

GRAND COUNTY
Planning Commission
Monday, August 8, 2022
4:30 P.M. Regular Meeting

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

REGULAR PC MEETING:

IN PERSON: County Commission Chambers 125 E. Center St. Moab, UT

VIRTUAL: 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, County Commission liaison, Planning & Zoning staff, interested citizens	
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 Items: (Administrative)	1) Approval of Meeting Minutes from July 11, 2022	<i>Chair</i>
Action items: (Public Hearings)	Public Hearings	
	2) Alternative Dwelling Communities Draft Ordinance – staff report	<i>Staff</i>
	3) Unified Transportation Master Plan – General Plan Amendment	
Presentation:	Presentations	
	4) Marc Stilson – Water Source protection	<i>Chair</i>
5:30 PM		
	Citizens to be Heard – public comment opportunity for any item not listed as a public hearing	<i>Chair</i>
Discussion Items:	Staff Updates	
	5) Housing study RFP status	<i>Staff</i>
	6) Future Land Use Descriptions -- review	
	Future Considerations	
	7) Future Land Use Map (FLUM) – next meeting	<i>Staff</i>

8) Deed restricted housing – qualifying criteria 9) Upcoming neighborhood planning workshops – proposed revised timeline	
6:30 PM	
Citizens to be Heard – public comment opportunity for any item not listed as a public hearing	<i>Chair</i>
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, July 11th, 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:

Commission Chair Emily Campbell, Commissioner Rick York, Commissioner Aaron Lindberg, Commissioner Makeda Barkley, Commissioner Bob O'Brien, County Commission Liaison Trisha Hedin, Planning Director Elissa Martin, Planner Jenna Gorney

Absent

Commissioner Steve Evers
Commissioner Tony Mancuso

Commission Chair Emily Campbell calls the meeting to order at 4:30pm

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 June 27th, 2022

Commissioner Barkley moves to approve the minutes.

Commission O'Brien seconds

All in favor - all

Approved

Discussion items:

2. County Commission update (2:17) - Commission Liaison Trisha Hedin

- Approval of tax rates for upcoming tax year
- Ridges Minor subdivision approved
- Approved letter to BLM to consider expanding existing night time closure for Sand Flats regarding UTVs
- Canvassing of Republican Primary Mike Lee (Senator) John Curtis (Representative)
- County looking to see if they have a Water Source Protection Ordinance: Ask GWSSA if there have been any previous efforts for that. Would help the County alot to have an Ordinance in place

Emily: Does the County have an idea of the various water impacts for different types of development? It would be helpful to know when looking at density and future development patterns? Does it make more sense to have higher density and smaller developments or higher density of single family lots? Could Mark Stilson assist?

- Provide us with data of tradeoff or matrices
- This would aid in Planning Commissions discussions around density and housing types such as ADUs, RVs

3. Housing Nexus Study RFP was posted 7/7 - Submission deadline is 7/22 (8:44)

- Planning Dept. did post the RFP last week
- The Housing study and linkage fee analysis will support policy changes to increase deed restricted housing in Grand County and provide new incentives for affordable housing
- This will be an update to the 2018 BAE Housing study, which was the basis for developing the Assured housing section in our LUC which now needs updated.
- Economic Development has Rural County grant funds they would like to contribute to the housing study but those funds expire at the end of the month - looking to get an extension in order to contribute.

4. Meeting with City Planning staff to discuss the future working group - Any thoughts of the makeup of this group, meeting frequency, initial items for discussion? (11:40)

- Staff focus points: Suggestions from PC
 - Commissioner York: Overnight accommodation build out and other subdivision build outs: within the City and County
 - Commissioner Lindberg. - When we address HDH - we are creating new markets - be sure we are planning to avoid a donut hole - and be vigilant that we are developing in a way that we want to see the County in years to come
 - Commissioner O'Brien - options for tiny homes etc. - density issue 'how much density are they (City) willing to take?' Is the idea to have a dense metro core rather than spread out throughout the County?
 - Commissioner Campbell - vigilance in having common definitions: workforce housing, common indicators
 - Trisha Hedin - expansions of deed restrictions?
 - Commissioner Barkley- have there been talks of them sharing info with us on current housing studies taking place

