39 | 115 | 144 | 25 | 94 | 2 | 108 | 50 | 20 | 25 | 85 | 28 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 39 | 115 | 144 | 25 | 94 | 2 | 108 | 50 | 20 | 25 | 85 | 28 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, % | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 43 | 126 | 158 | 37 | 138 | 3 | 121 | 56 | 22 | 28 | 96 | 31 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | NB | EB | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB | SB | WB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.1 | 10.5 | 11.1 | 10.3 |
| HCM LOS | B | B | B | B |

| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Vol Left, % | 61% | 13% | 21% | 18% |
| Vol Thru, % | 28% | 39% | 78% | 62% |
| Vol Right, % | 11% | 48% | 2% | 20% |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 178 | 298 | 121 | 138 |
| LT Vol | 108 | 39 | 25 | 25 |
| Through Vol | 50 | 115 | 94 | 85 |
| RT Vol | 20 | 144 | 2 | 28 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 200 | 327 | 178 | 155 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.31 | 0.452 | 0.27 | 0.238 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.579 | 4.964 | 5.464 | 5.525 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 644 | 724 | 657 | 648 |
| Service Time | 3.621 | 2.999 | 3.506 | 3.571 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.311 | 0.452 | 0.271 | 0.239 |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.1 | 12.1 | 10.5 | 10.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | B | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.3 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 0.9 |

Appendix C. Summary Memorandum of Stakeholder Group Interviews



MEMORANDUM

Re: Stakeholder Group Interviews Summary

Date: October 1, 2021

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a summary of stakeholder interviews completed with various groups for the Grand County and City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan (UTMP). Stakeholder groups representing various interests in the region were identified with the input from the project management team. The summary helps to identify general concerns/issues, specific needs, potential solutions, and the vision of stakeholders, to inform Draft Working Paper #1 – Current and Future Conditions of the UTMP. This memorandum will be presented to the project Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as part of Draft Working Paper #1.

The following stakeholder groups were interviewed:

- Downtown Business Owners
- River/Bicycle/Shuttle Business Owners
- Universities/Public Schools
- Trails
- Emergency Services
- Development (Contractor/Construction)
- Partner Governments
- Citizens at Large

Stakeholder group participants were asked to provide feedback and comment on the following questions regarding transportation in the area:

1. What do you view as the main mobility and transportation issues within Grand County and the City of Moab?
2. Are there specific intersections or roadways of most concern?
3. What is your vision for the future of transportation in Grand County and the City of Moab?
4. What solutions or projects are needed to realize the Vision?

Relevant discussions and comments were identified and have been organized first by stakeholder group and then by topic.



Downtown Business Owners

General Concerns/Issues:

- The amount of traffic, especially truck traffic, going through downtown Moab
- Truck traffic on US 191 produces excess pollution and noise
- Hard to create a safe pedestrian area with US 191 cutting through downtown Moab

Specific Needs/Potential Solutions:

- Lighting is poor at 200 North and US 191
- 400 North and 100 West is confusing for all users
- Access control on US 191
 - US 191 and Sage Drive requires a sharp southbound left-turn
 - US 191 and Bowling Alley Lane, and the surrounding area
 - Mivida Drive and US 191 has poor sight distance
- US 191 and SR 313 needs additional signage for the southbound acceleration lane
- Landscaped median islands on US 191 from 100 North to 300 South with green space to help slow traffic and provide a better experience
- Either better bicycle infrastructure along US 191 in downtown or route all bicycles to 100 West as an alternative route
- Eliminate parking on US 191 downtown from 100 North to 300 South
- Left-turns at the signals in downtown should be protected

Vision:

- Alternative modes of transportation for sustainable communities
- Be able to ride around the City more safely via bike paths and trails



River/Bicycle/Shuttle Business Owners

General Concerns/Issues:

- The number of trucks and through traffic traveling through downtown makes active transportation unsafe
- Sidewalks are lacking and children can't walk to school on sidewalks
- Major roads don't have bike paths or shoulders, large gaps in the bicycle network
- Too difficult to cross US 191 in downtown area; lack of pedestrian crossings
- Difficult and unsafe to cross US 191 south of downtown as there is no "transition zone" for people to slow down (unsafe for active transportation or vehicles)
- Need to have a route for active transportation to/from downtown and the USU campus
- Need sidewalks downtown
- Sand Flat Roads is experiencing a large increase in UTV traffic
 - Unpleasant for cyclists to get to Slick Rock Trail from downtown
 - Alternative route for UTVs to get to Sand Flats without utilizing Sand Flats Road
- Noise pollution from OHVs and trucks
- Not enough room to bicycle downtown and not a lot of walking room
- Need a parking facility for bikes around the area
 - Extra wide slots for e-bikes, pay slots for visitors, etc.)
- Wayfinding in the City to access Sand Flats

Specific Needs/Potential Solutions:

- Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to the river is dangerous for pedestrians
 - Bike paths or shoulders on Kane Creek Boulevard
- Fill in the bicycle path gap on SR 128
- US 191 south of the City of Moab to be widened to four lanes, to at least Spanish Trail Road
 - Left turns both from and to US 191 in this section are difficult
- Remove parking from one side of US 191 in the downtown area and create a cycle track or protected bicycle lane
- Fourth East and Millcreek Drive is a busy intersection and difficult to turn left
- Parking on US 191 in downtown needs to be behind buildings, not on US 191
- Need bicycle access coming from Poison Spider Trail or The Portal to downtown (a potential bicycle path on the south side of the tailing pond)

Vision:

- Have the downtown area more bicycle and pedestrian friendly and less vehicle-centric
- Remove trucks from US 191
- New solutions for people to get to downtown Moab
- Plan to accommodate a growing number of e-bikes in the area



Universities/Public Schools

General Concerns/Issues:

- The impact of OHVs on the streets
 - Their overall traffic behavior
 - Noise
- Equity in transportation
- Safety for children by connecting sidewalks and improving bus stop locations
- People on the east side of US 191 have difficulty reaching the west side of US 191, and vice-versa, particularly school children who aren't eligible for bussing
- Lack of safe crossings along US 191 in downtown
- Kids walk a long way without sidewalks
- Need to provide a connection for pedestrians from Aggie Boulevard to downtown Moab
- Limit pollution, idling, and dust
 - Air quality spikes on busy weekends
- Noise pollution and conserving quiet spaces
 - Engine braking along US 191 is loud
- Dangerous to bike along US 191
- Faded or non-existing bike lanes
- Need green infrastructure to diminish urban heat island effect
 - Traffic calming islands with greenery
 - Protected bike lanes with green medians
 - May help with stormwater and flooding
- No crossing guard program for school children
- Cycling along Spanish Valley Drive is scary

Specific Needs/Potential Solutions:

- A separated crossing (over?) US 191
 - 100 North
 - 100 South
- Frontage roads on US 191 to help get buses on/off the road safely
- Sidewalk gap on Holyoak Lane
- Road condition on 100 South, from Main Street to 400 East (a main route to the bus barn)
- A lot of the tourism industry employees live in San Juan County and walk on Spanish Valley or US 191 to get to work or appointments
 - Plan for a paved trail system
- Bike infrastructure in the City is dismal
 - US 191 and 100 North
 - US 191 and Center Street
 - US 191 and 100 South

Vision:

- Encourage alternative modes of transportation for sustainable communities
- Equity in transportation



- Be able to reach the southern part of the valley easily on a trail
- Have shuttles that can easily be accessed by both residents and tourists
- Insert bicycle and walking infrastructure as development grows and continues in new places
- Decrease exposed pavement and increase the shade canopy in the City
- Protect bicyclists and calm traffic

Trails

General Concerns/Issues:

- Lack of pedestrian infrastructure, separated bicycle lanes, and too much traffic
- Lack of secure bicycle infrastructure (storage/racks)
 - Increase in bicycle theft
 - With so many visitors, need to make sure there are areas people can find information and leave their bikes securely
- Need information about bicycle routes/wayfinding
- Connectivity to USU Campus once open
- Gaps in the sidewalk network and lack of sidewalk space
- General lack of connectivity

Specific Needs/Potential Solutions:

- A bicycle lane on Spanish Valley Drive
- Complete the gap on the trail along SR 128
- More safe crossings on US 191 in the City of Moab
- A bicycle lane on US 191 south of the City to Spanish Trail Road
- Provide maps and wayfinding at transportation hubs
- Connectivity issues for the Mountain View neighborhood
- Need safe crossings on US 191 at/near the following:
 - North of downtown in the new four-lane section
 - Aggie Boulevard
 - Spanish Trail Drive
 - Dogwood Avenue (a HAWK crossing)
- Bicycle path north of the USU Campus to downtown so those on the northwest side of the City do not have to cross US 191 to get to the campus
- A route for equestrians from Spanish Valley Arena to Ken's Lake

Vision:

- Any active transportation infrastructure should be tied into a future shuttle system
- Advertise a car-free vacation to Moab
- Have more electric powered mobility (electric scooters, bikes, motorcycles, eventually vehicles and OHVs)
- Have a community where people walk or bike to where they are going
- Secure bicycle parking at major hubs (MIT, aquatic center, grocery store, etc.)
- Facilities accommodating visitors that want to ride to/from the Spanish Valley Arena without crossing or riding on US 191
- Access to and linking of existing trails for equestrians

Emergency Services

General Concerns/Issues:

- Emergency response vehicles often get stuck in traffic or congestion
 - Emergency response vehicles are not marked
- Left-turns downtown are unsafe
 - Many unfamiliar users (tourists and children)
 - Need left-hand turn signals for traffic signals on US 191 downtown
- Crossing US 191 is difficult in downtown
- Deceleration lanes off of US 191 south of the City of Moab
- Noise pollution in downtown Moab
- Need public transportation between Spanish Valley and City of Moab
 - Key locations in Moab: hospital, downtown, village market, etc.
- The need for transportation to/from bedroom communities servicing Moab is going to increase (LaSal, Thompson, Green River)

Specific Needs/Potential Solutions:

- US 191 and 100 South, Center Street, and 100 North have unsafe left-turns as people get impatient and the amount of pedestrians
- Potential traffic signal locations:
 - US 191 and 200 North
 - US 191 and 400 North
- Potential roundabout locations:
 - Millcreek Drive and Sand Flats Road
 - 500 West and Kane Creek Boulevard
 - 300 South and 400 East
 - 400 East and Millcreek Drive
- Congestion at Sand Flats recreation booth on Sand Flats Road
- Congestion at US 191 and 500 West
- Widen US 191 south of the City of Moab downtown to four lanes
- Crash hot spots:
 - US 191 and Spanish Trail Road
 - US 191 and Dogwood Avenue
- Williams Way and 100 West – the bike path puts children headed to school onto the wrong side of the street northbound
- Need a bicycle path that brings bicycles down from Sand Flats Road and routes them to the Potatoe Salad Road to the Power Dam parking lot (down Powerhouse Lane to Millcreek Drive)
- Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to the river is dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists – drivers going too fast and too many bicyclists
- Bicycle lanes on Spanish Valley Drive from Moab City to County Line (and beyond)
- A user-initiated stoplight for getting emergency vehicles out of the emergency center onto US 191 in Spanish Valley (across from San Jose)

Vision:

- Safe movement of public and first responders



- Plan now for all the expected growth
- A bicycle commuter network for mobility, not only for recreation



Development (Contractor/Construction)

General Concerns/Issues:

- Too much traffic and congestion downtown
- Need a new solution beyond a bypass to get truck and pass-through traffic off of US 191 downtown
- Rural development in the south end of the County continues to increase
- Lack of parking for trailers (for OHVs) at trailheads
- OHV and OHV trailer traffic on Fourth East at Millcreek Drive, 300 South, 100 South, and 100 North
- No “transition zone” coming into the City from the South on US 191 (high speeds)
- Separated crossing (under) US 191 is the best type of east-west connection
- Get local and tourist traffic into a public transportation system, essentially leaving the trucks on US 191
- Don’t designate a UTV route in the City, leave them dispersed.

Specific Needs/Potential Solutions:

- Shuttle service to/from downtown Moab and Arches National Park
- Shuttle service utilizing US 191 and Spanish Valley Drive to remove vehicles from US 191
- Connect Utah State University Campus to other parts of the City
- Crossing US 191 at Aggie Boulevard is challenging
- Crossing US 191 in the downtown area
- Sand Flats Road and Millcreek Drive intersection is dangerous
- Southern curve of US 191 in Moab is dangerous for pedestrians and bicycles (Dogwood)
- Sidewalk gap on US 191 between Fourth East and Kane Creek Boulevard
- Bike path gap along Pack Creek near Chevron
- Need crossing improvements on US 191 at the following locations:
 - Pack Creek
 - Aggie Boulevard
 - Spanish Trail Road
- Path gap on SR 128
- Potential bypass along SR 279 south to the Hole in the Rock to eliminate truck traffic out of the valley
- Improve Spanish Valley Drive with a bicycle lane and/or widening

Vision:

- Want to be innovative, maybe something with electric vehicles
- Implement a public transportation system
- Reduce reliance on single vehicles
- More bicycle paths



Partner Governments

General Concerns/Issues:

- Need to understand the relationship of visitors and land use of surrounding areas
- 100 West is redeveloping
 - 100 West and Williams Way is a busy intersection with many children crossing
- Need an alternative to US 191 in downtown – potentially 100 West
- A parking area of 12-20 acres would be required for a mandatory shuttle parking hub for Arches National Park
- Coordination with the City and County on a shuttle system for Arches National Park
- Visitors to Sand Flats Road is increasing and getting busier
- Evaluate trailer parking areas to get them out of the City

Specific Needs/Potential Solutions:

- US 191 widened to four lanes south of the City of Moab
- Additional traffic signals on US 191 south of the City of Moab at:
 - Spanish Trail Road
 - Aggie Boulevard
- More people using 500 West as a “bypass” to Main Street
 - Concerns over intersection safety with the increased traffic on 500 West. Intersections of 400 North, Bartlett Avenue, Williams Way, and Kane Creek Boulevard
- Access control needed on US 191, specifically from Kane Creek Boulevard through the bend south on US 191 (many near misses in the two-way left-turn lane)
- Lack of shoulder or bicycle lane on Spanish Valley Drive, particularly for children going to school
- 100 South as a one-way south street and Main Street as a one-way north street to combat downtown traffic issues
- Left turns on US 191 in downtown are an issue (short times, long delays, and dangerous)
- Emergency Vehicle Bypass needed at the entrance of Arches National Park
- Parking along US 191 create sight problems, specifically in the Dogwood Avenue/US 191 area
- Street parking on US 191 in downtown Moab creates a hazard for through traffic, truck traffic, and truck traffic with trailers
- Potentially pay to park trailers outside of the City
- Complete the missing segment of pathway on SR 128

