

**ARCHES HOTSPOT REGION COORDINATING COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 17, 2020**

The Arches Hotspot Region Coordinating Committee held its Regular Meeting on the above date. Per Executive Order 2020-5 issued by Governor Gary R. Herbert on March 18, 2020, this meeting was conducted electronically. An anchor location was not provided. An audio recording of the meeting is archived at <http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>. A video recording is archived at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ic9QFiH7-yY>.

Regular Meeting—Call to Order and Attendance: Committee Chair Wells called the Regular Meeting to order at 2:06 PM. Participating remotely were Committee Members Wes Shannon, Mike Duncan, Karen Guzman-Newton, Curtis Wells, Kalen Jones, Evan Clapper, and Jaylyn Hawks. City staff participating remotely were Assistant City Manager Carly Castle, Assistant Engineer Mark Jolissaint, and City Recorder Sommar Johnson. County staff participating remotely was Community and Economic Development Director Zacharia Levine. UDOT staff participating remotely were Region 4 Traffic Operations Engineer Robert Dowell and Region 4 Deputy Director Monte Aldridge. Downtown Main Street Alliance Member Matt Hancock was present.

Approval of Minutes: May 27, 2020

Motion and Discussion: Committee Member Guzman-Newton moved to approve the minutes from May 27, 2020 with two corrections. She said when Committee Member Clapper referenced Ken Canyon that it needs to be corrected. She also said Committee Chair Wells was quoted as saying the four projects would be submitted to UDOT by the end of April; Committee Chair Wells said it should be corrected to the end of August or beginning of September. City Recorder Johnson suggested the corrections be sent to her email. Committee Member Hawks seconded the motion with two corrections.

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

Approval of Minutes: May 29, 2020

Motion: Committee Member Hawks moved to approve the minutes from May 29, 2020. Committee Member Guzman-Newton seconded the motion.

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

Citizens to be Heard:

There were no Citizens to be Heard.

Committee Member Reports

Committee Chair Wells reported a call with UDOT Region 4 Director Rick Torgerson and Region 4 Deputy Director Monte Aldridge. He said UDOT is looking for a downtown parking project. He said the off-Main Street parking project requires the most time, focus and assessment to deliver a concept design and budget by September 1, 2020. He said the Spanish Valley multi-use pathway already has a concept design and budget. He said the off-Main Street parking has been reviewed by UDOT and awarded funds previously so it is eligible to meet the Hotspot criteria for congestion and economic development. He said the Main Street improvements need modeling, but that cannot take place until the off-Main Street parking has a concept design. He stated receiving comments from some Committee Members that the South recreation parking project

does not make sense without a transit project. He said a decision regarding that project does not need to be made right now. He said the Committee needs to know who will deliver the concept design and budget for the off-Main Street parking and what the process looks like. He said Assistant City Manager Castle and City Engineer Williams have created a draft work plan and proposal. He said Committee Members and the Downtown Main Street Alliance have done a lot of work on the project as well. He said the City staff's proposal and the Downtown Main Street Alliance's proposal will need to be merged into one plan. He reported Mayor Niehaus sent an email to inquire about the Emma Boulevard dispersed parking project. He said it needs to be determined if that project can fit in the Hotspot funding scope. He stated the conversations with UDOT have indicated that 120-150 parking spaces are required for the parking project; if Emma Boulevard dispersed parking can help by adding parking spaces, it would be good to include that project. He reported there has been discussion regarding the use of decision lens software to rank projects against the Hotspot criteria. He said UDOT already validated the dispersed parking, downtown parking, and downtown Main Street improvements in the first round of Hotspot funding. He suggested to UDOT that a Committee Member make a motion to prioritize the projects and then the list will be turned over to UDOT on September 1st. He said Torgerson agreed that would be sufficient. He said Aldridge suggested a mini transit system project could potentially receive an operations and maintenance match from UDOT. He said the multi-use pathway project will require a discussion regarding congestion mitigation. He said the rest of June and the majority of July will be spent focusing on the off-Main Street parking project. He said a group of staff and Committee Members might need to be created to focus on the work plan for that project. He said the Committee will need to decide on the work plan first. He expressed needing guidance from the City Councilmembers serving on this Committee regarding the off-Main Street parking project.