5. Future Long Term Campark - Staff Report (24:00)

See Youtube recording for full discussion

- Draft language is based off OAO section, so it is currently set up as an Overlay District, but it could be transformed into a CUP.
- Draft was fine tuned based on previous PC feedback
- Will be brought to LU steering committee on Thursday (will also have reps from County Commission, Attorney and other department heads to discuss)
- Laura from HASU will attend regarding tracking and deed restrictions

- How Do We Permit this Long Term Campark?
 - Emily Campbell: Could we potentially license camparks through the business license in order to track violations? This way the use at the property would not be in jeopardy but an operator that may not be up to code standards may not be able to operate there.
 - Bob O'Brien - can we build these regulations into the overlay section of the code. I prefer the legislative approval version? Elissa: yes... it could be built into the Development Agreement.
 - Emily Campbell: the benefits of a CUP - it creates a use with standards and allows approval based on whether or not the development meets several factors, including mitigating impacts in the neighborhood.
 - Emily Campbell - manufactured home communities: currently our regulations are overburdensome. This use is a Conditional use Permit. We could consider merging these two uses and evaluating density. Evaluate the zoning districts these uses are permitted in. Density should vary based on the underlying zone.
 - Trisha Hedin - Be careful to maintain the rural character through regulations like landscaping and buffers.
 - What can we do to work on rent caps and incentives?
 - Aaron Lindberg - its important that we let residential property owners assist by providing housing on their property.
 - As an option: Potentially lease backyards to the Land Trust? They can apply for grants and get funding. This would allow residents to assist in the housing crisis
 - The Land Trust is willing to expand their task capacity to assist
 - How can we create more housing in a dispersed way across the community
 - Staff will look to circulate a draft code so that we can quickly move to Public Hearing - at which time can collect public comment.

5:35 - Citizens to be heard - None

6. Future Land Use Descriptions - updated version

- Tabled to next meeting

Future Considerations

Additional

Elissa martin: we need to have discussion on current zoning districts and how to match the Future Land Use Descriptions with the Future Land Use Maps as well as recommend changes to the existing zoning districts' uses permitted under the Article 3 Permitted Use Chart.

How can we address potential conflicts with the future land use maps and land use descriptions - could Bill Grimes share any best practices?

Adjournment 5:42pm pm

Motioned by Commissioner O'Brien

Seconded by Commissioner Barkley

All in favor - all

designate for employee housing on-site and others have stated that the cost of water and sewer impact fees for hookups to the sites is cost prohibitive.

If a property owner so chooses, individual dwelling sites within an Alternative Dwelling Community could be condominiumized and sold separately, leased long term or intermittently to seasonal workers who may come and go. The draft language does not currently include specific zoning districts or designated areas where these types of developments could be approved. The Draft Code includes Development standards specifically designed to mitigate the potential impacts that Alternative Dwelling Communities may have on a neighborhood. The application for an Alternative Dwelling or Long-Term Camping community would be a rezone for the overlay district. The decision would be legislative, and would require two public hearings, one at Planning Commission and one at County Commission.

If the Planning Commission chooses, an “eligibility map” may be created to designate specific areas where this type of development would be most appropriate, rendering other areas off-limits for the overlay district. It may also be appropriate or preferred to align the pending Future Land Use Designations with this effort, and include Alternative Dwelling Communities as a use by right (CUP) in certain zones.

All ADOs or Long-Term Camp Parks would be prohibited from being used as nightly rentals.

STAFF RECOMMENDTION: Move to keep the public hearing open for a period of 10 days to solicit public comment.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. Draft Code language
2. Proposed Ordinance

GRAND COUNTY, UTAH
ORDINANCE NO. _____(2022)

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE GRAND COUNTY LAND USE CODE BY
AMENDING ARTICLE 4 (SPECIAL OVERLAY DISTRICTS) TO INCLUDE
AN ALTERNATIVE DWELLING OVERLAY DISTRICT PILOT PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, Utah Code § 17-27a-102 enables a county to enact all ordinances, resolutions, and rules and various forms of land use controls and development agreements that the county considers necessary or appropriate for the use and development of land within the unincorporated area of the county;

WHEREAS, the previously named Grand County Council adopted the Grand County Land Use Code (“LUC”) on January 4, 1999 with Ordinance No. 299, as amended, for the purpose of regulating land use, subdivision and development in Grand County in accordance with the General Plan;

WHEREAS, from time to time the County adopts ordinances to modify its LUC and zoning map to improve the quality and order of land development and align the LUC with changing community conditions, public review noticing procedures, state law, contemporary planning concepts and streamlining land use reviews and permits;