Vision:

- A shuttle system and parking at trailheads/hubs
 - Parking hubs at Airport, SR 313, Arches National Park, Willow Springs, etc.
- Get the through traffic off of US 191 in the City of Moab
- A transit system within the City to move people within downtown

Citizens at Large

General Concerns/Issues:

- Traveling along US 191 for vehicles and bicyclists is difficult
- US 191 splitting the community and the division of east versus west
- Need better east-west connectors
- There is a lot of emphasis on bicycle trails and trailheads, but not on bicycle commuting to schools, work, etc.
- People do not know about alternative bicycle routes; or, they know but still decide to stay on the road regardless
- Many unfamiliar bicycle riders (tourists, children, families, etc.)
- Navigating downtown is troublesome on a bicycle. Narrow riding lanes, minimal bike lanes, etc.
- Increased growth and development along Spanish Valley Drive, need to focus on additional transportation options in the area
- Unsafe and/or completely disconnected non-motorized travel routes
- Too much focus on keeping downtown business activity isolated to Main Street, which creates parking and congestion issues
- Make it harder and more inconvenient to drive in downtown Moab
- Lack of green painted bike lanes in critical areas with right turn lanes and at intersections crossing US 191
- Kane Creek private property along Pack Creek (currently closed with fencing); general failure to secure easements through private property along Pack Creek/Mill Creek trail systems

Specific Needs/Potential Solutions:

- Crossing US 191, particularly for bicyclists and pedestrians, is difficult in the downtown area
- Traffic signals downtown are chaotic and not efficient to move people
- Gaps in the multimodal network that force users back to US 191:
 - 5/8ths of a mile on the path along SR 128 at the east end near Grand Staff Canyon
 - 100 South to City Market, no parallel bike lane off US 191
 - Going north on 100 East beyond 200 North
 - Connect Millcreek Bicycle path to Kane Creek (200 South to the west)
 - Currently dirt trails that people can bike through but there is a major gap from the US 191/Market Place area to Kane Creek Boulevard
 - Uranium Avenue has a pedestrian crossing but needs a connection from Uranium Avenue to the Green Belt west of US 191 and connect to the Skunk Alley Bridge to the north over Pack Creek.
- 400 north and 100 West area is confusing for all users (bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles)
- Install sidewalks along US 191 from 400 East to Aggie Boulevard
- Install sidewalks along Millcreek Drive from the residential to US 191/Aggie Boulevard
- Potential trail underpass at US 191/Aggie Boulevard; or some type of protected crossing

- The area of Beeman Road and Stocks Drive is getting a lot of traffic and development in the area.
 - No acceleration on US 191 north from Stocks Drive
- US 191 and Kane Creek Boulevard: vehicles are utilizing the northbound left-turn lane to exit McDonalds.
- Many pedestrians and cyclists crossing mid-block on US 191 from Kane Creek Boulevard to Fourth East
- 300 South and 400 East is a difficult left-turn due to heavy traffic
- Trimming trees on Mill Creek parkway near high school/YGP (bad sightlines)
- Bullicks Cross Creek Park gravel (pave gravel section)
- Connect 300 South to Kane Creek Blvd via skunk alley; pave gravel path behind retaining wall and secure easement from Zions Bank
- Crossing into northbound bike lane from Mill Creek path at 100 South
- Connect 200 South to Mill Creek Pathway from Virginian Hotel
- Figure out bike roads and pave/stripe smooth bike lanes (200 Sout between Mill Creek parkway and 400 East; 400 North from 100 West to 500 West; 200 South from Main St. to Bullicks Park)
- Angle parking that would allow for bike lanes throughout downtown
- Mill Creek Drive and Spanish Valley Drive intersection
- Through streets/connectors at W Park Drive and Walnut Lane
- Support business development on 100 West, 100 East, and the streets that cross Main Street downtown to support integrating land uses
- Implement best practices for designing a bike and pedestrian friendly community while acknowledging that visitors to Moab have to arrive by plane, train, or automobile
- Utilize best practices identified in the transportation and mobility study commissioned by the Colorado Association of Ski Towns
- Think of Moab and Grand County as a destination with land use, economic, transportation, and mobility issues (and opportunities) more akin to an urban/urbanizing environment or college town, rather than an isolated community
- Support and encourage the City's and County's continued utilization of planning experiments (i.e. low-cost, short-term, innovative changes that can be tested, iterated, and scaled when successful)

Vision:

- More transit options that allow living further away from the City center
- Alternative transportation friendly community
- More bicycle friendly and walking around the City center
- Less cars and congestion and more people traveling by foot and bicycle
- Eliminate parking issues
- Have a bicycle friendly community
- Reduce crowding and congestion on streets, particularly US 191 in downtown Moab
- Have a safe bicycle and walking commute
- Safe bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure for children
- Prioritize non-motorized travel



- Within 2 years, it should always be easier and faster to bike commute than auto commute
- Within 5 years, visitors should be able to have a car-free trip to Moab if they so choose.
- Within 5 years, visitors should be able to arrive in Moab by commuter train and/or air and transfer to a shuttle in terms of accessing downtown Moab
- In whatever timeline is possible given NEPA and other federal lands regulations, Moab's local transportation infrastructure is integrated with Arches National Park


Appendix D. Stakeholder and Community Outreach Summary

Results from the online survey distributed to the public and stakeholders:



Q1 What do you view as the main mobility and transportation issues within Grand County and the City of Moab? (select all that apply)

Answered: 65 Skipped: 0



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|----|
| Pedestrian walkways | 35.38% | 23 |
| Trails | 20.00% | 13 |
| Bicycle lanes | 47.69% | 31 |
| Public transit | 38.46% | 25 |
| Private shuttles | 3.08% | 2 |
| Traffic congestion | 66.15% | 43 |
| Parking | 32.31% | 21 |
| Connectivity | 24.62% | 16 |
| Safety for all modes of travel | 46.15% | 30 |
| Other (please specify) | 33.85% | 22 |
| Total Respondents: 65 | | |

| # | OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) | DATE |
|---|--|---------------------|
| 1 | Off Highway vehicles on the highway, trailers on side streets | 11/22/2021 8:56 AM |
| 2 | no enforcement of existing laws, jay walkers, speeding, running red lights and bicyclists doing whatever they want | 11/20/2021 11:13 AM |
| 3 | we have limited sidewalks, no upkeep of striping of bike lanes | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 4 | Not enough police to monitor traffic problems. I feel like the state ignores our dangerous situation. | 11/10/2021 7:12 PM |
| 5 | Too many noisy ATVs and no train to SLC | 11/10/2021 6:51 PM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 6 | GHG contribution of transportation sector, noise of ATVs and some motorcycles | 11/10/2021 9:33 AM |
| 7 | UTVs on the streets and for those of us on road bikes (skinny tires), the driveways are a hazard to bike tires and a hassle to negotiate sometimes. There is no reason I can see to make them with a 2" (sometimes greater) vertical rise. I avoid them and that can create problems for getting onto or exiting the existing bike paths. | 11/9/2021 11:10 PM |
| 8 | OHVs clogging and slowing traffic | 11/8/2021 1:55 PM |
| 9 | Spanish Valley commuter bike paths | 11/7/2021 10:51 PM |
| 10 | allowing vehicles that do not meet federal motor vehicle safety standards on public roads | 11/7/2021 3:09 PM |
| 11 | Need a bypass for Semi's, UTVs, Jeeps. Downtown could be so fabulous without the horrible traffic | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 12 | Moab is bisected by UDOT's desire to push more traffic through on 191. | 11/5/2021 12:53 PM |
| 13 | Left turn light signals on Main St. | 11/5/2021 12:07 PM |
| 14 | SPEEDING AND PEOPLE RUNNING RED LIGHTS! Major issue! | 11/4/2021 9:15 AM |
| 15 | Not just bike lanes - separated bike pathways and active transportation network infrastructure and connectivity. There are so many places to provide connectivity for bikes even if connectivity for vehicles is not desired. Examples: Park Rd, Walnut Ln to Hospital Rd, "Skunk Alley" to 300 S via Zions Bank parking lot, etc etc etc. Even the low hanging fruit would make a world of difference for bike commuters. | 11/4/2021 9:06 AM |
| 16 | Lack of a bypass for trucks | 11/3/2021 2:29 PM |
| 17 | Moab needs a bypass | 11/2/2021 6:25 AM |
| 18 | Left turn signals | 10/31/2021 6:50 PM |
| 19 | It's past time; commit to the bypass along the western rim. | 10/31/2021 8:43 AM |
| 20 | Shared carpools, company vand | 10/29/2021 7:41 PM |
| 21 | OHV ! | 10/29/2021 3:51 PM |
| 22 | speed limits | 10/29/2021 9:31 AM |

Q2 Are there specific intersections or roadways within Grand County and/or Moab of most concern?

Answered: 59 Skipped: 6

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 1 | every intersection on 191 need a stop light at this point | 11/22/2021 8:56 AM |
| 2 | Anything on main street | 11/20/2021 11:13 AM |
| 3 | kane creek blvd | 11/19/2021 5:56 AM |
| 4 | main street | 11/17/2021 7:00 PM |
| 5 | Please build Sp Valley pathway! | 11/13/2021 9:18 PM |
| 6 | Main Street, Kane Creek, 400 East and Spanish Valley Drive | 11/12/2021 2:26 PM |
| 7 | Millcreek Drive fast and unsafe for cyclists. Millcreek Dr and 191 almost impossible to make a left hand turn onto the highway. Millcreek Dr and 400 impossible to make a left hand turn onto 400. Making left hand turns in the downtown core of Main Street. Dangerous for pedestrians and for vehicles. 200 N and 400 N on Main is dangerous for pedestrian crossing. The speeds on the new expanded 5 Lanes from the Colorado bridge to 400 North. There is no reason (medians, ped refuge islands, trees, enforcement) for drivers to adhere to speed limits. | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 8 | The intersection near the South Maverick is busy and I often see semis speeding through that intersection. There is also no sidewalk headed north. Another place I find concerning is the area near the Blu Pig. I see pedestrians crossing the highway at night on a regular basis. | 11/11/2021 8:52 AM |
| 9 | 100 West — from the 3-way stop (super awkward intersection for vehicles an pedestrians) to where it crosses Main Street. Bike lane is awkward and has several dangerous curb cuts. Williams Way turning onto 100 West has bad sight lines. | 11/11/2021 7:20 AM |
| 10 | 500 west is a mess when tourists are leaving town as google maps sends them there as a bypass and it turns to a gridlock as they wait for the light by denny's backing traffic sometimes all the way to can creek. The McDonalds and the brew pub is very dangerous as people charge in and out and create traffic accidents. Maybe mcdonalds needs to have everyone enter their business from cane creek so they are not blocking the left turn lane for traffic trying to go left at light onto cane creek, very dangerous situation. Really we need a by pass with bridge over river cane creek to potash. I just do not get the people complaining in neighborhoods that are not even on cane creek. Moab needs to figure this out, it a deal breaker with the semi trucks and through traffic clogging up downtown with traffic noise and pollution. Every other growing town in US eventually figures out a bypass, so why is this seemly impossible here? | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 11 | southbound on Main Street, trying to turn left. | 11/10/2021 7:18 PM |
| 12 | Four way stop signs, light running, and speeding. There is also inadequate signage and speeding south of town. | 11/10/2021 7:12 PM |
| 13 | Yes, Westwatwr Road where we live has become noisy and dangerous due to ATVs rising by even as late as midnight. Main St. is a disaster with trucks, cars, jaywalkers. Why no overpass route? Now there is talk of scooters downtown too. Please don't do that. | 11/10/2021 6:51 PM |
| 14 | 400E at Millcreek | 11/10/2021 5:44 PM |
| 15 | Main Street, Murphy Lane and Spanish Valley Dr. are quite dangerous for bicyclists. | 11/9/2021 11:10 PM |
| 16 | 191 & Spanish Trail Rd. (Shell Gas Station) | 11/9/2021 8:22 PM |
| 17 | Main and Center Kane Creek Road | 11/9/2021 2:22 PM |
| 18 | all of 191 | 11/8/2021 7:37 PM |
| 19 | West side 100 S, Center, and 100 N at Main Street | 11/8/2021 4:03 PM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 20 | Crossing main street on a bike at any cross-section between 100N and 300S is scary, especially with children. 100N and streets like it are so wide - really lend themselves well to green infrastructure (traffic-calming inlets with curb cuts, indented basins, growing shade to reduce heat stress and urban heat-island effect...) | 11/8/2021 1:55 PM |
| 21 | For bikes: Millcreek/Hwy 191 at S. Maverick. We need a safe, paved way to stay on the East side of the road, where all the businesses are! Also, the area around McDonalds is terrifying on a bike, too many entrances and exits. PLEASE close the entrance to McDonalds and make them enter from Kane Creek Blvd! | 11/7/2021 10:51 PM |
| 22 | Spanish Valley Drive needs a multi use wide lane for bikes and pedestrians. We desperately need left lane green arrows on Main St.! I have been nearly run over 4 times because of inattentive drivers. This, even after watching carefully and hoping to catch the eye of drivers. Left lane signals would allow safe left turns for drivers and pedestrians. I know this is UDOT jurisdiction, but hopefully new leadership will get this on the table if it isn't already. | 11/7/2021 6:46 PM |
| 23 | Most roads are in terrible shape with potholes as they were never designed for this much traffic that currently occurs Sand Flats Road and Mill Creek Drive is a bad intersection Also Dogwood and Main Street with the number of tractor trailers parked on the shoulders | 11/7/2021 3:09 PM |
| 24 | Everything along US 191/Main Street. | 11/6/2021 9:16 PM |
| 25 | Hwy 191 through town | 11/6/2021 9:10 PM |
| 26 | Spanish Valley Drive is dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists without a dedicated pathway. It would also reduce congestion. | 11/6/2021 6:15 PM |
| 27 | 191 from 100 North to 400 South. Too congested, too busy, too dangerous. Need a bypass. | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 28 | Main Street (US 191), obviously. It is unsafe for pedestrians to cross even when they have a walk signal. It is unsafe for cars, because of people making illegal U-turns and people illegally jaywalking. It is unsafe for bicyclists to travel along, or even to cross from one side of town to the other. The effect spills over onto other streets (e.g. 400E, 500W) because of the number of cars/trucks using them as a way to avoid Main Street. | 11/6/2021 11:16 AM |
| 29 | 191 and Spanish Trail | 11/6/2021 9:39 AM |
| 30 | Main St. | 11/6/2021 9:34 AM |
| 31 | Spanish Valley Drive needs a bike lane for safety. Same for Arches NP. Intersection of Spanish Valley Drive and S Mill Creek Drive needs widening improvement. Center and Main OR 100N and Main OR 100S and Main should have a dedicated left turn signal so there is one place locals know they can go to get on or off of Main (191) when traffic is heavy. | 11/6/2021 8:58 AM |
| 32 | Yes, 191 will worsen and become more difficult to cross as UDOT is motivated to do so. UDOT is perversely motivated when considering livable communities. | 11/5/2021 12:53 PM |
| 33 | Main Street | 11/5/2021 12:07 PM |
| 34 | no sidewalk that connects from 400 east to dogwood or moab valley inn, 4th east and millcreek congestion, 3 way stop to sand flats will only get worse with new development at lions back, safety of crossing hwy 191 south with speed of traffic. need a frontage road. speeds of traffic approaching town from either end is not enforced. people drive WAY TOO FAST. | 11/4/2021 9:15 AM |
| 35 | Main Street and left turns thereon and 300 south | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |
| 36 | Mill creek drive Spanish trail | 11/3/2021 3:45 PM |
| 37 | Spanish Valley Drive. Plan to improve as continued development happens. | 11/3/2021 2:29 PM |
| 38 | all left turns on Main Street | 11/3/2021 2:28 PM |
| 39 | Main Street | 11/2/2021 6:25 AM |
| 40 | No | 11/1/2021 4:39 PM |
| 41 | highway 101 and south shell gas station, city maket intersection | 10/31/2021 6:50 PM |
| 42 | IF you asking "do we need roundabouts?" the answer is no. | 10/31/2021 8:43 AM |
| 43 | 4th East, 5th West, no left hand turn lights | 10/30/2021 8:46 PM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| | | |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 44 | • 191 & Kane creek, specifically related to the north 191 entrance of McDonald's • 100 S & 191 northbound should have a left turn arrow • Shell station- traffic going from 2 lanes to 1 in southbound direction | 10/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 45 | Down near the Shell station and most often turning left off of hwy 191 | 10/30/2021 10:08 AM |
| 46 | 100 west, 500 west, 400 east, sand flats rd | 10/30/2021 10:03 AM |
| 47 | 191 at Spanish trail | 10/30/2021 5:55 AM |
| 48 | Intersection on 191 and the shell station | 10/29/2021 11:53 PM |
| 49 | 400 East Hwy 191, 400 East Millcreek Drive | 10/29/2021 7:41 PM |
| 50 | Main Street, especially at the south (400 East intersection) and north (500 West intersection) entrances to town. High speed traffic, especially semi trucks, drive through red lights on a daily, if not hourly, basis. | 10/29/2021 7:37 PM |
| 51 | The intersection and lane merge at hwy 191 and Spanish Trail. | 10/29/2021 6:49 PM |
| 52 | 191 from Crescent Junction rye entrance of town as it's missing a lane in each side and people drive dangerously through it. 191 in the town Center is hectic and it's hard to turn left. | 10/29/2021 4:09 PM |
| 53 | Need the pathway built along Spanish Valley Dr for bike, pedestrian & horse use. Please work with San Juan to continue this path out to Pack Creek turnoff. | 10/29/2021 3:51 PM |
| 54 | NA | 10/29/2021 3:28 PM |
| 55 | all | 10/29/2021 2:57 PM |
| 56 | Highway 191 and Spanish Valley | 10/29/2021 1:58 PM |
| 57 | 400 East. Spanish Valley Dr. | 10/29/2021 9:31 AM |
| 58 | All of downtown Main Street. Also the exit onto 191 from City Market; also the turn into the Shell station from 191 south | 10/25/2021 6:34 PM |
| 59 | main street | 10/20/2021 1:58 PM |