Committee Member Hawks inquired if the Spanish Valley multi-use pathway project includes connecting from the Colorado River to 500 West. She asked if that portion has a plan and a budget created by the City. Committee Member Clapper said the current project plans to connect the Spanish Valley pathway to Mill Creek. UDOT Region 4 Traffic Operations Engineer Dowell said the path from 500 West to the Colorado River already exists. He said the path will be extended to the Moab Rock Shop and then cross the highway at the Hawk light to Emma Boulevard.

Committee Chair Wells said the Committee needs to focus their time on the project that is still in its infancy in terms of a concept and the cost associated with it.

Grand County Community and Economic Development Director Levine reported that he is resigning effective August 7. Committee Chair Wells inquired who will take the reins on the regional transportation plan. Community and Economic Development Director Levine said the transition planning will be determined by the County Council's and his supervisor's preferences. He said City Engineer Williams and Grand County Road Supervisor Jackson will need to play larger roles in the plan. He said the County has a consultant facilitating the process, but the County may request additional staff support. He said Planning Director Shepard has worked with City Engineer Williams on the plan as well.

Framework Update

Discussion: Committee Chair Wells reviewed the process framework document. He said, given the timeframe, a focus group will need to work outside of the public meetings on the design for the off-Main Street parking. He said the focus group will bring updates to the Committee in the first two meetings in July. He said the Main Street improvements modeling will be run through mid-August. He said late August will be the final project selection and ranking.

Committee Member Duncan provided a brief history on the Emma Boulevard dispersed parking project. He said there has been an unofficial right-of-way through one church's parking lot to the businesses on Main Street, but that is going away. He said that, even if UDOT funds a parking lot at the top end of Emma Boulevard, people will need to walk several blocks from the parking lot around to the businesses on Main Street.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton stated a conflict-of-interest regarding Emma Boulevard and that she will refrain from those discussions.

Off-Main Street Parking Concept Presentation by Committee Member Wes Shannon, President of the Downtown Main Street Alliance

Discussion: Committee Chair Wells requested the Committee keep in mind a way to merge City staff's work with the Downtown Main Street Alliance's work. Committee Member Shannon introduced Downtown Main Street Alliance Member Hancock as the presenter. Hancock reported owning land downtown at 44 West 200 North and 72 West 200 North. Committee Chair Wells asked Hancock to give a brief introduction about himself. Hancock stated having a first class honours degree in engineering and a master's degree in commerce and finance. He stated spending twenty years in aviation. He reported having a transportation background, but he does not have a background in road transportation. He reported reviewing the Hotspot funding legislation in full and there were a few takeaways: multimodal transportation projects are acceptable, projects that have a significant economic development impact associated with recreation and tourism, and projects that address congestion mitigation are prioritized. He said the Downtown Main Street Alliance considers the congestion between 200 North and 200 South on Main Street is due to the popularity of the businesses. He said diminishing the popularity to improve congestion is economically damaging. He said one of the Downtown Main Street Alliance's proposals is to expand into the side streets which are already zoned for commercial activity to manage some of the congestion issues. He said a complete street approach supports multimodal transportation options that prioritize all road users. He stated providing additional parking is necessary, but it needs to create desirable spaces that work. He said the U.S. Department of Transportation has complete street concepts for other cities that prioritize road users in the following order: pedestrians, transit, cyclists, and motor vehicles. He said the Downtown Main Street Alliance does not agree that the side streets require two turning lanes and one lane for through traffic. He reviewed the parking on East Center Street and agreed the template does not work for other locations. He said the existing parking spaces downtown need the widths standardized and reduced. He said the compact parking spaces are a great idea. He said another type of parking to consider is perpendicular parking. He shared photographs of multiple other cities with different parking designs. He stated reviewing national design codes and guides. He said the book "Achieving Multimodal Networks: Applying Design Flexibility and Reducing Conflicts" is a valuable resource. He said the Economic Development Director of the City of Lancaster in California has been extremely helpful. He said the Lancaster template could work well on East Center Street and West 100 North to create additional parking spaces. He said East 100 North could add spaces by using median parking from the Lancaster template. He showed a spreadsheet with various templates that could add 156 spaces on the side streets downtown. He said the UDOT Active Transportation Policy prioritizes the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and other active transportation users.

Committee Member Duncan inquired if Hancock would release the slides that show additional parking spaces and the templates used. Hancock said he is more than willing to release his document. Committee Member Guzman-Newton thanked Hancock for his presentation. Committee Chair Wells thanked Hancock for the time put into the presentation.