WHEREAS, the cost of housing in the Moab Area has become increasingly unaffordable, as the median home listing price was \$792,000 in June 2022, trending up 85.5% year-over-year¹, and the median home sales price as of May 2022 is \$694,000², which is unattainable by the annual household median income of \$52,000;

WHEREAS, out of 293 known rental units (excluding senior housing) in the Moab Valley, only seven (7) are currently available to rent, and out of those, five are 3-bedroom homes averaging a rental rate of \$4,000/month, and currently there are at least 50 residents on waitlists for various apartment complexes³;

WHEREAS, the supply of rental units available for workforce housing are at an all-time low;

¹ Utah Association of Realtors

² Utah Association of Realtors. Local Market Updates by County. (May 2022)

³ Moabhousing.com and Zillow

WHEREAS, the Moab Valley Multicultural Center reports the number of people they serve who meet HUD homeless program definitions for homelessness diversion, emergency shelter, homelessness prevention, rapid re-housing, and drop-in services is 165 adults and 98 children YTD;

WHEREAS, the lack of attainable housing can result in homelessness, undesirable living conditions, lack of funds available for other basic needs, and a decrease in the quality of life for Grand County workers and their families;

WHEREAS, according to a survey conducted by the Grand County Economic Development Department in 2021, 82% of employers reported the lack of attainable housing limited their ability to fully staff their company, and 65% reported having lost employees due to the housing shortage⁴;

WHEREAS, many employers in Grand County are unable to hire and retain employees because of the lack of attainable workforce housing;

WHEREAS, the County desires to amend the LUC Article 4 (Special Purpose Overlay Districts) to establish an Alternative Dwelling Overlay District as a pilot program for a period of one year, in order to provide opportunities for workforce housing;

WHEREAS, on _____, 2022, after a public hearing, the Planning Commission forwarded a _____ recommendation to amend LUC Article 4 with suggested changes;

WHEREAS, on _____, 2022, the County Commission held a public hearing to solicit public comment regarding the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has determined it is in the best interests of the public to implement a pilot program for development of alternative dwelling communities;

⁴ Grand County Economic Development Department, Moab Area Employee Housing Survey (2021)

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED that the Grand County Commission does hereby amend Article 4 of the Grand County Land Use Code as follows:

See Exhibit A

APPROVED by Grand County Commission in a regular public meeting on _____, 2022 by the following vote:

Those voting aye: _____

Those voting nay: _____

Those absent: _____

Grand County Commission:

ATTEST:

Jacques Hadler, Chair

Gabriel Woytek, Clerk/Auditor

EXHIBIT A

Disclaimer: This is a draft version of the LUC Code update to Article 4 (Special Purpose Overlay Districts) – public comment and further evaluation by Planning staff will likely warrant revisions to the language during the public hearing phase. A final version will be posted prior to the final recommendation by the Planning Commission.

4.9.1 Purpose

The Alternative Dwelling (ADO) Overlay District is intended to designate areas within which RV's, KOA-style cabins or tiny homes, modular homes, and camper vans are permitted for use as long-term housing or intermittent rentals for seasonal workers. Overnight rentals are not a permitted use within an approved ADO development. Alternative style dwellings, while part of the Grand County economy and tradition, are not appropriate in all zone districts and geographic areas of the County. ADO Districts should be applied only to parcel(s) where appropriate and compatible with adjacent land uses and neighborhoods.

The ADO District standards ensure that Alternative Dwelling developments are designed in a manner that addresses the impacts and the increased service needs they generate, including but not limited to traffic, noise, weed control, wastewater management, code and law enforcement, and emergency medical services. The ADO Districts will provide much needed designated workforce housing, which in turn, supports local businesses and the local economy. All ADO developments shall be deed restricted as local or seasonal workforce housing, and will be monitored with great care to prevent their use as overnight rentals.

4.9.2 Applicability

The regulations set forth in this section may be applied to real property located within the ADO eligible parcels map shown on Exhibit B to the ordinance, codified in this section upon application to and approval by the County Commission pursuant to the provisions herein.

When approving or denying an ADO District application, the Commission shall consider and make findings related to the proposed development on:

1. Traffic - ADO's should only be approved on parcels with frontage on a major collector street,
2. Noise and other nuisance impacts to adjacent properties and neighborhoods;
3. Relative benefit or impact on supply of workforce housing,
4. Appropriate location in relation to work centers and relative commute time.