Q3 What is your vision for the future of transportation in Grand County and Moab?

Answered: 60 Skipped: 5

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 1 | it being improved for the visitors fuck the locals | 11/22/2021 8:56 AM |
| 2 | Kids being able to cross main street safely while getting to the middle school and high school. Not having to worry about hitting someone while driving down main street. | 11/20/2021 11:13 AM |
| 3 | Traffic bypass around moab | 11/19/2021 5:56 AM |
| 4 | a by pass would alleviate most issues we face from congestion to safety concerns | 11/17/2021 7:00 PM |
| 5 | more bicycle - what would it be like to be a truly bicycle based community. of course it doesn't work for everyone. but it is such a small town, we should be able to make it work for more of us! | 11/16/2021 6:32 PM |
| 6 | Spanish valley pathway; county-wide shuttle (Crested Butte painted buses = ideal model) | 11/13/2021 9:18 PM |
| 7 | More public transit that serves the locals, a REAL bypass, not a bad concept developed to appease a few loud voices, responsible users of developed transportation and safety services. IE no jaywalking, cyclists wearing black clothing and riding in travel lanes in the dark. | 11/12/2021 2:26 PM |
| 8 | That we have a bypass for all of the freight trucks and thru-traffic and the State allows us to implement the trailering of OHV's. Safe, protected pedestrian/bike lanes throughout the valley especially in our downtown core. More quiet experience downtown, increase our air quality by reducing carbon emissions. Safe reliable transit options for cost burdened households. Rail service from our most dominant regional markets; SLC and DEN. Increase opportunities for visitors to come and visit Moab without a car. | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 9 | I think Moab needs a shuttle system connected to the national parks and other points of interest around Moab. | 11/11/2021 8:52 AM |
| 10 | More connectivity with pathways for bikes/pedestrians, especially between neighborhoods, parks, Cury Market, schools. A way to move through your day without have to contend with Main Street and Tourists. | 11/11/2021 7:20 AM |
| 11 | Good public transportation system, buses or vans, free of cheap subsidized passes for locals, especially those in need. With the north to south character of Moab, this is a no brainer. Loops connecting 500 west and 400 east. And a 2nd one that goes back and forth on 191 that provides a way for all the people now living or renting short term to get from spanish valley to moab. That would reall help with traffic and parking. But need to make it work by short waits, free or cheap and easy to access with predictable schedule, nobody wants to wait for a bus that never comes. | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 12 | small shuttle buses for locals. ban OHV's and Razrs on local roads. build a bypass for trucks and other thru traffic. | 11/10/2021 7:18 PM |
| 13 | Bussing from areas in town to the National Parks. Some way to free up roadways. | 11/10/2021 7:12 PM |
| 14 | Rail to SLC and Denver Bypass for trucks so they don't have to be on Main Shuttles at parks and no private cars No scooters etc downtown Ban ATVs un Grand County as Telluride has done Left turn lane on 191 and Spanish Valley Dr Bike Lanes | 11/10/2021 6:51 PM |
| 15 | Public transportation!! Parking permits for downtown. Pedestrian only zones. | 11/10/2021 5:44 PM |
| 16 | Keep the cars on only a very few streets and enforce speed limits. More, and more bike-friendly, bicycle lanes and trails with continuity the full length of Moab and Spanish Valley. | 11/9/2021 11:10 PM |
| 17 | Trolley with hop on/ off locations. | 11/9/2021 8:22 PM |
| 18 | Town shuttle. Shuttle service in Arches. Airport shuttle | 11/9/2021 2:22 PM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 19 | We need a bypass, more bike routes, public transit/ public shuttles, and more leadership to stand up for the people of Moab. | 11/8/2021 7:37 PM |
| 20 | Centralized parking (i.e. parking garages), public transit systems, and safer pathways for non-motorized transportation Amending zoning codes to require less off-street parking, redesigning wide ROWs downtown to allow more on-street parking | 11/8/2021 4:03 PM |
| 21 | Much more green infrastructure with better bike lanes and pedestrian crossings. As a world-destination mountain biking town, the town infrastructure is not at all bike friendly (aside from the Millcreek parkway) | 11/8/2021 1:55 PM |
| 22 | A bike path through Spanish Valley from Old Spanish Trail to town, with off shoots to S. Moab, the high school, and joining the Mill Creek Parkway. A connection (that is legally there) from Cinema Court to the Holyoak subdivision, a paved section from end of Holyoak to the hwy for bikes. Make it EASIER and quicker to bike or walk than to drive short distances. David Olsen started this and should be re-hired to complete the work! | 11/7/2021 10:51 PM |
| 23 | Small electric buses that travel Main Street and other main arteries. Connect to shuttles in the parks, perhaps Sand Flats and spits along Sand flats Road. | 11/7/2021 6:46 PM |
| 24 | Fix the roads and sidewalks, actual enforcement of speed limits and stop signs and lights at intersections | 11/7/2021 3:09 PM |
| 25 | A shuttle connecting Moab town (hotels/restaurants) and Arches Park | 11/7/2021 7:05 AM |
| 26 | A year ago, I sketched out a conceptual bus system for Moab, Green River, and Arches National Park, which can be downloaded here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/8rjuracx5w5v7ra/working.pdf?dl=0 There are also plans in the works to connect Moab to Salt Lake City by rail: https://utahrpa.org/link-utah | 11/6/2021 9:16 PM |
| 27 | Main Street will always be busy. It just gets really scary when pedestrians jay walk or when drivers are aggressive. Not sure there is a way to legislate that. | 11/6/2021 9:10 PM |
| 28 | A pedestrian/cyclist pathway from the county line to downtown. Perhaps a shuttle system from the county line to downtown for local residents not tourists. The BEST scenario would be a bypass for all trucks and through traffic. Get those damned trucks off Main Street. Oh...and NO parking on Main St from 100 North to 300 South. | 11/6/2021 6:15 PM |
| 29 | Need a bypass and make downtown Moab bike, pedestrian and shuttle friendly with lots of parking on sides streets. Increase bus and Uber access to strategic drop off points. Make Spanish Valley bike trail friendly (thought that was already on the books). Increase bus and shuttle routes on Spanish Valley. At least to Millcreek. A bike/shuttle/bus loop would be great between the new USU, downtown Moab, Spanish Valley. | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 30 | A future where we can shop and dine out downtown without fearing for our lives. | 11/6/2021 11:16 AM |
| 31 | bike lanes and hopefully shuttles are needed from Spanish Valley to town | 11/6/2021 9:39 AM |
| 32 | By pass | 11/6/2021 9:34 AM |
| 33 | Some kind of public transportation system that can get workers from Spanish Valley into town for work or shopping. A transit system that would take visitors from Moab into Arches NP. More bike lanes for locals to safely bike to work or shopping. Ideally for the Utah legislature to allow Moab to require OHVS be trailered to trailheads (maybe an exception for Sand Flats area and Steelbender since they're so close to town and would be a trailer parking nightmare?). Or as soon as electric OHVS are on the market require all rental companies in the area to transition to these vehicles. | 11/6/2021 8:58 AM |
| 34 | Land Planning is inseparable from transportation planning. To plan for transportation alone is to guarantee excessive spending on transportation. This is where DOT's are perversely motivated. The DOT is pressured to push more traffic through at higher speeds and adding lanes for convenience. It's a popular way of treating a symptom rather than the disease. Convenient roads perpetuate spending on roads and affects behavior of people. When a convenient road exists, people choose to live further from where they work. It's like chasing your tail while hemorrhaging tax money. | 11/5/2021 12:53 PM |
| 35 | Rerouting Highway 191 around Main Street | 11/5/2021 12:07 PM |
| 36 | get the semi-trucks off of main street. the downtown needs to be more pedestrian friendly and less vehicle-centric. bike lane along spanish valley drive for a safe mode of travel for | 11/4/2021 9:15 AM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

commuters. connectivity for bike lanes in town. separate bikes from traffic. parking structures to get parking off of main street between 100 north and 100 south.

| | | |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 37 | Moab should be "car-optional." Vehicles should be accommodated, but not required. My vision: Active transportation infrastructure and public transit makes vehicular travel far less desirable and convenient. | 11/4/2021 9:06 AM |
| 38 | public transportation, including to Arches National Park | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |
| 39 | Bypass Moab Valley | 11/3/2021 3:45 PM |
| 40 | Hopeful for a local shuttle/bus system to Spanish Valley and shuttle system to arches for the tourons. | 11/3/2021 2:29 PM |
| 41 | less traffic | 11/3/2021 2:28 PM |
| 42 | Let people decide on their own | 11/2/2021 6:25 AM |
| 43 | Free shuttle along 191 | 11/1/2021 4:39 PM |
| 44 | Left turn signals. More bicycle lines. No ohvs allowed on city roads | 10/31/2021 6:50 PM |
| 45 | Let the users define what mode of transportation they will use, don't waste resources and time trying to coerce people into conforming to your vision. Provide a bypass option for the thousands of vehicles per day who have demonstrated that they are just trying to pass through Moab to get where they are hoping to go. | 10/31/2021 8:43 AM |
| 46 | Left hand turn lights, bridge over the river on Potash then down Kane creek to main by McDonalds. This would take big trucks off Main Street without impacting neighborhoods | 10/30/2021 8:46 PM |
| 47 | BUSSES, BUSSES, BUSSES! Bus running from Springhill Suites to Windgate with stops along the way. Encourage folks to leave their vehicle at their hotel and take the bus into town. Will reduce number of vehicles, alleviate parking, climate friendly, reduce drunk driving. Eventually adding routes to residential areas encouraging locals, employees, and vacation renters to leave their cars at their houses and take the bus. When the tailings pile is moved put a massive parking area there and turn arches into a bus situation as well. Park city, telluride and I'm sure other resort towns already have this, I used to live in park city and I loved the bus | 10/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 48 | A safe nice bike path that connects Spanish valley to town. Shuttle service from the airport to town and to the National Parks. | 10/30/2021 10:08 AM |
| 49 | More walkable only areas downtown by creating pedestrian only areas, i.e 100 west and 100 east from center st. to 100 north, shuttles service to downtown, shuttle service to Arches and within the park. | 10/30/2021 10:03 AM |
| 50 | Bike paths from San Juan county that connects to the bike path down town, a rail system through the city and a bypass around main street | 10/29/2021 11:53 PM |
| 51 | Figure 8 shuttle 3 times per day for locals, shuttles up & down Main St for tourists hourly from 7AM to 10PM | 10/29/2021 7:41 PM |
| 52 | Better connectivity of hiking and bike trails leading from town to surrounding public lands. | 10/29/2021 7:37 PM |
| 53 | Be able to take a left hand turn safely. | 10/29/2021 6:49 PM |
| 54 | Some public transportation might help. Maybe some areas should be reserved to local residents only. More shuttle service for tourists. A lot more parking in town. | 10/29/2021 4:09 PM |
| 55 | Find some way to get a bypass for truck traffic downtown, Moab will never have a vibrant successful downtown until this happens. | 10/29/2021 3:51 PM |
| 56 | An extensive urban trail network allowing e-bikes on ALL paved pathways in the area (canyon, river-road, etc) and through town and SV | 10/29/2021 3:28 PM |
| 57 | Bypass Road | 10/29/2021 2:57 PM |
| 58 | The town needs a free shuttle bus to run from Arches to Spanish Valley Road. | 10/29/2021 1:58 PM |
| 59 | Possible shuttles from the valley to town for employees. | 10/29/2021 9:31 AM |
| 60 | improved bikeability and safety | 10/20/2021 1:58 PM |

Q4 What solutions or projects are needed to realize your Vision?