Community and Economic Development Director Levine said the complete streets designs that were presented are what the City and the community are interested in moving towards. He inquired if UDOT feels these designs fit the Hotspot funding. Aldridge said the concept of developing parking on city streets fits the mold of the Hotspot funding. He said UDOT would be focused on if the cost per stall is similar or less than the previous cost per stall of the parking structure. He agreed that design should come after the appeal to the Transportation Commission. He said it should be a concept and a concept-level estimate to be approved by the Transportation Commission. Levine said if the cost analysis ends up slightly more expensive but has a greater level of support and projections for improved economic outcomes that exceed those of the parking structure, then it should be given due consideration. Aldridge said it will all be evaluated.

Committee Chair Wells asked Committee Member Shannon and Hancock what the potential number of spaces would be based on the initial assessments. He said the goal for the original parking structure was 180 parking spaces. Hancock said that target could easily be met depending on how the different users of the streets are prioritized. He said that, in the blocks he has analyzed, he was able to get 156 additional parking spaces.

Committee Member Jones inquired if the off-Main Street parking would be perceived as the facilitation of the removal of Main Street parking. Community and Economic Development Director Levine asked if the Downtown Main Street Alliance would be content with this as a mitigation strategy for removing Main Street parking. Committee Member Shannon said the existence of the Downtown Main Street Alliance is because of Main Street parking removal. He said their stance is no removal of Main Street parking. He said preparation needs to be made for the potential removal of Main Street parking, even though it is unknown if the parking will be removed. Community and Economic Development Director Levine said the complete streets design presented by Hancock is trying to support downtown economies and he believes that is the direction to move towards, even if it does not achieve Hotspot funding or UDOT's approval.

Committee Member Duncan said it may be necessary to expand the scope another block further East of 100 East. He said he would like to scope out the basics and report back on the total number of potential parking spaces. He said he does not want to wait for a consultant to research the potential parking spaces. Committee Chair Wells said it sounds like Committee Member Duncan is volunteering to participate in the focus group.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton said there needs to be community outreach. Committee Member Jones said that, due to the tight timeframe, the pre-funding work needs to focus on establishing the minimum number of parking stalls that are needed to secure funding. He said after that, greater resources can be utilized for thorough public engagement and design elements.

Discussion of Off-Main Street Parking Project Work Plan & Scope of Work

Discussion: Committee Chair Wells stated this document is a product of the City engineering department. Assistant Engineer Jolissaint said this work plan was created as a jumping-off point, but the details have not been hashed out yet. Committee Chair Wells said he wanted to give the Committee the opportunity to reach a consensus on how to move forward with the project. Committee Member Duncan said he likes the three levels for the parking design alternatives.

Committee Member Jones shared the work plan with his edits. He said three conceptual designs are not necessary, because there are not many differences between level one and level two. He said it needs to be clear that we are willing to use smaller stall dimensions. He said not investing in a lot of concrete at this stage and instead working with the existing pavement will help keep costs down. Assistant Engineer Jolissaint agreed that level one does not achieve a lot of additional spaces because it does not include median parking. He said more could be achieved with narrow parking spaces, narrow travel lanes, and striping the medians.

Committee Chair Wells said there has been discussion regarding forming a focus group or subcommittee comprised of Committee members and staff to focus on the work plan and start to execute a concept design and budget. He said there cannot be more than three Committee members on the focus group, or it will constitute a quorum. He proposed having Committee Members Jones, Duncan, and Shannon serve on the focus group. He proposed Grand County Community and Economic Development Director Levine and City engineering staff be part of the focus group as well. He said the focus group could review Committee Member Jones' edited version of the work plan and the Downtown Main Street Alliance's presentation; then they could find a way to merge the two plans together. He said the focus group needs to start meeting as much as possible, and these will not be public meetings.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton inquired if Hancock could also be a part of the focus group. Assistant City Manager Castle said Hancock does not have an official role on this Committee and, for the sake of transparency, he would need to complete a conflict of interest form. She expressed concern regarding one specific stakeholder getting such a big say in the process and that it is not being opened up to other stakeholders or people who are interested. She suggested Hancock and Committee Member Shannon collaborating and then having Committee Member Shannon present the ideas to the focus group during their meetings. Committee Member Guzman-Newton expressed concern about the loss of time due to the back-and-forth if Hancock is not part of the focus group. She said the work that Hancock has done has produced more than the Committee has. Assistant City Manager Castle said she is ensuring the integrity of the process; if the Committee can vouch for Hancock's participation in the focus group, then it is defensible. Committee Member Shannon agreed that he could present the ideas from the Downtown Main Street Alliance, which would include Hancock's contributions. Committee Member Jones said Hancock might be better able to respond during meetings since he has familiarized himself with codes and design examples. Committee Chair Wells and Committee Member Shannon agreed. Committee Member Hawks said she is impressed with the amount of work done by Hancock and she would love to have him continue to be involved. She said the Committee and focus group are allowed to engage people with expertise in the process. She said the Committee's responsibility is to create the best plans possible and then present them to the community for everyone to provide input. She said it is appropriate to include Hancock in the focus group. Committee Member Duncan said he would love to have Hancock and Assistant City Manager Castle involved in the focus group.