Upon approval, and subject to all applicable zoning regulations, the development agreement and master plan shall control development of the applicable real property.

4.9.3 Identification on Zoning Maps

Approved ADO Districts and developments shall be indicated on the official Zoning Map.

4.9.4 Allowed Uses and Occupancy Standards

Uses allowed in the ADO Districts shall be as specified in the underlying base district together with permissible Alternative Dwellings. Accordingly, Alternative Dwellings developments shall be allowed to incorporate new residential and commercial uses otherwise allowed by the underlying base district.

All ADO developments shall comply with the following occupancy requirements:

- A. Alternative Dwelling developments shall be occupied by Active Employed Households or local Grand County residents as defined in Article 10 for a period of 30 days or more, or
- B. Occupied by seasonally employed persons for less than 30 days with proof of employment from a local Grand County business.

4.9.5 Development Standards in ADO Districts

Unless otherwise specified below, all development in an ADO District shall comply with the development standards of the underlying zoning district.

A. Utilities, Water and Wastewater Management.

1. ADO developments shall be served by public water and sewer facilities. Each dwelling site shall have hookups to water, sewer, gas and electric, otherwise shared common facilities shall be provided.
 - a. Sites without utility hookups shall be served by shared common facilities that provide utility service for a communal kitchen and bathhouse(s) (with showers), per the minimum State Health code requirements.
 - c. A potable water supply shall be provided within 200 feet of dwelling sites.
2. ADO developments shall include greywater reuse systems for all shared or group shower or laundry facilities and use the greywater for beneficial on-site uses such as reducing the use of culinary water for landscaping irrigation.
3. ADO developments shall utilize drought-resistant, water-wise, and xeriscape landscaping design principles.
4. To the maximum extent possible, ADO developments shall utilize bioretention and biofiltration systems to manage stormwater runoff.

B. Common Space, Landscaping and Screening

1. ADO developments shall incorporate into their site plan usable, functional common open space such as a pocket park, community garden, playground, or other usable landscaped area accessible to the residents.
2. Either a sight-obscuring fence or a landscaped buffer shall be installed on all sides of the ADO project boundary.
3. Screening shall be provided for common area trash receptacles, or other equipment storage.
4. ADO's shall maintain a weed-free landscape to the greatest extent possible.
5. One tree of a species suitable for the area shall be provided for each dwelling site (Existing trees on the site may be used to satisfy this requirement.)
6. On-site trails and trail connections identified in the Grand County Non-Motorized Trails Master Plan shall be placed in a public easement.

C. Height, Density and Scale

1. The minimum lot size for an ADO development is 0.5 acre.
2. Up to 4 dwelling sites per every 0.5 acre are permitted in ADO's, up to 32 sites on 4 acres.
2. Dwelling sites required area:
 - a. Dwelling sites shall be a minimum of 600 sq. ft and no larger than 1,200 sq.ft.
 - b. Each dwelling site shall be at least 20 feet in width
4. There shall be a minimum of 16 feet between dwelling units, and a minimum of 10' distance from any other structure.
5. Dwellings may be constructed to the maximum height allowed by the underlying zone district.
6. ADO developments shall be subject to the ridgeline standards in Section [6.9.8](#).

D. Site Configuration, setbacks and parking

1. Dwelling sites shall be oriented south facing to the greatest extent possible, to maximize the energy saving benefits of passive solar design.
2. Communal buildings and dwellings shall maintain the setbacks of the underlying zone.
4. ADO developments shall implement design features that create an appealing and active interface with the fronting roadway.
5. All development must fit the topography of the property (building that steps with terrain). No mass grading or grading of a flat building envelope is permitted.
6. One off-street parking space per dwelling site is required to mitigate impacts on adjacent land uses and neighborhoods.

E. Internal Driveway & site pads

1. ADO developments that have more than 2 dwelling sites shall have an internal driveway not less than 20 feet wide. Each site shall be arranged so that all dwellings have access to the internal driveway. The interior driveway shall be properly drained; have a durable dust-free, all weather surface of gravel, asphalt, or chip and seal.
2. Each site designated for RV's, travel trailers, or camper vans shall provide a 4 inch concrete or gravel pad.