Answered: 58 Skipped: 7

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 1 | no semi rigs or atv's, utv's on county paved roads and city streets | 11/22/2021 8:56 AM |
| 2 | enforcement of traffic laws on main street | 11/20/2021 11:13 AM |
| 3 | udot proposed bypass on Kane Creek blvd | 11/19/2021 5:56 AM |
| 4 | A by pass the city has had options for for over 50 years I have been here for | 11/17/2021 7:00 PM |
| 5 | more designated bike paths and bike lanes. more parking for bikes. Perhaps local business incentives for riding your bike, other community encouragement and participation for chaining the culture. | 11/16/2021 6:32 PM |
| 6 | Money! | 11/13/2021 9:18 PM |
| 7 | All of them! So little has been done in past decades whatever is done in the near and mid future will get us barely caught up to the 21st Century. Traffic calming in the down town core, clustered parking lots or structures, oversized parking for oversized vehicles, reliable and user friendly shuttles that don't just stop at hotels and restaurants, they need to serve folks need to travel to their place of business. | 11/12/2021 2:26 PM |
| 8 | Cooperation with the State and UDOT to prioritize a future that doesn't keep focusing on building more bigger, wider, faster roadways. If the State continues on its projected path of growth we will need to think about moving more people more efficiently and rail, biking and walking are possible options. Bike share programs, safe protected infrastructure (which includes lighting on paths), transit. More housing density downtown to allow for more mobility and less car dependence. Planning and engineering staff that can be creative in retrofitting our public spaces-streets. | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 9 | Working with the parks to set up a shuttle from Moab to popular trailheads. We also would need to purchase buses and establish routes | 11/11/2021 8:52 AM |
| 10 | I would like bike paths that dead end to be linked up — maybe all the way to Millcreek/Powerhouse trailhead and Old City Park on the south — and more linkages from west side neighborhood (Mountain View, Westwood/Palisade, etc. to schools, parks, City Market, etc. (the east side of town). | 11/11/2021 7:20 AM |
| 11 | Already said bridge across river to potash. The people on cane creek can have berms installed with nice landscaping and engineer it to minimize impact and make it easy for these people to get around peak traffic if they need to get in or out of their homes. There are not too many of these people really. The hillside people can also have a dedicated mitigation plan to engineer sound mitigation and easy access to their homes. The rest of us are suffering because a few of these people are whining, lets look at what can we do for the good of the whole community instead of focusing on a tiny group of vocal opponents | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 12 | spend tourist dollars on buses. major approval from DOT and state dollars for bypass. laws and law enforcement. | 11/10/2021 7:18 PM |
| 13 | We will have to have a bypass with the best sound barriers made. | 11/10/2021 7:12 PM |
| 14 | Leaders who care more about the people who actually live here than businesses who make money on renting ATVs | 11/10/2021 6:51 PM |
| 15 | Get people out of their cars by inspiring a change of behavior | 11/10/2021 5:44 PM |
| 16 | Acquisition of properties to connect different segments of non-motorized trails and lanes. | 11/9/2021 11:10 PM |
| 17 | City & county working with the businesses to allow for trolley parking and for areas for people to wait. | 11/9/2021 8:22 PM |
| 18 | Institute shuttles asap! | 11/9/2021 2:22 PM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 19 | - amend parking code to require fewer spaces for affordable/workforce/deed restricted housing - create street designs to allow for on-street parking in 100ft ROWs in downtown, especially in residential areas (R-3 specifically) - build a parking structure/central transportation hub - create/require more sidewalks and bike paths along heavily used streets - designated routes for UTVs - eventually implement public transportation? with consideration of connections to regional communities? this seems to be a challenge and a lower priority before others listed. | 11/8/2021 4:03 PM |
| 20 | Bike lanes that also are part of a larger green infrastructure plan on all new road projects | 11/8/2021 1:55 PM |
| 21 | We need to gain right of way on about 30 properties in Spanish Valley along Pack Creek. Liens should be placed on each property asap and when it is next sold, the land should be bought from the current owner by the county to complete a bike trail/fire break/access/and floodway through the entire Pack Creek drainage. | 11/7/2021 10:51 PM |
| 22 | Lots of money, determination to ask for a lot to get some, focus, affordable housing, because if this is for the community, the community needs to be able to actually live here. This IS for us, right? | 11/7/2021 6:46 PM |
| 23 | Local government should work with the manufacturers of UTV's to lobby state government to get non compliant vehicles off of public roads | 11/7/2021 3:09 PM |
| 24 | Transit hub | 11/7/2021 7:05 AM |
| 25 | Funding for studies is a necessity to move the process along. UDOT also needs to see state-wide public transit as a necessity. | 11/6/2021 9:16 PM |
| 26 | Take the OHV element out of the mix. It will reduce the number of vehicles, reduce conflicts, reduce the noise that causes so much irritation to locals. | 11/6/2021 9:10 PM |
| 27 | A bypass. A bike/pedestrian trail from the south county line to downtown. | 11/6/2021 6:15 PM |
| 28 | It doesn't seem like, in the overall scheme of things, it would cost that much \$\$ to put in bike lanes on Spanish Valley especially now with the new hospital going in and all the new housing out that way. See above. At least extend the bike paths on Spanish Valley to the new housing project that was supposed to start this summer... | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 29 | Enforcement. Stand at the corner of Center and Main, and just count the number of pedestrians jaywalking or crossing against the walk signal, and the number of cars that don't allow pedestrians to cross. If each and every single one of them got a \$100 ticket, the situation would improve. | 11/6/2021 11:16 AM |
| 30 | Bike lanes or trails down Spanish Valley to Ken's Lake | 11/6/2021 9:39 AM |
| 31 | UDOT needs to get with it!! How many surveys?? | 11/6/2021 9:34 AM |
| 32 | Money! Yes funding for public transportation systems and bike lanes. What Springdale and Zion did is a good example except Moab and Arches will be more complicated and costly due to a larger town and park. Plus making sure to see what low income locals need and would use to get them to work and shopping (including bus passes they can afford). And the Utah Legislature to practice what it preaches about letting counties determine their needs (regarding OHVs). | 11/6/2021 8:58 AM |
| 33 | Plan for multiple small commercial cores approximately 1/2 mile apart to allow for non-auto commuting. Allow congestion on roads between residential(only) areas and commercial cores. This is a planning problem more than a traffic problem. To think that we can simply build bigger wider roads to accommodate traffic is just not true. Planning and inconvenient roads are necessary. This takes significant public education and much of the public will not want to hear it. It is however a reality. | 11/5/2021 12:53 PM |
| 34 | bridge across Colorado River, excavate tunnel in Moab Rim | 11/5/2021 12:07 PM |
| 35 | major financial investment in our community to create a more liveable town for locals. make travel in and around town safer for pedestrians and cyclists. public transport options to move people from the valley into town and back | 11/4/2021 9:15 AM |
| 36 | Invest in bike infrastructure and network connectivity. Eliminate parking on main st and expand the sidewalks. | 11/4/2021 9:06 AM |
| 37 | buses or large vans | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| | | |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 38 | Additional Colorado river bridge Connection from US 279 to US 191 via Kane Creek canyon. | 11/3/2021 3:45 PM |
| 39 | See above | 11/3/2021 2:29 PM |
| 40 | less tourism advertising | 11/3/2021 2:28 PM |
| 41 | A bypass for 191 | 11/2/2021 6:25 AM |
| 42 | Funding | 11/1/2021 4:39 PM |
| 43 | 100,000 | 10/31/2021 6:50 PM |
| 44 | We need to stop pretending that the country is not continuing to grow and the bypass is not going to happen. Excuses like "it's too late", "it's too complicated" or "it's too expensive" belie a lack of leadership on the part of those who should be making decisions. Of course it is too late, expensive and complicated, but that's not really any different than the challenges faced by any community throughout the country. Moab needs to evolve beyond the us against them mentality and accept that it will be more helpful to embrace reality and focus on how to make the best of the inevitable. | 10/31/2021 8:43 AM |
| 45 | Bridge over Kane and left hand turn lights. Better roads and sidewalks everywhere in the city and county Main Streets and subdivision | 10/30/2021 8:46 PM |
| 46 | BUSSES, BUSSES, BUSSES | 10/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 47 | Closing 100 west, 100 east to center st. and 100 north to all traffic - pedestrians only. | 10/30/2021 10:03 AM |
| 48 | On connected bike path from the river to Spanish valley would be a great start | 10/29/2021 11:53 PM |
| 49 | Purchase shuttles, hire & train drivers, educate public Provide bus, train options into Moab Establish a system of Link- On-Utah & Link-On-USA | 10/29/2021 7:41 PM |
| 50 | Designated and separated bike lanes along Spanish Valley Drive to Kens Lake, Kane Creek Blvd to end of pavement, Potash Road, Colorado River road to Castle Valley, and along highway 313. Better traffic lights along highway 191 leading into town. But, I bet there will eventually be more traffic lights between Denny's and the river due to all the new hotels, so that will help. And south of town at the University intersection. | 10/29/2021 7:37 PM |
| 51 | Extending 4 lanes to all of 191. | 10/29/2021 6:49 PM |
| 52 | Adding lanes to 191 all the way to town. Limiting none local driving in some areas. More parking. Bike lanes. Public transportation. | 10/29/2021 4:09 PM |
| 53 | The State, County and City need to make a bypass a priority, not ignore the need. | 10/29/2021 3:51 PM |
| 54 | Dedicated bike paths to all reasonably spaced destinations (bar-m, sand flats, river road, potash, kens lake, etc) | 10/29/2021 3:28 PM |
| 55 | Bypass Road | 10/29/2021 2:57 PM |
| 56 | Free shuttle buses and bicycle lanes. | 10/29/2021 1:58 PM |
| 57 | Change the speed limits in town to what the road design allows for. There is no reason other than some squeaky wheels why entire streets that are 50 feet wide and straight should be 20 mph. (300S). 400 E is 70 feet wide and straight. It has a speed limit of 25 mph. It is ridiculous. | 10/29/2021 9:31 AM |
| 58 | More clear bike lanes and less on street parking | 10/20/2021 1:58 PM |

Q5 Contact Information

Answered: 24 Skipped: 41

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|-----------------|-----------|----|
| Name | 100.00% | 24 |
| Company | 0.00% | 0 |
| Address | 91.67% | 22 |
| Address 2 | 25.00% | 6 |
| City/Town | 100.00% | 24 |
| State/Province | 95.83% | 23 |
| ZIP/Postal Code | 91.67% | 22 |
| Country | 0.00% | 0 |
| Email Address | 83.33% | 20 |
| Phone Number | 66.67% | 16 |

| # | NAME | DATE |
|----|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Susie Harrington | 11/16/2021 6:33 PM |
| 2 | Karen Guzman Newton | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 3 | Christy Calvin | 11/11/2021 7:21 AM |
| 4 | Marcia Ewell | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 5 | Tom Edwards | 11/10/2021 7:19 PM |
| 6 | Marsha | 11/10/2021 7:13 PM |
| 7 | Colleen | 11/10/2021 6:54 PM |
| 8 | Linda Mattick | 11/9/2021 2:23 PM |
| 9 | Audrey and Tim Graham | 11/7/2021 10:52 PM |
| 10 | Linn DeNesti | 11/7/2021 6:47 PM |
| 11 | Pete | 11/7/2021 3:10 PM |
| 12 | Mike Christensen | 11/6/2021 9:17 PM |
| 13 | Janet Landon | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 14 | LuDean Merritt | 11/6/2021 9:35 AM |
| 15 | Jeff Pillus (Office) | 11/5/2021 12:55 PM |
| 16 | Joe Kingsley | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |
| 17 | Shane | 11/2/2021 6:26 AM |
| 18 | Crystal muzik | 10/31/2021 6:51 PM |
| 19 | Samantha Derbyshire | 10/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 20 | Joette Langianese | 10/30/2021 10:05 AM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| | | |
|----|-----------------|---------------------|
| 21 | Carter Lloyd | 10/29/2021 11:54 PM |
| 22 | Charlotte Mates | 10/29/2021 7:43 PM |
| 23 | Matt Slawson | 10/29/2021 3:30 PM |
| 24 | Alison Ling | 10/29/2021 2:00 PM |

| # | COMPANY | DATE |
|---|---------|------|
|---|---------|------|

There are no responses.