Committee Chair Wells asked Assistant City Manager Castle to coordinate with the selected Committee Members to schedule a focus group meeting as soon as possible.

Discussion Regarding Previous Dispersed Parking Projects/Main Street Improvements and Possible Action Item Regarding Emma Boulevard

Discussion: Committee Chair Wells inquired if the Emma Boulevard dispersed parking project needs to be discussed by UDOT and the City, or if it is something the Committee should be involved in. Aldridge said UDOT does not view Emma Boulevard as a separate effort. He said the Committee and the City are responsible to make a recommendation on a concept for the project. He said it is clear that UDOT will not participate in building the City street, but they

could pay for the paving of the parking areas. He said there is funding available and the Committee, community, and the City can decide what concepts to propose.

Committee Chair Wells inquired if the Committee is interested in seeing a concept/overview of the Emma Boulevard project as a first step to potentially include it in the list of recommendations for UDOT on September 1.

Committee Member Jones recalled the previous discussions of this project being pretty contentious. Committee Member Duncan said the last meeting about this project involved many stakeholders and he is unclear what was decided. Assistant City Manager Castle said there was a really productive meeting with about 60 stakeholders prior to COVID-19. She said there is a workable scenario from an engineering perspective that would create about 20 parking spaces. She said it felt like there was support for one of the scenarios after that meeting.

Committee Member Duncan said he is unsure about the Emma Boulevard project meeting the cost per stall criteria and if the walking distance to the businesses will be acceptable. Committee Member Jones suggested City staff discuss with key stakeholders to confirm if the project has support from the community. Assistant City Manager Castle said the City could try reaching out to the stakeholders. Committee Member Guzman-Newton said members of the community have stated that something is better than nothing.

Committee Chair Wells asked Aldridge if UDOT would view the additional parking from the Emma Boulevard project as a contribution to the total additional parking created by the off-Main Street parking project. Aldridge said, if the Committee feels the project is a benefit to the community and will provide parking opportunities for that portion of the community, then it does fit the definition of dispersed parking. He said if it is cost effective to provide that parking and there's a benefit to it, then it can be reasonably included. He said the potential for 160 additional parking spaces is very intriguing, and the fact that the parking is dispersed around town should help with the capacity issue. He said the additional parking will help address the challenges of Main Street and capacity. He said if the proposal is well-developed then it will be a benefit to the community from a congestion perspective.

Committee Chair Wells said there will be a follow up with the Committee regarding the Emma Boulevard project.

Aldridge requested the focus group look at a pedestrian plan. He said that, if parking is substantially increased, then it will bring a substantial increase of pedestrians to the downtown area.

Committee Member Guzman-Newton inquired who is involved in the focus group. Committee Chair Wells said the focus group includes Committee Members Jones, Duncan, and Shannon, as well as Levine from the County and City engineering staff. He said City staff will figure out how to include Hancock in the focus group. Committee Member Duncan inquired if there is a restriction regarding having Hancock as a consultant if he is not a formal member of the focus group. Committee Chair Wells said that can be decided at the first focus group meeting. Committee Member Guzman-Newton requested that a member of the City planning department be included in the focus group. Assistant City Manager Castle agreed.

Scheduling the Next Meeting

No discussion was held on this item.

Adjournment: Committee Chair Wells adjourned the meeting at 4:40 PM.