F. Dwelling Design

1. Air conditioning units and similar mechanical requirements should be avoided on rooftop locations, and fully screened from view.
2. Plastic or vinyl awnings are not permitted. Awnings must be of solar stabilized materials.
3. Structures on site shall be constructed of durable primary materials such as stone, brick and earth derived materials; wood lap siding; fiber cement board lapped, shingled, or panel; metal siding; glass; or engineered stone.

4. Aside from solar panels or other infrastructure related to energy efficiency and water use/reuse, ADO developments shall utilize non reflective materials.

4.9.7 ADO District Application

A. Procedure. An ADO District application shall be reviewed and approved in accordance with the procedures of Section [9.2](#), Text and Zoning Map Amendments (Rezoning), and shall be considered to be a Zoning Map amendment.

B. Application. A developer shall submit an ADO District application with the information contained in Section [9.2.3](#) together with a development agreement and master plan as follows:

1. The development agreement shall include the following information:
 - a. Legal description of the property;
 - b. A statement describing the proposed development of the property by gross acre; number of units, common area and open space acreage, and other related development features as proposed by the developer or requested by the County;
 - c. All other required components of the development agreement outlined in Section ___ local occupancy requirements; and
2. The master plan shall include the following information:
 - a. Legal description of the property;
 - b. Identification of all proposed land uses including dwelling types intended for each proposed site, and any non-residential uses;
 - c. Development envelope indicating compliance with underlying zone setbacks;
 - d. Location and dimensions of each dwelling site and corresponding parking spaces proposed on the property;
 - d. Location of common open space(s) and public easements for trail and trail connections if any;
 - e. Location of common facilities, such as bathhouses, communal kitchen or other accessory structures;
 - d. Identification of site planning features designed to ensure compatibility and a seamless transition between proposed Alternative Dwellings development and surrounding neighborhoods or site conditions;
 - e. Identification of sensitive lands within or adjacent to the proposed development and how the development's impacts will be mitigated, including but not necessarily limited to the following:
 - (1) Public drinking water supply watersheds (recharge areas for the aquifer in the Glen Canyon formation);
 - (2) Floodplains and riparian habitats;
 - (3) Slopes in excess of 30 percent; and

(4) Significant geological, biological, and archaeological sites;

f. Location of specific utilities and infrastructure that are designed and installed to conserve limited natural resources such as water. Examples include the incorporation of gray-water reuse systems, implementation of water conserving landscapes, installation of real-time water monitoring systems, and the incorporation of water-efficient fixtures, bioretention and biofiltration swales;

g. ADO notes (TBD)

C. Recordation. The developer shall record the development agreement and master plan in the real property records of Grand County, Utah, prior to issuance of a building permit for any unit within a site plan approved hereunder. Once approved, the development agreement and master plan may not be amended or modified without reapplication to the County.

D. Effect. Review and consideration of an ADO District application is a discretionary legislative decision. Further, approval of an ADO District application does not constitute site plan, preliminary plat, or final plat approval. Rather, such approval shall be deemed approval of permission to develop under the standards of this section and the master plan.

E. Lapse of Approval. The ADO District approval shall automatically expire and be void unless a site plan is approved for the development within 2 years of ADO District approval.

F. Conflict. In the event of conflict between the provisions of Section [9.2](#) and this Section [4.6.7](#), this section shall control.

Agenda Summary

GRAND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

August 8, 2022

TITLE:	A RESOLUTION OF THE GRAND COUNTY COMMISSION ADOPTING THE "UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN" AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND COUNTY GENERAL PLAN
FISCAL IMPACT:	N/A
PRESENTER(S):	Elissa, Planning & Zoning Staff

Prepared By:

ELISSA MARTIN

**GRAND COUNTY
PLANNING & ZONING**

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Attorney Review:

N/A

POSSIBLE MOTION:

I move to send a favorable recommendation to the County Commission to approve the proposed resolution to amend the 2022 General Plan and adopt the Grand County and City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan as an appendix to the Transportation Element of the General Plan.

SUMMARY: Grand County and the City of Moab jointly prepared the Unified Transportation Master Plan (UTMP), An Action Plan to Improve Safety For All, with the assistance of consultants, Kimley-Horn Associates. The UTMP identifies actions, strategies, and 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 Grand County and City of Moab UTMP identifies improvements to roads, streets, trails, and connections that are under jurisdiction and responsibility of Grand County and City of Moab. Recommended projects will 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.