| # | ADDRESS | DATE |
|---|---------|------|
|---|---------|------|

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Box 264 | 11/16/2021 6:33 PM |
| 2 | 804 Pear Tree Lane | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 3 | 187 Park Drive | 11/11/2021 7:21 AM |
| 4 | 639 N 500 W | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 5 | 4300 Easy St | 11/10/2021 7:19 PM |
| 6 | Marshall | 11/10/2021 7:13 PM |
| 7 | Kennedy | 11/10/2021 6:54 PM |
| 8 | 380 Park Drive | 11/9/2021 2:23 PM |
| 9 | 1701 Murphy | 11/7/2021 10:52 PM |
| 10 | 575 Jonny Way | 11/7/2021 6:47 PM |
| 11 | 150 S State St Ste 100 Box 50 | 11/6/2021 9:17 PM |
| 12 | 1612 Rocky Rd | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 13 | 505 N Main St | 11/6/2021 9:35 AM |
| 14 | 301 4th East | 11/5/2021 12:55 PM |
| 15 | 324 E 300S | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |
| 16 | 1870 desert hills dr | 11/2/2021 6:26 AM |
| 17 | po box 1262 | 10/31/2021 6:51 PM |
| 18 | 729 Bartlett cr. | 10/30/2021 10:05 AM |
| 19 | 3373 Watchman Trail | 10/29/2021 11:54 PM |
| 20 | 375 East Pueblo Court | 10/29/2021 7:43 PM |
| 21 | 517 Winesap | 10/29/2021 3:30 PM |
| 22 | 4191 E Lipizzan Jump | 10/29/2021 2:00 PM |

| # | ADDRESS 2 | DATE |
|---|-----------|------|
|---|-----------|------|

| | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 900 Kane Creek Blvd | 11/16/2021 6:33 PM |
| 2 | 668 N. 500 W. | 11/10/2021 7:13 PM |
| 3 | 3439 Westwater Road | 11/10/2021 6:54 PM |
| 4 | Apt 304 | 11/9/2021 2:23 PM |
| 5 | PO Box 1029 | 11/7/2021 6:47 PM |
| 6 | Unit 207 | 11/5/2021 12:55 PM |

| # | CITY/TOWN | DATE |
|---|-----------|------|
|---|-----------|------|

| | | |
|---|------|--------------------|
| 1 | Moab | 11/16/2021 6:33 PM |
| 2 | Moab | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| 3 | Moab | 11/11/2021 7:21 AM |
|----|----------------|---------------------|
| 4 | Moab | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 5 | Moab | 11/10/2021 7:19 PM |
| 6 | Moab | 11/10/2021 7:13 PM |
| 7 | Moab | 11/10/2021 6:54 PM |
| 8 | Moab | 11/9/2021 2:23 PM |
| 9 | Moab | 11/7/2021 10:52 PM |
| 10 | Moab | 11/7/2021 6:47 PM |
| 11 | Moab | 11/7/2021 3:10 PM |
| 12 | Salt Lake City | 11/6/2021 9:17 PM |
| 13 | Moab | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 14 | Moab | 11/6/2021 9:35 AM |
| 15 | Moab | 11/5/2021 12:55 PM |
| 16 | Moab | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |
| 17 | Moab | 11/2/2021 6:26 AM |
| 18 | moab | 10/31/2021 6:51 PM |
| 19 | Moab | 10/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 20 | Moab | 10/30/2021 10:05 AM |
| 21 | Moab | 10/29/2021 11:54 PM |
| 22 | Moab | 10/29/2021 7:43 PM |
| 23 | Moab | 10/29/2021 3:30 PM |
| 24 | Moab | 10/29/2021 2:00 PM |
| # | STATE/PROVINCE | DATE |
| 1 | UT | 11/16/2021 6:33 PM |
| 2 | utah | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 3 | Ut | 11/11/2021 7:21 AM |
| 4 | UT | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 5 | UT | 11/10/2021 7:19 PM |
| 6 | Utah | 11/10/2021 7:13 PM |
| 7 | UT | 11/10/2021 6:54 PM |
| 8 | Utah | 11/9/2021 2:23 PM |
| 9 | UT | 11/7/2021 10:52 PM |
| 10 | UT | 11/7/2021 6:47 PM |
| 11 | Utah | 11/6/2021 9:17 PM |
| 12 | UT | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 13 | UT | 11/6/2021 9:35 AM |
| 14 | Utah | 11/5/2021 12:55 PM |
| 15 | UT | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| | | |
|----|------|---------------------|
| 16 | Utah | 11/2/2021 6:26 AM |
| 17 | ut | 10/31/2021 6:51 PM |
| 18 | UT | 10/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 19 | Utah | 10/30/2021 10:05 AM |
| 20 | UT | 10/29/2021 11:54 PM |
| 21 | UTah | 10/29/2021 7:43 PM |
| 22 | UT | 10/29/2021 3:30 PM |
| 23 | Utah | 10/29/2021 2:00 PM |

| # | ZIP/POSTAL CODE | DATE |
|----|-----------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 84532 | 11/16/2021 6:33 PM |
| 2 | 84532 | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 3 | 84532 | 11/11/2021 7:21 AM |
| 4 | 84532 | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 5 | 84532 | 11/10/2021 7:19 PM |
| 6 | 84532 | 11/10/2021 7:13 PM |
| 7 | 84532 | 11/10/2021 6:54 PM |
| 8 | 84532 | 11/9/2021 2:23 PM |
| 9 | 84532 | 11/7/2021 10:52 PM |
| 10 | 84532 | 11/7/2021 6:47 PM |
| 11 | 84111 | 11/6/2021 9:17 PM |
| 12 | 84532 | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 13 | 84532 | 11/6/2021 9:35 AM |
| 14 | 84532 | 11/5/2021 12:55 PM |
| 15 | 84532 | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |
| 16 | 84532 | 11/2/2021 6:26 AM |
| 17 | 84532 | 10/31/2021 6:51 PM |
| 18 | 84532 | 10/30/2021 10:05 AM |
| 19 | 84532 | 10/29/2021 11:54 PM |
| 20 | 84532 | 10/29/2021 7:43 PM |
| 21 | 84532 | 10/29/2021 3:30 PM |
| 22 | 84632 | 10/29/2021 2:00 PM |

| # | COUNTRY | DATE |
|---|-------------------------|------|
| | There are no responses. | |

| # | EMAIL ADDRESS | DATE |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | susie@withgaia.com | 11/16/2021 6:33 PM |
| 2 | condomoab@gmail.com | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 3 | christycalvin@xmission.com | 11/11/2021 7:21 AM |
| 4 | marciablues@gmail.com | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 5 | mash52@yshoo.com | 11/10/2021 7:13 PM |

Grand County & City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan

| 6 | linda.mattick@att.net | 11/9/2021 2:23 PM |
|----|------------------------------|---------------------|
| 7 | graham4grand@yahoo.com | 11/7/2021 10:52 PM |
| 8 | linndenesti@gmail.com | 11/7/2021 6:47 PM |
| 9 | Mike@UtahRPA.org | 11/6/2021 9:17 PM |
| 10 | jlandon@xmission.com | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 11 | Platformx02@gmail.com | 11/6/2021 9:35 AM |
| 12 | moabking@gmail.com | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |
| 13 | shane@lynkage.net | 11/2/2021 6:26 AM |
| 14 | muzik311@yahoo.com | 10/31/2021 6:51 PM |
| 15 | samanthaderbyshire@gmail.com | 10/30/2021 1:32 PM |
| 16 | joettel@frontiernet.net | 10/30/2021 10:05 AM |
| 17 | carter.lloyd.cl@gmail.com | 10/29/2021 11:54 PM |
| 18 | char.mates@yahoo.com | 10/29/2021 7:43 PM |
| 19 | mhslawson@icloud.com | 10/29/2021 3:30 PM |
| 20 | alisonling53@gmail.com | 10/29/2021 2:00 PM |
| # | PHONE NUMBER | DATE |
| 1 | 4352600222 | 11/16/2021 6:33 PM |
| 2 | 4352609889 | 11/12/2021 9:54 AM |
| 3 | 8015189182 | 11/11/2021 7:21 AM |
| 4 | 9707084843 | 11/10/2021 8:11 PM |
| 5 | 4352596037 | 11/10/2021 7:19 PM |
| 6 | 3104655653 | 11/9/2021 2:23 PM |
| 7 | 435-220-0185 | 11/7/2021 10:52 PM |
| 8 | 2062266995 | 11/7/2021 6:47 PM |
| 9 | 385-355-4567 | 11/6/2021 9:17 PM |
| 10 | 4352607642 | 11/6/2021 3:14 PM |
| 11 | 9704035088 | 11/5/2021 12:55 PM |
| 12 | 14352601824 | 11/3/2021 4:34 PM |
| 13 | 220-0172 | 10/30/2021 10:05 AM |
| 14 | 8016471227 | 10/29/2021 11:54 PM |
| 15 | 8018704062 | 10/29/2021 7:43 PM |
| 16 | 7039095837 | 10/29/2021 2:00 PM |

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Comments received during the November 2021 community meeting via comment cards available at the meeting:

| Source | Comment |
|-------------------------|--|
| November Public Meeting | Consider using a local geotechnical firm for local projects. |
| November Public Meeting | Consideration of growth rates based on other factors of growth. For example, the airport breaking the 10 year growth projection in 3 years. Car rental growth, shuttles, taxi, rail, rocky mountaineer. VTOL (vertical takeoff) UAV (unmanned air vehicles) are coming in time. Where would they take off and land? These will be electric vehicles. There is a rumor about an industrial park out near the airport. Blue Hills Road could get much busier. Road widening near the airport likely needed in the next 10 years. |
| November Public Meeting | Close center from Williams Way to 191, or beyond. Maybe a pedestrian plaza. - Tammy Taylor |
| November Public Meeting | I'm wondering how Kane Creek Road around past the portal can accommodate the proposed 500 residential units the new landowner wants to build down there. It is a narrow, winding road & it seems like it would be a huge expensive undertaking to expand it to accommodate that, and I don't think local taxpayers should be paying for that, especially because many of us do not want to see 500 units down KC Road. |
| November Public Meeting | Needed Bike/ pedestrian connections between 300 South & Kane Creek via pedestrian bridge (existing) and bike to school route from the hawk near city market across pack creek to kane creek (off highway route behind businesses) |
| November Public Meeting | Ranna suggests no signal at 200 North and Main but add some sort of HAWK device. Something to help the pedestrians get across. Perhaps a RRFB. |
| November Public Meeting | Ranna - Tunnel or bridge at Aggie Blvd or perhaps at end of proposed trail into Moab. Try not to have to stop 191 for pedestrians. |
| November Public Meeting | The manual on uniform traffic control devices outlines warrants that must be met in order to install traffic control signs. What warrants are being considered with regards to when to implement protected left turns? What other mitigation strategies are on the table, and what metrics are we using to determine when they become necessary? - Kaya Woodall |
| November Public Meeting | 300 South. Need radar / cameras to address speeding in the area. People speed through the area, more patrols. |
| November Public Meeting | Look at Figure 8 shuttle from Lions Park to Arena - 3 times a day 7 am noon 5 pm. Eventually add short buses feeding into Figure 8 from neighborhoods. Shuttles need to have bike racks. Ask UDOT / UTA about van. Advertise / advertise / advertise Salt Lake Express / Airplanes / Medical Apptmt. Mileage PD SEUTC. - Charlotte Mates 801-870-4062 (cell/text) |
| November Public Meeting | Front of comment card: South of town 400 South / 191 Roundabout Back of comment card: see image below for diagram they drew on the back of the comment card. |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Comments received during the November 2021 community meeting via maps available for comment at the meeting (See Map 1 and Map 2 on the following page):

| Source | Comment Location on Map | Comment |
|--------|-------------------------|---|
| Map 1 | A | Repave (pave?) bike trail |
| Map 1 | B | Deadly |
| Map 1 | C | Bike Access / Sidewalk |
| Map 1 | D | Bike Trail / Flood Control / Fire Control Access along all of Pack Creek |
| Map 1 | E | Open this!! (Connection between San Miguel north to path over Pack Creek eventually to 400 West) |
| Map 1 | F | Better bike access please and trail improvements |
| Map 1 | G | Protected Left Turn |
| Map 2 | I | Solar Farm Parking for National Park / City Shuttles? Outdoor Venue? |
| Map 2 | J | Bike Lanes! To Captain Ahab (on Kane Creek Blvd) |
| Map 2 | K | Infill / Pedestrian space in downtown Moab (Near Sand Flats/Millcreek Dr) |
| Map 2 | M | Tiny home / van communities Can be seasonal / long-term housing |
| Map 2 | N | All within the flood way! Bike lanes! Green Belt! Fire break! |
| Map 2 | O | Housing! (near USU) Sooner than later please! How will this connect to the city for peds and bikes? |
| Map 2 | Q | Bike trail along Pack Creek: Place liens on properties adjacent to the creek and when they change hands (2 years of 30 years) county buys right of way for the trail. Many access ways from Murphy for bikes & fire control |
| Map 2 | R | Need figure 8 shuttle from Shell Station to Lions Park 3 times a day (7 am, Noon, 5 pm) Char Mates (801) 870-4062 cell / text Link-On-Utah Link-On-USA |
| Map 2 | S | Why? Lets use our water more efficiently & put housing - Arnie (Circling the farm land) |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

The following comments were received from the December Public Outreach meeting regarding proposed projects.

| Project Name | Project Description | Public Meeting (12/17) Notes | Public Priority |
|---|--|--|-----------------|
| Active Transportation | | | |
| US 191 Sidewalk Improvements #1: Fourth East to Bittle Lane | Construct new sidewalk to connect existing gap along US 191 from Fourth East to Bittle Lane | | |
| 200 North and US 191 Traffic Signal | Construct traffic signal at US 191 at 200 North intersection | Additional lighting needed Anything to make 191 more friendly Safety enhancements | |
| Dogwood Avenue and US 191 Area Crossing | Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing on US 191 near Dogwood Avenue (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon/"HAWK" crossing) | Very scary for kids to cross via bike This would be nice Additional lighting needed Please. Dangerous. | 1 (High) |
| Millcreek Drive Sidewalk Improvements | Construct sidewalk where missing on Millcreek Drive, Spanish Valley Drive to bridge north of Lasal Road | | |
| Holyoak Sidewalk Connection | Construct sidewalk along Holyoak Lane from Mill Creek Drive to Wagner Avenue | | |
| 100 East Bicycle Lanes | Install bicycle lane pavement markings on 100 East from 200 North to Millcreek Trail and on to City Market | Yes | |
| Shared Use Path Construction and Connections; Pack Creek and Mill Creek | Construct a shared use path that connects the pedestrian hybrid beacon on US 191 at City Market crossing Pack Creek to Kane Creek Boulevard and north to 300 South. Also a connection to 100 West. | Important local transit route Yes please! Connects to Zions Bank as well as Skunk Alley bridge | 1 (High) |
| US 191 at Aggie Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing | Construct tunnel at US 191 and Aggie Boulevard intersection to cross US 191 | I am a USU employee who bikes to work daily Very useful | |
| Kane Creek Boulevard Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to Kane Creek Recreation Parking (end of pavement) | Good idea, this road is rough to bike. | |
| Kane Creek Boulevard Bicycle Lanes Improvements | Stripe bicycle lanes and construct paved shoulders (if needed) on Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to 500 West | | |
| Murphy Lane Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Murphy Lane from Millcreek Drive to Spanish Trail Road | Great! | |
| Colorado River Shared-Use Path Gap | Construct shared use path along Colorado River between Grandstaff Canyon and Goose Island (existing gap) | Safety risk without this Great idea Love it! Good idea Forestry, Fire, and State Lands permitting is in place and ammendable if needed | |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Project Name | Project Description | Public Meeting (12/17) Notes | Public Priority |
|---|---|--|-----------------|
| Spanish Valley Drive Shared-Use Path | Construct a shared use path on Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to South County line | Yes! (Already happening) Yes! Support kids and families with dedicated paths to county line, not just shoulders | 1 (High) |
| Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead Connections | Construct trail connections to Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead (Powerhouse Lane) to Pack Creek and/or Millcreek pathways | | |
| Sand Flats Recreation Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Access | Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to connect Sand Flats Recreation to downtown. | Could this be done on the pipeline easement paralleling pipedream? | |
| Sand Flats Road Shared-Use Path | Construct shared-use path from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | recreation focus not needed I think unnecessary, sand flats is kind of all about the recreation/dirt roads | 3 (Low) |
| San Miguel Connection | Construct a connection between San Miguel north to path over Pack Creek, eventually connecting to Millcreek Drive | | |
| 500 West Safe Routes to School Improvements | Evaluate bike lane and parking needs on 500 West from 400 North to US 191 to provide a "Safe Route to School". | Bike lane please Protected bike lane | 1 (High) |
| 100 West Corridor Assessment | Complete a corridor assessment for 100 West from Swanny City Park to 100 South including pedestrian and bicycle crossings, sidewalks, capacity improvements, and bike lane needs. | | |
| Pack Creek Drainage Assessment | Complete an assessment/feasibility study for improvements to the Pack Creek drainage including a bike trail, fire break, access, and floodway considerations. | This would be a huge disturbance in an important wildlife corridor Worry for loss of wildlife corridor if completely developed. Note, fire break Pack Creek often clogged with tumbleweeds | |
| Roadway Improvements | | | |
| Park Drive Connection | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Park Drive, Opal Avenue to Park Road | This is great, it has been a barrier for our city ambulances. Easy fix. Needed Yes! | |
| Walnut Lane Street Connection | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Walnut Lane to Orchard Park Lane (Hospital Road) | Needed | |
| US 191 to Spanish Valley Drive Connection near Beeman Road | Construct new east-west street connection between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road | I would love to see a stop light Should include an acceleration lane Yes! | |
| Millcreek Drive/Aggie Blvd and US 191 Intersection Improvements | Construct traffic signal at Millcreek Drive and US 191 intersection | Tunnel/bridge for pedestrians/bikes, please Poorly labeled shoulder. Operates as a turn lane on N. 191 on to 4th E. | |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Project Name | Project Description | Public Meeting (12/17) Notes | Public Priority |
|--|--|---|-----------------|
| US 191 / Meador Drive Traffic Signal Improvements | Construct traffic signal at US 191/Meador Drive | Not supportive | |
| US 191 and West Moab Boat Dock Road Improvements | Identify and construct safety improvements to Moab Boat Dock Road intersection at US 191 | Strongly support High use and dangerous - If nothing else add mirrors for right turns Eliminate right turn. Implement "left hand turn" only. Move bike path to under bridge and have bikes cross back over at court house wash bridge. The reason for this is to put acceleration lane coming out of boat dock. | 1 (High) |
| US 191 Gemini Bridges and Bar M Access Improvements | Realignment of access roads on US 191 at Gemini Bridges and Bar M (AKA Old Highway, Moab Canyon) | Yes! This would be great | |
| Sand Flats Road Improvement | Roadway improvement (paving) on Sand Flats Road from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | It is in pretty rough shape | |
| Millcreek Drive Corridor Assessment and Preliminary Plan | Prepare preliminary plans for the Millcreek Drive corridor from Spanish Valley Drive to Fourth East, including the Fourth East/300 South intersection. Plans may identify intersection improvements to the following: -Millcreek Drive / Spanish Valley Drive -Millcreek Drive / Murphy Lane -Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road -Millcreek Drive / Fourth East -Fourth East / 300 South | | |
| Fourth East Improvements | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements (intersection and segment) to Fourth E. Street between 100 North and US 191 | Southbound 4 E left turn lane onto Kiva seems slightly undersized Including green infrastructure! Protected bike lanes? Encourage students to ride bikes. Fix pot poles and add sidewalks. Overdue Capacity seems fine, pavement could be smoother. Repaint lines. Remove stop sign at 100 N. the dip is too deep. Particularly around GCHS, balance capacity with speed and safety Balance increased capacity with risk for increased speed; most needed by highschool and youth garden. | |
| Spanish Valley Drive | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to County Line | Not accommodating more vehicles, yes to bike lanes Pedestrian access , driveway safety and speed is more important than capacity | |
| Kane Creek Boulevard | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to Kane Creek Recreation Parking; Including the intersection of Kane Creek Boulevard and 500 West | | |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Project Name | Project Description | Public Meeting (12/17) Notes | Public Priority |
|--|---|---|-----------------|
| Spanish Trail Road | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Spanish Trail Road from US 191 to Murphy Lane | | |
| Parking | | | |
| Oversized Lot Parking Improvements | Construct over-sized parking lots north and south of downtown Moab | <p>Leave to private sector</p> <p>Much needed</p> <p>Please do not block views or develop natural areas for this, maybe revamp trash ed development sites?</p> <p>ON USU campus, allow USU to asses small fee</p> | |
| Arches National Park Overflow Parking Area | Parking at UMTRA site for Arches NP/City Shuttles/etc | <p>Yes</p> <p>Much needed</p> <p>Not doable in realistic time scales per DOE</p> | |
| US 191 Parking | Evaluate no parking zones on US 191 to limit parking inhibiting sight distances; including freight parking | <p>In conjunction with relocation of parking to pedestrian use, and to improve safety and reduce travel time through downtown</p> <p>Prohibit trailer parking and reduce speed limit</p> <p>Leave parking on Main Street!! Reduce speed on Main</p> | |
| Multimodal Transfer Center | Construct a multi-modal transfer center near Canyonlands Regional Airport, connecting Moab Canyon Pathway, SR 128 Trail, and shuttle services | | |
| Grand County Shuttle System | Implement shuttles (transit, medical, retail, etc.) to serve key destinations including Arches, Airport, Hospital, USU, Spanish Valley/Spanish Trail Road, Rocky Mountaineer Hub, etc. | <p>Needed</p> <p>Library, grocery store, courthouse and other essentials for residents (please not tourist-centric!!)</p> | |
| General Strategies / Policies / Future Considerations | | | |
| Shared Use Path Design Standards | Updating standards, guidelines, and criteria for shared use path construction. | Yes | 1 (High) |
| Complete Streets Policy | Develop a Complete Streets Policy to guide future design of streets in the City and County. | <p>Green infrastructure as focus and critical need, yes!</p> <p>Why not on a maintenance plan</p> <p>Great!</p> | |
| Downtown Bicycle Parking Facilities | Include bicycle parking facilities with new or re-development throughout the downtown area. | | |
| Active Transportation Design Guidelines | Incorporate design guidelines/policies to separate users of the transportation system whenever possible, particularly downtown (trucks, vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles), with active transportation facilities | A bypass would remove trucks | |
| Pavement Maintenance and Preservation Program | Establish a comprehensive pavement maintenance program | Yes, yes, yes | |
| E-Bike Consideration | Develop policies concerning use of e-bikes on all paved pathways | <p>Yes!</p> <p>Make friendly for older residents</p> | |



UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

| Project Name | Project Description | Public Meeting (12/17) Notes | Public Priority |
|--|--|---|-----------------|
| Downtown Wayfinding Signage | Implement wayfinding signage to trails, trailheads, and on street cycling routes alternatives to US 191 in downtown Moab | This would be nice! Could be good | |
| Wayfinding Signage (Parking) | Add parking signs to encourage parking in the city-owned lots and available spaces | Sure | |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Awareness Campaign | Develop education campaign and materials encouraging safe practices by motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists. | | |
| UDOT Frontage Road Study | Adopt UDOT Frontage Study once completed | Much needed on South 191 | |
| East-West Spanish Valley Connections | Consider future east-west connections, particularly from US 191 | | |
| Car-Free Moab Travel | Incorporate goals to provide mobility choices to enable visitors and residents to be car-free. | This would be AMAZING | |
| Future Trail Acquisition | City and County to acquire easements when possible to connect different segments of trails and shared-use paths | | |
| OHV Noise Pollution Abatement | OHV noise mitigation strategies | Highest priority of all Slower speed limits helped, but larger parking areas needed at trailheads Ban OHVs in town! | 1 (High) |
| ITS Policy and Strategies | Identify opportunities to implement ITS to improve traffic operations and safety | | |
| Multimodal Node | Consider future opportunities for multimodal interaction at key public/private spaces | | |
| Rail Service Feasibility Study | Feasibility Study to evaluate short rail kickouts/spurs connecting the future parking at UMTRA site to the airport. | | |



Appendix E. Active Transportation Improvement Project Summaries



UTMP Project Information Sheet

US 191 Sidewalk Improvements: Fourth East to Bittle Lane

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | US 191 Sidewalk Improvements: Fourth East to Bittle Lane |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Pedestrian Facilities |
| Project Description | Construct sidewalk to connect existing gap along US 191 from Fourth East to Bittle Lane |
| Project Length | 425 ft. |
| Jurisdiction | City; UDOT |
| Planning Horizon | Near (1-6 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$70,000 |
| Priority | Low |
| Other Notes | Will require coordination with UDOT |



Project Number: AT1



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Dogwood Avenue and US 191 Area Crossing

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | Dogwood Avenue and US 191 Area Crossing |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Pedestrian Facilities |
| Project Description | Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing on US 191 near Dogwood Avenue (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon/"HAWK" crossing) |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | City; UDOT |
| Planning Horizon | Near (1-6 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$300,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | Will require coordination with UDOT |



US 191, looking North



US 191, looking South

Project Number: AT2



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Millcreek Drive Sidewalk Improvements

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | Millcreek Drive Sidewalk Improvements |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Pedestrian Facilities |
| Project Description | Construct sidewalk where missing on Millcreek Drive from Spanish Valley Drive to bridge north of Lasal Road |
| Project Length | 0.93 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City; County |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$800,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | |



Project Number: AT3



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Holyoak Sidewalk Connection

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Holyoak Sidewalk Connection |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Pedestrian Facilities |
| Project Description | Construct sidewalk along Holyoak Lane from Mill Creek Drive to Wagner Avenue |
| Project Length | 0.47 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$400,000 |
| Priority | Low |
| Other Notes | |



Project Number: AT4



UTMP Project Information Sheet

US 191 at Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | US 191 at Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities |
| Project Description | Construct tunnel at US 191 and Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard intersection to cross US 191 |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Long (13+ years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$1,600,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | |



US 191/Millcreek Drive, looking East



US 191/Millcreek Drive, looking West



US 191/Millcreek Drive, looking West

Project Number: AT5



UTMP Project Information Sheet

100 East Bicycle Lanes




| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | 100 East Bicycle Lanes |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Bicycle Facilities |
| Project Description | Install bicycle lane pavement markings on 100 East from 200 North to Millcreek Trail and on to City Market |
| Project Length | 0.68 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Near (1-6 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$60,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | Recommended in Moab Downtown Plan (2019) |



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Kane Creek Boulevard Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Kane Creek Boulevard Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Bicycle Facilities |
| Project Description | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to Kane Creek Recreation Parking (end of pavement) |
| Project Length | 3.87 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City; County |
| Planning Horizon | Long (13+ years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$2,860,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | Similar recommendation in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Kane Creek Boulevard Bicycle Lanes Improvements


| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Kane Creek Boulevard Bicycle Lanes Improvements |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Bicycle Facilities |
| Project Description | Stripe bicycle lanes and construct paved shoulders (if needed) on Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to 500 West |
| Project Length | 0.77 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$590,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | Similar recommendation in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Murphy Lane Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Murphy Lane Paved Shoulders (Bicycle) Improvements |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Bicycle Facilities |
| Project Description | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Murphy Lane from Millcreek Drive to Spanish Trail Road. |
| Project Length | 2.51 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$1,860,000 |
| Priority | Low |
| Other Notes | |




Project Number: AT9



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Shared Use Path Construction and Connections; Pack Creek
 and Mill Creek

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | Shared Use Path Construction and Connections; Pack Creek and Mill Creek |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Shared-Use Paths |
| Project Description | Construct a shared use path that connects the pedestrian hybrid beacon on US191 at City Market crossing Pack Creek to Kane Creek Boulevard and north to 300 South. Also a connection to 100 West. |
| Project Length | 0.40 mi |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$630,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | |



Project Number: AT10



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Colorado River Shared-Use Path Gap

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Colorado River Shared-Use Path Gap |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Shared-Use Paths |
| Project Description | Construct a shared use path along Colorado River between Grandstaff Canyon and Goose Island (existing gap) |
| Project Length | 0.66 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$4,530,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | Will require coordination with UDOT |




Project Number: AT11



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Spanish Valley Drive Shared-Use Path

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | Spanish Valley Drive Shared-Use Path |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Shared-Use Paths |
| Project Description | Construct a shared use path on Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to South County Line |
| Project Length | 5.10 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$8,500,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | Partially funded; To be implemented as development continues; Recommended in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |




Project Number: AT12



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead Connections

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead Connections |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Shared-Use Paths |
| Project Description | Construct trail connections to Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead (Powerhouse Lane) to Pack Creek and/or Millcreek pathways |
| Project Length | 1.11 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City; County |
| Planning Horizon | Long (13+ years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$1,025,000 |
| Priority | Low |
| Other Notes | |




Project Number: AT13



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Sand Flats Recreation Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Access

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Sand Flats Recreation Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Access |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Shared-Use Paths |
| Project Description | Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to connect Sand Flats Recreation to downtown |
| Project Length | 2.18 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City; County |
| Planning Horizon | Near (1-6 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$2,000,000 |
| Priority | Low |
| Other Notes | May be completed concurrently with developments in the area |



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Sand Flats Road Shared-Use Path

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Sand Flats Road Shared-Use Path |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Shared-Use Paths |
| Project Description | Construct shared-use path from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead |
| Project Length | 7.0 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Long (13+ years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$6,500,000 |
| Priority | Low |
| Other Notes | |



Project Number: AT15



UTMP Project Information Sheet

San Miguel Connection

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | San Miguel Connection |
| Project Category | Active Transportation - Shared-Use Paths |
| Project Description | Construct a connection between San Miguel north to path over Pack Creek, eventually connecting to Millcreek Drive |
| Project Length | 350 ft. |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$475,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | |



Looking north from San Miguel Ave.