The UTMP establishes a goal to reduce traffic-related serious injury crashes and fatalities to zero per year, by the year 2025. The goal is consistent with that of the Utah Department of Transportation which set Utah's ultimate goal of Zero Fatalities

The UTMP will be adopted as an amendment to the 2022 Grand County General Plan, Transportation Element. As part of this amendment, minor revisions to the General Plan, chapter seven, Transportation, will be made in order to be consistent with the UTMP.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Send a favorable recommendation to the County Commission to approve the UTMP in anticipation of applying for US DOT's Safe Streets and Roads for All Grant as a joint application with the City of Moab before the submission deadline.

ATTACHMENT(S):

1. UTMP presentation
2. Proposed Resolution
3. [Grand County and City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan](#)



Grand County & City of Moab

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION

MASTER PLAN

Presentation to Grand County Planning Commission



Project Overview

- UTMP identified actionable steps and projects to achieve the community's goals for a safe, reliable, connected, and efficient transportation system.
- UTMP implementation will improve mobility and connectivity for people, not just cars.
- Recommended General Strategies include:
 - Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Awareness Campaign
 - Pavement Management and Preservation Program
 - Sidewalk and pathway connectivity
 - Local street connections
 - Wayfinding signage
 - Traffic signal improvements



Project Outcomes

The UTMP identified 38 improvement projects:

- Prioritized based on recommendations from stakeholders, community, technical advisory committee (TAC) and Council

The 38 improvement projects were categorized by type:

- Active transportation improvements and planning assessments (19 projects)
- Roadway improvements and assessments (14 projects)
- Parking and transit improvements (5 projects)



Project Outcomes

The 38 improvement projects were estimated to cost:

- Active transportation improvements and planning assessments (\$32,650,000)
- Roadway improvements and assessments (\$55,950,000)
- Parking and transit improvements (\$12,240,000)



Project Outcomes

Of these 38 projects, there are 8 proposed assessments:

- 500 West Safe Routes to School Improvements Planning
- 100 West Corridor Planning
- Pack Creek Drainage Planning
- Mill Creek Corridor Assessment and Preliminary Plan
- Fourth East Improvements Planning
- Spanish Valley Drive Roadway Planning
- Spanish Trail Road Planning
- US-191 Parking Evaluation



Community and Stakeholder Engagement

To date, there have been:

- Three community meetings,
- Four technical advisory committee (TAC) meetings, and
- One set of comprehensive stakeholder interviews



Community and Stakeholder Engagement

- On-going input opportunities
 - Project website:
<https://www.grandcountymoabtmp.com/>
 - Project email address:
GrandCounty.MoabTMP@gmail.com
 - Project hotline: 833-701-INFO (7636)





Discussion & Questions

RESOLUTION No. _____ (2022)

**A RESOLUTION OF THE GRAND COUNTY COMMISSION ADOPTING THE
“UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN” AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE
GRAND COUNTY GENERAL PLAN**

WHEREAS, the Grand County Council (Council) adopted the Grand County General Plan (the Plan) on August 5, 1996 with Resolution No. 2301, updated April 6, 2004 with Resolution No. 2654; and,

WHEREAS, on May 17, 2022 the Grand County Commission approved Resolution No. 3319 adopting an update to the General Plan, “General Plan 2022”; and,

WHEREAS, the Plan, as required in the Land Use Development and Management Act (LUDMA) includes a “Transportation” element; and,

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Grand County and the City of Moab Unified Transportation Master Plan (UTMP), An Action Plan to Improve Safety for All, is to identify, plan for and prioritize near-, mid-, and long-term transportation projects, which include street connections, roadway improvements, and new pathways that will enhance connectivity, multi-modal transportation and safety; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the UTMP in a public hearing on August 8, 2022 and _____ recommended _____; and,

WHEREAS, due notice was given that the Commission would meet to hear and consider the UTMP in a public hearing on August 16, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered all evidence and testimony presented with respect to the General Plan amendment and has determined, subsequent to said public hearing that the adoption of this resolution is in the best interests of the citizens of Grand County, Utah.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Grand County Commission that it does hereby adopt the *Grand County and City of Moab Unified Transportation Plan*, attached hereto as Exhibit “A” as an amendment to the Grand County General Plan Transportation Element.

APPROVED THIS 16TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2022, by the following vote:

Those voting aye: _____

Those voting nay: _____

Absent: _____

ATTEST:

Jacques Hadler, Chair

Gabriel Woyteck, Clerk/Auditor