Looking north from San Miguel Ave.



UTMP Project Information Sheet

500 West Safe Routes to School Improvements

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | 500 West Safe Routes to School Improvements |
| Project Category | Active Transportation Planning Assessment |
| Project Description | Evaluate bike lane and parking needs on 500 West from 400 North to US 191 to provide a "Safe Route to School". |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$75,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | |




500 West, looking North

UTMP Project Information Sheet

100 West Corridor Assessment


| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | 100 West Corridor Assessment |
| Project Category | Active Transportation Planning Assessment |
| Project Description | Complete a corridor assessment for 100 West from Swanny City Park to 100 South including pedestrian and bicycle crossings, sidewalks, capacity improvements, and bike lane needs. |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$75,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | |



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Pack Creek Drainage Assessment

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Pack Creek Drainage Assessment |
| Project Category | Active Transportation Planning Assessment |
| Project Description | Complete an assessment / feasibility study for improvements to the Pack Creek Drainage including a bike trail, fire break, access and floodway considerations. |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | City; County |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$300,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | |



Project Number: AT Plan 3




Appendix F. Roadway Improvement Project Summaries



UTMP Project Information Sheet


Park Drive Connection

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Park Drive Connection |
| Project Category | Roadway Connection |
| Project Description | Construct street and sidewalk connection of Park Drive, Opal Avenue to Park Road |
| Project Length | 300 ft. |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$180,000 |
| Priority | Low |
| Other Notes | |



UTMP Project Information Sheet
 Walnut Lane Street Connection

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Walnut Lane Street Connection |
| Project Category | Roadway Connection |
| Project Description | Construct street and sidewalk connection of Walnut Lane to Orchard Park Lane (Hospital Road) |
| Project Length | 100 ft. |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$60,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | |




Project Number: R2



UTMP Project Information Sheet

US 191 to Spanish Valley Drive Connection at Beeman Road

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | US 191 to Spanish Valley Drive Connection near Beeman Road |
| Project Category | Roadway Connection |
| Project Description | Construct new east-west street connection between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road |
| Project Length | 0.5 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$2,560,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | Similar recommendation in Spanish Valley Transportation Plan (2008) |



Project Number: R3



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Millcreek Drive/Aggie Blvd and US 191 Traffic Signal

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | Millcreek Drive/Aggie Blvd and US 191 Traffic Signal |
| Project Category | Intersection Control |
| Project Description | Construct traffic signal at Millcreek Drive and US 191 intersection |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | City; UDOT |
| Planning Horizon | Near (1-6 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$650,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | Will require coordination with UDOT |



Aggie Boulevard looking East



Aggie Boulevard looking East



Millcreek Drive looking West




Millcreek Drive looking West

UTMP Project Information Sheet

Meador Drive and US 191 Traffic Signal

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Meador Drive and US 191 Traffic Signal |
| Project Category | Intersection Control |
| Project Description | Construct traffic signal at US 191 and Meador Drive |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$775,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | Will require coordination with UDOT; Similar recommendation in US 191 Corridor Preservation Study (2015) |





Project Number: R5



UTMP Project Information Sheet

200 North and US 191 Traffic Signal

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | 200 North and US 191 Traffic Signal |
| Project Category | Intersection Control |
| Project Description | Construct traffic signal at US 191 at 200 North intersection |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | City; UDOT |
| Planning Horizon | Near (1-6 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$650,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | Will require coordination with UDOT; also recommended in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |



UTMP Project Information Sheet

West Moab Boat Dock Road and US 191 Improvements

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | West Moab Boat Dock Road and US 191 Improvements |
| Project Category | Roadway Improvement |
| Project Description | Identify and construct safety improvements to Moab Boat Dock Road intersection at US 191 |
| Project Length | N/A |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Near (1-6 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$50,000 - \$200,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | May require coordination with UDOT |



Project Number: R7



UTMP Project Information Sheet

US 191 Gemini Bridges and Bar M Access Improvements

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | US 191 Gemini Bridges and Bar M Access Improvements |
| Project Category | Roadway Improvement |
| Project Description | Realignment of access roads on US 191 at Gemini Bridges and Bar M (AKA Old Highway, Moab Canyon) |
| Project Length | 500 ft |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Mid (7-12 years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$325,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | |



Project Number: R8



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Sand Flats Road Improvement

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Sand Flats Road Improvement |
| Project Category | Roadway Improvement |
| Project Description | Roadway improvement (paving) on Sand Flats Road from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead |
| Project Length | 7.0 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Long (13+ years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$30,000,000 |
| Priority | Low |
| Other Notes | |




Project Number: R9



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Kane Creek Boulevard

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | Kane Creek Boulevard |
| Project Category | Roadway Assessment |
| Project Description | Reconstruct and widen Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to Kane Creek Recreation Parking; Including intersection improvements to Kane Creek Boulevard and 500 West |
| Project Length | 4.64 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City; County |
| Planning Horizon | Long (13+ years) |
| Cost Estimate | \$20,000,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | Similar recommendation in Moab and Spanish Valley 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2021) |



Kane Creek Blvd., looking south

Kane Creek Blvd., looking north

Project Number: R10



UTMP Project Information Sheet
Millcreek Drive Corridor Assessment and Preliminary Plan

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Millcreek Drive Corridor Assessment and Preliminary Plan |
| Project Category | Roadway Planning Assessment |
| Project Description | Prepare preliminary plans for the Millcreek Drive corridor from Spanish Valley Drive to Fourth East, including the Fourth East/300 South intersection. Plans may identify intersection improvements to the following: -Millcreek Drive / Spanish Valley Drive -Millcreek Drive / Murphy Lane -Millcreek Drive / Sand Flats Road -Millcreek Drive / Fourth East -Fourth East / 300 South |
| Project Length | 1.65 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City; County |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$250,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | |



Project Number: R Plan 1



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Fourth East Improvements

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | Fourth East Improvements |
| Project Category | Roadway Planning Assessment |
| Project Description | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements (intersection and segment) to Fourth E. Street between 100 North and US 191 |
| Project Length | 1.18 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | City |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$100,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | |



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Spanish Valley Drive

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Project Name | Spanish Valley Drive |
| Project Category | Roadway Planning Assessment |
| Project Description | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to County Line; Spanish Valley Drive to be an alternative route to US 191 during incidents |
| Project Length | 5.10 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$100,000 |
| Priority | High |
| Other Notes | Similar recommendation in Spanish Valley Transportation Plan (2008) |




Project Number: R Plan 3



UTMP Project Information Sheet

Spanish Trail Road

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Project Name | Spanish Trail Road |
| Project Category | Roadway Planning Assessment |
| Project Description | Conduct an assessment of capacity and multimodal improvements to Spanish Trail Road from US 191 to Murphy Lane |
| Project Length | 0.95 mi. |
| Jurisdiction | County |
| Planning Horizon | Off the shelf |
| Cost Estimate | \$100,000 |
| Priority | Medium |
| Other Notes | |



Project Number: R Plan 4



Appendix G. Project Prioritization Information



| Category Weighting | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Prioritization Category | Percentage |
| Safety | 28.0% |
| Livability and Economic Growth | 15.0% |
| Operational Efficiency | 17.5% |
| Implementation | 17.5% |
| Preservation and Resiliency | 10.0% |
| Public and TAC Input | 12.0% |
| Total | 100% |

| Safety Weighting | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Fatal/Serious Injury Crash Weight | |
| Minor/Possible Injury Crash Weight | |
| Property Damage/Unknown Crash Weight | |
| Bicycle Crash Weight | |
| Pedestrian Crash Weight | |
| Proactive Perceived Safety Benefit | |

| Livability and Economic Growth Weighting | |
|--|--|
| Mixed-Use Connectivity | |
| Primarily Serves Commuters | |
| Transit-Supportive | |

| Operational Efficiency Weighting | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Connectivity (Gap, Multimodal) | |
| Current ADT | |
| Future ADT | |
| Functional Classification | |

| Implementation Weighting | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Funding | |
| Project Implementation Readiness | |

| Preservation and Resiliency Weighting | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Known High-Maintenance Intensity Area | |
| Green Infrastructure | |

| Community and TAC Priority Weighting | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Public Priority | |
| TAC/Stakeholder Priority | |

Roadway Projects

Active Transportation

Number of crashes, normalized to 0-1
 Number of crashes, normalized to 0-1
 Number of crashes, normalized to 0-1
REMOVED FOR ROADWAY PROJECT EVALUTION
REMOVED FOR ROADWAY PROJECT EVALUTION
 Mixed-Traffic (1), Designated (2), Protected (3):
 Normalized to 1

REMOVED FOR AT PROJECT EVALUATION
REMOVED FOR AT PROJECT EVALUATION
REMOVED FOR AT PROJECT EVALUATION
 Number of crashes, normalized to 0-1
 Number of crashes, normalized to 0-1
 Mixed-Traffic (1), Designated (2), Protected (3):
 Normalized to 1

Yes (1), No (0)
 Yes (1), No (0)
 Yes (1), No (0)

Yes (1), No (0)
 Yes (1), No (0)
 Yes (1), No (0)

Yes (1), No (0)
 ADT, normalized to 0-1
 ADT, normalized to 0-1
 1 (local) - 5 (arterial), normalized

Yes (1), No (0)
 ADT, normalized to 0-1
 ADT, normalized to 0-1
REMOVED FOR AT PROJECT EVALUATION

None (0), Known Funding Partners (1), Funded (2) :
 Normalized to 1
 Off the Shelf (3), Near (1-6 years) 2, Mid (7-12 years)
 1, Long (13+ years) (0): Normalized to 1

None (0), Known Funding Partners (1), Funded (2) :
 Normalized to 1
 Off the Shelf (3), Near (1-6 years) 2, Mid (7-12 years)
 1, Long (13+ years) (0): Normalized to 1

Yes (1), No (0)
 Yes (1), No (0)

Yes (1), No (0)
 Yes (1), No (0)

Low (1), Medium (2), High (3); Normalized to 1
 Low (1), Medium (2), High (3); Normalized to 1

Low (1), Medium (2), High (3); Normalized to 1
 Low (1), Medium (2), High (3); Normalized to 1

| Project Number | | | | | | Safety | | | Livability and Economic Growth | | | Operational Efficiency | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Project Number | Project Type | Primary Route | From | To | Project Description | Bicycle Crashes | Pedestrian Crashes | Proactive Perceived Safety Benefit | Mixed-Use Connectivity | Primarily Serves Commuters | Transit-Supportive | Connectivity (gap, multimodal) | Current ADT | Forecasted (2040) ADT |
| Instructions: | Choose from Dropdown | | | | | # of crashes (total of the most recent 5-years, currently) | # of crashes (total of the most recent 5-years, currently) | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Enter ADT | Enter Future ADT |
| AT1 | Pedestrian Facilities | US 191 | Fourth East | Bittle Lane | Construct new sidewalk to connect existing gap along US 191 from Fourth East to Bittle Lane | 0 | 0 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 16646 | 24251 |
| AT2 | Pedestrian Facilities | US 191/Dogwood | - | - | Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing on US 191 near Dogwood Avenue (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon/"HAWK" crossing) | 1 | 1 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 19768 | 28798 |
| AT3 | Pedestrian Facilities | Millcreek Drive | Spanish Valley Drive | Lasal Road | Construct sidewalk where missing on Millcreek Drive, Spanish Valley Drive to bridge north of Lasal Road | 0 | 0 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 4013 | 5846 |
| AT4 | Pedestrian Facilities | Holyoak | Millcreek Drive | Wagner Avenue | Construct sidewalk along Holyoak Lane from Mill Creek Drive to Wagner Avenue | 1 | 0 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 1500 | 2142 |
| AT5 | Pedestrian Facilities | US 191/Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard | - | - | Construct tunnel at US 191 and Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard intersection to cross US 191 | 0 | 0 | Protected (Separated Facility) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 16646 | 24251 |
| AT6 | Bicycle Facilities | 100 E | 200 North | Uranium Avenue | Install bicycle lane pavement markings on 100 East from 200 North to Millcreek Trail and on to City Market | 0 | 0 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2081 | 3032 |
| AT7 | Bicycle Facilities | Kane Creek Boulevard | 500 West | Kane Creek Recreation Park | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to Kane Creek Recreation Parking (end of pavement) | 0 | 0 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | No | No | No | No | 1393 | 2030 |
| AT8 | Bicycle Facilities | Kane Creek Boulevard | US 191 | 500 West | Stripe bicycle lanes and construct paved shoulders (if needed) on Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to 500 West | 0 | 0 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4654 | 6780 |
| AT9 | Bicycle Facilities | Murphy Lane | Millcreek Drive | Spanish Trail Road | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Murphy Lane from Millcreek Drive to Spanish Trail Road | 0 | 0 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | Yes | No | No | 1970 | 2870 |
| AT10 | Shared-Use Paths | Pack Creek | US 191 | Kane Creek Boulevard | Construct a shared use path that connects the pedestrian hybrid beacon on US 191 at City Market crossing Pack Creek to Kane Creek Boulevard and north to 300 South. Also a connection to 100 West. | 1 | 1 | Protected (Separated Facility) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 19768 | 28798 |
| AT11 | Shared-Use Paths | Colorado River | Grandstaff Canyon | Goose Island | Construct shared use path along Colorado River between Grandstaff Canyon and Goose Island (existing gap) | 0 | 0 | Protected (Separated Facility) | No | No | No | Yes | 1144 | 1667 |
| AT12 | Shared-Use Paths | Spanish Valley Drive | Millcreek Drive | South County Line | Construct a shared use path on Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to South County line | 0 | 0 | Protected (Separated Facility) | Yes | Yes | No | No | 2047 | 2982 |
| AT13 | Shared-Use Paths | Millcreek Canyon | Area connections | | Construct trail connections to Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead (Powerhouse Lane) to Pack Creek and/or Millcreek pathways | 0 | 0 | Protected (Separated Facility) | No | No | No | Yes | 4013 | 5846 |
| AT14 | Shared-Use Paths | Sand Flats Road | ionshead development | 400 East | Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to connect Sand Flats Recreation to downtown. | 0 | 1 | Protected (Separated Facility) | Yes | No | No | No | 2256 | 3287 |
| AT15 | Shared-Use Paths | Sand Flats Road | Fee Booth | Porcupine Rim Trailhead | Construct shared-use path from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | 0 | 0 | Protected (Separated Facility) | No | No | No | No | 1176 | 1713 |
| AT16 | Shared-Use Paths | San Miguel | San Miguel | Millcreek Drive | Construct a connection between San Miguel north to path over Pack Creek, eventually connecting to Millcreek Drive | 0 | 0 | Protected (Separated Facility) | No | Yes | No | Yes | 4013 | 5846 |

| Project Number | | | | | | Implementation | | Preservation and Resiliency | | Community and TAC Priority | | Project Prioritization Score | Rank |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Project Number | Project Type | Primary Route | From | To | Project Description | Funding | Project Implementation Readiness | Known High-Maintenance Intensity Area | Green Infrastructure | Public Priority | TAC Priority | | |
| Instructions: | Choose from Dropdown | | | | | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Formula Only - Don't Edit | Formula Only - Don't Edit |
| AT1 | Pedestrian Facilities | US 191 | Fourth East | Bittle Lane | Construct new sidewalk to connect existing gap along US 191 from Fourth East to Bittle Lane | Known Funding Partners | Near (1-6 years) | No | Yes | Low | Low | 0.55 | 4 |
| AT2 | Pedestrian Facilities | US 191/Dogwood | - | - | Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing on US 191 near Dogwood Avenue (Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon/"HAWK" crossing) | Known Funding Partners | Near (1-6 years) | No | No | High | High | 0.78 | 2 |
| AT3 | Pedestrian Facilities | Millcreek Drive | Spanish Valley Drive | Lasal Road | Construct sidewalk where missing on Millcreek Drive, Spanish Valley Drive to bridge north of Lasal Road | Known Funding Partners | Mid (7-12 years) | No | Yes | Low | High | 0.43 | 9 |
| AT4 | Pedestrian Facilities | Holyoak | Millcreek Drive | Wagner Avenue | Construct sidewalk along Holyoak Lane from Mill Creek Drive to Wagner Avenue | Known Funding Partners | Mid (7-12 years) | No | Yes | Low | Low | 0.47 | 6 |
| AT5 | Pedestrian Facilities | US 191/Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard | - | - | Construct tunnel at US 191 and Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard intersection to cross US 191 | Known Funding Partners | Long (13+ years) | No | Yes | Low | Medium | 0.55 | 3 |
| AT6 | Bicycle Facilities | 100 E | 200 North | Uranium Avenue | Install bicycle lane pavement markings on 100 East from 200 North to Millcreek Trail and on to City Market | None | Near (1-6 years) | No | No | Low | High | 0.41 | 10 |
| AT7 | Bicycle Facilities | Kane Creek Boulevard | 500 West | Kane Creek Recreation Park | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Kane Creek Boulevard from 500 West to Kane Creek Recreation Parking (end of pavement) | Known Funding Partners | Long (13+ years) | Yes | No | Low | High | 0.23 | 14 |
| AT8 | Bicycle Facilities | Kane Creek Boulevard | US 191 | 500 West | Stripe bicycle lanes and construct paved shoulders (if needed) on Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to 500 West | Known Funding Partners | Mid (7-12 years) | Yes | No | Low | Medium | 0.47 | 7 |
| AT9 | Bicycle Facilities | Murphy Lane | Millcreek Drive | Spanish Trail Road | Construct paved shoulders (for use by bicyclists) on Murphy Lane from Millcreek Drive to Spanish Trail Road | None | Mid (7-12 years) | No | Yes | Low | Low | 0.28 | 13 |
| AT10 | Shared-Use Paths | Pack Creek | US 191 | Kane Creek Boulevard | Construct a shared use path that connects the pedestrian hybrid beacon on US 191 at City Market crossing Pack Creek to Kane Creek Boulevard and north to 300 South. Also a connection to 100 West. | Known Funding Partners | Mid (7-12 years) | No | No | High | High | 0.80 | 1 |
| AT11 | Shared-Use Paths | Colorado River | Grandstaff Canyon | Goose Island | Construct shared use path along Colorado River between Grandstaff Canyon and Goose Island (existing gap) | Known Funding Partners | Off the Shelf | No | No | Low | High | 0.37 | 11 |
| AT12 | Shared-Use Paths | Spanish Valley Drive | Millcreek Drive | South County Line | Construct a shared use path on Spanish Valley Drive from Millcreek Drive to South County line | Known Funding Partners | Off the Shelf | No | Yes | High | High | 0.51 | 5 |
| AT13 | Shared-Use Paths | Millcreek Canyon | Area connections | | Construct trail connections to Mill Creek Canyon Trailhead (Powerhouse Lane) to Pack Creek and/or Millcreek pathways | None | Long (13+ years) | No | No | Low | Low | 0.22 | 15 |
| AT14 | Shared-Use Paths | Sand Flats Road | Lionshead development | 400 East | Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to connect Sand Flats Recreation to downtown. | Known Funding Partners | Near (1-6 years) | No | Yes | Low | Low | 0.44 | 8 |
| AT15 | Shared-Use Paths | Sand Flats Road | Fee Booth | Porcupine Rim Trailhead | Construct shared-use path from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | Known Funding Partners | Long (13+ years) | No | No | Low | Low | 0.18 | 16 |
| AT16 | Shared-Use Paths | San Miguel | San Miguel | Millcreek Drive | Construct a connection between San Miguel north to path over Pack Creek, eventually connecting to Millcreek Drive | None | Mid (7-12 years) | No | Yes | Low | Medium | 0.36 | 12 |

| Project Number | | | | | | | Safety | | | | Livability and Economic Growth | | | Operational Efficiency | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Project Number | Project Type | Primary Route | From | To | Project Description | Planning Level Cost (2022) | Fatal Crashes | Injury Crashes | PDO Crashes | Proactive Perceived Safety Benefit | Mixed-Use Connectivity | Primarily Serves Commuters | Transit-Supportive | Connectivity (gap, multimodal) | Current ADT | Forecasted (2040) ADT | Functional Classification |
| Instructions: | Choose from Dropdown | | | | | Estimate | # of crashes (total of the most recent 5 years, currently 2017-2021) | # of crashes (total of the most recent 5-years, currently 2017-2021) | # of crashes (total of the most recent 5-years, currently 2017-2021) | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Enter ADT | Enter Future ADT | Choose from Dropdown |
| R1 | Roadway Connection | Park Drive | Opal Avenue | Park Road | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Park Drive, Opal Avenue to Park Road | \$ 180,000 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | No | Yes | No | Yes | 203 | 290 | Local/Other |
| R2 | Roadway Connection | Walnut Lane | Walnut Lane | Orchard Park Lane (Hospital) | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Walnut Lane to Orchard Park Lane (Hospital Road) | \$ 60,000 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | 769 | 1098 | Local/Other |
| R3 | Roadway Connection | New Route | Spanish Valley Drive | US 191 | Construct new east-west street connection between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road | \$ 2,560,000 | 0 | 2 | 7 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | No | Yes | No | Yes | 2000 | 2856 | Minor Collector |
| R4 | Intersection Control | Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard and US 191 | - | - | Construct traffic signal at Aggie Boulevard/Millcreek Drive and US 191 intersection | \$ 650,000 | 0 | 2 | 5 | Mixed-Traffic (i.e. Sharrows, etc.) | No | Yes | No | No | 16646 | 24251 | Principal Arterial |
| R5 | Intersection Control | Meador Drive and US 191 | - | - | Construct traffic signal at Meador Drive and US 191 intersection | \$ 775,000 | 0 | 1 | 3 | Mixed-Traffic (i.e. Sharrows, etc.) | No | Yes | No | No | 8115 | 11822 | Principal Arterial |
| R6 | Intersection Control | 200 North and US 191 | - | - | Construct traffic signal at US 191 at 200 North intersection | \$ 650,000 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Mixed-Traffic (i.e. Sharrows, etc.) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 15606 | 22735 | Principal Arterial |
| R7 | Roadway Improvement | Moab Boat Dock Road and US 191 | - | - | Identify and construct safety improvements to Moab Boat Dock Road intersection at US 191 | \$50,000-\$200,000 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | No | No | No | No | 14566 | 21219 | Principal Arterial |
| R8 | Roadway Improvement | Gemini Bridges Access and US 191 | - | - | Realignment of access roads on US 191 at Gemini Bridges and Bar M (AKA Old Highway, Moab Canyon) | \$ 325,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Mixed-Traffic (i.e. Sharrows, etc.) | No | Yes | No | No | 9260 | 13489 | Principal Arterial |
| R9 | Roadway Improvement | Sand Flats Road | Sand Flats Road Access | Porcupine Rim Trailhead | Roadway improvement (paving) on Sand Flats Road from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | \$ 30,000,000 | 0 | 4 | 2 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | No | No | No | No | 1176 | 1713 | Minor Collector |
| R10 | Roadway Improvement | Kane Creek Boulevard | US 191 | Kane Creek Recreation Park | Reconstruct and widen Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to Kane Creek Recreation Parking; including intersection improvements to Kane Creek Boulevard and 500 West | \$ 100,000 | 1 | 7 | 11 | Designated (i.e. Bike Lane, Sidewalk, etc.) | Yes | No | No | No | 4654 | 6780 | Major Collector |

| Project Number | | | | | | | Implementation | | Preservation and Resiliency | | Community and TAC Priority | | Project Prioritization Score | Rank |
|----------------|----------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Project Number | Project Type | Primary Route | From | To | Project Description | Planning Level Cost (2022) | Funding | Project Implementation Readiness | Known High-Maintenance Intensity Area | Green Infrastructure | Public Priority | TAC Priority | | |
| Instructions: | Choose from Dropdown | | | | | Estimate | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Choose from Dropdown | Formula Only - Don't Edit | Formula Only - Don't Edit |
| R1 | Roadway Connection | Park Drive | Opal Avenue | Park Road | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Park Drive, Opal Avenue to Park Road | \$ 180,000 | None | Mid (7-12 years) | No | No | Low | Low | 0.2004 | 9 |
| R2 | Roadway Connection | Walnut Lane | Walnut Lane | Orchard Park Lane (Hospital Lane) | Construct street connection and sidewalk of Walnut Lane to Orchard Park Lane (Hospital Road) | \$ 60,000 | None | Mid (7-12 years) | No | No | Low | Medium | 0.2720 | 6 |
| R3 | Roadway Connection | New Route | Spanish Valley Drive | US 191 | Construct new east-west street connection between Spanish Valley Drive and US 191 near Beeman Road | \$ 2,560,000 | None | Mid (7-12 years) | No | No | Medium | Medium | 0.2622 | 8 |
| R4 | Intersection Control | Millcreek Drive/Aggie Boulevard and US 191 | - | - | Construct traffic signal at Aggie Boulevard/Millcreek Drive and US 191 intersection | \$ 650,000 | Known Funding Partners | Near (1-6 years) | No | No | Low | Medium | 0.3462 | 4 |
| R5 | Intersection Control | Meador Drive and US 191 | - | - | Construct traffic signal at Meador Drive and US 191 intersection | \$ 775,000 | Known Funding Partners | Mid (7-12 years) | No | No | Low | Medium | 0.2708 | 7 |
| R6 | Intersection Control | 200 North and US 191 | - | - | Construct traffic signal at US 191 at 200 North intersection | \$ 650,000 | Known Funding Partners | Near (1-6 years) | No | No | High | Medium | 0.5259 | 1 |
| R7 | Roadway Improvement | Moab Boat Dock Road and US 191 | - | - | Identify and construct safety improvements to Moab Boat Dock Road intersection at US 191 | \$50,000-\$200,000 | Known Funding Partners | Near (1-6 years) | No | No | High | High | 0.3788 | 3 |
| R8 | Roadway Improvement | Gemini Bridges Access and US 191 | - | - | Realignment of access roads on US 191 at Gemini Bridges and Bar M (AKA Old Highway, Moab Canyon) | \$ 325,000 | Known Funding Partners | Mid (7-12 years) | No | No | Low | Medium | 0.2753 | 5 |
| R9 | Roadway Improvement | Sand Flats Road | Sand Flats Road Access | Porcupine Rim Trailhead | Roadway improvement (paving) on Sand Flats Road from Sand Flats Road Access to Porcupine Rim Trailhead | \$ 30,000,000 | None | Long (13+ years) | No | No | Low | Low | 0.0976 | 10 |
| R10 | Roadway Improvement | Kane Creek Boulevard | US 191 | Kane Creek Recreation Park | Reconstruct and widen Kane Creek Boulevard from US 191 to Kane Creek Recreation Parking; including intersection improvements to Kane Creek Boulevard and 500 West | \$ 20,000,000 | Known Funding Partners | Long (13+ years) | Yes | No | Low | High | 0.5151 | 2 |